DID JOHANN SEBASTIAN BACH
WRITE THE SIX CELLO SUITES?

Martin W B Jarvis

Faculty of Law Business & Arts
Charles Darwin University

Thesis

For the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Dedicated to my wife Erna

Johann Sebastian Bach seated at the Organ

1 Engraving by I.C. Dehuë
DECLARATION

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. I hereby certify that the work embodied in this thesis has not already been accepted in substance for any degree, and is not being currently submitted in candidature for any other degree.

Martin W B Jarvis

30. vi. 07

0-0-0-0-0-0-0
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In undertaking this thesis I have been most fortunate to have as my Supervisor, Associate Professor Nicholas Routley, PhD Camb MA MusB, from Sydney University. I am most grateful to him for his expertise, invaluable advice and encouragement, particularly over the period of the writing up of the research where his guidance in academic writing style was crucial. I am also most grateful to internationally renowned forensic scientist and document examiner Dr Bryan Found BSc, GradDipEd, GradDipNeurosci, PhD, RFP (ANZFSS) who provided me with assistance and advice in the preparation of the Forensic Document Examination aspect of this thesis. My thanks also go to my Associate Supervisor, Professor David Carment, for his enthusiasm and interest in my research as well as very valuable advice.

Others who have provided assistance are:

**Professor Yo Tomita**, ‘The Bach Bibliography’ at Queen’s University Belfast, for much advice and direction over the past years and for giving me unlimited access to his library of facsimile manuscripts

**Robyn Maynard**, sociologist/historian at Charles Darwin University, for much assistance with feminist literature and social history

**Clemens Brenneis and Ute Nawroth** part of the music staff at Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin Preussischer Kulturbesitz for granting me the privilege of examining the original manuscript of the 1725 *Klavierbüchlein*

**Professor Robert L Marshall**, formerly of Brandeis University USA, for his correspondence and interest in my research

**Emeritus Professor Alan Powell** for his encouragement, advice and interest in my project

**Suzanne Eggleston Lovejoy** Irving S. Gilmore Music Library Yale University Library for the privilege of examining the 1720 *Clavier-büchlein vor Wilhelm Friedemann Bach*

**Professor Jay Gitlin**, Yale University, for interest in my research and for organising my seminar at Yale

**Professor Robert Levin**, Harvard University, for arranging access for me to examine the manuscript of the 1713 *Perpetual Canon for 4 Voices* at the Houghton Library

**Trish Doyle, Anja Behlmer** for their assistance with the German language

**Barbara Rabbett MA**, for assistance with French linguistics and proof reading

**Clare and Melvyn Kaufman**, for their general assistance, advice and support

**Barbara Cotton** and the Charles Darwin University Inter-library loan staff, for their resourcefulness and patient assistance

**Glenda Snyder**, special thanks for her enthusiasm and assistance on a day-to-day basis with tracking manuscripts and other texts
ARTICLES PUBLISHED OR SUBMITTED BASED ON THIS RESEARCH

2006, *Stringendo* “Strange to my Ears - The Anna Magdalena Bach Cello Suites?” Vol 28 no. 1


2003, *Stringendo* “Did J S Bach Compose the Cello Suites’ Part 2 (Morphological Study)” Vol 25 no. 1


ABSTRACT

A manuscript of the Six Cello Suites in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian Bach has never been found. All that is known to exist from the 18th Century are four manuscripts of the Cello Suites, in the handwriting of a number of scribes (more than four); some of these scribes, such as Johann Peter Kellner, are known and some are anonymous. These ‘four sources’, as they are commonly known, have been used, in the absence of any supposed missing manuscript of Johann Sebastian Bach, to produce the very many printed editions of the Cello Suites that have been published since the first half of the 19th Century. Mainly because of the wide range of conflicting editorial approaches and decisions that have been made in each new edition, argument continually surrounds both the interpretation of the Cello Suites, and the filiations of the ‘four sources’ to each other.

Such disagreement, particularly regarding the interpretation of the works, raises many questions about the Cello Suites. Although the titlepages of both the manuscripts from the 1720s state that the Cello Suites were composed by Johann Sebastian Bach, it is possible that they were not, in fact, written by him. This issue forms the main focus of this thesis.

To seek an answer to this question of authorship, and to assist in the investigation of the scribal attributions, both of the Cello Suites and other manuscripts, as well as investigating the filiations of the ‘four sources’, the scientific principles and techniques of Forensic Document Examination have been invoked. This is, as far as the author is aware, the first time that such a scientific methodology has been applied in the context of manuscript studies. This thesis presents the findings of that Forensic Document Examination, in tandem with the results of the application of more conventional musicological techniques of authentication and dating of manuscripts. The conclusions drawn from the investigation challenge the traditional view of who the scribes of a number of manuscripts were, and show that there is valid reason to question the authorship of the Cello Suites, and indeed other works normally ascribed to Johann Sebastian Bach.
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INTRODUCTION
INTRODUCTION

The canons are falling

One by one

Including “le célèbre” of Pachelbel

The final movement of Frank’s sonata for piano and violin…John Ashbery²

Bach the supreme cantor, the creative servant of the Word of God, the staunch Lutheran, is a legend. It will have to be buried along with all the other traditional and beloved romantic illusions…Friedrich Blume³

1. PREAMBLE - A NEW HYPOTHESIS ON THE ORIGINS OF THE SIX CELLO SUITES - RESEARCH BACKGROUND

In 2001, I began a study of some of the facsimile manuscripts of Johann Sebastian Bach. This was prompted by the publication, in the year 2000, of the Facsimile Edition of Bach’s Six Cello Suites by Bärenreiter, and edited by Bettina Schwemer & Douglas Woodfull-Harris.

Since my student days at the Royal Academy of Music in London, in the early 1970s, I have been intrigued by the compositional origins of the Cello Suites. I was informed, at the time, that there was no original manuscript of the Suites, only a copy made by Anna Magdalena Bach.⁴ (See Figure 1) On receiving the Facsimile Edition, I immediately made comparisons between it and the facsimile manuscript of the Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas that I had already in my possession.

⁴ Throughout the rest of this thesis, unless quoting others, I shall refer to Johann Sebastian Bach as Johann Sebastian and similarly Anna Magdalena Bach as Anna Magdalena.
Even at this early point of my investigations, though I was not comparing like with like, so to speak, I was struck by what appeared to be the remarkable similarity of the music-calligraphy in both.

Figure 1 The title page of the Schwanenberger manuscript containing the *Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas* and the *Six Cello Suites* in Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy (Circa 1727)\(^5\).

The Neue Bach Ausgabe became my next source, particularly ‘Die Notenschrift Johann Sebastian Bachs’\(^6\). I quickly became aware of what I perceived as a problem with the accepted understanding of the relationship between the manuscripts that I had examined, and believed a new approach was called for to resolve the conundrums thrown up by my enquiries.

---


As a result of my desire to find answers, I made contact, through the Northern Territory Police Forensic Laboratory, with the Victoria Police Forensic Science Centre and was introduced to renowned Forensic Document Examiner Dr Bryan Found, who is based at La Trobe University. Dr Found offered to instruct me in the use of Forensic Document Examination techniques, and since that time in late 2001, I have made a study of this field of scientific endeavour, and have applied these methods and principles to the manuscripts and writings of Anna Magdalena and Johann Sebastian.

The results of my research suggest that there is a need to re-evaluate the role of Anna Magdalena in Johann Sebastian’s musical output. For example, there is evidence that suggests that Anna Magdalena’s handwriting and music-calligraphy are present in the 1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann Bach. (See Chapter III)

In addition to the Forensic Document Examination, a comparative study of the Cello Suites with the other suites and partitas attributed to Johann Sebastian was undertaken. This revealed a large number of ambiguities that appear to challenge the accepted authorship of the Six Cello Suites.

---

7 Throughout this thesis ‘Forensic Document Examination’ will be written with capital letters
8 The results of my research have been validated by Dr Found.
2. BACH AND THE CANON OF WESTERN MUSIC

Johann Sebastian holds a unique place in the Canon of Western Music and he is often described as the …Father of the Baroque.\(^9\) Since 1950, the beginning of contemporary Bach scholarship, much work has been undertaken by such as Blume, Dadelsen, Dürr, Emmery, Eppstein, Marshall, Schulenberg, Schulze, Williams and Wolff, to name but only a few, to shed light on the musical output and life of surely one of the truly …supreme artistic figures of modern history.\(^10\) Of course, wearing such a heavy mantle as the …Father of the Baroque has meant that Johann Sebastian’s life and work, until very much more recent times,\(^11\) has possibly not received the type of critical examination to which others, such as Mozart, have been subjected.\(^12\) This has meant that there are received histories of some works that have yet to be fully, and objectively, tested.

In order to seek the truth about both Johann Sebastian and his music, it is very important to be able to look at his works in a dispassionate manner; for it would appear that much of what has been received about both him and his music has more often than not been transmitted canonically rather than critically. The great Bach scholar Robert L Marshall in his criticism of Christoph Wolff’s book ‘Johann Sebastian Bach - The Learned Musician’ in the New York Review, June 2000, says that Wolff’s book …*can be seen as the capstone of a long tradition of musical*

---

\(^9\) See Mary Nemet’s comment below


\(^{11}\) Peter Williams. *The Life of Bach*. (UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004) and Chapter I in this thesis

biography – a fundamentally nineteenth-century heroic tradition. It is time now to bring Bach biography into the twentieth-century – not to mention the twenty-first. 13

Further, on the subject of humanising Johann Sebastian, Marshall states:

...There may even be a reluctance to appear to be attempting to topple the great man from his pedestal by investigating ("exposing") his temper, his taste in humour, his obsessions, his resentments, his human frailties - in brief, his humanity. Needless to say, there is no need to fear such a thing. Bach's exalted position upon that metaphorical pedestal, thanks to the unchallenged, almost incomprehensible magnitude of his achievement, is unassailable. The hope here, rather, is that the figure atop the pedestal be formed out of something less like marble and more like flesh and blood.14

3. A SUMMARY OF THE MUSICAL OUTPUT OF JOHANN SEBASTIAN

The works by Johann Sebastian are often divided into three general periods: his early works to 1717, the Cöthen period of 1717 to 1723 and his work after his move to Leipzig in 1723 until his death in 1750. His work prior to the 1717 move to Cöthen, in very general terms, is of music for the church.15 The period at Cöthen sees the production of secular instrumental music as the focus. His output after the move to Leipzig is of larger scale works and keyboard repertoire. Clearly there were reasons, stimuli or demands on his time that changed Johann Sebastian’s musical interests and

14 Marshall, 2000: 520
15 Marshall states that according to Blume, …Bach had seen himself, and had to be seen by posterity, above all as a secular composer...who only reluctantly spent most of his creative life in the service of the church (Marshall, 2000: 498)
that brought about shifts in his musical stylistic output. What were those demands or stimuli?

There is certainly plenty of evidence to show that the nature of Johann Sebastian’s early employment matched the type of musical output produced, whether that was at Lüneburg, Arnstadt, Mühlhausen or Weimar. In very general terms, this was church-based music, and was exactly the kind of music expected from him as an organist and as Concert Master.16

...All we know for certain is that he must have been a master of organ-playing and organ composition, in Weimar in 1703, and then in Arnstadt and Mühlhausen. But is it right to assume that he had any special fondness for the organ? The fact that he was a tremendous executant [sic], virtuoso and

16 See Christoph Wolff, *J S Bach The Learned Musician*. (New York: Norton, 2000): 148, and Peter Williams, *The Life of Bach*. (UK: Cambridge University Press, 2004): 63. It is worth pointing out, that the ‘received’ understanding is that Johann Sebastian Bach was a violinist of some considerable ability. However, there is no material/physical evidence that this was the case. The only known reference that Johann Sebastian Bach played the violin was made by Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, in one of his letters to Johann Nicholas Forkel towards the end of 18th Century, see Chapter I Literature Review. However, when Johann Sebastian Bach, around 1735, …put down a bare outline of his professional career for a family Genealogy (Wolff, 2000: 2) he made no mention of his violin playing in any form (see below)


(1) Court Musician, in Weimar, to Duke Johann Ernst, Anno 1703;
(2) Organist at the New Church in Arnstadt, 1704;
(3) Organist at the Church of St Blasius in Mühlhausen, Anno 1707
(4) Chamber and Court Organist in Weimar, Anno 1708;
(5) Concert Master as well, at the same Court, Anno 1714;
(6) Capellmeister and Director of Chamber Music at the Court of the Serene Prince of Anhalt Cöthen, Anno 1717
(7) Was called hence, Anno 1723, to become Music Director and Cantor at St Thomas School, in Leipzig; where, in accordance with God’s Holy Will, he still lives and at the same time holds the honorary position of Capellmeister of Weissenfels and Cöthen.

We might be tempted to consider that his mention of Concert Master was an oblique reference to violin playing (see Wolff, 2000: 148), and to see it as the same as the contemporary function of Concert Master, that is to say, as Principal Violinist in an orchestra. However, this was not the case at Weimar, where the title was given to Johann Sebastian Bach for status reasons only – his duty statement makes no mention of violin playing, but mentions only organ playing, taking rehearsals and, by inference, composing. See also Peter Williams, 2004, on this subject. Finally, whilst there are many known composition/keyboard students of Johann Sebastian Bach (see Wolff, Christoph. (ed.) *NewBach Reader*. (NBR) (New York: Norton, 1998): 315 – 317) there is no known violin pupil of his, which seems at odds with idea that he was a renowned violinist.
technician, miles above all his contemporaries, predecessors and successors, does not necessarily mean that the organ was more to him than an instrument on which to develop his skill. Was Bach particularly attached to the organ? Hardly. His last official post as organist was the Mühlhausen appointment, which he gave up in 1708 when he was only twenty-three. In Weimar his duties were partly those of organist and partly those of the court musician. From 1716 - 17 he never had any further official connection with the organ whatever. He taught the organ, improvised, gave recitals, played for friends and important personages, tested and adjudicated on organs, but was never again a church organist. If Bach had felt a fundamental affinity with the organ he would certainly not have found it difficult to obtain one of the important organ posts of which there was still such an abundance in Germany. There is, however, no evidence that he ever made any effort to obtain such a post.\footnote{Blume 1963: 217}

However at Cöthen his role changed completely. 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. There is no doubt that the music that Johann Sebastian wrote at Cöthen, and shortly afterwards, is principally responsible for his position in the canon. Blume argues convincingly that Johann Sebastian saw himself principally as a secular composer.\footnote{Ibid. 214 - 227}
4. A BRIEF RECEPTION HISTORY OF THE SIX CELLO SUITES

It would surely be no exaggeration to suggest that the Six Cello Suites (see Figure 2) attributed to Johann Sebastian, form a pillar of the Baroque repertoire for cellists and violists alike. No musical manuscript for the cello, dating from that period in music history, compares in any way with the Six Cello Suites. Their importance to the cello repertoire, therefore, cannot be overstated.

A full investigation of the filiations and transmission of the four handwritten Sources\(^\text{19}\) of the Cello Suites forms a central part of this thesis. The following is a brief summary of their ‘reception history’ through the centuries since their composition. The first part of this reception history is based on the work of Hans Eppstein in the ‘NBA Kritischer Bericht’, Sechs Suiten für Violoncello solo (Kassel

\(^\text{19}\) See Hans Eppstein, Sechs Suiten für Violoncello Solo BWV1007 – 1012. NBA Vol. 6, No. 2, (Kassel u.a.: Bärenreiter, 1990)
u.a.: Bärenreiter, 1990); this represents the generally accepted position and forms the basis for Schwemer & Woodfull Harris in their Bärenreiter edition.

4.1 The 18th Century

It is not known when, or for whom, or why the *Six Cello Suites* were composed. Traditionally, it is said that they were in existence by 1726. Since handwritten copies of the *Six Cello Suites* exist that are approximately dated from the latter part of the 18th Century, it can be assumed that the *Cello Suites* were performed throughout the period, though how often they were played is unknown.

4.2 The 19th Century

The *Six Cello Suites* were first published under the title ‘Six Sonates ou Etudes Pour Le Violoncelle Solo Composées Par J. Sebastien Bach Oeuvre Posthume’\(^20\) in Paris in 1824. One Pierre Norblin claimed to have *discovered the manuscript of the cello suites in Germany after a long search.*\(^21\)

Though Robert Schumann did make an arrangement of them with piano accompaniment,\(^22\) it seems that they disappeared from the cello repertoire sometime during the late 19th Century. Why cellists apparently abandoned them, and why they were not considered, as the *Violin Sonatas & Partitas* were for violinists, an important part of the cellists’ repertoire is unknown. Part of the answer to that question might well be found in the title of the first printed edition mentioned above. Labelled as

\(^{20}\) Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 5
\(^{21}\) Ibid.
\(^{22}\) Benjamin Chee *It is quite remarkable, even unbelievable, when one considers that the Bach cello suites were once considered by no less august a personage as Robert Schumann as "incomplete". Schumann even went so far as to provide piano accompaniments for these pieces -* http://inkpot.com/classical/bachvcmc.html* (accessed 26 August 2006)
...Etudes, they may have been considered as lesser music. This was certainly partly
the case, as Casals found out.23

The Six Cello Suites were, apparently, ‘rediscovered’ by Pablo Casals in 1890 when
he was around 14 years old. He and his father, it is said, came across a copy in a
music shop. ...Casals discovered that, if they were played at all, the Bach Suites had
been used as academic, technical exercises...For the next twelve years he worked on
them in seclusion...at the beginning of his career he began to introduce them into his
recital programmes...he performed them on many hundreds of occasions, he never
approached them without reverence, humility – and even fear.24 Casals’ 12 year long
study of the Cello Suites, prior to performance, begs the question: why did it take him
so long to make musical sense of them?25 The Six Cello Suites, being ostensibly by
Johann Sebastian, should have been reasonably easy for Casals to interpret, simply by
drawing on his knowledge and prior experience of Johann Sebastian’s other music.26
What was it about their composition that made interpretation so difficult?

If indeed, the Cello Suites were considered to be lesser music,...academic, technical
exercises, as described above, this would go a long way to explaining why they fell
from favour. Perhaps they were perceived as not grandiose enough for 19th Century
taste. This highlights, once again, the musical comparison between the works for the
violin and the works for the cello.

24 Ibid.
25 Curiously, the long delay before performing the Cello Suites cannot be said of performers of the
Violin Sonatas & Partitas.
26 It is most likely that Casals had a knowledge of a reasonable amount of Johann Sebastian’s music
including the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas and the Brandenburg Concertos
4.3 The 20th Century

During the course of the 20th Century, the *Six Cello Suites* became established as a very significant part of the cello repertoire and, in addition, a very important set of works for violists and other instrumentalists too. Dimitry Markevitch27 in his article ‘The Recent Editions of the Bach Cello Suites’28 claimed to have 61 editions of the *Six Cello Suites* in his library and stated that, since Louis Norblin in 1824, some 93 editions/versions of the *Cello Suites* had been published. It is extremely important to stress that these different editions vary substantially one from another, both in terms of their articulations (bowings) and, much more significantly, in the notes themselves. Considerable polemic is engendered as each new version is published.29  Cellist Uzi Wiesel,30 concerning the large number of versions of the *Cello Suites*, offers the following advice:

...The Bach [Cello Suites] I heard in Paris [were] played in a jungle of styles - probably reflecting the vast number of editions and the influences of individual teachers and artists...young, talented players are inheriting some mistakes and misunderstandings. To prevent these, and avoid turning them into études in self-expression, it is advisable to study all four original copies.31

---

27 The late Dimitry Markevitch, was publisher of the *Six Cello Suites* edition in 1964, and discoverer of the Westphal manuscripts of the *Cello Suites*. [http://www.cello.org/Newsletter/Articles/markevitch.htm](http://www.cello.org/Newsletter/Articles/markevitch.htm)


30 Uzi Wiesel was born in Tel Aviv, Israel. After graduating with honours from the Academy of Music in Tel Aviv, he went to the *Juilliard School* in New York, where he studied with Felix Salmond and Bernard Greenhouse, and was awarded the highest prize from the school upon his graduation. He was awarded the Piatigorsky prize in 1953, and a year later, he began studies with the great Pablo Casals in Prades, France. [http://www.music.indiana.edu/som/ehmccf/honorees/wiesel.html](http://www.music.indiana.edu/som/ehmccf/honorees/wiesel.html)

31 The four standard Sources as given by Eppstein in the ‘Sechs Suiten Für Violoncello Solo Faksimile-Belband Zum Kritischen Bericht Serie VI – Band 2’
and the lute version. However, being a purist and sticking to one version, such as Anna Magdalena’s, can result in strange playing (to my ears).³²

There can be little doubt that the many editions have caused, and continue to cause, much debate among cellists. Paul Tortelier, the great French Cellist, was so determined to deal with this issue, that his editorial notes contain lengthy advice on the matter of interpretation, even to the point of adding … supplementary signs³³ to assist with the process.

Why is this so? Why should there be a need for so many different versions of the Six Cello Suites? What is it about the Bach Cello Suites that makes them, according to the great contemporary cellist Yo-Yo Ma, …considered by many to be the most challenging of the solo repertoire?³⁴ One possible explanation is that they were not actually composed by Johann Sebastian.

5. ANNA MAGDALENA’S ROLE AND HANDWRITING (MUSIC-CALLIGRAPHY)

With respect to the Cello Suites, Anna Magdalena is traditionally understood to have been the most important copyist of them.³⁵ It is believed that some time around 1727 she made a copy from a now lost, or no longer extant, fair-copy in Johann Sebastian’s hand.³⁶ (See also Chapter I)

³³ See some of Paul Tortelier’s editorial notes in the Stainer & Bell Edition 1983 given in Appendix F
³⁵ Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 6
³⁶ Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 6
It is commonly accepted that Anna Magdalena Wilcken\textsuperscript{37} moved to Cöthen sometime around the second half of 1720, and that Johann Sebastian had met Anna Magdalena some time prior to that.\textsuperscript{38} It is also believed that Johann Sebastian may have been directly responsible for Anna Magdalena Wilcken’s employment at the Cöthen Court.\textsuperscript{39} If that was the case, it would seem likely that they had a musical relationship for some substantial period\textsuperscript{40} before Anna Magdalena arrived at the Court. If indeed they did have a close professional association over an extended period prior to Anna Magdalena’s arrival at Cöthen, this could have led Anna Magdalena to develop a music-calligraphy style which, tradition has it, is so very similar to that of Johann Sebastian that it is difficult to distinguish the one from the other. Certainly there has been much confusion caused by the supposed similarity of their music-calligraphy.\textsuperscript{41}

Figure 3 shows an excerpt from the opening bars of the \textit{E major Partita} for Unaccompanied Violin, and is a good example of the problem of attempting to distinguish their music-calligraphy, if indeed they were written by two people. The top example is attributed to Johann Sebastian and the lower one to Anna Magdalena.

The issue of the supposed similarity in their music-calligraphy forms a core part of this thesis and is fully explored in the second part of Chapter III.

\textsuperscript{37}There are a number of spellings of Anna Magdalena’s maiden-name; I will use only Wilcken, except when quoting others.


\textsuperscript{39}Ibid.

\textsuperscript{40}It will be shown in this thesis that there is a strong possibility that this was well before the traditionally accepted date of around 1720/21 and possibly back to 1713.

6. Bach Biography Since 1802

The documentation of Johann Sebastian’s life, particularly of his early years is sparse indeed. Consequently, his private life is shrouded in a kind of mystery. The fact is that much of what has been written about Johann Sebastian’s domestic situation is, at best, highly educated conjecture or to quote Blume …beloved romantic illusion.\textsuperscript{42} As Marshall puts it:

\begin{quote}
...To compound the problem for the would-be biographer, we probably know less about Bach's private life (with the possible exception of Shakespeare's) than we do about that of any of the other supreme artistic figures of modern history. The surviving documents bearing on his life, whether written by others or by Bach himself, are almost invariably "official" in character; bills, receipts, letters of application, or of appointment or resignation, letters of recommendation, complaints or reprimands to or from employers and other authorities. There are no diaries, no memoirs. Not a single letter from Bach to any of his children, or to his first wife, Maria Barbara, or his second wife, Anna Magdalena, has survived; we may assume that not many were written.\textsuperscript{43}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{42} Blume, 1963: 218.
\textsuperscript{43} Marshall, 2000: 47.
Russel Stinson goes further:

...There can be little doubt that Johann Sebastian Bach’s youth is the least understood period of his life...We know next to nothing about Bach’s musical education or about his activities as a performer during this period, and his early development as a composer is far from clear.44

Johann Nikolaus Forkel’s45 biography of Johann Sebastian ‘On J S Bach’s Life, Genius, and Work’ appeared in 1802 at a time when …the tide of nationalism was running high.46 The subtitle of the book ‘For Patriotic Admirers of True Musical Art’ lends support to the argument that a degree of idealisation was taking place and that Forkel’s intent was to present …a new hero to the people of Germany47 rather than an objective scholarly account of Johann Sebastian’s life and work. It is also important to realise that when Johann Sebastian’s second eldest son, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach (1714-1788), communicated with Forkel in the latter part of the 18th Century, he was already in his 60s. His memories of his father, particularly those from many decades earlier, must, consequently, be treated with a degree of circumspection. Joseph Kermann states: (My emphasis is in bold italic type)

…About Bach’s early years as a musician at the courts of Weimar and Cöthen, and even before that, Emanuel was happy to relay facts and stories

45 Johann Nikolaus Forkel (1749 – 1818) was a friend of C. P. E. Bach. In 1801 Forkel began to serve as adviser for Oeuvres complètes de Jean Sebastien Bach, Hoffmeister & Kühnel’s emerging series of Bach’s keyboard music. This work led to the firm’s publication, in 1802, of his important biography, Ueber Johann Sebastian Bachs Leben, Kunst und Kunstwerke, which was based on material that he had assembled for the third and last volume of the Allgemeine Geschichte. George B. Stauffer ‘Forkel, Johann Nikolaus’, Grove Music Online ed. L Macy (10.06.04) <http://www.grovemusic.com>
46 NBR, 1998: 418
47 Ibid.
that he had from his father, or that had been otherwise sanitised by family memory.\textsuperscript{48}

Mary Nemet\textsuperscript{49} describes the current situation, with regard to biographies of Bach, in the following terms:

...There are many legends about musicians and perhaps there are none more prevalent than those about J S Bach, variously portrayed as the 'Father of Baroque' (by no lesser a figure than Albert Schweitzer who described Bach as 'the climax and end of Baroque music') Many portrayals, even today, appear to be invincible and contain long-standing-clichés that brook no argument. Theologians and musicologists have often likened, if not elevated Bach to sainthood; but what was his true life like?\textsuperscript{50}

Notwithstanding the tremendous amount of excellent research that has taken place since 1950, long-standing and untested assumptions about Johann Sebastian still exist, particularly in the general community.

\textbf{7. A 21\textsuperscript{st} Century Approach}

For the first time, Forensic Document Examination techniques, a scientific methodology, have been used to examine the manuscripts of both Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena. Besides opening a door to new knowledge and understanding, these techniques have confirmed some of the findings of Bach-scholars such as Georg

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{49} Mary Nemet is one of Australia’s most accomplished violinists, a former student of Arthur Grumiaux, a prominent string educator, AMEB Examiner, Review Editor for Stringendo.
\item\textsuperscript{50} Mary Nemet “Review of ‘The True Life of J.S. Bach by Klaus Eidam” Stringendo, Vol 25, No1 (2003): 24
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
von Dadelsen and Walter Emery, with particular regard to Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy.

It is important to state at this point, that Forensic Document Examination involves the scientific study of documents and handwriting for the purpose of demonstrating authenticity or otherwise. **It must not be confused with graphology**, which is not a recognised science, and purports to offer a means of analysing the character of the writer.

In undertaking this research and in order to gain access to the original manuscripts of a number of centrally important works, I visited the State Library at Berlin, the Houghton Library at Harvard University, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University. In addition, the extensive facsimile resources of the British Library, the State Library of Berlin and the Bach Bibliography at Queen’s University Belfast were examined.

8. **GENERAL NOTES ON PRESENTATION:**

- I will use the modern German spelling ‘Klavierbüchlein’ when referring to the ‘Notebooks’; but will use the English plural form with the addition of the ‘s’.
- I have used the spelling of the movement titles as given in the manuscripts concerned.
- I have used the spelling ‘Kapelle’, except when quoting others.
- Quotations within the text are given in *italics* preceded by three dots (…) 
- I will refer to *New Bach Reader* simply as NBR
CHAPTER I

LITERATURE REVIEW
CHAPTER I

LITERATURE REVIEW

A SURVEY OF BACH BIOGRAPHY/SCHOLARSHIP
FROM FORKEL TO DATE,
WITH SPECIFIC REFERENCE TO THE SIX CELLO SUITES AND ANNA MAGDALENA BACH

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 past two centuries or so have brought many hypotheses …doing so according to fashions in biography. Peter Williams

I.1 PREAMBLE

For the most part, that which has been written about the life and work of Johann Sebastian, since Spitta in the mid-nineteenth century, has merely amplified the accepted traditions laid down by Johann Nikolaus Forkel in his biography ‘On Johann Sebastian’s Life, Genius, and Works’, published in 1802, that is to say, each subsequent biographer has assumed a supportive position in regard to Forkel’s basic story of the life and work of Johann Sebastian - more or less without question.

---

51 Williams, 2004: 196/197.
53 NBR, 1998: 418
54 See Blume, 1963: 214
challenging this apparent lack of critical perspective of some of the more recent biographies of Johann Sebastian, Peter Williams puts it thus:

…there is no attempt to see what Philipp Emanuel’s agenda might have been both in the Obituary and elsewhere, nor in the assumptions made in the first biography (Forkel 1802, a book more typical of its time and place than of J S Bach’s). 55

The fact that it has taken so long to challenge the content of the ‘Obituary’ is in itself of interest as, according to Emeritus Professor of History Alan Powell at Charles Darwin University:

...Such a document as an obituary, certainly if written by a family member, as in this case, should have been analysed and challenged immediately, as its author clearly has a strong self-interest in what is written. It seems odd to me, as a professional historian that it has taken essentially two centuries for this to occur. 56

Whilst much important detail has been added to the body of knowledge of Johann Sebastian’s life and work since Forkel, there are still very many gaps in the received knowledge of one of the most important figures in the history of music, and there has been a tendency to fill these gaps with conjecture, albeit highly educated conjecture. As Robert L Marshall puts it (My emphasis in bold italic type):

---

56  Professor Powell, personal communication, 18.5.05
...Although we have now reached the point in Bach research where, in effect, the last scribe and the last watermark have been traced, catalogued, and assimilated, we are left with countless unanswered questions regarding the fundamentals: **chronology and even authenticity**. We still know next to nothing, for example, except in the very broadest terms, about when most of Bach's instrumental compositions were written.  

The purpose of this review, then, is to establish what the received understanding is of Johann Sebastian’s compositions and work methods, with specific reference to both the *Six Cello Suites* and Anna Magdalena, and the connection, if any, between them. In undertaking this, the fact remains, however, that *Bach suffers from under documentation*.  

This Literature Review centres round the major biographies of Johann Sebastian, from Forkel forwards. It also reviews, as apposite to the theme of this thesis, the most recent studies of aspects of Johann Sebastian’s life and work. Also included are materials from the New Bach Reader (NBR) as well as other relevant material. I have presented discussion of the references to the *Six Cello Suites* first, then those that refer to Anna Magdalena; I have also included, towards the end of the Literature Review, a summary of material relating the handwriting of both Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena and material relating to three other significant texts, i.e. the three *Klavierbüchleins* (1720, 1722, and 1725) written for Wilhelm Friedemann Bach and Anna Magdalena Bach.

---

My reason for choosing this approach is to build a picture of the attitudes to both Anna Magdalena and the *Six Cello Suites* from the earliest accounts. I believe this will show that much of what has been written in more recent times has been based on assumptions made by earlier biographers, rather than objective research which might challenge the received history of both.

![Figure 1. 1 Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach (centre)](image)

1.2 THE *SIX CELLO SUITES*

Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach (1714-1788) makes only two references to the *Six Cello Suites*: one in the Obituary of his Father, and the other in a letter to Johann Nikolaus Forkel, dated December 1774. It is worthy of note that Carl Philipp Emanuel was about 6 years old in 1720 when the *Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas*

---

59 A pen and wash sketch by A Stöttrup, 1874
60 NBR, 1998: 304
61 Ibid. 397
were, by tradition, completed. It is generally assumed that the *Six Cello Suites* are from roughly the same period (see below). If this is the case, it is highly unlikely that he, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, was aware of the actual composition of either group of works at the time of their writing.\textsuperscript{62}

Johann Nikolaus Forkel,\textsuperscript{63} 1802, ‘On Johann Sebastian’s Life, Genius, and Works’, clearly accepts the *Cello Suites* as a composition of Johann Sebastian, and, like many others, he pairs the works in his comments with the *Violin Sonatas & Partitas*.

\textbf{Figure 1. 2} Johann Nikolaus Forkel (1749-1818)\textsuperscript{64}

\textsuperscript{62} See Williams, 2004, for his comments and views on the Philipp Emanuel’s…agenda in the Obituary
\textsuperscript{63} …Forkel, who had been director of music at the University of Gottingen since 1779, was one of the first music historians in the true sense of the word; amongst other things he planned the publication of many great works. His biography of Bach, dedicated to Baron van Swieten and originally intended as the last part of a comprehensive "General History of Music", relies heavily on information provided by Bach’s sons, Carl Philipp Emanuel and Wilhelm Friedemann, both of whom Forkel knew personally. (Barbara Schwendowius and Wolfgang Dömling. (ed.) Johann Sebastian Bach, Life, Times, Influence. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1977: 160).
\textsuperscript{64} An anonymous engraving, from around 1800
However, he does appear to have some doubts about the musical merit of the *Cello Suites*, as his comment regarding the comparative merits of the violin works, with respect to the *Six Cello Suites*, is tinged with a slight hesitation:

> ...*For a long series of years, the violin solos were universally considered by the greatest performers on the violin as the best means to make an ambitious student a perfect master of his instrument. The solos for the violoncello are, in this respect, of equal value.*

This seems to imply a corollary, i.e. that in other respects, the *Six Cello Suites* are not of *equal value*. This slight hesitation might of course be due to the fact that Forkel had not actually heard the *Six Cello Suites* performed, or indeed the *Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas* for that matter.

In the above comments about the *Cello Suites*, Forkel appears to merely paraphrase Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach when he says,

> …*the violin solos were universally considered by the greatest performers on the violin as the best means to make an ambitious student a perfect master of his instrument. The solos for the violoncello are, in this respect, of equal value.*“

---

65 NBR, 1998: 472
66 Ibid.
This compares with Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach’s own words in one of his letters to Forkel, written in December 1774:

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.\(^68\)

Clearly, Forkel was merely repeating, and then amplifying by mentioning the Six Cello Suites, what he had been told by Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, rather than bringing any particular objectivity to the situation.

Philipp Spitta, 1889, ‘Johann Sebastian Bach’, in his detailed analysis of the Cello Suites\(^69\) points out the significant musical and structural differences between the Cello

\(^{68}\) NBR, 1998: 397
\(^{69}\) Spitta, 1879, II: 99 –101
Suites and the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, which he attributes to the different capabilities of the instruments concerned:

...In the six compositions for violoncello alone, a general character may also be perceived, which is distinct from that of the works for the violin in proportion to the difference of the instruments in readiness of expression.70

He asserts that Johann Sebastian invented the Viola Pomposa, the instrument for which the 6th Suite is believed to have been written … although it was written for the viola pomposa invented by Bach.71 He attributes many of the differences between the two works to the differences in the sonorities of the two instruments … from the deeper pitch and the fuller tone of the instrument.72

He also recognises the important structural uniqueness of the Six Cello Suites:

...Then follow[s], according to rule, the allemande, courante and sarabande, and before the concluding gigue in each case there are two intermezzos which consist in the first two suites (in G major and D minor) of minuets, in the third and fourth (in C major and E flat major) of bourrees, and in the last two (C minor and D major) of gavottes. The uniformity of design in all the suites shows, too, that the last suite is conceived of as one whole with all the rest, and hence we may include it without further remark among the violoncello solos.72

70 Ibid. 99
71 Ibid.
72 Ibid.
73 Ibid. 100
He states that *the decisive character of the dance-forms places them almost above the violin suites.*

He concludes that the *Six Cello Suites* were probably written for the Gamba-player Abel, a friend of Johann Sebastian’s. As far as the dating of the *Cello Suites* is concerned, Spitta believes that they must belong to the Cöthen period.

C Hubert Parry, 1909, ‘Johann Sebastian Bach’ has little to say about the *Six Cello Suites* save that the *regularity of order makes them conspicuous* amongst Johann Sebastian’s works. He asserts that the *Cello Suites* come from Johann Sebastian’s Cöthen period and also that Johann Sebastian invented the Viola Pomposa.

Albert Schweitzer, 1911, ‘J.S. Bach’, supports the idea that the *Six Cello Suites* come from the Cöthen period. He offers some explanation for the lack of *chord-playing* by suggesting that the cellos that were played in Germany at the time used a *non-relaxable bow*. He also observes that Johann Sebastian does not use or *even employ a simple kind of two-part polyphony* in the *Six Cello Suites*. He also asserts, repeating Parry, that Johann Sebastian invented the Viola Pomposa.

---

74 Ibid. 101
75 Ibid. 100
76 Ibid. 71
77 Parry, 1909: 119
78 Wolff, 2000: 414, suggests rather, that he might have simply made or suggested modifications to the violoncello piccolo.
80 Ibid.
81 Ibid.
82 Ibid.
Hans Vogt, 1988, ‘Johann Sebastian’s Chamber Music’, raises questions about the chamber music of Johann Sebastian in general, including authenticity, chronology and the categorisation of chamber works. He gives a comprehensive analysis of all Six *Cello Suites* and makes some very detailed comments about the Suites in general and their compositional chronology:

...It is generally assumed that Bach wrote the six solo suites for cello after the solo works for violin, because he wanted to create a complementary group for the latter. But this cannot be substantiated. In fact, Eppstein believes that it was the other way around: first came the rather modestly conceived cello works, then the boldly fashioned violin pieces - although this characterization should not be taken as a value judgment. It is beyond doubt that the two cycles were written at very nearly the same time and this is confirmed by the music. With all due caution it might be ventured that, like the keyboard inventions, the cello suites are informed by a certain didactic intent, more so than the sonatas and partitas for violin. This impression, however, may only be due to the fact that Bach evidently had to acquire a knowledge of cello technique. We know that he played the violin and the viola, but nothing is mentioned about his playing the cello.84

He also draws attention to the fact that the *Six Cello Suites* are structurally unique in Johann Sebastian’s output:

---

84 Vogt, 1981: 178
...Regarding the two Minuets, I and II, we call attention to the fact that in all the cello suites, Bach interrupts the traditional sequence of movements by inserting a pair of lighter dance movements in penultimate position, between the Sarabande and the Gigue. In the first two suites the two interpolated movements are Minuets, in suites 3 and 4 they are Bourrees, in the last two suites, they are Gavottes. These movements are all characterized by elemental rhythm and dance qualities; they are replete with the joy of making music, as if Bach took particular pleasure in working outside the "official" sequence of suite movements.85

His comments on the 4th Cello Suite identify it as unusual to a point where ... cellists seem to give this work a wide berth....86 He states that the chords, which open the Prelude, are progressively broken up ...so that it is difficult to establish the continuity.87 Further, he demonstrates the remoteness, in a key structure sense, that the composer takes the work to, by informing us of the introduction of an ...F-flat major Neapolitan Sixth88 at bar 80, needed to draw the movement to a conclusion.

In his further comments on the 4th Cello Suite, he identifies other examples of the singular nature of the Suite in question.89

Wilfred Mellers’, 1980, ‘Bach and the Dance of God’, approach to the Six Cello Suites is best exampled by his chosen title for the chapter concerned, i.e. ‘Voice and Body: Bach’s Solo Cello Suites as an Apotheosis of the Dance’. He takes the position

85 Vogt, 1981: 179
86 Ibid. 181
87 Ibid.
88 Ibid.
89 Ibid. 182
that the *Cello Suites* belong to the Cöthen period and that …They were written around 1720.\textsuperscript{90} Rather interestingly, he points out that:

...Bach cannot have been aware how radically his idea differed from that current in the eighteenth century; the evidence is simply audible in his work, and nowhere more impressively than in the suites for solo cello.\textsuperscript{91}

He adds:

...And just when his music had to be dance-oriented, he became fascinated by the technical problem of writing music for melody instruments unaccompanied.\textsuperscript{92}

This is a curious statement for a number of reasons. Firstly, it is unclear why Mellers suggests that Johann Sebastian …had to [make his music] …dance-oriented and secondly, as of the end of 1720 (a date chosen, I believe because of the date 1720 on the ‘Autograph’ of the *Violin Sonatas & Partitas*), Johann Sebastian must surely have been aware that things were changing at Cöthen and that his future relationship with the Prince would not be as it had been since his arrival in 1717. Consequently, it would be unlikely that Johann Sebastian would suddenly consider it to be an imperative to make his music …dance-oriented.

Klaus Eidam, 1999, ‘The True Life of J S Bach’, has little to say regarding the *Six Cello Suites* apart from his assertion that they come from the …amazingly abundant\textsuperscript{93}

\textsuperscript{91} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{92} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{93}
early years that Johann Sebastian spent at the Cöthen Court where he ...lavished attention on the violin and cello...;\textsuperscript{94} for after the Prince married on December 11\textsuperscript{th} 1721 ...The list of Bach’s works shows that ...Bach wrote nothing but clavier music for his own domestic use.\textsuperscript{95}

Christoph Wolff, 2000, ‘Johann Sebastian Bach – The Learned Musician’, gives probably the most thorough study of the life and work of Johann Sebastian ever published. Certainly, it is at least on a par with the works of both Spitta and Schweitzer in its length and detail.

Wolff, however, makes few references to the Six Cello Suites. Given the paucity of factual information, he, like all other biographers, is left to make statements about the musical life Johann Sebastian experienced at the Cöthen Court; mere conjecture – which he freely acknowledges.\textsuperscript{96} He dates the composition of the Cello Suites to the period at Cöthen and suggests that some of them might have come from an earlier period in Johann Sebastian’s compositional life:

\textit{...This regular rehearsal schedule suggests a weekly or even more frequent program of courtly performances. In keeping with practices at other courts, musical soirees and other forms of musical entertainment must have been an integral part of courtly life at Cöthen, even though we lack specific information and, even more regrettably, most of the actual music made on those occasions. The repertoire would have consisted primarily of}\n
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid.  
\textsuperscript{96} Wolff, 2000: 196
instrumental music for larger and smaller ensembles, concertos and sonatas in particular, as well as solo pieces such as keyboard and lute suites. Nevertheless, we can be sure that at least Bach's instrumental compositions whose extant primary sources can be securely dated to the Cöthen years, such as the Brandenburg Concertos, the French Suites, The Well-Tempered Clavier; the Sonatas and Partitas for solo violin, and the Suites for solo cello (even if some of them may be of earlier origin), were performed at various courtly functions.97

Wolff lists the Six Cello Suites amongst the works copied by Anna Magdalena.98

Mark Smith, 2000, ‘The drama of Bach’s life in the Court of Cöthen, as reflected in his Cello Suites’99 gives an in-depth study of the Six Cello Suites in a context where the Suites, as described by Smith, offer a musical insight into the mind of Johann Sebastian during his later troubled times at the Cöthen Court. It is an attempt to explain the compositional origins and unusual features of the Six Cello Suites. In his analysis, Smith asks many questions; for example, having given some explanation of the words Suite [sic] discordable and identified the …unusual use of scordatura by Johann Sebastian, Smith asks …What was the extra purpose?100, and whilst he gives some possible answers to his questions, he offers no real explanation, either on this occasion or on other similar occasions. He attempts a dating of the Cello Suites by connecting thematic material to various dates and events that might have inspired

98 Ibid. 231.
100 Ibid. 34.
Johann Sebastian to compose. Further, he gives evidence of the compositional origins of the *Suites* by examples of similar material from Johann Sebastian’s past works; for example, he likens the Prelude to the 3rd *Suite* to the Wedding Cantata BWV 202.

In his other writing and personal communications to me, Smith is of the opinion that the words *Ecrire par Madame Bachen. Son Epouse* written on the title page of the manuscript containing the *Cello Suites* translates as *...in the handwriting of Anna Magdalena* i.e. she was the copyist and not writer, as in composer.

Davitt Maroney, 2000 ‘Bach - an extraordinary life’, stays well within the boundaries of traditional scholarship on the subject of the life of Johann Sebastian and only once suggests something a little unusual when he makes reference to Johann Sebastian playing the cello:

... one can only imagine what impression was made by the six extraordinary sonatas for unaccompanied violin, BWV 1001-1006 (dated 1720), and the six perhaps even more original suites for solo cello, BWV1007-1012. Bach played both instruments.

---

101 Ibid. 34 ‘Implications for Dating the Suites’
102 See Appendix E
In 2000, three new editions of the *Cello Suites* were published:

- Bärenreiter-Verlag produced a critical edition of the *Six Cello Suites*. Edited by Bettina Schwemer and Douglas Woodfull-Harris, the edition includes facsimiles of the four handwritten manuscript Sources and a facsimile of the first printed edition, plus a ‘Text Volume’ that explores the known Sources for the *Cello Suites* and various other issues, for example, matters of performance style.

- Breitkopf published an edition with a facsimile of Mus. Ms. Bach P 269, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript and a lengthy *Kritischer Bericht* (Afterword) edited by Kirsten Beisswenger, which includes some discussion of the Sources and advice on interpretation.


I will limit my comments to issues relating to the Sources of the *Six Cello Suites* only.

All three editions essentially base their discussion of the textural as well as the dating of sources on Hans Eppstein’s *Kritischer Bericht for the edition of the cello suites, published in the New Bach Edition (NBA VI/2).*\(^{104}\)

\(^{104}\) Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 4
Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris attempt to trace the origins of the *Cello Suites* through an analysis and comparison of five sources, i.e. Anna Magdalena’s manuscript (Source A, Mus. Ms. Bach P 269), the copies by Johann Peter Kellner (Source B, Mus. Ms. Bach P 804), two anonymous copies (Sources C, Mus. ms. Bach P 289 & Source D, Mus. Hs. 5007) and the first printed edition by Janet et Cotelle from around 1824 (Source E, Platten-Nr.: 1497). The Lute Suite version (Source H, BRÜSSEL, II, 4085), is used as an additional source.

The dating of Anna Magdalena’s manuscript is given as ...*some time between 1727 and 1731*, and we are informed that ...*There is no question that Source A [Anna Magdalena’s manuscript] is the principal source for the cello suites, if only because of its proximity to the composer.* We are also informed that the manuscript ...*is not entirely free of mistakes.*

They tell us that the manuscript ...*was probably prepared for Heinrich Ludwig Schwanberg (1696 -1774)* and that the title page was probably added by him. There is no discussion regarding the wording ...*écrite par Madame Bachen. Son Eponge,* written on the title page of the combined manuscript *Violin Sonatas & Partitas,* apart from it ...*strikes an unusually familiar tone unique in Bach’s music... and suggests that the owner was closely connected with the Bach family;* and it is accepted by Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris that the words denote Anna Magdalena as the ...*copyist.*

---

105 Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 4
106 Ibid. 6
107 Ibid.
108 Ibid. 4
109 Ibid. 4
110 Ibid.
Source B, Kellner’s manuscript, it is claimed is closest to Bach’s lost autograph in point of time as it dates from the same period as that of the violin sonatas, which bears the date “Anno 1726” in Kellner’s hand.

The two anonymous handwritten Sources, C and D are seen as inferior to the two principal Sources, A and B. However, Schwemer and Woodfull-Harris argue that despite being separated considerably in time from Sources A and B, the two later manuscripts are careful and painstaking copyist’s manuscripts. 

Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris conclude that there must have been an additional three sources, i.e. Sources [X], [F] and [G]. (See Figure 1.4) They link the Sources and summarise the relations between the Sources as follows:

A ...is a relatively faithful copy of the lost autograph [F]

B was not prepared from Source [F] but from another ...manuscript from Bach’s circle [X]

C, D & E ... derive from the lost manuscript [G]

111 Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 7
112 Ibid. 4
113 Ibid. 7
114 Ibid.
115 Ibid. 5
116 Ibid. 9
117 Ibid.
118 Ibid.
Some connection is made between the 1720 Autograph of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas and the double manuscript\textsuperscript{119} containing the Cello Suites, in so far as the title page of the 1720 Autograph of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas indicates that it is “Libro primo” and it is assumed that …the manuscript originally continued with the Cello Suites as its “libro secondo”.\textsuperscript{120} It is pointed out that the order in which the two sets of works for violin and cello were written …has never been clarified,\textsuperscript{121} though it is suggested that …To judge from style, the cello suites probably arose first.\textsuperscript{122} They go on to suggest a number of possibilities for the Cello Suites’ origins, and for whom they may have been intended. They suggest that they may have been started during Johann Sebastian’s time at the Cöthen Court when he had the time and opportunity to …experiment,\textsuperscript{123} but finished after his move to Leipzig in 1723, as the use of a five-string violoncello for the Sixth Suite, …suggests that it arose at later date.\textsuperscript{124} They put

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{TreeDiagram.png}
\caption{Tree diagram depicting the Sources from the Bärenreiter Edition Text Volume p. 5}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{119} Konvolut
\textsuperscript{120} Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 9
\textsuperscript{121} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{122} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{123} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{124} Ibid.
forward a case for their theory of the later re-working of the Suites into their supposed Source [G].\textsuperscript{125}

Leissinger gives a much broader set of Sources to support his edition,\textsuperscript{126} than Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris; or indeed by Beisswenger, who limits her discussion to Sources A – D.

Leissinger, also tells us that the words written on the title page of Anna Magdalena’s combined manuscript were written by Georg Heinrich Ludwig Schwanberg (1696 – 1774) and he …meticulously identified the copyist...[and] he added Bach’s profession Maitre de Chapelle, thus making it clear that these works belong to the sphere of the court.\textsuperscript{127}

Leissinger points out that Source C … is usually – but incorrectly – reckoned part of the musical estate of the Hamburg organist Johann Christian Westphal (1773 – 1828),\textsuperscript{128} and he also offers some information about the fact that ...In discussion of the sources it has been completely overlooked, that Carl Philipp Emanuel once owned a manuscript of the suites for violoncello.\textsuperscript{129} He goes on to suggest that this fact could explain the origin of Source C.

Beisswenger, whose edition is based essentially on Source A, observes that …A comparison of the two manuscripts of violin soli shows that AMB [Anna Magdalena]

\textsuperscript{125} For the purposes of clarity, in my discussion of the Sources I have square bracketed all the Sources, not just [X], [F] and [G]; this is to avoid visual confusion with the name of pitched notes
\textsuperscript{127} Leissinger, 2000: 2
\textsuperscript{128} Ibid. 2
\textsuperscript{129} Ibid. 5
was a conscientious copyist, who was faithful to the source in an extreme measure (even reproducing changes of pages and stave).\textsuperscript{130} Beisswenger goes on to point out that in her opinion, apart from the problematic transcription of the articulation marks...which is characterised by negligence...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 soli and her transcription.\textsuperscript{131}

Beisswenger makes some interesting points regarding the possibility that...The additions [in Sources C and D] might represent a stylistic and aesthetic stage dating from after Bach's death.\textsuperscript{132} She also supports the idea that Source C must have its origins in the manuscript owned by C.P.E. Bach.\textsuperscript{133}

Whilst all three editions are very interesting and offer some very good ideas, they basically add no new information regarding the origins of the two most important Sources of the Cello Suites, i.e. the manuscripts of Anna Magdalena and Johann Peter Kellner’s.\textsuperscript{134} Nor do they attempt to explain the musical ambiguities of the Cello Suites, and, apart from the articulation marks, why Anna Magdalena’s manuscript is believed to contain so many...errors.

Malcolm Boyd, 2000, ‘Bach’, gives a general overview of Johann Sebastian’s work in the instrumental genre, stating that the suite and the sonata were the main compositional vehicles for him during the Cöthen period. He points out that in the Six

\textsuperscript{131} Ibid
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid 78
\textsuperscript{133} Ibid
\textsuperscript{134} Ibid
Cello Suites …The form is at its most classical\textsuperscript{135}…where his concern for symmetry is apparent also in the additional dances.\textsuperscript{136} He identifies the last two Suites as being …noticeably more difficult to play, with a higher proportion of double stops and (in No. 6, at least) more virtuoso passages. He goes on to suggest that the two last suites might have …originated independently of the others. He observes that the use of scordatura by Johann Sebastian is …something of a puzzle, as it is the only occasion where he …employed such a technique. He suggests that the fact that the 5\textsuperscript{th} Cello Suite exists in a version for the Lute (BWV995) might have something to do with this.

Peter Williams, 2004, ‘The Life of Bach’, discusses fairly briefly the Six Cello Suites. He points to the differences between them and the Violin Sonatas & Partitas …The Cello Suites contrast six different preludes, much as the later six partitas for harpsichord do, and they also vary instrumental requirements: No. 6 for five strings…No. 5 for Scordatura.\textsuperscript{137} He continues by likening the 5\textsuperscript{th} Cello Suite to one by Biber in its tuning, and is sure that the work of Biber would have been known at Cöthen …by c1720.\textsuperscript{138}

John Butt’s book ‘Bach Interpretation – Articulation Marks in Primary Sources’ 1990, is not specifically focused on the central issues of this thesis (Anna Magdalena and her role in the Six Cello Suites). However, he does discuss, briefly, the …striking slur\textsuperscript{139} in the Lute arrangement of the 5\textsuperscript{th} Cello Suite, which he argues …suggests a fairly free run to be played ‘in one bow’ with as little intermediate articulation as

\textsuperscript{135} Given that the Six Cello Suites are unique in their “symmetry” it is difficult to understand Boyd’s use of the term “classical”.


\textsuperscript{137} Williams, 2004: 88

\textsuperscript{138} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{139} John Butt. Bach Interpretation – Articulation Marks in Primary Sources of J S Bach (UK: Cambridge University Press, 1990): 181
This slur, in the lute version (BWV 995), is remarkable, as it departs radically from the bowing articulation in the original 5th Cello Suite version, that contains few slurs, see Figure 1.5; this, plus the fact that the semi-quaver groupings are distinctly different in their presentation, certainly does not reinforce the concept that the Cello Suites, as written out in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, are, as Eppstein put it … Quelle A, die um 1730 entstandene Abschrift Anna Magdalena Bachs, dürfte die relativ getreue Kopie eines Bachschen Autographs darstellen or according to Beisswenger a copy of the … now lost autograph, or indeed a no longer extant manuscript, source [F] as argued by Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris. (See above)

Figure 1.5 The Prelude of the 5th Cello Suite (top example) in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript with the arrangement in Johann Sebastian’s hand for Lute BWV 995 (centre example). Butt’s Example 116 is the lowest example

Ruth Tatlow in her recent article ‘Collections, bars and numbers: Analytical coincidence or Bach’s design’ published on-line at Understanding Bach/2 (2007), explores the possibility that there is an underlying mathematical proportion in some of Johann Sebastian’s works. She identifies that:

140 Ibid.
141 Eppstein, 1990: 18 “Source A, the copy by Anna Magdalena Bach developed around 1730, might represent a relatively faithful copy of a Bach’s autograph.”
142 Beisswenger, 2000: 78.
...Anna Magdalena's copy of the Cello Suites lacks the parallel proportions at levels three, four and five [...characteristic of the works he published or copied in fair hand\textsuperscript{145}] showing that it is either a) not a faithful copy of Bach's score, or b) that Bach had not yet revised it to a state where he would consider it worthy of publication.

Clearly, her conclusions have some potential significance for those seeking greater understanding of the origins of the Cello Suites.

\section*{I. 3 ANNA MAGDALENA BACH}

Maria Hübner, 2004, ‘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 New Bach Reader and gives documentary evidence of Anna Magdalena’s life, 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. However, Hübner does confirm the statements of others quoted in this thesis, and additionally, makes a very interesting observation regarding the uniqueness of the words written by Schwaneberger on the title page of the manuscript containing the Six Cello Suites:

\textit{...Das von Schwanberg geschriebene Titelblatt zu diesen Abschriften enthält einen für diese Zeit ungewöhnlichen Vermerk zur Kopistin\textsuperscript{146} [The title page to these copies, written by Schwanenberger, contains, for this period in time, an unusual note as to the copyist: \textit{écrite par Madame Bachen. Son Épouse}]}

\textsuperscript{145} Personal communication regarding her article via email 30.04.07

\textsuperscript{146} Maria Hübner, \textit{Anna Magdalena Bach. Ein Leben in Dokumenten und Bildern.} (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2004): 53
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 but one letter only that contains Anna Magdalena’s own words, and that is in the form of a draft letter.\textsuperscript{147} Other references are those in the Cöthen Court records relating to her marriage to Johann Sebastian and payments made to her, and various other references such as the one contained in the \textit{Obituary} by C.P.E. Bach and Johann Friedrich Agricola written in 1750, though not published until 1754\textsuperscript{148} …\textit{He} [Johann Sebastian] \textit{took for his wife, in Cöthen, in the year 1721, Mistress Anna Magdalena.}\textsuperscript{149} (See below)

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 \textit{…my present wife sings a good, clear soprano}\textsuperscript{150} in an excerpt from Johann Sebastian’s letter to Georg Erdmann, Imperial Russian Residence agent at Danzig, 28 October 1730.

Carl Philipp Emanuel’s only known reference to his stepmother appears in his Father’s Obituary.\textsuperscript{151} His comments are matter of fact:

\textit{…He took for his second wife, in Cöthen, in the year 1721, Mistress, Anna Magdalena, youngest daughter of Mr. Johann Caspar Wülken [sic], court

\textsuperscript{147} NBR, 1998: 213-214
\textsuperscript{148} Ibid. 297
\textsuperscript{149} Ibid. 305
\textsuperscript{150} Ibid. 152
\textsuperscript{151} Ibid. 305
Trumpeter to the Duke of Weissenfels. Of thirteen children, namely, six sons and seven daughters, whom the latter bore him, the following six are still alive:

1) Gottfried Heinrich, born in 1724;

2) Elisabeth Juliane Fridrike, born in 1726 and married to the Organist of St. Wenceslas's in Naumburg, Mr. Altnikol, a skilled composer;

3) Johann Christoph Friedrich, born in 1732, now Chamber Musician to the Imperial Count of Schaumburg-Lippe;

4) Johann Christian, born in 1735;

5) Johanna Carolina, born in 1737;

6) Regina Susanna, born in 1742. The widow is also still living.

Forkel makes only very passing reference to Anna Magdalena as Johann Sebastian’s second wife, not even mentioning her by name. He mentions only that Johann Sebastian had been married twice. In these brief comments, he is very dismissive, through total omission, of the significance of Johann Sebastian’s wives to his musical life and his life in general, apart from their roles as mothers to his children:

...Such was the life of this remarkable man. I only add that he was twice married and that he had by his first wife seven and by the second wife thirteen children, namely, eleven sons and nine daughters. All the sons had admirable

\footnote{Ibid. 430}
talents for music; but they were not fully cultivated, except in some of the elder ones.\textsuperscript{153}

This might be taken as typical of the attitude towards women in the period,\textsuperscript{154} but it also sets the scene for what followed in the 19\textsuperscript{th} Century with regard to attitudes to Anna Magdalena’s contribution in particular.

Spitta, on the other hand, speaks most generously and sensitively about Anna Magdalena,\textsuperscript{155} and what he has to say also reveals the esteem in which he held her. He gives, as far as possible, a detailed history of Anna Magdalena’s family background and he clearly recognises her talents as a musician and that she had a very close relationship with Johann Sebastian. He stops well short of any suggestion that Anna might have composed, but rather he casts her in the role of a dutiful wife, helping her husband by making copies of his music. Again, as with Forkel, this might merely reflect attitudes to women at the period of writing.\textsuperscript{156} Spitta is also convinced that Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena had a very tender and loving relationship citing such songs as ‘Bist du bei mir’\textsuperscript{157} \textit{is evidently supposed to be addressed by a husband to a beloved wife} \textsuperscript{158} and the so called ‘Wedding Poem’ \textit{That they should find their place here after the lapse of several years is a striking proof of a happy married life}\textsuperscript{159}.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{153} Ibid. 30
\item \textsuperscript{154} See Chapter V for some discussion of this issue
\item \textsuperscript{155} Spitta, 1879, II: 147 – 153.
\item \textsuperscript{156} The particular comment of Spitta’s that Anna Magdalena copies \textit{without trace of feminine ineptitude} surely reveals his own disposition towards women, that is to say, that women are, in his opinion, usually inept
\item \textsuperscript{157} This work is attributed to Stolzel by Von Dadelsen
\item \textsuperscript{158} Spitta, 1879, II: 151.
\item \textsuperscript{159} Ibid. 152
\end{itemize}
Spitta also identifies as further proof of Johann Sebastian’s affection for Anna Magdalena:

...[a] *portrait of her* [Anna Magdalena] *in oils, twenty-five inches high by twenty-three wide and painted by Cristofori... In their rank of life it was an unusual distinction to have a portrait taken, and she must have had it done by Johann Sebastian's desire: a fresh proof of the affection and high estimation on which the married life of this pair of artists was founded - a model to all.*

He also points out that the portrait, which is now lost, was, apparently, in the possession of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. This is rather odd, as one might suppose that such a portrait would have found its way into the hands of one of Anna Magdalena’s own children, rather than her stepson.

Finally, Spitta discusses Anna Magdalena’s life after the death of Johann Sebastian, and, like all who have investigated this matter, expresses some distress and bewilderment that …*the widow of one of its* [Germany’s] *greatest sons - herself, too, an artist – [was left] to perish thus [in poverty].*

He also raises the vexed question of the lack of financial support for Anna Magdalena from her family…*Whether the sons could not or would not help is not known.*

---

160 Ibid. 153
161 Spitta, 1879, III: 276
162 Ibid.
There are, within Spitta’s text, a number of disputed statements, for example, according to von Dadelsen in the ‘Afterword in the 1988 Facsimile of the 1725 Klavierbüchlein’\textsuperscript{163} the …instructions for playing from a Figured bass\textsuperscript{164} are not in the hand of Johann Sebastian, as is suggested by Spitta, but in the hand of Johann Christoph Friedrich Bach, from page 123 of the Klavierbüchlein, and Anna Magdalena Bach, from page 124. And, there is no evidence to support the idea that Johann Sebastian had any claim to …fame\textsuperscript{165} during his lifetime.

Parry gives a brief outline of Anna Magdalena’s family background and observes that …little more in detail is known of their [Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena’s] domestic circumstances than there is in his first wife’s time.\textsuperscript{166} Parry is obviously very convinced of Anna Magdalena’s musical ability…There is no doubt that she was extremely musical.\textsuperscript{167}

However, he makes no direct suggestion that she composed anything at all, and is rather condescending in his remarks regarding Anna Magdalena’s skills as a performer, in his reference to the 1725 Klavierbüchlein:

...These, as a matter of fact, are rather more difficult and are on a larger scale than the suites included in the first book, and both of them have

\textsuperscript{163} Georg von Dadelsen. Documenta Musicologica Klavierbüchlein für Anna Magdalena 1725. (Kassel u.a., Bärenreiter, 1988): 16
\textsuperscript{164} Spitta, 1879, II: 152
\textsuperscript{165} Ibid. III: 276
\textsuperscript{166} C Hubert Parry. Johann Sebastian Bach. (London: Putman and Company Ltd, 1909). Parry is referring to the fact that there is very little known about Johann Sebastian’s domestic situation during either marriage
\textsuperscript{167} Parry, 1909: 95
preludes, of which that to the E minor Partita is on a very extensive scale, suggesting progress in Anna Magdalena’s efficiency as a performer.¹⁶⁸

He gives her full credit for musical handwriting but casts her in the role of copyist and dutiful wife only. Parry takes a very ‘romantic’ view of Johann Sebastian’s relationship with Anna Magdalena and paints a picture of a loving and caring marriage where Johann Sebastian is to be seen as his wife’s teacher:

...There is something specially attractive about the idea of Bach's making this collection of pieces for his young wife to play, and the spirit of the works themselves seems to suggest the tenderest [sic] and most loving relations between them,¹⁶⁹

And a little later,

...If the quality of these works truly prefigured Bach's feelings towards his wife at this time, their married life had indeed an auspicious beginning.

Here we see support for the position that the relationship between Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena was much more significant than simply that of a man needing a wife to look after his children from his previous marriage to Maria Barbara. Parry,
clearly, is deeply troubled by the fact that Anna Magdalena was left to die in poverty by her family.¹⁷⁰

Charles Sanford Terry, 1928 ‘Bach – A Biography’, gives a more detailed description of Anna Magdalena’s background and has something to say about Anna Magdalena’s character and what might have attracted Johann Sebastian to her, but his rather oblique reference to Johann Sebastian’s first wife, Maria Barbara is not explained:

...He [Johann Sebastian] was no longer of the impressionable age, when youth is attracted by superficial graces, and the character of his second wife reveals the more abiding qualities he preferred. She was Anna Magdalena Wilcken, youngest daughter of Johann Caspar Wilcken, formerly Hof trompeter at Zeitz, and since 1719 in similar employ at Weissenfels. Their marriage on the 3rd of December 1721 took place, by the Prince's express permission, in Bach's own lodging. Like her bridegroom, the bride was of Thuringian origin: Anna Magdalena's paternal grandfather, Stephan Wilcken, had been Stadt musicus at Schwerstedt. On her maternal side, too, she came of musical stock: her mother was the daughter of Herr Liebe, organist at Friessnich near Weida in the principality of Reuss. Born at Zeitz on 22 September 1701, she had barely completed her twentieth year when marriage made her the stepmother of a daughter only seven years younger than herself. Possessing a soprano voice of singular charm, she probably owed her training to a member of the Zeitz Capelle, which broke up when the Duchy of Sachsen-Zeitz fell to the Elector in 1718. Her father found fresh employment at Weissenfels, while Anna

¹⁷⁰ Parry 1909: 384. According to Christoph Wolff (Wolff, 1983: 263), Carl Philipp Emanuel was the only male member of the Bach family to send Anna Magdalena any money to help her during the last 10 years of her life.
Magdalena secured an engagement at the little Court of Anhalt-Zerbst, whose relationship to that of Cöthen accounts for her appearance there in the autumn of 1720 in a similar capacity.¹⁷¹

Terry states that Anna Magdalena continued to work after their marriage and ...

...proved herself a true helpmeet in his work and continues by linking the so called ‘Wedding Poem’, that appears in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, directly to Johann Sebastian ...A husband of forty, he wrote in it the lines:

_Ihr Diener, werthe, Jungfer Braut._
_Viel Glücks zur heutgen Freude._
_Wer sie in ihrem Krüntzchen schaut_
_Und schönen Hochzeit-Kleide,_
_Dem lacht das Herz vor lauter Lust_
_Bei ihrem Wohlergehen,_
_Was Wunder, wenn mir Mund und Brust_
_Vor Freuden übergehen.“_173

172 Ibid. 138
173 Ibid.

Your servant, sweetest maiden bride;
Joy be with you this morning!
To see you in your flowery crown
And wedding-day adorning
Would fill with joy the sternest soul.
What wonder as I meet you,
That my fond heart and loving lips
O’flow with song to greet you.
Terry does not quote the, in many ways the more telling, second verse of this poem.\textsuperscript{174}

In his book on the life of Johann Christian Bach, 1929, Terry raises the issue of Anna Magdalena’s poverty at the end of her life and suggests that her situation as an ...\textit{Almosenfrau} [Alms Woman] when viewed from ...\textit{the standpoint of their generation} might not have carried any ...\textit{stigma}. Whatever the actual case, Terry is of the opinion that Johann Christian was not in a financial position to assist his mother.\textsuperscript{175}

Schweitzer is firmly of the belief that Anna Magdalena was a wonderful woman, a good housewife and very talented as well. In fact he takes his belief in her talent to a point where he is happy to describe her not just as a musician but also as an ...\textit{artist, who could enter intelligently into her husband’s work}.\textsuperscript{176} However, he makes not even the slightest suggestion that she might have composed in any direct way. He observes that Anna Magdalena and Johann Sebastian’s handwriting are very similar but gives

\begin{quote}
\textit{Cupido, der vertraute Scha1k,}
\textit{Lässt keinen ungeschoren.}
\textit{Zum Bauen braucht man Stein und Ka1k,}
\textit{Die Löcher muss man bohren,}
\textit{Und baut man nur ein Hennen-Haus,}
\textit{Gebraucht man Holz und Nägel.}
\textit{Der Bauer drischt den Welzen aus}
\textit{Mit gross und kleinen Flegel.}
\end{quote}
\hspace{1cm} (See NBA V/4, KB: 72)

\begin{quote}
\textit{Cupid, that trusted rogue,}
\textit{Lets no one go unshorn.}
\textit{To build one needs both stone and lime,}
\textit{The holes must be bored.}
\textit{And even for a hen house}
\textit{You need both wood and nails.}
\textit{The farmer threshes wheat}
\textit{With large and tiny flails}
\end{quote}
\hspace{1cm} (See Marshall, 1990: 198)

\textsuperscript{174} Sanford Terry does not quote the rather mysterious second verse of the ‘Wedding Poem’

\textsuperscript{175} Sanford Terry, 1928: 48

\textsuperscript{176} Schweitzer, 1911, Vol. I: 107
no explanation apart from stating that …in the course of years her script became so much like that of her husband that it is difficult to distinguish one from the other.\textsuperscript{177}

He is also greatly troubled by the fact that the Bach family allowed Anna Magdalena to die in poverty; he offers no explanation, though hints at family problems:\textsuperscript{178}

\begin{quote}
...In one thing only did the family spirit forsake him: he [Carl Philipp Emanuel] did not take his stepmother in her hour of poverty, and allowed her, two years after the death of her husband [Johann Sebastian] (1752) to beg for alms from the Council that he had so proudly withstood, and finally let her die in receipt of poor relief, on 27th February 1760. Even if he felt no special sympathy for her, and was himself not in flourishing circumstances, he owed it to the honour of his father to save Magdalena Bach from want. Thus Bach's economical sense became meanness in his second son.\textsuperscript{179}
\end{quote}

Vogt gives a very brief outline of Anna Magdalena’s family background and describes her as a …trained soprano.\textsuperscript{180} He makes much of the similarity between Anna Magdalena’s handwriting and that of Johann Sebastian. He points out that, for most of the time since Johann Sebastian’s death, great confusion has existed as a result of the remarkable similarity in their handwriting but does not question this. He also states that Anna …Magdalena wrote many of his [Johann Sebastian’s]

\textsuperscript{177} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{178} The situation that Anna Magdalena found herself in, after Johann Sebastian’s death, is most curious and begs many questions about the domestic situation of the Bach family after the death of Maria Barbara in July 1720.
\textsuperscript{179} Schweitzer Vol. I: 159: 160
\textsuperscript{180} Vogt, 1981: 44
manuscripts for him,\textsuperscript{181} thereby implying that she did more than copy music directly and might have indeed taken the music from dictation.

Vogt is also intrigued by the fact that Anna Magdalena received such a high salary from the Cöthen Court. As he puts it \textit{...Striking differences are found in the salaries of the other musicians.}\textsuperscript{182} He makes the comparison with Concert Master Spiess’ salary, which, according to him, was the same as that for Anna Magdalena; he also gives an example of one Freytag who was to receive 5 Taler quarterly.\textsuperscript{183} Vogt’s quoted figure of 200 Taler\textsuperscript{184} is disputed by Wolff, who puts the figure for Speiss even higher at 300 Taler. (See page 57)

Robert L Marshall, 1990, ‘The notebooks for Wilhelm Friedemann Bach & Anna Magdalena Bach’ makes some significant observations about Johann Sebastian’s private life and his relationship with Anna Magdalena, as well as her role, particularly at Cöthen \textit{...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 his children}.’\textsuperscript{185}

\textsuperscript{181} Ibid. 19 & 20
\textsuperscript{182} Ibid. 42
\textsuperscript{183} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{184} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{185} Marshall, 1990: 193
He points out as, mentioned previously, that:

...With the exception of William Shakespeare, we probably know less about the private life of Johann Sebastian Bach than we do about that of any of the other supreme artistic figures in modern history.\textsuperscript{186}

He attributes this to the fact that...Not a single letter from Bach to any of his children, or to his first wife, Maria Barbara, or his second wife, Anna Magdalena, has survived.\textsuperscript{187} With reference to Anna Magdalena, Marshall states that:

...We should not be surprised to notice that while Bach may have failed to mention to Erdmann [Bach’s letter to Erdmann written 28 October 1730] the names of any of the other members of his family, he did not fail to mention that his second wife [Anna Magdalena] was musical...Anna Magdalena, however, was not merely musical; she was herself a professional musician. She was in fact Bach’s colleague at Cöthen where she was employed as “Singer to His Highness the Prince” and as a “Chamber Musician” (i.e. an instrumentalist\textsuperscript{188}) as well.\textsuperscript{189}

Marshall also states that because Bach had the title ...Actual Kapellmeister to the Court of Saxe-Weissenfels,\textsuperscript{190} 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 [four years before his

\textsuperscript{186} Ibid. 192
\textsuperscript{187} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{188} In a recent communication, via email (03.09.04), in answer to my question of Prof. Marshall as to what instrument he believed Anna Magdalena might have played, besides keyboard that is, his response was the violin.
\textsuperscript{189} Marshall, 1990: 193
\textsuperscript{190} Ibid.
arrival at Cöthen when Anna Magdalena was just 12 years old]. Marshall is of the opinion that …it is likely that Bach himself, in his capacity as Kapellmeister at Cöthen – a post he held from 1717 – was instrumental in recruiting Anna Magdalena for the Cöthen musical establishment.\textsuperscript{191}

David Schulenberg, 1992, ‘The Keyboard Music of J S Bach’, when referring to the 1725 \textit{Klavierbüchlein} states …It is conceivable that Anna Magdalena herself composed some of the anonymous pieces in the 1725 volume.\textsuperscript{192} This is the only direct statement made by any of the reviewed authors that allows for the possibility that Anna Magdalena might have indeed been a composer.

Klaus Eidam attacks the biographers of Johann Sebastian thus… \textit{Where Bach’s second wife is concerned nobody cares about her situation at all}.\textsuperscript{193} He continues quoting from Werner Neumann (of the Bach-Archiv, Leipzig):

\begin{quote}
...But the artist, sixteen years younger than he, no doubt felt it a real good fortune to be chosen by the famous court music director as partner in life and mother of his children.
\end{quote}

He argues that such a statement as Neumann makes is quite preposterous and he goes on to suggest that the whole traditional idea of Johann Sebastian’s marriage to Anna Magdalena is illogical:

\textsuperscript{191} Marshall, 1990: 193
\textsuperscript{193} Eidam, 1999: 142
A young woman of today would hardly deem it a special stroke of luck to marry, right after her twentieth birthday, a widower almost sixteen years her senior, with four children - particularly a young lady who was already practising her own profession and not at all badly paid.

Anna Magdalena Wülcken [sic] was both independent and successful in a period when young women of that description were quite a rarity, since most girls only waited for the day when they could get married and become housewives and mothers. Mademoiselle Wülcken was prin cyclic singer at the court of Anhalt-Zerbst, and her own income amounted to almost half that of Bach's. Thus she was very well off by herself and did not need to rely at all on an early marriage.

For his part, Bach is depicted as though the eligible daughters of the land were merely his for the asking. If that were the case, considered purely from the point of view of common sense and contention, this Mademoiselle Wülcken was by no means a wise choice. Why would the widower Bach select such a slip of a thing, more than fifteen years younger than he, used to going her own way, and totally inexperienced in running a household, much less in bringing up children?194

Eidam, however, whilst acknowledging Anna Magdalena’s great musical gift, makes no suggestion that she was capable of composing and leaves her in the traditional role

194 Eidam, 1999: 142
of copyist …but it [their love] is attested even more by the many music manuscripts that prove what devotion she attended to the compositions of her husband.195

He examines the internal family relationships and dynamics that must have existed when Anna Magdalena became stepmother to Johann Sebastian’s four children and identifies that…Bach’s relationship with Friedemann changed when he took a second wife”196 and

...We cannot assume that Friedemann received the advent of a stepmother with indifference, much less enthusiasm. His father's love had been bestowed on him to an exceptional degree, but now an unfamiliar young woman, barely seven years older than his elder sister, stood between them. Even if Bach loved "his big son" no less than before, he could divide his affections again, and they must necessarily have been unequal shares. The lively young woman, who with her love had restored him to life, simply had more to offer him than his eleven-year-old son. And at that time a delicate but deep rift must have arisen in the Bach home. As far as we know, after Bach's death his two elder sons, Friedemann and Carl Philipp Emanuel, never supported Anna Magdalena in any way, though they were both on thoroughly good terms with each other at the time. She was and she remained their stepmother... The rift their father’s love for the young woman [Anna Magdalena] had brought into their family at Cöthen never healed; for both of them [Carl Philipp Emanuel and Wilhelm Friedemann], she remained an outsider.197

195 Ibid.
196 Ibid. 141
197 Eidam, 1999: 350
Wolff is clear in his belief that Johann Sebastian was devoted to his wife Anna Magdalena and examples this in a number of ways.\textsuperscript{198} He lends support to the idea that she was very musical and that she was an important copyist of Johann Sebastian’s and tells us that, in 1713, Johann Sebastian visited Weissenfels.\textsuperscript{199}

Wolff gives a detailed account of the finances of the Cöthen Court orchestra, and he describes the salary ratios; Johann Sebastian’s salary, for example, amounted to:

\textit{...exactly one-fifth of the music budget, while the salary of the next highest paid musician, Joseph Spiess, amounted to one-tenth of the budget (the chamber musicians’ salaries were all around 150 talers, and the other capelle members earned a mere fraction of that, down to annual pay of 32 talers.}\textsuperscript{200}

He goes on to say that Anna Magdalena’s \textit{...salary of 300 talers would easily have funded two or three highly qualified instrumentalists.}\textsuperscript{201} The amount of 300 talers represented a huge salary, particularly for a woman of only 21 years of age, and made Anna Magdalena the second highest paid musician, after Johann Sebastian as Capelle Meister; she was the fourth most highly paid member of court staff.\textsuperscript{202} Wolff explains this rather curious situation by suggesting that Johann Sebastian had misjudged the generosity of his patron.\textsuperscript{203} Therefore, unless Anna Magdalena was being paid this very large sum for her extraordinary skills as a musician, other than as a singer, the

\textsuperscript{198} Wolff, 2000: 394
\textsuperscript{199} Ibid. 216 [it is possible that that is when Johann Sebastian first met Anna Magdalena]
\textsuperscript{200} Ibid. 204
\textsuperscript{201} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{202} NBR, 1998: 94
\textsuperscript{203} Wolff, 2000: 203
conclusion must be reached that it was simple greed on the part of Johann Sebastian that motivated the payment of such a disproportionate salary to his wife. There is, however, no evidence that Johann Sebastian actually controlled the music budget at the Court, or if indeed such a concept existed.

Wolff continues later that:

...When Magdalena Wilcke [sic] celebrated her twenty first birthday in Cöthen on September 22, 1721, having reached top rank and pay in a princely capelle with her first professional appointment (above that of her father and brother), she could rightfully anticipate a most promising career as a singer. [Wolff does not mention that she was also an instrumentalist.]

Smith, takes the position that the Prince had some involvement in Johann Sebastian’s choice of his second wife. He seems to imply that Johann Sebastian had had no previous knowledge of Anna Magdalena prior to her arrival at Cöthen; and further that Anna Magdalena was a kind of gift from the Prince to Johann Sebastian following the sudden and unexpected death of his first wife, Maria Barbara, during a visit, with the Prince, to Carlsbad. Smith believes the Prince might have felt some responsibility. According to Smith the Prince and Johann Sebastian had become close friends:

...An early sign of the friendliness of the Prince's family towards the Bach family was the christening of Bach's first Cöthen-born child in the Palace

204 Ibid. 217
chapel with as godparents, not only Prince Leopold, but also his brother and sister. Furthermore, during his first summer in Cöthen, Bach (together with six other members of the court and a harpsichord) was taken by his bachelor prince on a long, and seemingly frivolous, excursion to the spa-town of Carlsbad... Inevitably, Bach and the Prince would have become well-acquainted with each other in such a situation.

Two years later (in 1720) this excursion was repeated but with a tragic consequence for Bach. His beloved wife Maria Barbara (left in Cöthen with the children) died unexpectedly, while Bach was away. It is very clear from Bach's obituary, that her death came as a great shock and loss to Bach.

Quite possibly, not only Bach, but also Prince Leopold felt some guilt over this event. Fourteen months later, the singer Anna Magdalena Wilcken joined the Court, and within 10 weeks, she and Bach were married "by command" of the prince, just eight days before the Prince's own wedding. This short courtship and the "command" of the Prince leads one to suspect that Bach's second wedding was deliberately timed, by the Prince, to be close to the Prince's own wedding which again shows the closeness of their friendship.  

Unusually, Boyd consigns his listing of references to Anna Magdalena to her maiden name Wülcken. Though the reason for this is unclear, it does suggest that he has a degree of disregard for Anna Magdalena, borne out by his general comment about her. He states that …there is nothing to link his name with Anna Magdalena before 25

205 Smith, 2000: 32/33
September 1721 and that whilst she …*was well trained in music by her father and maternal uncle*…[and] *she continued to be of professional service to her husband as a neat and accurate copyist of his music. Above all she became stepmother to Maria Barbara’s four surviving children.*\(^{206}\)

Davitt Maroney’s references to the wives of Johann Sebastian are typical, giving the impression of marital bliss, subservience and their irrelevance to the central story of Johann Sebastian’s life and musical output. This is particularly true of his treatment of Anna Magdalena, though he does give her credit as a singer. He also suggests that they might have known each other prior to her arrival at the Cöthen Court …*Anna Magdalena was a professional singer. Bach had possibly come into contact with her in such a musical context.*\(^{207}\)

Ulrich Leissinger in his edition of the *Six Cello Suites* discussed previously, states that…*From her copy of the solos for violin it becomes evident, however, that Anna Magdalena Bach was certainly a talented and well-trained musician.*\(^{208}\) However, he goes on to state that her copy of the violin solos indicates that she was not …*familiar with specifics of stringed instrument notation.*\(^{209}\)

Peter Williams is generous in his praise of Anna Magdalena, describing her as …*precociously accomplished singer* [and]…*the gifted Anna Magdalena.*\(^{210}\) He believes that:

\(^{206}\) Boyd, 2000: 75  
\(^{207}\) Maroney, 2000: 50  
\(^{208}\) Leissinger, 2000: 4  
\(^{209}\) Ibid.  
\(^{210}\) Williams, 2004: 95/96
...she could well have come into contact with Bach before he became a widower, on... a professional visit to one of the ducal court in the neighbourhood, visits that for both of them, as fee-paid musicians, are known to have made.211

Williams observes that Anna Magdalena...who was something of a local diva - received a salary three-quarters of her new husband [and that] the court’s musical expenditure was much dominated by husband and wife.212 As a consequence of this level of financial contribution to the Bach household, Williams suggest that this might have caused …ill feeling among the rest of the court.213 He is also of the opinion that Anna Magdalena probably continued her professional work for a long period after the records currently available reveal, and that Anna Magdalena was involved in teaching the children.214

It is worthy of note that not one of the commentators on Johann Sebastian’s life and music makes any significant statements about Maria Barbara and her involvement in his music.

I.4 THE KLAVIERBÜCHLEINS

Spitta takes it for granted that the two Klavierbüchleins were written, for most part at least, for Anna Magdalena by Johann Sebastian. The normal assumption is always that the 1725 Klavierbüchlein belongs to the Leipzig period, as the date, 1725, is after Johann Sebastian’s arrival at Leipzig (1723).

211 Ibid. 95
212 Ibid. 96
213 Williams, 2004: 96
214 Ibid. 98
Parry assumes that the date of 1725 for the 2nd Klavierbüchlein is correct, i.e. that the collection was started then. He also makes mention of the fact that the 1st Prelude of the Preludes and Fugues in the Well-tempered Clavier is to be found in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein. He makes no mention of the interesting fact that five bars are missing from this version, though he does make mention of the fact that the ...first Prelude, in C, of the Wohltemperierte Clavier... in a much shorter form had already appeared in Friedemann's Büchlein [1720].

He does not mention that the earlier version is not in the hand of Johann Sebastian but, according to Wolfgang Plath, is in the hand of Wilhelm Friedemann; and nor does he make reference to the fact that the C clefs, in bar 4 and in the insert prior to bar 6, are not in any recognisable form of Johann Sebastian’s C clefs but rather those that occur in the manuscripts prepared by Anna Magdalena. I will discuss this in much greater depth later.

Schweitzer also supports the position that the Klavierbüchleins were written by Johann Sebastian, firstly in 1720 for Wilhelm Friedemann and then two, one in 1722 and the other in 1725, for Anna Magdalena. In all three cases the assumption is that the Klavierbüchleins were written in part as teaching/instructional material for both Wilhelm Friedemann and Anna Magdalena:

215 Parry. 1909: 100
217 See Kobayashi, 1989: 13
…We still possess two Klavierbuchlein (Little Books for the Clavier) von Anna Magdalena Bach, the first belonging to 1722, the second, - which is in a fine green leather binding - bearing the date 1725. The first contains twenty-four easy pieces for the clavier; the second consists of preludes, suites, chorales, and sacred and secular songs. Bach also instructed his wife in the art of playing from Figured basses. At the end of the Klavierbuchlein of 1725 we find "some highly important rules of General Basso" recorded in his handwriting.218

Then later, regarding the 1720 Klavierbüchlein for Wilhelm Friedemann

...musical education also belonged to the sphere of religion; and so Bach wrote in Friedemann's Klavierbuchlein (Little Clavier Book), over the first piano pieces he gave to his eldest son, "In Nomine Jesu".219

And,

...When the pupils had acquired the sense of touch, he gave them moderately difficult exercises. This is clear from the arrangement of Friedemann's Klavierbuchlein, in which, according to our ideas, the difficulties increase rather rapidly. He familiarised them from the beginning with the "manieren", i.e., the embellishments. In Friedemann's Klavierbüchlein they are all noted and explained on the first page, so that we would almost believe that the teacher had used them for the first finger exercises. This authentic information

219 Ibid. 167
as to how Bach himself performed the embellishments is of the utmost practical significance for us.  

Robert L Marshall, 1972 ‘The Compositional Process of J S Bach Vol I & II’, is specifically a study of the vocal music of Johann Sebastian; he makes no specific references, therefore, to the *Klavierbüchleins*. However, he does make a number of very important points regarding Johann Sebastian’s work habits that are pertinent to the core of this thesis, and I have included them for purposes of completeness.

He observes that …*evidently [Bach] did not make use of independent sketch books (in any event, none survive).*  

This, if true, raises a question of process as it seems extraordinary that a composer of such a huge amount of music could have achieved this output without appearing to need or use some form of notebook. It is possible that notebooks were in fact used and then destroyed as irrelevant to Johann Sebastian’s ongoing needs, though this would appear to be unlikely; they could, of course, have been destroyed by others. In the Preface to Volume I of the ‘Compositional Processes of J S Bach’, Marshall writes:

...Now it is not difficult to understand why a large-scale study of Bach’s creative process has never been undertaken. An empirically oriented era of humanistic scholarship like the present one is reluctant to be drawn into the seemingly metaphysical realms of genius, inspiration, fantasy, and so on, which seem to belong more properly in the domain of the psychologist if not that of the poet and philosopher. Indeed, in the case of Bach the would-be

---

220 Ibid. 216
221 Marshall 1972, Vol. II: 3
investigator of the creative process is discouraged very early in his pursuit. For one realizes soon enough that Bach was a remarkably "clean" worker, and that, while his compositions rarely seem to have sprung forth fully grown from the head of their creator, the manuscripts contain few traces of the genesis of the compositions notated in them. This was all evident to Philipp Spitta, who was apparently convinced of the futility of an attempt to gain insight into Bach's creative process. He remarks in his biography of Bach:

“Bach's scores do not give the impression that he made many sketches or experimented with the basic ideas in advance, as did, for example, Beethoven. The appearance of the scores suggests that they were written after the work concerned was thought out internally by the composer thoroughly and extensively, but not to such an extent that the composer did not conceive any further during the act of writing. The cases in which he rejected the entire original layout of a piece are relatively rare; corrections of details, on the contrary, are frequent (II, 180). And, in his essay ‘Beethoveniana’ Spitta writes:

“We know that Johann Sebastian occasionally made jottings in advance for a planned composition. In general the creative act was for him, too, [as it was for Mozart] an internal one; only it seems to have come to fruition more slowly, although with the same steadiness as in Mozart's case. Despite the great complexity of [Bach's] music, we know of few cases where the layout of a piece was rejected once it had been worked out. Nor did he often falter while working out the details. Sometimes he made changes when he took up a work again at a later
date; but for an understanding of the way it was formed in the beginning, the evidence provided by such changes tells us nothing (p. 181).”

What might be concluded from these remarks is that Johann Sebastian’s working methods remain a mystery; this opens the door to any number of possibilities.

In his essay, ‘The Notebooks for Wilhelm Friedemann and Anna Magdalena Bach: Some Biographical Lessons’ Marshall gives a detailed study of the three Klavierbüchlein and he attributes their principal authorship, as one might expect, to Johann Sebastian. He uses them as a means to …shed light on this sphere of the composer’s private life. [i.e. Johann Sebastian’s household] He observes that the 1722 text …is a torso: two-thirds of it have apparently been lost or cut out. In its present state it contains only fifty pages…originally it contained 150 pages. He states that…From the contents of the 1722 notebook we can observe that Anna Magdalena was not a beginner at the keyboard at the time of her marriage, but rather a quite competent player. He argues that Johann Sebastian …intended the volume to serve not so much for his wife’s instruction as for her pleasure.

With respect to the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, Marshall is most certain that …In contrast to the earlier volume, it seems not to be so much for her as by her; it was presumably Anna Magdalena herself who, for the most part, decided on the contents and character of the volume. He casts Anna Magdalena in the role of teacher when
discussing some of the less technical demanding pieces and suggests that …*she was the teacher this time and that she used the pieces in giving keyboard lessons… to her children.*

Von Dadelsen, 1957, ‘Die Klavierbüchlein für Anna Magdalena Bach, Kritische Berichte’, and 1988 ‘Documenta Musicologica Klavierbüchlein für Anna Magdalena 1725’, gives a detailed analysis of the material in the volume. He gives an explanation for the …*chronological disorder* of the pieces and some analysis of the complex handwriting issues. He identifies Anna Magdalena as the writer of the …*Some Rules of Thoroughbass* at the end of the volume and Carl Philipp Emanuel as the writer of the script on the front cover. He points out that the …*book still raises many questions*, for example …*How did the book, that should have been passed on to Anna Magdalena’s own children, come into the possession of Carl Philipp Emanuel?*

Ralph Kirkpatrick, 1959, ‘Facsimile Edition of the 1720 Klavierbüchlein’ writes that the 1720 Klavierbüchlein:

...*has an avowedly pedagogic character [however] it soon becomes clear that we have here not an a priori organized method of instruction but rather a collection of pieces that reflect only fragmentarily and to a certain extent haphazardly the intense musical life of the Bach household.*

---

226 Ibid.
227 Dadelsen, 1988: 13
228 Ibid.14
He gives some indication as to the composer of various pieces and identifies the handwriting of Wilhelm Friedemann in a number of the places. In the Preface, Kirkpatrick acknowledges the work of identifying the handwriting to Wolfgang Plath in his 1963, ‘Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann’, Kritische Berichte, Bärenreiter, in which Plath presents a detailed study of the contents of the volume in question. In the Kritische Berichte, Plath identifies other handwriting including that of Johann Peter Kellner.

Christoph Wolff makes no comment regarding the Klavierbüchleins, other than to list them among Johann Sebastian’s works from the Cöthen period and to indicate that Anna Magdalena …wrote the title page [of the 1722 Klavierbüchlein]…and a few headings, but the musical entries are written exclusively in Johann Sebastian’s hand.

Williams is of the opinion that the 1722 Klavierbüchlein was written as …token of Bach’s warm affection for his new wife and that both Klavierbüchleins were written as a means to further …his wife’s keyboard technique.

---

230 Wolff, 2000: 231
231 Ibid. 218
232 Williams, 2004: 97
233 Ibid.
I. 5 MATTERS OF HANDWRITING

Over the past 50 years or so, many of Johann Sebastian’s works have been subjected to extensive and thorough handwriting examination. As the main focus of this thesis is the application of a new approach to the examination of handwriting, using the scientific methodology of Forensic Document Examination, it is essential that the fine work of the musicologists who have studied these matters be fully examined – not only in the context of Anna Magdalena’s involvement in the production of the manuscripts concerned, but also to provide an understanding of the current scholarly position regarding this subject.

Studies of Bach’s handwriting examined for this thesis include works such as:

- Walter Emery has written on the subject of the handwriting with specific reference to the ‘London autograph of the Forty-Eight’ – the manuscript of the Wohltemperierte Klavier II, 1953235

---

234 Translation by Dr Yo Tomita
• Don O. Franklin in ‘Re-constructing the Urpartitur for WTII: a study of the “London autograph (BL Add. MS 35021)”’.²³⁶

The work of Walter Emery and Georg von Dadelsen, in particular, is of central importance to this thesis. It is on the basis of their work, in establishing that there are characteristics of another writer’s music-calligraphy within the manuscripts of Johann Sebastian (whom they identify as Anna Magdalena), which form the starting point of my investigations.

Walter Emery’s article on the subject of the ‘The London Forty-Eight’, is an historical account of the manuscript BL 35021 [‘The London Autograph of the Forty-Eight’] plus an analysis of the music-calligraphy, to identify the possible writers of the manuscript. As the first part of the article is given over to tracing the origins of the manuscript, I will only discuss the second part which relates to issues of handwriting. Emery states that … There is only one type of evidence that is of any use for determining the authenticity of 35021; that of handwriting.²³⁷ He gives a total of 17 examples of handwriting taken from a variety of sources, he groups the manuscripts of 35021 into Group A and B and then, having stated that Group B is …evidently written by the same person,²³⁸ goes through a process of comparison of manuscripts (for example …If Bach wrote Fig. 2, clearly he wrote Fig. 1 and so on). He suggests that…The C-clefs in Figs. 1, 3, 7 and 11 are of a type that Bach began to use soon after 1722…From 1725 onwards this type is commoner than any other, to judge by the

²³⁷ Emery, 1953: 113
²³⁸ Ibid. 114
published facsimiles and such unpublished material as I have had occasion to consult.\textsuperscript{239} (See Figure 1.6)

He points out that there are three other types of C clefs used in manuscripts with which he is acquainted and that one of those …disappears soon after 1720 and is not illustrated here.\textsuperscript{240} See further discussion of Anna Magdalena’s C clef types in Chapter III.

In his discussion on the use and structure of …downstem [sic] notes\textsuperscript{241} he examines the position of the down-stems in both groups, identifies that in the … Autograph of

\textsuperscript{239} Ibid. 114
\textsuperscript{240} Ibid. 115
\textsuperscript{241} Ibid.
the Organ Sonatas (c. 1730…) the minims are wrong [I presume he means by this that the down-stem is placed on the right-hand side of the minim rather than the left]. but the shorter notes are usually right and concludes that …The chief differences between Group A and Group B can be summed up under the following headings: the treatment of the down-stems: the density of the writing; the C-clefs: time-signatures: and the treatment of the group dotted-quaver-semiquaver.

He remarks, when discussing the F major Prelude … that the Group A clefs of the first page might have been written by some member of the Bach household [other than the writer of the music that is to say] … This possibility that – Bach wrote the notes, after someone else had prepared the manuscript…by writing the clefs – is equally unsatisfying. After some further analysis and comparison of Groups A and B he concludes that …the peculiarities of Group A can be matched in manuscripts [known to be] written by Anna Magdalena242 (the Organ Sonata V in the MS. P 272 and the 1725 Klavierbüchlein MS. P 225)243

Emery states that …it is well known that she did not share her husband’s views on paper-saving.244 With regard paper-saving he also puts forward a theory to explain …The peculiarities of the F major Prelude245 which he gives as follows:

Anna began to copy this movement; but at the end of the first page she realized that in her writing the Prelude would occupy the remaining three pages of the sheet. She accordingly called in her husband, who compressed

---

242 Ibid. 118
243 Ibid.
244 Ibid. 119
245 Ibid.
not only the rest of the Prelude, but also the whole of the Fugue, into the allotted space; though even he had to resort to marginal additions.

Georg von Dadelsen in his work, ‘Bemerkungen zur Handschrift Johann Sebastian Bachs, seiner Familie und seines Kreises’ 1957, recognises that the first and most important question that must be posed in the process of handwriting identification is whose music calligraphy is whose? Dadelsen examines the work of Walter Emery in his work on the ‘London Autograph’ of the *Wohltemerierte Klavier II*, described above. However, Dadelsen seeks more certainty that this music-calligraphy is indeed that of Anna Magdalena, and goes on to connect the handwriting of Anna Magdalena with these documents via a comparison of handwriting in:

A. a dedication entry in a bible dated 1749,

B. Anna Magdalena’s application to the Leipzig Council for the transfer of guardianship of her 4 children dated 2nd October1750 (sic)\(^{246}\) (See Figure 1.7)

C. The *Cello Suites*, (P 269) and importantly, through the writing of the words *écrite par Madame Bachen. Son Epouse* on the title page of the combined manuscript (P 268/269) of the *Violin Sonatas & Partitas* and the *Cello Suites*.\(^ {247}\)

\(^{246}\) The date on the letter is the 21st of October, written twice, with the date 20th October given at the top of the letter

He poses the question whether the text and the music within the 1725 Klavierbüchlein are necessarily by the same person and points out *...that there were in Bach’s circle numerous instances for the opposite, [that is] …that the music and the text come from different writers.*\(^{248}\)

\(^{248}\) Dadelsen, 1957: 30
However, he is satisfied that the handwriting in *1725 Klavierbüchlein* and the *Violin Sonatas & Partitas* (P 268 & P 269) are in Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy and confirms that, in his view, Walter Emery was correct in his assumptions.  

Dadelsen goes on to explore the handwriting of Anna Magdalena, stating his hypothesis that, in fair copies, Anna Magdalena closely imitates Johann Sebastian’s best writing, which is clearly different from sketch concept writing. He discusses this in connection with the *1725 Klavierbüchlein*, citing examples of C clefs given in Emery discussed previously; he also gives examples of occasions in which she deviates from her usual C clef style to match the C clefs of Johann Sebastian. However, he goes on to say that whilst it is often the case that copies made by Anna Magdalena begin with an imitation of Johann Sebastian’s clef forms, Anna Magdalena’s own forms quickly re-establish themselves.

He constructs a method for the dating of Anna Magdalena’s manuscripts through an analysis of the construction and positioning of her natural signs, bass clef and accolade brackets; this material is similar to the material presented in the Facsimile Edition of the ‘Klavierbüchlein für Anna Magdalena Bach 1725’.  

Georg von Dadelsen also explores the music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian in his very important work ‘Beiträge zur Chronologie der Werke Johann Sebastian

---

249 See Dadelsen, 1957: 31, para 2  
...Wir haben also im Haupschreiber des Klavierbüchleins von 1725, der Violin-sonaten und Cellosuiten p 268/269 wirklich Anna Magdalena Bachs von uns. Hiermit werden die Vermutungen Walter Emeralds in jeder Weise Bestätigt.  
250 Ibid. 31  
251 Bärenreiter, 1988
Bachs’.252 He points out that ...Bach first uses the Hakenform of C clef in 1723253 and then, because he believes that ...this form of C clef is one of the most important criteria for dating Johann Sebastian’s later works,254 he classifies Johann Sebastian’s C clef forms as in Figure 1.8.255 The matter of the C clefs used is of central importance in this thesis, and will be discussed in Chapter III.

![Bach used three different basic forms of C clef:](image)

**Figure 1.8** Dadelsen’s classification of Johann Sebastian’s C clef forms256

> Bach presents three different kinds of C clef:

> The 3 [or pretzel] form

> The Hakenform

> The two-part form, in which the arms may or may not be curved...or straight

Dadelsen suggests a possible progressive development of Johann Sebastian’s ...Hakenform,257 as is shown in Figure 1.9, and he proposes this development took place around the time of the move from Cöthen to Leipzig.258

---

253 Dadelsen, 1958: 85
254 Ibid. ...Da die Bildung des C-Schlüssels bis in die letzten Jahre hinein eines der wichtigsten Datierungskriterien bleibt.
255 Ibid. ...der hakenförmige C-Schlüssel, den Bach zum ersten Male im Jahre 1723 verwendet.
256 Dadelsen, 1958: 86
257 Dadelsen, 1958: 86
258 Ibid. ...Der Übergang von der einen zur anderen fällt zeitlich etwa mit Bachs Übersiedlung von Köthen nach Leipzig
He states that the…Numerous examples of handwriting in the year 1723 bear witness to this change. The forms between d until g are an almost unambiguous demonstration of this.260

Dadelsen also gives a …Tabellen zur Schrift-Analyse261 where he offers some information regarding the variety of music-symbols used over an extended period of time by Johann Sebastian. Characteristics of the writing are given, for example:

• Inclination (1. just, 2. to the left, 3. to the right, 4. changing)
• Strength and pressure,
• Size of the notes.262

The Table itself conveys this information in a very compressed form, laying out examples of the types of musical-symbol in numeric ordering as shown in Figure 1.10

---

259 Ibid. 86
260 Ibid. …Zahlreiche Handschriften des Jahres 1723 sind Zeugen dafür. Die Zwischenformen d bis g sind ein nahezu eindeutiges Kriterium.
261 Table of Handwriting Analysis
262 Neigung 1. gerade 2. links 3. rechts 4. wechselnd, Kraft und Druck, Grösse der Notenzeichen
In the Appendix to his book, Dadelsen also gives a selection of facsimile examples of a variety of manuscripts.

Following on from Dadelsen’s work, Yoshitake Kobayashi presents his analysis of the range of Johann Sebastian’s clefs in the ‘Neue Bach Ausgabe - Die Notenschrift Johann Sebastian Bachs’ in Figure 1.11. (My underlining - Anna Magdalena’s (AMB) clef types, added by me for comparison, are given to the right)

263 Dadelsen, 1958: 1
**Figure 1.11** Kobayashi’s clef categories

**Violinschüssel = Violin Clef (Treble Clef)**

Standardformen = Standard form

![G clef AMB]

**Fleischerhakenform = Meat hook form**

C –Schüssel = C Clef

Hakenform = Hook form

![C Clef Type 1 AMB]

“Zweiteilige”:

Two part form

![C Clef Type 1 AMB]
Dreierform oder Brezelform = Three-way form or pretzel shape

Übergangsformen = Transitional forms

Baßsclüssel = Bass Clef

ovale Form = Oval form

runde Form = Round form

Kobayashi explains that the reason for undertaking the analysis is to provide a … chronology [of the] creative [works].\textsuperscript{264} In the Script Forms, given above, he offers a range of …characteristic forms of symbols and recognises that …Each handwriting record is naturally physiologically subjected to certain variations … [and] moreover hand strokes change greatly with time.\textsuperscript{265} He also points out that his analysis is based only on the note manuscripts and that the letter documents have not been considered.\textsuperscript{266} He admits that he has not used the technologies available in his examination, such as …infrared photography, because of cost.\textsuperscript{267} Whether or not he used the scanning technology that was available in the 1980s is not known, as no

\textsuperscript{264} Kobayashi, 1989: 13 …Schaffenschronologie
\textsuperscript{265} Ibid. …zudem ändern sich Schriftzüge häufig im Laufe der Zeit
\textsuperscript{266} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{267} Ibid. 15
mention is made of it. As Gerhard Hertz points out ... *Kobayashi’s method of inquiry does not differ from that used by Dürr or Dadelsen.*

Kobayashi’s work is very detailed and thorough, but a number of his suggestions are open to challenge. In chapter III, using techniques from Forensic Document Analysis, I offer alternative suggestions.

One cannot challenge or doubt the integrity and the sincerity of the work undertaken by Emery, Dadelsen... *in his remarkable study of 1958.* Dürr and Kobayashi, to explain the apparently very confusing variations in Johann Sebastian’s music-calligraphy. It would appear, however, that none of them have applied the scientific principles of Forensic Document Examination - for example the use of full pen-stoke analysis. This leads them, inevitably, to some conclusions that are not, in my view, scientifically well founded. For example, the variations and inconsistencies they identify in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian appear to fall well outside the scientifically accepted parameters of variation or habituation in writing; further, this is done without any attempt to offer any explanation for these sudden and essentially erratic changes in Johann Sebastian’s music-calligraphy style.

Whatever their differences in intention, all those who have investigated this matter of handwriting are unanimous in this opinion: Anna Magdalena copied the music of her husband Johann Sebastian or other composers. As von Dadelsen puts it when referring to the contents of the *1725 Klavierbuchlein* ... *the rest of the contents was*
determined by Anna Magdalena. On the whole, these are short pieces of “galantrie”: minuets, polonaises, marches...little pieces which she copied out.\textsuperscript{270}

Mark Smith explains the similarity in their handwriting as follows:

\textit{...The close similarity in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena...is well explained by considering Bach as his young wife's teacher (copying being an important part of learning). By the time of their marriage, Bach had a high reputation and status as an all-round musician, including music teaching.}\textsuperscript{271}

In the matter of handwriting similarity, Wolff, whilst not referring to Anna Magdalena but rather to Johann Sebastian’s brother Christoph, who was a pupil of Pachelbel, states:

\textit{...How strong an influence Pachelbel had on Christoph is most strikingly reflected in Christoph's music handwriting, which closely resembles that of his teacher.}\textsuperscript{272}

In stating this, Wolff identifies the most common explanation for the similarity between Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena’s handwriting, i.e. as Mark Smith described, it is simply a result of Anna Magdalena modelling herself on the master,

\textsuperscript{270} Dadelsen, 1988: 11
\textsuperscript{271} AUSTA South Australia Newsletter, July 2003
\textsuperscript{272} Wolff, 2000: 48
Johann Sebastian. The possibility that Anna Magdalena could have been anything more than a copyist is given no consideration.273

**I.6 CONCLUSION**

There is agreement amongst all authors about the *Six Cello Suites*: a) they were composed by Johann Sebastian; b) they come from the Cöthen period (1717-1723) and c) that Anna Magdalena copied them for the manuscript that also contained the *Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas*. For the most part, those who pass comment on them laud the musical merits of the *Suites*, but also single them out as exceptional in some way, though with some degree of qualification.

There is a consensus among those who mention her that Anna Magdalena was a talented musician, and all agree and give recognition to the fact that she was a singer. Not all, however, agree on her other role, as a *…chamber musician*. As is seen above, Robert L Marshall states emphatically that this phrase implies that she was also an instrumentalist, though he makes nothing of this beyond the simple statement. The Court records274 show Anna Magdalena listed as a *Chamber Musician* and not specifically as a singer, whilst other *…Associates*, the *…two Monjou sisters*, are listed as *…Singers* and Johann Bernhard Bach and Johann Colm are listed as copyists. According to Wolff, in the ‘New Grove - Bach Family’, Anna Magdalena is described on two occasions, in baptismal records, as a ‘court singer’ but on a third occasion as a ‘chamber musician’.275 This begs the question, what else was Anna Magdalena doing?

---

273 See Boyd, 2000: 75, for a typical summary of Anna Magdalena’s contribution to the musical output of her husband. Also see Wolff, 2000: 396 for similar.
274 See Wolff, 2000: 194
It is difficult to understand why recent authors have done little, if anything, to address the uncertainties surrounding Anna Magdalena’s role, and have essentially continued to amplify the accepted story of Johann Sebastian’s life and work. This situation is summed up, trenchantly, by David Yearsley in his review of Christoph Wolff’s book, ‘Johann Sebastian Bach - The Learned Musician’. He points out that:

...The ‘Learned Musician’ is designed to be the crowning achievement of two centuries of Bach scholarship rather than the starting point of a new tradition. Like Forkel before him, Wolff has given us a transcendent Bach. Now we need someone to bring him back down to earth.\textsuperscript{276}
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II.1 METHODS/APPROACH

This chapter focuses on the research methods used in the preparation of this thesis. The principal aim of the investigation is to seek evidence, if it exists, that could support the hypothesis that it is unlikely that Johann Sebastian Bach was the composer of the *Six Cello Suites*.

The two fields of investigation used to develop the hypothesis are:

1. Scientific Evidence - Forensic Document Examination of both Script Features and Music-Calligraphy

II.2 SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE - FORENSIC DOCUMENT EXAMINATION OF BOTH SCRIPT FEATURES AND MUSIC-CALLIGRAPHY

Whilst the principles of Forensic Document Examination have been applied very successfully to handwriting for many years in the realms of police criminal investigation, they have not been fully tested with respect to music-calligraphy. Notwithstanding, given that writing itself *is a conscious act...made up of innumerable subconscious, habitual patterns or mannerisms*, there would seem to be little reason to believe that the same basic principles should not apply to music-calligraphy. However, in respect of the act of copying, there may be some doubt as to validity of the method, as, by definition, the writer is “copying” from an existing model and therefore may be attempting to disguise their personal style in order to...

---

simulate or emulate the original. That being said, there is evidence to show that, even in the case of an attempt at an exact copy, the copyist may betray themselves through small personal writing habits – this is, indeed, how forgeries are detected. For this reason the focus of the research, in the first part of Chapter III, is handwriting, i.e. script, as well as those elements of music-calligraphy that can be defined as graphemes (see below).^278

On the surface, it may appear that there is little connection between issues of handwriting and the re-attribution of the Cello Suites. In point of fact, an investigation of all matters pertaining to the traditionally accepted role of Anna Magdalena as a copyist, including an investigation of her handwriting and music calligraphy, is critical to this issue, as the traditional view of her role, has influenced our understanding of the reception history of the Cello Suites. The latter has been shaped by scholars who have made assertions regarding the supposed similarity of the handwriting of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena. It is essential, therefore, that this supposed similarity of handwriting, a cornerstone of Bach scholarship, be thoroughly re-examined, through the application of scientific method. The outcome of such an examination may provide a different perspective, casting possible doubt on the validity of the traditional view of Anna Magdalena’s role.

Handwriting investigation, or more correctly, Forensic Document Examination, forms the central part of the thesis and is the part in which the most startling discoveries have been made. The Forensic Document Examination of various manuscripts has produced evidence that the variations in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian, as

^278 See Hilton, 1982: 182
described by such as Yoshitake Kobayashi in the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*, are inconsistent with scientifically accepted handwriting theory and principles, such as the following:

...*Writing is a conscious act. Still, through repeated use, the actual formation of each letter and word becomes almost automatic, so that the experienced writer concentrates most of his conscious thought on the subject matter rather than on the writing process itself. Thus, writing comes to be made up of innumerable subconscious, habitual patterns, which are as much a part of the individual as any of his personal habits or mannerisms.*

In view of the well-documented, and assumed, uncanny similarity of the music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena, handwriting samples taken from the manuscripts and documents attributed to Johann Sebastian, as well as from others believed to be in the handwriting of Anna Magdalena, have been subjected to Forensic Document Examination techniques. The similarity of their handwriting appears to defy the accepted understanding of handwriting principles. This issue merits investigation:

...*As with any skilled learnt motor behaviour, individuals are found to deviate in their abilities to perform identical movements both in relation to other individuals' attempts and when repeating. Indeed there are a large number of variables that can impact on an individual's ability to produce images in a consistent fashion in relation to a particular model. These include the writing*

---

279 Hilton, 1982: 153
system they were originally taught, their propensity to consciously modify the images away from the writing system, subconscious modifications to the movements, individual motor skills, the nature of individuals' neural processing and biomechanical/postural restrictions associated with any particular writing event. Individuals can purposefully change their motor output, and therefore the images that they produce, and can attempt to imitate the images produced by others. Under normal writing conditions these variables, in combination, result in any given individual producing handwriting that is both variable and likely to be pictorially and structurally different to the handwriting produced by other individuals. This, in combination with the difficulty that individuals have in copying accurately the handwritten images of others results in handwriting being a useful form of identification evidence in the forensic sciences.²⁸⁰ (My emphasis)

II.2.1. Resources

The handwriting analysis that has been undertaken has used, as source material, the facsimile\(^{281}\) documents in the *Niue Bach Abusage*, plus a number of other non-original documents obtained via the State Library of Berlin (Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz). Also examined were the original manuscripts of the *1713 Perpetual Canon for 4 Voices* and both the *1720* and the *1725 Klavierbüchleins*, at Houghton Library Harvard University, Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library Yale University, and the State Library of Berlin respectively. The material that has been examined in detail is, in the main, high quality facsimile material held on campus. It is as follows (original documents asterisked):

- The facsimile of the *Six Cello Suites* (NBA & Bärenreiter)
- The facsimile of the “1720 autograph” of the *Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas* (Heugel)
- Black & white photographs of the Anna Magdalena manuscript of the *Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas* (supplied by Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz)
- The facsimile *3 Two Part Inventions* (Wiener Urtext Edition)
- The original manuscript of the *1725 Klavierbüchlein für Anna Magdalena* (State Library of Berlin)
- Colour photographs of the *1722 Klavierbüchlein für Anna Magdalena* (supplied by Staatsbibliothek Preussischer Kulturbesitz)
- The original manuscript of the *1720 Clavier-Büchlein vor Wilhelm Friedemann Bach* (Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library Yale University)
- The original manuscript of the *1713 Perpetual Canon for 4 Voices* (Houghton Library Harvard University)

\(^{281}\) The word ‘facsimile’ is not a recognised expression by professional document examiners and, technically, should be referred to as a ‘non-original document’. However, for the purpose of this thesis, I will use ‘facsimile’, as it is the standard language of musicology
• The facsimile Orgelbüchlein (VEB Deutscher Verlag)

• The black & white facsimile material in the Neue Bach Ausgabe (Bärenreiter)

• The black & white facsimile manuscript of the Lute Suite arrangement of the 5th Cello Suite (KJOS Music)

• The facsimile of the Suite pour le Clavecin arrangement of the 3rd Violin Partita. (KJOS Music)

• The facsimile of Das Wohltemperierte Klavier I (Deutscher Verlag)

• The facsimile of BWV 1021, Violin Sonata in G

In addition to the above, I have examined, at the State Library of Berlin, Harvard University, the British Library and the Bach Bibliography at Queen’s University Belfast, a large number of facsimile manuscripts of the works of Johann Sebastian.

For advice and direction on the document examination undertaken, and for confirmation of the results therefrom, I have been fortunate to have had the assistance of Dr Bryan Found, an internationally recognised Forensic Document Examiner, based at La Trobe University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia. In undertaking the document examination, I have used ‘Documentation of Forensic Handwriting Comparison and Identification Method: A Modular Approach’ authored by Found and Rogers. This text is accepted, by the Australian & New Zealand police service and government, as the ‘standard’ method of handwriting examination.282 In the

---

282 Dr Bryan Found (http://www.latrobe.edu.au/humanbio/forensic/bryanscv.html) is a Senior Research Fellow in the School of Human Biosciences, La Trobe University and Head of the Forensic Validation Testing Laboratory. His duties include undertaking research on the motor control of handwriting and its forensic applications, the design, manufacturing, delivery and analysis of forensic document validation cases for Forensic Document Examiners internationally and the supervision of graduate research projects. Bryan also conducts workshops and specialist training lectures both nationally and internationally. He is a Senior Forensic Officer in the Document Examination Team of the Applied Science Branch, Chemistry Division, Victoria Police, at the Victoria Forensic Science Centre. His duties have included the management of the Team and its resources, the management of the examination of over 350 cases per annum, the examination of handwritten images, machine-generated images and other aspects of documentary evidence, the preparation of laboratory reports and
manuscript and document examination undertaken in this thesis, the principles, described in the aforesaid text, have been applied. In addition, other texts on the subject of document examination have been used as sources of extra advice and opinion.  

II.2.2 The Method

The theory and methodology of Forensic Document Examination used in the preparation of this thesis, is firmly founded on the notion that handwriting is itself a practiced skill, developed over the many years of life, and changing, normally slowly, as the writer matures:

...Writing is more, however, than a set of subconscious habits. It is a living, gradually changing part of the writer and is far from a mechanical reproduction prepared by the complex human mechanism of muscles and nerves that are called into play to produce it. It is influenced by a mental picture of copybook form, modified by individual taste and the writer's ability to imitate that which is in his mind.

The comparison between the handwriting of two people involves many issues; for example, age difference, characteristics relating to the styles originally learnt at

---

283 The most important of these being the works of: Huber & Headrick, Hilton and Williamson & Meenach. A complete list of the additional reference texts is given in Bibliography
284 An example of the application of the methodology is given in Appendix L.
285 Hilton, 1982: 153
school as a child and the writing implement used. Wilson R. Harrison goes further and says:

… 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 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.

Although this is so, it does not follow that the comparison of various specimens of handwriting to determine whether or not they have been written by the same person is necessarily simple and straightforward, even when there is no possibility of disguise having been introduced. The comparison of handwritings can never be accomplished mechanically as though pieces of a jigsaw puzzle were being compared with the spaces which remain to be filled. Human beings never function with the regularity and precision of machines, which is why natural variation will be a characteristic of every specimen of handwriting which is the subject of examination and comparison. The influence on handwriting of this natural variation has already been considered in some detail, but it must be repeated that because of it, one is unlikely to encounter passages of handwriting or even individual words which are perfect replicas, even when they have been written under similar conditions by a practised penman.

286 Found & Rogers, 1999: 2
It follows from this that because two specimens of handwriting, even when written by the same person, can never be replicas, a measure of judgment is called for on the part of the examiner when he has to decide whether:

(1) The differences in the handwritings being compared can be regarded as being due to variation, or if they are indicative of different authorship;

(2) In the absence of any consistent differences which cannot reasonably be attributed to natural variation, the sum total of resemblances in letter design and in details of structure uncovered by the examination can be explained only on the grounds that the writings are of common authorship, and that the possibility of the resemblances occurring by chance can be discounted.287

When comparing Johann Sebastian’s and Anna Magdalena’s handwriting, both script and musical-calligraphy, we are faced with an age difference of some 16 years, and, given the fact that they did not learn at the same institutions, there might also be a variation in …the writing system originally taught.288 Finally, they were of opposite genders.289

In order to fully grasp the importance of this, it must be understood that the processes involved in the development of handwriting (detailed above), relate to a number of

---

288 Found & Rogers, 1999: 2
289 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. {R. Huber., A. Headrick. Handwriting Identification: Facts and Fundamentals. (New York: CRC Press, 1999): 312}. 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.
basic writing style issues that evolve over a lifetime: when comparing the writing of a person at age 20, with the writing of the same individual at age 50, there will probably be very noticeable differences which will have occurred for variety of reasons; those reasons maybe such things as injury, physical sickness, failing eyesight etc. In the case of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena, for reasons already given, of differences of age and experience, we might expect to see a considerable difference in their notational and script styles. However, as will be seen, the opposite appears to be the case; her music-calligraphy and his are, by tradition, all but identical. If we presume that they both learnt to write musical notation before they met, which is more than reasonable given the period in history and that they were both professional musicians,\textsuperscript{290} then the assumed similarity in the styles becomes even more remarkable.

II.2.3 Elements of handwriting to be examined

The elements examined are as follows:

- Script
- Time signatures
- The ‘movement titles’ of the works in question
- Clefs
- General musical notation
- Signatures

II.2.4 Script Feature-Analysis

The examination of the handwriting or script of Anna Magdalena and Johann Sebastian, and all the items listed above, have been subjected to standard

\textsuperscript{290} See Marshall 1990: 192-200
analysis/examination according to the methods described by Found & Rogers 1999.

The basic procedure is as follows:

**Step One - Specimen contamination**

…The aim of this preliminary examination is to determine whether there is any indication that the specimen writings contain specimens from more than one writer. A specimen document containing a quantity of handwriting that can establish features that the examiner believes characterises the specimen writer is selected.\(^{291}\)

**Step Two - The determination of whether the specimen and questioned entries are comparable**

...In essence, the examiner’s opinion regarding the outcome of the visual comparison is based on the identification of a number of similar or different features between the questioned and specimen writings.\(^{292}\)

**Step Three – The comparison of questioned handwriting with specimen handwriting**

The examination of questioned handwriting is carried out through the process of ‘feature detection’,

...which rationalises that given an adequate quantity of skilled specimen and questioned writing, the brain can perform an analysis of the specimen writing and determine either visually or using magnification, special features which contribute to the writer’s pictorial character.\(^{293}\) (See Figure 2.1)

\(^{291}\) Found & Rogers, 1999: 9 – chapter author Sharon Birchall

\(^{292}\) Ibid. 1999: 11

\(^{293}\) Found & Rogers, 1999: 17
The method described above, is the ideal approach for the examination of a questioned document, when it is possible that either of two known individuals could have been the author of the questioned document. Through this method, one of the authors can be identified and the other excluded. In the case of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena, however, because of the paucity of known specimens of his

294 These flow charts are based on Found & Rogers 2003: 20 and personal communications with Dr Found.
handwriting, and also due to the fact that it is known that Johann Sebastian employed a secretary at certain times, it has not been possible to obtain sufficient examples of his ‘known’ writings to properly use this method. It is important to stress that there must be absolute certainty regarding the source material in this process, as contaminated\textsuperscript{295} material will invalidate the outcomes. So whilst there are letters that have a ‘Bach’ signature on them, there is no guarantee that the writer was, indeed, Johann Sebastian.\textsuperscript{296}

\textsuperscript{295} See Found & Rogers 2003: 11

\textsuperscript{296} See the section on Johann Sebastian’s signatures in Chapter III
The method described above, is the ideal approach for the examination of a number of questioned documents, when it is not possible to identify any of the authors specifically. Comparisons are made between the writings to establish if any of the questioned documents are attributable to the same author. In the document
examination undertaken in the preparation of this thesis, a combination or hybrid form of both the above described methods was used.

II.2.5 Writing Implements - Quills
The writing implement at the time was the quill, i.e. a feather sharpened and shaped to form a “nib” for writing. The steel pen did not appear until the mid-19th Century.

Goose feathers were the preferred type of feather, taken from the left wing of living birds. The five outer feathers were the best for writing, with the second and third feathers being the most sought after.297

The natural variation in the base material and the skill and style/technique of the quill sharpener (knife or person) all impact on the final product.298 To quote Dr Found on the matter of the use of quills …*It may increase the natural variation in the handwriting and adds to the difficulty of the identification tasks quite a bit*299

![Figure 2.3. An example of quills](image)

---

297 Britannica Micropaedia: 858
298 See Appendix I for method of cutting a quill
299 Personal communication via e mail 19/12/02
300 Photo taken from Britannica Micropaedia: 858
The next variant will be the user of the quill. The heaviness or lightness of the hand of the user will make significant differences to the refinement of the writing, even if the same quill is used. All these matters make it highly unlikely that Anna Magdalena and Johann Sebastian could have accidentally written music with such a close resemblance.

II.2.6 Music-calligraphy analysis

For the purposes of this thesis, certain elements of music-calligraphy will be treated as a sub-set of general script analysis, and, therefore, the same basic principles of examination will be applied to them also.

The time signatures

The writing of time signatures is, like all other aspects of handwriting, a learned habitual process where …the information required to produce these complex movements stems from ‘motor programs’ or motor memories within the brain. A time signature is made up of a combination of numerals - numerals which, themselves, have been learned as a normal part of the development of handwriting, and that are, then, arranged in a specific manner, one above the other. Aspects of a time signature that can be subjected to testing or examination are the numerals themselves, and the habitual layout or positioning of the numerals with respect to each other. Where numerals are concerned:

---

301 Found & Rogers, 1999: 11
302 ...The numerals 0-9 can be regarded in the same way as block capital writings. They too show the same sort of variation in method of construction and proportion. Figures 8 and 0 are variable in both the point at which the writing lines starts and ends, as well as in the direction of the pen movement which can... be related to the left- or right-handedness of the writer. David Ellen. The Scientific Examination of Documents (London: Taylor & Francis, 1997): 15.
three fundamental factors are involved—form, writing quality or movement, and variation. When a specimen of numerals is the work of one writer, a unique combination of these factors will present, and will form the basis of a positive identification.303

The ‘movement titles’ of the works in question

Movement titles, for example ‘Sarabande’, are, by definition, words, and therefore contain elements that can be subjected to handwriting comparison. Also, they provide common words, where:

…information can also be gained... this can provide information regarding the feature relationship between combinations of characters and words and the relationship of the allographs to layout features within the document itself including baselines304 and margins.305

The clefs

Clefs provide a rich source of material for stylistic comparability, as they are learned features of an individual’s repertoire of symbols that are ...the product of a long period of modification of the copybook-form and adaptation to his needs and abilities.306 Each clef type in turn has been learned through much repetition and, therefore, great variation is unlikely once a ‘model’ has been established. This does not imply that there would be no variation at all, but rather, that any variation would

---

303 Hilton, 1982: 217
304 …The base line is the imaginary line upon which each letter sits. (D Williamson., E. Meenach. Cross-Check System for Forgery and Questioned Document Examination. (Nelson-Hall, 1981): 3
305 Found & Rogers, 1999: 13
306 Harrison, 1966: 291
be relatively small; any variation would fall within such limited parameters that the symbols (clefs - a writing “feature”) would remain recognisable:

...Feature detection is based on the rationale that, under normal conditions, given a sufficient amount of writings, skilled writers are unlikely to produce handwritten images that are exactly the same... which is why it is not surprising that persons in the general population easily recognise familiar writings...307

General musical notation

A lack of "complexity"308 and an inconsistency of placement of certain aspects of musical notation, for example, the construction and positioning of stems or beaming, make them unsuitable, when taken in isolation, for handwriting comparison. Nevertheless, the overall flow of musical writing, which might well be characterised as similar in structure to that of signatures, is, like them, open to comparison.

...Whilst the comparison of signatures adheres to the same principles that pertain to handwriting, however signatures bear no recognisable text characters ...[therefore] ...the stylised forms or features are to be compared rather than any grapheme types.309

307 Found & Rogers, 1999: 18
308 …Lines, vertical or horizontal, are not considered complex as they are simple actions and therefore do not contain enough basic information to make comparison valid Found & Rogers, 1999: 27
309 Found & Rogers, 1999: 14
Signatures

Johann Sebastian’s manuscripts contain a variety of differing ‘signatures’ that can be subjected to comparison in the standard mode.

On the advice of Dr. Bryan Found, the use of scanning technology was added to the traditional range of tools (ruler, protractor and loupe) and techniques used in this research. This technology was of assistance in the comparison of handwriting and the presentation of evidence. Wherever possible, the source material used consisted of high-quality facsimile, but in two instances (Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas and the 1722 Klavierbüchlein) only photographs were available at the time of analysis. I do not believe that the use of facsimile and photographs materially influenced the overall outcome of the analysis, as this research did not involved the study of paper substance, binding, watermarks etc.310

II.2.2 Musical Evidence – Issues of Questionable Authorship - Chapter IV

Chapter IV focuses on issues of questionable authorship through an examination of the transmission and filiations of the four handwritten Sources of the Cello Suites and a comparative morphological/stylistic study of the Cello Suites.

The hypothesis, that someone other than Johann Sebastian composed the Six Cello Suites, required the examination of the evidence and the processes by which claims to authorship of any piece of music from the 18th Century have been made. Leading on from this, the connection between the Six Cello Suites and Six Violin Sonatas & Partitas also required exploration. And in this regard, the three earliest versions of the

310 See Appendix K – Forensic Document Examination Glossary of Terms
Violin Sonatas & Partitas and the two early manuscripts of the Cello Suites, (Sources A and B), were also closely compared. The findings from this study are presented in Chapter IV, in which the relationship between the ‘1720 Autograph’ and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, explored in Chapter III, is further developed.

The morphological and stylistic study, which forms the second part of Chapter IV, is centred on the unaccompanied string music attributed to Johann Sebastian, i.e. the Six Cello Suites and the Six Unaccompanied Sonatas & Partitas for violin. The method used was, in part, statistical in nature. All the repertoire of the non-public suite and partita genre attributed to Johann Sebastian, was investigated. This was done so as to establish, whether or not his music, in the genre of the suite/partita, possesses compositionally, an inter-movement structural style such that it would be possible to establish a musical/structural “finger print” for Johann Sebastian. This information could then be used to show whether or not the Six Cello Suites fall within or outside his musical style. Other elements were also investigated.
CHAPTER III

HANDWRITING AND MUSIC-CALLIGRAPHY INVESTIGATION
CHAPTER III
HANDWRITING AND MUSIC-CALLIGRAPHY INVESTIGATION

Forensic Document Examination is the study of physical evidence, and physical evidence cannot lie - Roy A. Huber\textsuperscript{311}

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\textsuperscript{312}

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\textsuperscript{313}

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\textsuperscript{314}

\textsuperscript{314} Charles Hamilton. The Hitler Diaries – Fakes that fooled the World. (University Press of Kentucky, 1991): 71
III. 1 HANDWRITING INVESTIGATION

III.1.1. A NEW APPROACH

In this Chapter, a new approach has been taken to help solve the puzzling, and often vexed, issue of the similarity between the music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena. Using the methods of Forensic Document Examination, described in Chapter II, characters in the handwriting and music-calligraphy of Anna Magdalena, that are distinctive in nature and that set her handwriting clearly apart from Johann Sebastian, will be identified. In the examination undertaken in the preparation of this Chapter, all available, relevant documents and writings have been included in the analysis; for reasons that will become clear, music-calligraphy, apart from the clef types used, has been given little or no consideration in the first part. The primary reason for choosing this path of investigation is that, from a forensic examiner’s position, handwriting provides material that is of a more ‘complex’ nature. As Found & Rogers assert …*It is the complexity of the handwriting that is crucial.* (See Figure 3.1) However, the matter of similarity between the music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena is pertinent to the final conclusions of this thesis. For the purpose of clarity in what follows, the expression ‘handwriting’ refers to non-music-calligraphy, that is to say, personal ‘script’; music-calligraphy will be referred to as such.

---

315 *The complexity of handwriting is based on...the ease that a handwriting sample might be simulated by another writer* (Found & Rogers, 1999: 26) *...as complexity increases (as reflected in the number of strokes, for example), the likelihood that the samples will diverge in some way from each other would, in general, increase.* (Found & Rogers, 1999: 27)

316 Found & Rogers, 1999: 27

317 Could two people, separated, in age by 16 years, with differing educational and experiential backgrounds, accidentally possess such similar music-calligraphy; or is a different hypothesis required to explain the handwriting issues?
Figure 3.1 The generalised complexity of relationships between the amount of skilled writing available in the sample, the ease which the sample could be simulated and the likelihood of a chance match with more than one writer.\textsuperscript{318}

It must be stated at the outset, that the final evaluation, following an investigation, comparison or examination of any specimens of handwriting, particularly when the specimens are very similar, will always be a matter of opinion:

\textit{...therefore [the final evaluation] should be referred to as ‘opinion identification evidence’ whereby expert opinion refers to the examiner’s belief in the extent to which the evidence supports that the specimen writer did or did not write the questioned writing.}\textsuperscript{319}

In the following handwriting analysis, then, the conclusions presented are weighed in the context of the balance of probability that either Anna Magdalena or Johann Sebastian wrote the specimen in question.

\textsuperscript{318} See Found & Rogers, 2003: 35 This diagram shows graphically that the more complexity the written item contains, the less likely it is to be matched, by chance, in another’s writing, and the increased level of skill required to copy it accurately

\textsuperscript{319} Found & Rogers, 1999: 3
The possibility of a chance match between the two handwritings must also be considered. However, there are good reasons to believe that it is highly unlikely that such a chance match could have occurred:

…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.320

The importance of absolute certainty, regarding authorship, cannot be overstressed, as contaminated material will invalidate the outcomes. This is best illustrated, in modern times, by the so-called ‘Hitler Diary Hoax’, which Dr Bryan Found recommended to me as a case study. The experts who authenticated the ‘Diaries’, had been given material, as ‘standard’,322 which turned out to be forged material.323

In the case of Johann Sebastian, there is a scarcity of ‘known specimens’ of his handwriting. This is due to the fact that he is known to have employed a secretary at certain times – a secretary who may well have penned, and indeed signed, letters on his behalf. The consequence of this for Bach researchers is that it is impossible to identify, with certainty, the author of handwriting material – even that bearing his

322 ‘Standard’ in this case means material that is known to be by the author in question
324 See Wolff, 2000: 392
signature. So, whilst there are letters bearing a ‘Bach’ signature, there is no guarantee that the writer of any particular letter/document was, indeed, Johann Sebastian. From a forensic point of view, therefore, a ‘Bach’ signature is insufficient proof of authorship.

In the case of Anna Magdalena, by contrast, there are a few documents/letters that are known, with certainty, to be in her handwriting. Consequently, on the basis of the statistical improbability that their writings are identical, (see above) it is possible to identify the writings of Anna Magdalena without the need for direct comparison with Johann Sebastian.

In the handwriting analysis that follows, the main focus of argument or discussion is the facsimile material contained in the *Neue Bach Ausgabe “Die Notenschrift Johann Sebastian Bachs”* written by Yoshitake Kobayashi. Other material that has also been subjected to similar analysis is the *1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann*.

### III.1. 2 In search of the handwriting of Anna Magdalena Bach

Put very simplistically, the generally accepted position, regarding the extant manuscripts attributed to Johann Sebastian, is as follows: those manuscripts that still exist, in his handwriting, were composed by him; those extant manuscripts, in the handwriting of Anna Magdalena, are merely copies of music composed by Johann Sebastian. As will be seen later, the handwriting analysis that has taken place to

---

325 For example the ‘Wine & Taxes’ letter dated 1748 can not with 100% certainty be said to be in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian even though it has his ‘signature’, because, according to Dr Found and Optometrist Melvyn Kaufman at the Royal Free Eye Hospital, London, following the examination of the letter, it does not appear to be the writing of someone with cataracts or any kind of sight impairment, which it is known that Johann Sebastian experienced at that time of his life. (Personal communications October and November 2004) See also Huber & Headrick, 1999: 192/93

326 See Chapter I, Literature Review
support this position since …Philipp Spitta demanded such examination\textsuperscript{327} in the 19\textsuperscript{th} Century, has focused, for the most part, on the music-calligraphy of the two people and has ignored or excluded any other handwriting specimens,\textsuperscript{328} i.e. any non-music documents written by either of them.\textsuperscript{329}

The remarkable similarity between the music-calligraphy of Anna Magdalena and Johann Sebastian often makes it unreliable as a source of guaranteed identification.

...An additional difficulty arises in Bach's case: his second wife, Anna Magdalena, wrote many of his manuscripts for him. But her musical handwriting came to resemble her husband's so closely that for a long time Anna Magdalena's manuscripts were mistaken for autographs - for example, the most important source for the Six Suites for Cello Solo or the manuscript of the Sonata for Violin and b.c. [basso continuo] in G Major BWV 1021, which was not discovered until 1928. Researchers have only been able to straighten these matters out in the last few decades.\textsuperscript{330}

Figure 3.2 demonstrates the remarkable similarity in the music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian (see Example.3.2.1) and Anna Magdalena (see Example.3.2.2). To give greater emphasis to this similarity, an example of Johann Peter Kellner’s copy of the same bars taken from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} Unaccompanied Sonata is also shown in Example 3.2.3.

\textsuperscript{327} Kobayashi, 1989: 13
\textsuperscript{328} The exception to this rule given by Kobayashi is the title page of the 1722 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann and the work of von Dadelsen discussed in Chapter I
\textsuperscript{329} See Kobayashi, 1989: 13
\textsuperscript{330} Vogt, 1981: 19
Figure 3. 2 Examples of Music-Calligraphy

Example 3.2. 1 Excerpts taken from the 1st Movement of the A minor Sonata attributed to Johann Sebastian

Example 3.2. 2 Excerpts taken from the 1st Movement of the A minor Sonata attributed to Anna Magdalena

Example 3.2. 3 Excerpts taken from the 1st Movement of the A minor Sonata in Kellner’s manuscript

It can clearly be seen that there can be no mistaking Johann Peter Kellner’s copy for either Johann Sebastian’s manuscript or that of Anna Magdalena. However, it is far less easy to determine the differences between the manuscripts of Anna Magdalena and Johann Sebastian. It is this similarity that has caused the confusion mentioned by Hans Vogt. Therefore, means other than those used in the past must be found to prise the handwriting of the two of them apart. Example 3.2.4 and Example 3.2.5 are the closing bars of the Largo from the C major Sonata. On the surface, the two examples do not exhibit great similarity in execution, or vertical alignment, however, when re-aligned using computer technology, the similarity between the two is quite extraordinary. (See Examples 3.2.6 and 3.2.7)
III.1. 3 DEFINING ANNA MAGDALENA BACH’S HANDWRITING

In order to trace Anna Magdalena’s handwriting and music-calligraphy through the volumes of music attributed to Johann Sebastian, it is essential first to establish characteristics that pertain only to her handwriting and music-calligraphy, characteristics that are, as far as possible, clear and unequivocal.
For the purposes of demonstrating handwriting variation, Figure 3.3 contains examples of the handwriting of two of Johann Sebastian's family members and an unknown associated individual:

**Figure 3.3** Handwriting examples

**Example 3.3. 1** The handwriting of C. P. E. Bach – Schwendowius and Dömling, 1977, p. 54

**Example 3.3. 2** The handwriting of J. C. F. Bach, *1725 Klavierbüchlein*, p. 123

**Example 3.3. 3** The handwriting of an unknown scribe *1725 Klavierbüchlein*, p. 110

There are a number of sources for establishing the characteristics or features of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting, where those sources are accepted, by all experts, as being unchallengeable as the handwriting or music-calligraphy of Anna Magdalena. The items in question are:
• Item 1 - The 1725 Klavierbüchlein für Anna Magdalena Bach\textsuperscript{331} (second part thereof, which also contains Anna Magdalena’s handwritten text at the end of the volume)
• Item 2 - The title page of the 1722 Klavierbüchlein für Anna Magdalena Bach\textsuperscript{332}
• Item 3 - Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Six Cello Suites\textsuperscript{333}
• Item 4 - Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Six Violin Sonatas & Partitas\textsuperscript{334}
• Item 5 - Anna Magdalena’s 1750 Petition written to the Council of the City of Leipzig two weeks after the death of Johann Sebastian\textsuperscript{335}
• Item 6 – The 1741 “Herzens Freündin” Letter

Utilising the sources listed above, the method used to establish those identifiable characteristics or features is as follows:

1. To use the 1750 Petition to the Council of City of Leipzig, written by Anna Magdalena in August 1750, following the death of Johann Sebastian, as the definitive source\textsuperscript{336} for her script, to initially establish her letter shapes (graphemes\textsuperscript{337}) and number forms (also graphemes).

\textsuperscript{331} See Dadelsen, 1988: 14 - 16
\textsuperscript{332} See Wolff, 2000: 218
\textsuperscript{333} See Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 4
\textsuperscript{334} Ibid. 6
\textsuperscript{335} See Schwendowius & Dömling, 1977: 65
\textsuperscript{336} As the letter was written after the death of Johann Sebastian, clearly, Johann Sebastian’s handwriting cannot be present. Comparison of the handwriting in the ‘Petition’ with other known samples of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting shows that it is very likely in her hand.
\textsuperscript{337} “Letters can be thought of as either graphemes (such as the images representing the letter ‘g’, which might be uppercase, lowercase, cursive or printed) or allographs, which are specific forms of graphemes (such as the printed character ‘g’).” (Found & Rogers, 1999: 11) For the purpose of this examination clefs are seen as stylised or specific forms of the letters C, F & G, therefore allographs. Time signatures are also treated as allographs as they form a specific arrangement of numbers.
2. Using the information from Item 1 (i.e. the 1750 Petition to the Council), as a means to affirm that the handwriting in the latter parts of the 1725 Klavierbüchlein is also in Anna Magdalena’s handwriting.

3. Using the handwriting in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein as an additional source of information about Anna Magdalena’s handwriting habits for comparison purposes.

Finally,

4. Adding to that information by using the musical sources, given above, to establish the forms of Anna Magdalena’s clefs (C, F & G - allographs), time-signature types (allographs) and also additional material regarding her number habits.

The above process provides a basis for the examination and comparison of the ‘unknown’ writings. Having established that they are indeed by the same writer, Anna Magdalena in this case, they then become the ‘known’ specimens, referred to as ‘exemplars’. These are then used when examining the ‘questioned’ writings.\textsuperscript{338} In undertaking this document examination, matters of ‘copy-book’\textsuperscript{339} style have been considered in drawing the conclusions.

\textsuperscript{338} …the term ‘questioned’ indicating that not everything about the document is accepted for what it appears to be (Ellen, 1997: 3)

\textsuperscript{339} …Copybooks and writing instruction give us general parameters within which the writing should be executed and prescribe certain consistencies that should be observed. (Huber & Headrick, 1999: 102)
THE CONCLUSION DRAWN IS THAT ANNA MAGDALENA’S HANDWRITING IS IN ALL OF THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS – THESE BECOME THE KNOWN SPECIMENS FOR THE PURPOSES OF FURTHER EXAMINATION

QUESTIONED DOCUMENTS
For example: Orgelbüchlein, 1720 Klavierbüchlein, Das Wohltemperierte Klavier I
What is created through the hybrid method of forensic examination, see Figure 3.4 and pages 96 and 98, is an intersection between the handwriting of Anna Magdalena and her music-calligraphy, particularly her C clef forms, giving conclusive proof, from two perspectives, of her involvement in the documents examined.

What follows is a summary of the handwriting analysis that has taken place over an extensive period; it represents, by example, the process and conclusions rather than the mechanics of the totality of the analysis itself.

Plate 3.1 A photograph showing some of the traditional tools for Forensic Document Examination i.e. protractor, loupe, ruler, transparencies and tracing paper
III.1. 4 Handwriting characteristics

From the two pages of Anna Magdalena’s ‘1750 Petition to the Council of the City of Leipzig’ given below, in Figures 3.5 & 3.5.1, some general observations can be made:

- The writing is of an uneven nature
- The letter formations are of differing sizes
- The left margin is large and ragged and the right margin is almost non-existent
- The baselines of writing appear to have a degree of curvature
- Capital letters are often highly stylised
- The script form is generally both upper and lowercase ‘Kurrentschrift’ script style. However, some French Script forms are also present.
- There is a significant obvious slant to the writing

340 I will use the word ‘Kurrentschrift’ to describe Anna Magdalena’s cursive German script. …The Kurrent script, [Kurrentschrift] which is commonly known as “The Old German Script” evolved from the gothic cursive handwriting at the beginning of the 16th century. The gothic cursive had been in use throughout much of the medieval ages [Middle Ages] and had developed into a staggering number of different writing styles. The need for a uniform and legible handwriting led many important writing masters to the development of the Kurrentschrift, a script that was soon adopted by many chancelleries because it was beautiful, fast to write and comparatively legible. This initiated the widespread use of Kurrentschrift as an everyday handwriting. Over the next two hundred years, writing styles became more and more standardized, so that by the end of the 18th century the “modern” form of the Kurrentschrift was established. (http://www.waldenfont.com/content.asp?contentpageID=8) Anna Magdalena used three forms of script; the Fraktur alphabet “…called because of its ornamental twiddly bits (curlicues) break the continuous line of a word (http://www.omniglot.com/writing/german.htm), for the most formal writings e.g. the title page of the 1722 Klavierbüchlein; for other writings she uses upper and lower case of old German Chancery Script which appears to be quite similar to the later 19th Century Sütterlin script type, created by the Berlin graphic artist Ludwig Sütterlin (1865-1917), who modeled it on the style of writing used in the old German Chancery. See Appendix H. She also used French script form when writing in French or Italian. See Appendix H
Figure 3.5 Anna Magdalena’s Petition to the Council of the City of Leipzig, 1750
Table 3.1 Graphemes - letters, words and numbers
Anna Magdalena’s alphabet graphemes & numerals taken from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, Anna Magdalena’s Manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, the Six Cello Suites and the 1750 Petition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grapheme</th>
<th>Image</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aa</td>
<td>![Aa Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>![Bb Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cc</td>
<td>![Cc Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dd</td>
<td>![Dd Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ee</td>
<td>![Ee Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ff</td>
<td>![Ff Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gg</td>
<td>![Gg Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hh</td>
<td>![Hh Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ii</td>
<td>![Ii Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>![J Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>![k Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ll</td>
<td>![Ll Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mn</td>
<td>![Mn Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nn</td>
<td>![Nn Image]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As an example of the approach taken to the analysis, an examination of Anna Magdalena’s signature at the conclusion of her Petition to the Council in Figure 3.5.1 is undertaken as follows. (See Figure 3.5.2)

The most striking features in Anna Magdalena’s signature are the unusual capital ‘A’ at the beginning of ‘Anna’, on the far left, and the ‘Kurrentschrift’ form capital letter ‘B’ in the word ‘Bach’ (spelt B a c h i n {or possibly} i u m)\(^{341}\) – though Anna Magdalena spells her name ‘Bachin’ on the title page of the 1722 Klavierbüchlein. She also uses of the Kurrentschrift script lowercase ‘h’ in the word ‘Bach’ and has also added her maiden name (Wilcken) at the bottom.

An examination of the entire document gives a clear picture of Anna Magdalena’s use of both graphemes and whole words, for example it can be seen that she uses two forms of the grapheme ‘m’, viz the capital ‘M’ at the start of the word ‘Music’ in Figure 3.5.3, which begins at a low point on the left; and then the lower case ‘m’ at the end of the word ‘Cantorem’ in Figure 3.5.3, which flows up from the base of ‘e’ and the grapheme itself begins at the top of the letter ‘m’. She also crosses her letter ‘t’ in the mid to lower part of the vertical stoke.\(^{342}\)

\(^{341}\) There are at least two occasions where ‘Bachium’ is used see Kobayashi, 1989, Abb. 3: 27 and the NBR, 1998: 211 (no explanation is offered for the use of this form)

\(^{342}\) See Appendix H
Further examples of other characteristic words, graphemes and numerals within the 1750 Petition are as follows:

The expression ‘characteristic’ or more correctly ‘feature’ is applied in two senses: firstly, words which are repeated within the Petition; for example, the word ‘zu’ (the word on the far left of the top line in Figure 3.5.3); secondly, words or letter grapheme shapes that have a clear and unusual style to them; for example the capital allograph ‘C’ (see Figure 3.5.3 above) which has an additional ‘c’ shape attached, forming a type of ‘x’ shape at the upper part of the ‘C’ $\mathcal{C}$. Another example is the capital ‘T’ in “Thomae”.

In addition to the non-music documents, the music manuscripts also contain words that are of use in defining Anna Magdalena’s handwriting style. Besides the standard ‘movement titles’, there are other words and graphemes that can be used as standards.
It is clear from Figure 3.6, that the cursive handwriting, as it occurs in the Petition and the 1725 Klavierbüchlein (for example the words and ) are written by the same person; similarly, with the Six Cello Suites and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Six Violin Sonatas & Partitas, it can be seen, though a little less obviously, that, for example, the ‘d’ in “fundamental”, from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, is very similar to the ‘d’ in “des” from the Six Cello Suites. Likewise, from the examples given above, the words “Fine” in both the Cello Suites and the Violin works, and the word “Tempo” from the Violin works are similarly constructed to the letter ‘T’ in “Thomas” from the Petition. Also, the
construction of the numerals supports the general position that the same person wrote
the given material.

All the above Forensic Document Examination confirms the accepted position,
which is, that Anna Magdalena is very likely to have written all the above words,
allographs and numerals.\textsuperscript{343}

\textsuperscript{343} The reasons for choosing some of the above words, letters and numbers as examples, will become
clear later. However \ldots certain words, usually short have an importance in Forensic Document
Examination \ldots are not words in the usual sense of the term, but are symbols. They are put on
paper not as a successive series of letters, but are executed as single units. (Huber & Headrick, 1999: 74)
III.1. 5 CLEFS\textsuperscript{344}

Another source of identification comes from the style and execution of the various types of clef used by Anna Magdalena. It is accepted that the following C clefs are those of Anna Magdalena:\textsuperscript{345} (See Figure 3.7)

![Type 1 Clef](image1)
![Type 2 Clef](image2)
![Type 3 Clef](image3)

**Figure 3.7** The clef types in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein and the Six Cello Suites

The C clef is by far the easiest to distinguish, as each person has his or her own unique style for the execution of this,\textsuperscript{346} now much less frequently used, clef; the particular individual nature of C clefs was, of course, a critical factor in Walter Emery’s work, discussed in Chapter I.

Far more difficult to distinguish are differences in the execution of the G clef and the F clef.

![Type 1 G Clef](image4)
![Type 2 G Clef](image5)
![Type 3 G Clef](image6)

**Figure 3.8** Examples of Anna Magdalena’s G clef as they appear in her manuscript of the 2nd Partita from the Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas

\textsuperscript{344} Clefs are types of allographs i.e. specific types of grapheme
\textsuperscript{345} See Dadelsen, 1988 Afterword – Table of Contents: 14 -16
\textsuperscript{346} See Appendix G for examples of contemporary C clefs
As can be quite clearly seen in Figure 3.8, the G clefs written by Anna Magdalena generally tend to lean towards the right and are often left ‘open’\(^{347}\), with the ‘G’ line running through the ‘swirl’ at the start of the pen stroke. Also in the G clef, there is often a type of lowercase ‘y’ feature contained in the swirl, as exampled in the middle example in Figure 3.8. This is consistent throughout the hundreds of G clefs within the manuscript of the *Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas*. Examples of Anna Magdalena’s F clefs are given in Figures 3.9 and Figure 3.10.

\[\text{Figure 3.9} \text{ Examples of Anna Magdalena’s F clefs as they appear in the Prelude of the 3rd Cello Suite}\]

\[\text{Figure 3.10} \text{ Examples of the F clef as they appear in the Gigue of the 1st Suite pour le Clavecin 1725 Klavierbüchlein}\]

\(^{347}\) See the 2\(^{nd}\) and 3\(^{rd}\) G clefs
III.1. 6 Anna Magdalena’s Signature

The two signatures of Anna Magdalena in Figures 3.11 and 3.12 clearly demonstrate the consistent nature of her signature in both documents. Other writings within the 1741 letter, shown in Figure 3.13, below, confirm that the 1741 Letter, when compared with the 1750 Petition, is indeed in the handwriting of Anna Magdalena; it can, therefore, be used as an additional source to trace Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in the documents that follow.348

348 See Table 3.1 for an alphabet of Anna Magdalena’s graphemes.
Figure 3.13 A letter from Anna Magdalena dated 1741

The written text in modern German:

“Als die HochEdlen, Hoch- Ehr- und Tugend-
begabten Jonffer, Jonfer Christiana Sybilla Bosin, meiner besonders hochgeehrtesten Jonfer Gefatterin u. werhesten Herzens Freudlin Erfreücher Geburths Tag einfiel; wolte mit diesen kleinen doch wohlgemeinten Andencken sich bestens empfehlen.

Anna Magdalena Bachin

III.1. 7 DETECTING ANNA MAGDALENA’S HANDWRITING

Using the detailed information from the previous section, it is now possible to go in search of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting. See Figure 3.14. The marked areas are of particular interest.

Figure 3. 14 Perpetual Canon for 4 Voices, dated 1713, showing Anna Magdalena’s characteristic clefs, numerals and capital B (Kurrentschrift script which, in this case, appears to be a large lowercase ‘b’) in the word Bach (note the use of the lowercase Kurrentschrift script form ‘h’)

---

350 For examples of Johann Sebastian’s signatures see below
There appears to be evidence of the handwriting of Anna Magdalena Bach as far back as 1713, the year when it is possible that Johann Sebastian visited his colleague Johann Kasper Wilcken at Zeitz, whilst giving his first guest appearance at Weissenfels. Anna Magdalena would have been nearly 12 years old. I have examined the original document at the Houghton Library Harvard University.

Firstly, it can be seen that the unusual Kurrentschrift capital ‘B’ in the word Bach, in the lower right hand corner in Figure 3.14, is, despite a 37 year separation in the writings, remarkably similar to the capital ‘B’ used in the ‘1750 Petition’ and the 1741 Letter. (See Figure 3.14.1) In all the following examples the ‘questioned writing’ is to the left of the exemplars.

![Figure 3.14. 1](image1)

**Figure 3.14.1** On the far left is the questioned capital ‘B’, and on the right, the exemplar lowercase and capital ‘B’s, from the Petition and the 1714 Letter.

![Figure 3.14. 2](image2)

**Figure 3.14.2** On the left is the questioned grapheme showing the flow direction of the pen-stroke and on the right the exemplar graphemes from the 1741 Letter and the 1750 Petition.

It can be seen that the Kurrentschrift script ‘h’ is used in the word “Bach” in the same way that it is used in the 1750 Petition (Note: the apparent dot above the ‘c’ Figure

---

351 The date ‘1713’ might of course have been added much later, though this is unlikely.
352 See Marshall, 1990: 193
353 See Wolff, 2000: 216
354 See Appendix U for the complete German Script alphabet
3.14 In the name ‘Bach’ is an ink splash – in Figure 3.14.3 the ink splash has been removed.

When the whole word is observed in Figure 3.14.3, the similarity in style is very noticeable, particularly given that there is a separation of some 37 years between the writings (1713 to 1750 - assuming the date was written on the Canon at the time):

![Figure 3.14.3](image)

**Figure 3.14.3** On the left is the questioned signature ‘Bach’ and on the right the exemplar signatures from the 1741 Letter and the 1750 Petition. Note: The writer appears to have used a lowercase Kurrentschrift ‘b’ in the questioned signature and the known signature from 1741, instead of the correct uppercase ‘B’ as is shown in the exemplar on the far right. See Appendix H for ‘copybook’ examples of Kurrentschrift Script forms.

In the execution of the ‘A’ in Figure 3.14.4, in what appears to be an abbreviation for the word August, there are marked similarities with the ‘A’ in word “Aug” from the 1750 Petition and the ‘A’ in the word “Aria” from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein:

![Figure 3.14.4](image)

**Figure 3.14.4** On the left is the questioned material, and on the right the exemplars from the 1750 Petition and the 1725 Klavierbüchlein

The execution of the numerals in the date ‘1713’ in Figure 3.14.5 is very similar to the method of execution of the numerals in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, particularly the join between the number 1 and the adjacent number; note that both the numbers ‘1’ in the
numeral eleven, have dots above them, and that there is a striking similarity in the execution of both dots (the first being slightly oval shaped, with the pen stroke pulling to the right, and the second being a round dot). Also, the numeral ‘7’ is executed at a similar angle and style to the exemplar from the 1722 Klavierbüchlein title page.

Further examples of what appears to be the handwriting of Anna Magdalena are given in Figure 3.15

Figure 3.15 On the far left (column A) are the questioned clefs and on the right (column B) the exemplars from the known sources given in Figures 3.7, 3.8 & 3.9 on pages 128 and 129. On the far right-hand side, and for the purposes of comparison, are examples of Johann Sebastian’s most common clef forms (column C). Johann Peter Kellner’s clef forms in column D are given for the purposes of comparison.
All of the 3 clef types (C, F, & G) in the ‘Canon’ appear very similar to those known to be by Anna Magdalena. In each of the examples given above, the clef given to the right of each pair is in Anna Magdalena’s handwriting. The exemplars are taken from Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas (G clef) the Cello Suites (F clef), the 1725 Klavierbüchlein and the last sample is also from the Six Cello Suites.

Other examples of graphemes executed in Anna Magdalena’s style (the exemplars taken from Appendix V - Anna Magdalena’s Alphabet - are on the right of each specimen):

1. The capital ‘D’

2. The letter ‘t’, which is crossed in the middle, as was Anna Magdalena’s habit (see Appendix R for examples)

3. The ‘g’

Note, too, that the slant of the letters ‘D’, ‘t’ and ‘g’ is virtually identical with the exemplars at approximately 50 degrees from the horizontal.

The word ‘pertetuuo’ (sic) has been misspelt, that is to say, it should have been spelt either ‘perpetuo’ or ‘perpetuum’, suggesting that a young person might have written the word – Johann Sebastian was 28 years old in 1713, Anna Magdalena was 11, nearly 12, years old at the time.

355 Examples of Johann Sebastian’s crossing of the letter ‘t’ are given in Appendix H.
Figure 3. 16 The title page of the Cantata “Nun komm, der Heiland” BWV 61 dated 1714
Possible traces of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting appear next on the title page of the Cantata ‘Nun komm, der Heiland’ dated 1714. See Figures 3.16.1 to 3.16.5

**Figure 3.16.1** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplar material from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the *Six Violin Sonatas & Partitas* and the title page of the 1722 Klavierbüchlein.

**Figure 3.16.2** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplar from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein.

**Figure 3.16.3** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplars from the 1750 Petition.

**Figure 3.16.4** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplar from the *Six Cello Suites*.

**Figure 3.16.5** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplar from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein.
Figure 3. 17 The title page of Cantata Barmherziges Herze der ewigen Liebe BWV 185 dated 1715
The material below in Figures 3.17.1 to 3.17.6 shows that there is striking resemblance in the method of execution of the letters and numbers in the exemplars on the right and the questioned specimens on the left hand, taken from the title page of Cantata Barmherziges Herze der ewigen Liebe BWV 185 dated 1715.

**Figure 3.17.1** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplar from the 1750 Petition.

**Figure 3.17.2** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplars from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein and the 1750 Petition.

**Figure 3.17.3** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplar from the 1750 Petition.

**Figure 3.17.4** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplar from the 1750 Petition.

**Figure 3.17.5** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplar from the 1750 Petition.

**Figure 3.17.6** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplars from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein and the 1722 Klavierbüchlein.
Figure 3. 18 The title page of Cantata Bereitet die Wege, bereitet die Bahn! BWV 132 dated 1715
Below, in Figures 3.18.1 to 3.18.3, are other examples taken from the same year, 1715. Similarities are present in the 3‘b’s in the top line (Bereitet die Wege, bereitet die Bahn) of the questioned specimen and ‘b’ of the exemplar as well as in the capital letter ‘A’ in the word ‘Advent’ and capital ‘B’ in Bach. Note: It appears that, in the bottom right-hand corner of the title page, the writer has given Johann Sebastian’s age in 1715 as 30 years. (See Figure 3.18)

**Figure 3.18. 1** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplars from the 1750 Petition

**Figure 3.18. 2** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplars from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein and the 1722 Klavierbüchlein

**Figure 3.18. 3** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplars from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein and the 1750 Petition
Figure 3. 19 The title page of the 1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann Bach
Anna Magdalena’s handwriting also seems to appear in the 1720 Klavierbüchlein written for Wilhelm Friedemann Bach. From the title page:

**Figure 3.19. 1** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplars from the 1722 Klavierbüchlein

**Figure 3.19. 2** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplars from the 1750 Petition

**Figure 3.19. 3** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplar from the 1750 Petition

**Figure 3.19. 4** On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplars from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein and the 1722 Klavierbüchlein
Figure 3.19. 5 Page 1 of the 1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann Bach
Figure 3.19. 6 On the left are the questioned clefs from the 1st page of the same volume and on the right the exemplars from *Six Cello Suites* and the *1725 Klavierbüchlein*

Figure 3.19. 7 On the left is the questioned material from the 1st page of the same volume and on the right the exemplar from the *1750 Petition*

Figure 3.19. 8 On the left is the questioned material from the 1st page of the same volume and on the right the exemplar from the *1750 Petition*

Note that the above-circled letter ‘t’ in Figure 3.19.5 has been crossed in the lower middle of the pen stroke as in Figure 3.14
Figure 3.19. The ‘Explication’ of the 1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann Bach
Figure 3.19. 10 On the left is the questioned material from the ‘Explication’ page of the same volume and on the right the exemplar from the 1750 Petition

Figure 3.19. 11 On the left is the questioned material from the ‘Explication’ page of the same volume and on the right the exemplar from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein

Figure 3.19. 12 On the left are the questioned C clefs from the ‘Explication’ page of the same volume and on the right the exemplars from the Six Cello Suites and the 1725 Klavierbüchlein

Note that the circled letter ‘t' in Figure 3.19.9 has been crossed in the lower middle of the pen stroke as in Figure 3.14.
Figure 3.19. 13 The ‘Applicatio’ of the 1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann Bach
Figure 3.19. 14 On the left is the questioned material from the ‘Applicatio’ page of the same volume and on the right the exemplar from the 1722 Klavierbüchlein

Figure 3.19. 15 On the left is the questioned material from the ‘Applicatio’ page of the same volume and on the right the exemplars from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein and the 1750 Petition

Figure 3.19. 16 On the left is the questioned material from the ‘Applicatio’ page of the same volume and on the right the exemplars from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas

Further discussion of the 1720 Klavierbüchlein occurs later in this chapter.
Figure 3.20 The title page of the *Orgelbuchlein* (appended) undated
Using the same techniques of handwriting examination, it is clear that Anna Magdalena’s script is visible on the appended title page of the Orgelbüchlein. Once again questioned specimens are on the left-hand:

**Figure 3.20. 1** On the left is the questioned material and on the right exemplars from the 1750 Petition and the 1722 Klavierbüchlein

**Figure 3.20. 2** On the left is the questioned material and on the right exemplars from the 1750 Petition and the 1725 Klavierbüchlein

**Figure 3.20. 3** On the left is the questioned material and on the right exemplars from the 1750 Petition and the 1725 Klavierbüchlein

Note: Interestingly, for some unknown reason, the name ‘Johann’ on the appended title page, Figure 3.20, has been spelt ‘Joanne’. The Latin spelling for Johann is Johannes or Joannes. It seems an odd mistake to make, and surely a very unusual error to misspell one’s own name.
Figure 3.20. 4 On the far left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplars from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein and the Six Cello Suites C clef Types 1, 2 & 3
Figure 3.21 The title page of the 1st book of *Das Wohltemperierte Klavier*
Similarly, in Figures 3.21.1 to 3.21.6, it can be seen that Anna Magdalena’s script appears on the title page of the 1722 1st book of Das Wohltemperierte Klavier.

Based on a similar type of handwriting examination, further analysis of Kobayashi’s volume reveals many more examples of what appears to be Anna Magdalena’s hitherto unidentified handwriting; out of the 150 or so documents contained in the book, at least 44 appear to contain traces of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting.

**Figure 3.21.1** On the left is the questioned material and on the right exemplar from the 1750 Petition and the 1725 Klavierbüchlein

**Figure 3.21.2** On the left is the questioned material and on the right exemplars from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein and the 1722 Klavierbüchlein

**Figure 3.21.3** On the left is the questioned material and on the right exemplar from Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Six Violin Sonatas & Partitas

**Figure 3.21.4** On the left is the questioned material and on the right exemplars from Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Six Violin Sonatas & Partitas

**Figure 3.21.5** On the left is the questioned material and on the right exemplar from the 1750 Petition
Figure 3.21. 6 On the left is the questioned material and on the right the exemplars from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein and the Six Cello Suites C clef Types 1,2&3
III.1. 8 THE HANDWRITING OF JOHANN SEBASTIAN

Figure 3. 22 A record of a payment to Johann Sebastian, dated 15th of September 1706, showing his signature

As it is known that Johann Sebastian employed the services of a private secretary at different times in his life, and as there is such a paucity of extant letters or documents known, with any certainty, to have been written by him, finding a reliable model to make the necessary comparisons between Johann Sebastian’s handwriting and Anna Magdalena’s is not without significant problems. As an example of the difficulty experienced in defining Johann Sebastian’s handwriting, what is presented below is the range of signatures attributed to Johann Sebastian.

356 See Wolff, 2000: 392
357 …The surviving documents bearing on his life, whether written by others or by Bach himself, are almost invariably "official" in character bills, receipts, letters of application, or of appointment or resignation, letters of recommendation, complaints or reprimands to or from employers and other authorities. There are no diaries, no memoirs. Not a single letter from Bach to any of his children, or to his first wife, Maria Barbara, or his second wife, Anna Magdalena, has survived; we may assume that not many were written.” - Marshall, 2000: 47
Figure 3.23 Examples of Johann Sebastian Bach’s name/signature as given in the Neue Ausgabe “Die Notenschrift Johannes Sebastian Bachs” and other sources.

The range of styles fall into four types, as given as follows:

Example 3.23.1 Signature type 1, the capital ‘B’ is formed around a vertical ‘L’ or inverted ‘T’ axis with two discrete pen movements.

Example 3.23.2 Signature type 2, the capital ‘B’ is executed in a single pen movement.
Example 3.23. 3 Signature type 3, Johann Sebastian’s name is written with the ‘J’ below the baseline, and the “Joh” is given some degree of flourish.

Example 3.23. 4 Signature type 4, examples of miscellaneous signatures/writings

Two important observations need to be made about the above ‘signatures’:

- On no occasion does Johann Sebastian use the Kurrentschrift script form to substitute for the ‘h’ in word ‘Bach’

- The capital ‘B’, particularly as it appears in Example 3.23.1, type 1 (the most commonly accepted form of Johann Sebastian’s name), first appears, according to Kobayashi, in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian as early as 1708.358 (See Figure 3.23.5)

---

358 Assuming that the date was written at the time
Figure 3.23. 5 Examples of Johann Sebastian’s name/signature in chronological order according to Yoshitake Kobayashi in the Neue Ausgabe and the ‘Wine & Taxes’ letter of 1748 plus a record of quarterly payment for his services at Arnstadt dated 15.ix.1706.
It is important to stress, at this point, that scientifically speaking ...The signature, above all others, is the word which is written automatically and without conscious thought about the mechanics of its production.\textsuperscript{359} From the preceding pages of signatures it can clearly be seen that the variation across the totality of signatures is outside the scientifically accepted norm for variation. There is also no clear consistent development of the style over the years from 1708, assuming the date to be correct, to 1748. Therefore, it is impossible to establish without any doubt whatsoever, which of the given signatures is truly that of Johann Sebastian - it is highly unlikely that all of them are. For example it is my opinion that this signature of Johann Sebastian, as it appears thus, in Schwendowius & Dömling, 1977, ‘Johann Sebastian Bach, Life, Times, Influence’ is likely to be a simulation\textsuperscript{360} as it exhibits aspects associated with a lack of fluency due to an attempt to copy. (See Figure 3.24) \textsuperscript{361}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{signature_simulation.png}
\caption{An example of a signature simulation (forgery), demonstrating similar characteristics to the above example of Johann Sebastian’s supposed signature, taken from Harrison, 1966, p. 375}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{359} Harrison, 1966: 375
\textsuperscript{360} From a forensic document examiner’s point of view, to emulate is to copy a style with no intent to cause deception. To simulate is to copy with the intent to deceive – Dr Bryan Found, personal communication.
\textsuperscript{361} See Huber & Headrick, 1999: 289 and Harrison, 1966: 375
To establish the *natural variation* in the signature/written name of Johann Sebastian, an examination of the available material must take place. Given, below, is an example of the process, whereby the word ‘Bach’ is examined, in an attempt to identify characteristics consistent in all the writings of the word.

In Figure 3.24.1 it can be seen that:

- The capital letter ‘B’ is written in a consistent manner such that it is formed of two parts, that is to say an inverted ‘T’ shape and a highly curvaceous sweeping movement

- The end-effector from the letter ‘c’ to the letter ‘h’ is consistent, and flows from the top of the letter ‘c’

- The slant or slope of the writing is very similar and on an essentially level baseline
• The letter ‘h’ is formed of an upward loop

• The letter ‘a’ is separated from the letter ‘B’ in all examples

• The letters ‘a’, ‘c’ & ‘h’, flow one to the other in all examples

• The relationship between the height of the capital ‘B’ and the ‘ach’ is consistent.

• Both have a full-stop to the far right

Given the above similarities in execution, it would be safe to argue that the examples were written by the same writer, and the differences between the writings fall neatly within the parameters of natural variation. Applying the technique to the other ‘signatures’ given in Figure 3.23.5 exposes the likelihood that some ‘signatures’ fall well outside, what was established in the preceding discussion, as natural variation. This approach could be applied to all the ‘signatures’, as a tool to re-evaluate the chronological ordering of the compositions of Johann Sebastian, as given by Kobayashi.
In Figure 3.24.2 it can be seen that:

- The capital letter ‘B’ is written in a consistent manner such that it is formed by a single stroke.

- The end-effector from the letter ‘c’ to the letter ‘h’ is consistent, and flows from the top of the letter ‘c’.

- The slant or slope of the writing is very similar and on an essentially level baseline.

- The letter ‘h’ is formed of an upward loop.

- The letter ‘a’ is separated from the letter ‘B’ in all examples.
• The letters ‘a’, ‘c’ & ‘h’, flow one to the other in all examples

• The relationship between the height of the capital ‘B’ and the ‘ach’ is consistent

• Both examples have a full-stop to the far right

Given the above similarities in execution, it would be safe to argue that the examples were written by the same writer and the differences between the writings fall neatly within the parameters of natural variation.

Assuming that the ‘signatures’ in Figures 3.24.1 and 3.24.2 are all by Johann Sebastian – even though there is some doubt that this the case (see below on page 173) - applying the same analytical technique and approach to the other ‘signatures’ given in Figure 3.23.5 exposes the likelihood that some of those ‘signatures’ fall well outside what has just been defined as falling within the accepted parameters of natural variation. (See Figure 3.25)
In the examples given below, the writings exhibit features that are unlikely to be consistent with the natural variation in Johann Sebastian’s handwriting, as demonstrated in the preceding examination of the word ‘Bach’

Figure 3.25 Examples of the doubtful examples of the writing of Johann Sebastian’s name taken from Figure 3.23.5

In the above it can be seen that:

- The capital ‘B’ is executed in a distinctly different manner to the examples in Figures 3.24.1 and 3.24.2, and is a Kurrentschrift form of the letter ‘B’

- The end-effector from the letter ‘c’ to the letter ‘h’ is consistent and flows from the bottom of the letter ‘c’ in the two examples on the left. In the case on the far right ‘Bach’ is written in broken lowercase
• The slant or slope of the writing is very similar, on an essentially level baseline but strongly leaning from left to right in the ‘h’ at end of the word ‘Bach’

• In the two cases of full cursive writing, the letter ‘h’ is formed of an upward loop from the base of the letter ‘c’

• The letter ‘a’ is not separated from the letter ‘B’ in the two cursive examples

• The letters ‘B’, ‘a’, ‘c’ & ‘h’, flow one to the other in both full cursive examples

• The relationship between the height of the capital ‘B’ and the ‘ach’ is consistent

• The letter ‘c’ is truncated or ill-formed in all examples

Given the above similarities in execution, it is arguable that the examples were written by the same writer, and the differences between the writings and the writings in the preceding discussion fall outside the parameters of natural variation. The conclusion being that there is a strong likelihood that some of the examples in Figure 3.23.5 are in the handwriting of a person other than Johann Sebastian.
Below, are five examples of Anna Magdalena’s signature spanning a period of 16 years; her surname has been broken down in the same manner as the material in Figure 3.24.1; each alternate line has the same examples as in Figure 3.25.

Figure 3.26 A comparison between the grapheme styles of Anna Magdalena and the material in Figure 3.25 – it is worthy of note that, in the final example, the letter ‘h’ is written in the standard form - one which is consistent with Anna Magdalena’s writing. (See Table 3.1 Graphemes)
It is very clear that there are great similarities between the writings in Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in Figure 3.26 and the questioned signatures in Figure 3.25. It can be argued, therefore, that there is a strong likelihood that the same writer is involved, i.e. Anna Magdalena.

Johann Sebastian’s ‘signature’ types, given below, are in order of date, beginning in 1706 and ending in 1748. They are taken from Figure 3.23.5, with the addition of two further examples, drawn from a record of quarterly payment for his services at Arnstadt dated 15.ix.1706 and the Wine & Taxes letter of 1748.

![Signature Examples](image)

**Figure 3.27** The accepted chronological ordering of the signatures as given by Kobayashi, along with examples taken from a record of quarterly payment for his services at Arnstadt dated 15.ix.1706 and the 1748 Wine & Taxes letter.

The group does not include the signatures given in Figure 3.25, as it is clear that they fall well outside the structures of the above, even allowing for natural variation.

---

There are problems of consistency with regard to the signatures in Figure 3.27; for example, the signatures from Johann Sebastian’s earlier life (1706 and 1708), differ significantly from those of later periods – note, particularly, the placement of the end-effector from the letter ‘c’ to the letter ‘h’. Assuming Kobayashi to be correct in his chronology, Johann Sebastian, for some unknown reason, appears to have changed his writing style, sometime between 1715 – 1720, with respect to the letter ‘c’ (from an end-effector flowing from the base of the letter ‘c’ upwards to the letter ‘h’ to an end-effector from the top of the letter ‘c’ to the letter ‘h’). The evidence of later signatures suggests that he maintained this change for the rest of his life. In addition, in 1721, he appears to have changed the structure of his capital letter ‘B’, from the two-part capital ‘B’, as described in Figure 3.24.1, to a single stroke, as described in Figure 3.24.2 (see the two examples taken from the 1721 dedication to the Brandenburg Concertos in Figure 3.27); this change is coincident with his involvement with Anna Magdalena. The Brandenburg dedication example is of particular interest, as the writing of the name itself is distinctly different in both cases. In the first example, on the left, the letters are separated, whereas in the second example, on the right, the letters flow from one to the other. The significance of this is that what we observe is the writing of a drawn form of the name, on the left, and the signature style on the right. Whether all the writings in Figure 3.27 are executed by the same person is outside the scope of this thesis and they are presented for the sole purpose of demonstrating the uncertainty associated with the representation of the name ‘Bach’.
At this point it is worthwhile comparing three questioned signatures of Johann Sebastian with those known signatures of Anna Magdalena:

Unlike the ‘signatures’ of Johann Sebastian, in Figure 3.27, Anna Magdalena signatures exhibit the level of consistency in execution that is normal in a signature across a 16-year period (1741 – 1757)\textsuperscript{363}…through repetition he [she] executes a semiautomatic formation of strokes, which tends to assume a consistent pattern, but always varying slightly from this ideal and from other specimens of he [her] signature.\textsuperscript{364} Anna Magdalena uses her graphemes in a constant manner, making it very easy to recognise her signature…which when repeated time and again serve to distinguish his [her] signature from all others.\textsuperscript{365}

In Figure 3.29 when the questioned name ‘Bach’, on the left of each pair, is compared with the two known specimens on right, it is clear, using the ‘Williamson & Meenach ‘Cross-Check System’, that the graphemes exhibit the script characteristics of those of Anna Magdalena.

\textsuperscript{363} See Hübner, 2004: 75-102
\textsuperscript{364} Hilton, 1982: 172
\textsuperscript{365} Ibid. 173
The question name ‘Bach’, on the left of each pair, is compared with the two known specimens:

A  
Questioned 1713

B  
AMB 1741

C  
Questioned 1722

D  
AMB 1750


The Williamson and Meenach ‘Cross-Check System’ – ‘Slant Pattern’ (above and below the line) analysis for the above ‘Bachs’.

Based solely on the principle of habit patterns...

...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.366

Having subjected the above to the ‘Cross-Check System’, it can be seen that all four ‘Bachs’ exhibit very similar features; for example, the incomplete grapheme ‘c’, and the consistent use of the Kurrentschrift type script lower-case ‘h’. It can, be argued therefore, that the above ‘Bachs’ are very likely to have been written by the same person. As two of the signatures are by a ‘known writer’, then the writer of the other two is most probably Anna Magdalena.

366 Williamson & Meenach, 1981: 2 & 51
Interestingly and somewhat curiously, in Figure 3.30, a comparison of both sets of the results produced by the Williamson & Meenach ‘Cross-Check System’ for Type 1 and Type 2 signatures, shows that there is a strong possibility that they were not written by the same writer – particularly in the case of the ‘Top & Bottom Letter Pattern’ analysis on the far left.

Figure 3.31 The title page of Gott ist mein König dated 1708
Figure 3.32 Examples of handwriting attributed to Johann Sebastian:

Example 3.32.1 New Bach Reader, 1999, p. 98, dated 1723

Example 3.32.2 Schwendowius and Dömling, 1977, p. 88 dated 1730

Example 3.32.3 Wine & Taxes, a letter 1748

It is clear that the authors of the above examples are not likely to be one and the same person.
III.1. 9 Johann Sebastian’s Clef Forms

The matter of C clef forms was given some attention in Chapter I. Here I will comment on some issues raised Kobayashi.

Kobayashi states that …hand strokes change greatly with time,367 whereas the accepted position of Forensic Document Examiners is that such changes are, normally, gradual.368 His hypothesis is undermined, however, by his own examples: Johann Sebastian’s so called …Hakenform, his most commonly used form of C clef, appears consistently executed, from its appearance in the ‘Fuga’ in the 1720 Klavierbüchlein fur Wilhelm Friedemann369 through to the 1748 Kanonische Veränderungen über Vom Himmel hoch da komm ich her BWV 769370, a span of 28 years.

![Figure 3.33 “Hakenform” 1723](image1) ![“Hakenform” 1748](image2)

Whilst some differences are observable in the two examples in Figure 3.33, those differences are easily attributable to the range of physiological variations that occur normally on a moment-to-moment basis in anyone’s handwriting,372 and hardly amount to great changes in the execution of the C clef over the intervening 28 years.

367 Kobayashi, 1989: 13
368 See Hilton, 1982: 286
369 See facsimile edition, 1959, ‘Klavierbüchlein fur Wilhelm Friedemann’, Yale University Press: 70 – there is some debate regarding the actual date when the Fuga in question was written in the 1720 Klavierbüchlein
370 See Kobayashi, 1989: 182
372 See Found & Rogers, 1999: 2
The second issue, raised by Kobayashi, relates to the range of C clef types claimed by him to be those of Johann Sebastian: a total of 12, if all are counted as different; a total of 4, if grouped, in clef shapes of a similar nature or style.

For the most part, Kobayashi’s basic assumption appears to be that all of the music presented therein is in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian; he seeks only to arrange the works in chronological order and to explain the differences in the styles of writing. In order to explain the appearance of such a wide range of differing styles of C clefs, Kobayashi argues that Johann Sebastian possessed a variety of C clef types which he used in differing circumstances and at different times; for example, …the difference between everyday writing and calligraphy…and Marshall’s three level division of the autographic sources into composing score, fair copy and revision copy…the everyday writing (hurried, also sketchy writing, as in most first drafts…)…calligraphic (clean, easily read writing, as in most fair copies).\(^{373}\)

However, Kobayashi has to admit that these are no clean separations, since examples of both types of writing …everyday and …calligraphic appear in both sorts of document …first draft and fair copies. It must be concluded, therefore, that making any safe distinction between the types of writings, or, indeed, reaching any safe conclusions about the writings themselves, is fraught with potential problems, as no clear separation of style is maintained. Additionally, experience tells us that it is not at all the usual practice for composers or musicians in general, to use such a wide variety

\(^{373}\) Kobayashi, 1989: 15
of C clef types. Like all writing, the execution of a C clef must surely become, after many repetitions, a semiautomatic/semiconscious process – i.e. a habit.\textsuperscript{374}

III.1. 10 Pen-stroke Execution Analysis or Character Construction\textsuperscript{375}

Before discussing the ‘C clef problem’ of a number of the works attributed to Johann Sebastian, particularly those in the 1720 Klavierbüchlein and the Orgelbüchlein, it is important to explain how the internal structure of any given C clef (or any type of clef for that matter) is deduced. Any grapheme is formed from a number of pen-strokes with a given direction for each (see above); so it is for clef forms. In Figure 3.34, for example, it can clearly be seen that the C clef, on the far left, comprises three discrete pen movements: A, B and C. A lifting of the pen from the paper precedes each part of the clef. The second example, above, involves six pen movements: A, B, C, D, E and F. It is easy to see that, given the increased complexity in the second example, the two C clefs are unlikely to have been written by the same person. This is made even more

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure3_34}
\caption{Pen-stroke direction analysis}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{374} See Hilton, 1982: 154
\textsuperscript{375} See Found & Rogers, 2003: 24
likely, by the fact that the two examples have significantly different slants. The final example is the so-called Hakenform C clef of Johann Sebastian and comprises two (2) pen movements only.\textsuperscript{376}

Clef forms, like any other grapheme, are executed as a matter of habit.\textsuperscript{377} It is highly unlikely, therefore, that having once established, through repetition, one style of C clef, that a variation in the type and style of clef will vary outside what would be perceived as normal parameters for other types of writing. In the 1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann, the variation in the clef forms falls well outside the parameters of normal variation, as can clearly be observed in Figure 3.35.

\footnote{376 See discussion of Kobayashi’s theory of the C Clefs of Johann Sebastian above} \footnote{Williamson & Meenach, 1981: 2 & 51}
III.1. 11 ‘C’ Clef Types in the 1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann Bach

Figure 3.35 The C clefs from the 1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann Bach placed in the order in which they occur in the text.378

Figure 3.35 illustrates the great variety of styles in the C Clefs of the 1720 Klavierbüchlein. There are, in fact, 18 different clefs, though some may be natural variants of the same person’s C clef style. For example, the differences in C clefs, given in Figure 3.36, could be due to writing circumstances; i.e. quill differences, writing speed, writing surface or the condition of the writer.

Figure 3.36 Possible variants of the same type of C clef

378 It is possible that some of the clefs are those of ‘Anon 5’ (=Johann Schneider), but discussion of this is outside the scope of this thesis
The 6 remaining C clefs are, based on a stylistic and pen-stroke execution analysis, clearly written by more than one person. See Figure 3.37

![Figure 3.37](image) Unlikely variants of the same C clef type

There may, of course, be room for some debate about which of the above C clefs are possible variants of other C clefs, but what is clearly established is that there are a number of distinct C clef types within the *1720 Klavierbüchlein*.

As has been noted earlier in this Chapter, there is a remarkable similarity between the calligraphic styles of the first 3 C clefs, on the left hand side of each pair in Figure 3.38 and those of Anna Magdalena in Figure 3.7, repeated for convenience in Figure 3.38.

![Figure 3.38](image) A comparison between C clef types from the *Six Cello Suites* and the *1725 Klavierbüchlein* to the right of each pair, with the C clefs found in the early part of the *1720 Klavierbüchlein* to the left.

All three types of C Clef can be traced through from the *Orgelbüchlein* (1713-), the *1720 Klavierbüchlein*, the *1722 Klavierbüchlein*, the *1725 Klavierbüchlein*, the *Six*  

---

379 The pen-stroke execution analysis involves the examination of both the pen flow direction and the number of different pen-strokes involved, i.e. the number of times the pen must leave the paper to perform the construction of the grapheme. (See Figure 3.34)

380 The 2nd clef and 5th clef in this line are considered, by Kobayashi (see above), to be C clefs used by Johann Sebastian; the “Dreierform” oder “Brezelform”: Three-way form or pretzel shape, and in the latter case the “Hakenform”: Hook form.
Cello Suites, the 2nd book of Das Wohltemperierte Klavier (1741?), to the BWV 69 (1748). (See Figure 3.39) The results of the examination are summed up as follows:

**Figure 3.39** Example allographs – C clefs from 1713 – 1748

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1713</th>
<th>1713(?)</th>
<th>1720</th>
<th>1722</th>
<th>1725(?)</th>
<th>1727(?)</th>
<th>1741(?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="C Clef Type 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="C Clef Type 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="C Clef Type 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="C Clef Type 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="C Clef Type 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="C Clef Type 1" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="C Clef Type 1" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1713</th>
<th>1713(?)</th>
<th>1720</th>
<th>1722</th>
<th>1725(?)</th>
<th>1727(?)</th>
<th>1748(?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="C Clef Type 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="C Clef Type 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="C Clef Type 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="C Clef Type 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="C Clef Type 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="C Clef Type 2" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="C Clef Type 2" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1713(?)</th>
<th>1720</th>
<th>1722</th>
<th>1725(?)</th>
<th>1727(?)</th>
<th>1741</th>
<th>1748(?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="C Clef Type 3" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="C Clef Type 3" /></td>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="C Clef Type 3" /></td>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="C Clef Type 3" /></td>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="C Clef Type 3" /></td>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="C Clef Type 3" /></td>
<td><img src="image7.png" alt="C Clef Type 3" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Figure 3.39 Anna Magdalena’s C clef Types 1, 2 and 3, are shown in columns marked 1725(?) & 1727(?) and can be traced from 1713(?) to 1748(?). What is particularly note-worthy is that in the majority of cases, including the Orgelbüchlein, the 1720 Klavierbüchlein and Das Wohltemperierte Klavier I, all three C Clef Types occur in each work. From left to right, the manuscripts examined are as follows:

381 The (?) denotes uncertainty of actual date of composition
1713 Canon for 4 Voices
1713 (?) Orgelbüchlein
1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann
1722 Das Wohltemperierte Klavier I
1725 (?) Klavierbüchlein für Anna Magdalena
1727 (?) Six Cello Suites
1741 (?) Das Wohltemperierte Klavier II
1748 (?) Lobe den Herrn, meine Seele

III.1. 12 Issues of Natural Variation

Figure 3.40 shows C clefs from the 1722 Klavierbüchlein and examples of Type 1 C clefs of Anna Magdalena, taken from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, the Six Cello Suites and Das Wohltemperierte Klavier II.

The issue of variation in the length of the double down stroke (double bar) in the C clefs can be accounted for as … mutability of handwriting or “natural variation” [and] … need occasion no surprise, since human beings cannot be expected to function with the precision of machines. Wilson Harrison goes on to say that … It is this
natural variation which is pointed out by those who know little or nothing of the principles on which they are based...the document examiner’s opinions on the authorship of handwriting, will depend on his ability to determine whether the differences shown in the writings can safely be discounted as due to natural variation or whether they indicate that more than one writer is concerned.382

A demonstration that the C clef forms fall within the range of natural variation is given in Figure 3.40.1, where examples of C clefs taken from the Cello Suites manuscript and the 1725 Klavierbüchlein are presented.

![Figure 3.40.1 Examples of C clefs in Anna Magdalena’s handwriting taken from the 6th Cello Suite and the 1725 Klavierbüchlein](image)

It can be seen that the length of the double down stroke (double bar) varies greatly across the examples, from often full length in the 6th Cello Suite to very short in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein. This could be explained, of course, simply as the difference between the use of the C clef as either alto or soprano. However, if the C clefs in Figure 3.40.1 are compared with the C clef examples in the 1720 Klavierbüchlein, Das Wohltemperierte Klavier and the Orgelbuchlein, it can clearly be seen that they easily fit well within the ...natural variation of C clef forms as seen in Anna Magdalena’s handwriting. (See Figure 3.40.2)

382 Harrison, 1966: 298
Why Anna Magdalena appears to use three variations of C clef type is not known. It does appear, however, that wherever there is a known presence of Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy in manuscript the three forms are present; for example, in the 6th *Cello Suite*. It is, of course, possible that each of the three clef forms identifies a different person; in which case, what we observe in many of Johann Sebastian’s manuscripts, as well in those of Anna Magdalena, is a group of writers involved in the preparation of the manuscripts – a kind of cottage industry perhaps. However, for the purposes of this thesis, the examination of that possibility is not central.
III.1. 13 The Use of Slant and Other Techniques to Determine Authorship

**Figure 3.41** *Wer nur Lieben Gott läßt walten* with Anna Magdalena’s Type 2 C clef (from the 1725 *Klavierbüchlein*) inserted for comparison.

In order to identify the writer of the work, in Figure 3.41, known characteristics are compared with questioned material; in this example of the method, the lowercase grapheme ‘b’ is used. In Figure 3.41.1, the lowercase ‘b’ from known sources written by Johann Sebastian, show a tendency to be written towards the vertical (70 – 85 degrees).

**Figure 3.41.1** A range of lowercase ‘b’, in Johann Sebastian’s handwriting, in manuscripts known to be by him; for example, the Sarabande of the Partita in A minor, in the 1725 *Klavierbüchlein*. 

185
In Figure 3.41.2., the lower case ‘b’, from known sources of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting, shows a distinct tendency to lean to the right (50 – 52 degrees).

![Figure 3.41.2](image)

**Figure 3.41. 2** A range of lowercase ‘b’, in Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in the manuscripts and documents previously listed.

![Figure 3.41.3](image)

**Figure 3.41. 3** Questioned material from the 1720 Klavierbüchlein

Clearly, the ‘b’, in Figure 3.41.3, which is 52 degrees from the horizontal, is more likely to belong with the group in Figure 3.41.2, in Anna Magdalena’s handwriting, than the group shown in Figure 3.41.1. In support of this conclusion, it should be noted that Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in the 1750 Petition lies between 50 and 55 degrees from the horizontal. The importance of this element in the handwriting of an individual is described thus:

...Slant[^383^], which may vary between writers from backhand to sharply inclined forehand slope can be considered a further element of form. No study of letterform is complete without consideration of all these factors, for together they describe the form of the writing[^384^].

Wilson R Harrison, on the same subject, points out that:

...it is not surprising that the past generation of writers on the identification of handwriting attach considerable importance to slope [slant] and its

[^383^]: Slant. The angle or inclination of the axis of letters relative to the baseline (Hilton, 1982: 21)
[^384^]: Baseline defined as: The ruled or imaginary line upon which the writing rests. (Hilton, 1982: 21)
measurement, for this was rightly regarded as an identifying feature of some value.  

Figure 3.41. 4 The uppercase Kurrentschrift Script ‘W’, in formal and informal forms, taken from the ‘1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann’ and the ‘1750 Petition’ clearly, showing a similar slant to the right, as in the above examples: Figure 3.41.2 & 3.41.3,

Further examination of the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, using the Williamson & Meenach ‘Cross-Check System’ – ‘Slant Pattern’ analysis, suggests that the word ‘Prelude’, as it appears in the two Keyboard Partitas, are in the same handwriting as the word ‘Prelude’ in the 1st Cello Suite. An examination of the grapheme constructions also gives evidence of the same writer. For example, in A, B and C, in Figure 3.41.5, the grapheme ‘d’ exhibits identical openness of the loop; the relationship between the graphemes ‘e’ and ‘l’ are very similar in all the first three cases, as is the relationship between the grapheme ‘u’ with the ‘d’ and the ‘e’.

385 Harrison, 1966: 329
Figure 3.41. A Williamson & Meenach ‘Cross-Check System’ – ‘Slant Pattern’ analysis of the word ‘Prelude’. A, B and C are clearly by the same writer, whereas D is only possibly by the same writer as A, B and C. E is clearly not by the same writer, as the sum of the dissimilarities is greater than the sum of the similarities. Example D is assumed to be in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian and E is …anonymous from later in the 18th Century.³⁸⁶

³⁸⁶ See Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 5
If it is accepted that Anna Magdalena wrote example A, the word ‘Prelude’ in the 1st Cello Suite, then it would appear that it is she who wrote examples B and C, the word ‘Prelude’, in the two Keyboard Partitas. This is supported by additional evidence of what appears to be Anna Magdalena’s C clef Type 1 and her numerals 8 and 3 in the time signature at the opening of the ‘Prelude’. (See Figure 3.41.6)

![Figure 3.41.6 The opening bar of the ‘Prelude’ from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein with examples of Anna Magdalena’s Clef Type 1 and time signature.](image)

Why Anna Magdalena should have written only these few details is not known, and is not important. However, the suggestion that the words ‘Prelude’ were written by her has some greater significance for the contents of the 1720 Klavierbüchlein and similarly for Das Wohltemperierte Klavier, as the grapheme ‘P’, in examples B and C, appear in both texts.
II.1.14 CONCLUSION REGARDING HANDWRITING

From the preceding document examination, it is the considered opinion of this examiner that the following conclusions might safely be drawn:

1. Anna Magdalena’s handwriting appears to be present in all the examined documents

2. In the music manuscripts examined, Anna Magdalena’s clef allographs (C, F & G Clefs) appear to be present

3. It is likely that Anna Magdalena was involved in the preparation of the 1720 Klavierbüchlein and, to a lesser extent, the Orgelbüchlein, as well as Das Wohltemperierte Klavier I.

4. In addition to that of Johann Sebastian, the handwriting of unknown others is also present in some of the documents examined.

The examination presented in this Chapter is merely a summary of the much more extensive examination undertaken in preparation for this thesis. The Appendix H contains some additional material that was also examined.
5. The coincidence of graphemes (script forms) and allographs (Clef Types), and a 'signature’ in three cases, in the above-examined manuscripts, creates an intersection, such that the chance of two authors being involved in the writings is extremely unlikely. Therefore, having safely identified Anna Magdalena’s handwriting, signatures and music-calligraphy in the known specimen
documents (Items 1 – 6 on page 115), it is possible to conclude that Anna Magdalena was involved with Johann Sebastian before 1720 and possibly as early as 1713, if the date on the Canon for 4 Voices was added at the time of writing, which is by no means certain. However, as Anna Magdalena’s allographs, her C clefs in particular, appear for the first time in the Orgelbüchlein, (line 1, \textsuperscript{388} p. 15 - ‘Jesu meine freude’), it is possible to assume that she was involved fairly early in the writing of the work in question and, therefore, well before 1720. Remarkably, Anna Magdalena’s handwriting also appears in the title of the same work (‘Jesu meine freude’) in almost exactly the same form, see Figure 3.43, as in the 1720 Klavierbüchlein; likewise her C clef allograph, Type 2, appears in both versions.

![Figure 3.43 'Jesu meine freude' in Orgelbüchlein and the 1720 Klavierbüchlein](image)

How Anna Magdalena could have been involved in the preparation of the 1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann, Das Wohltemperierte Klavier I and the Orgelbüchlein will be discussed later in this thesis.

\textsuperscript{388} On lines 2 and 3 of the same page, as with all the preceding pages, the clef allograph used is the ‘Three-way form or pretzel shape’.
III.2 MUSIC-CALLIGRAPHY INVESTIGATION

III.2. 1 The Often Vexed Issue of the Similarity between the Music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena

At the opening of this Chapter, I indicated that it was accepted that there are inherent difficulties in distinguishing the music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian from that of Anna Magdalena and vice versa, and I presented examples to clearly demonstrate this point. (See Figure 3.2) I argued that a new approach was needed to deal with this often vexed issue, and in the ensuing section of the Chapter, showed how Forensic Document Examination techniques, investigating elements other than standard music-calligraphy, could be used to explore the musical relationship and involvement of Anna Magdalena with Johann Sebastian. In this section, I will turn my attention to this rather more difficult issue and use the same techniques and principles of Forensic Document Examination to investigate the music-calligraphy of both Anna Magdalena and Johann Sebastian.

To restate: the three basic principles that underpin the forensic examination of any handwritten document are:

- 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. Bryan Found389

• 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

• ...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

Applying the above principles and the techniques of Forensic Document Examination, the manuscripts were subjected to rigorous examination, using Comparison and Identification Method I, as described in Chapter II, where the writings of two known authors are available to be compared with the questioned document.

390 Williamson & Meenach, 1981: 2 & 51
391 Ellen, 1997: 45
392 These flow charts are based on Found & Rogers 2003: 20, and personal communications with Dr Found.
The method, described above, is the ideal approach for the examination of a questioned document, when it is possible that either of two known individuals could have been the author of the questioned document. Through this method, one of the authors can be identified and the other excluded. It is important to stress that there

393 This flow charts are based on Found & Rogers 2003: 20, and personal communications with Dr Found.
must be absolute certainty regarding the source material in this process, as contaminated\textsuperscript{394} material will invalidate the outcomes.

In what follows, the music-calligraphy of both Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena will be identified and examined for characteristics.

\textsuperscript{394} See Found & Rogers 2003: 11
Figure 3. 45 Examples of Johann Sebastian’s music-calligraphy taken from, the 1720 Klavierbüchlein, 1725 Klavierbüchlein, Lute Suite BWV 997 (c.1730) and Cantata BWV 14 (1735), Wohltemperierte Klavier II (c 1741)
Figure 3. 46 Examples of the music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian taken, at random, from Wohltemperiertes Klavier II (c 1741), Lute Suite BWV 997 (c1730) Klavierbüchlein 1725, 1720 Klavierbüchlein, Variation 1 BWV 769 (1748), Mathew Passion (1736) Magnificat (c 1732/5), Mass in B minor (c 1733) and the Orgelbüchlein (1713/14 -?).
III.2.2 Characteristics of Johann Sebastian’s music-calligraphy taken from the preceding examples, which span some 20 plus years

The following are general statements that describe the characteristics of Johann Sebastian’s music-calligraphy:

- 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.
- The stem curves from the note-head into the up or down stem-stroke (see preceding and following examples).
- The note-head and the stem appear to be connected, suggesting a single pen-stroke action, in an either upwards or downwards movement.
- The note-heads have an oval appearance.
- The stems do not protrude through the outer beam.
- The penmanship appears to be of a light and swift nature.
- The note-heads are relatively small.
- The music-calligraphy is concise (see preceding example).
- The crotchet rests are in a ‘tick’ (✓) form.
- The quaver rests are in a right-sloping standard ‘seven’ (7) form.
- The leger lines are short.
- The beaming is wavy.
- The beaming is parallel when two or more beams are used (see preceding examples).
Figure 3.47 Examples of Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy taken from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, Six Cello Suites and the manuscript of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas.
Figure 3. 48 Examples of the music-calligraphy of Anna Magdalena, taken at random from her manuscript of the *Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas*, the Violin Sonata in G (c. 1730) 1725 *Klavierbüchlein* the *Six Cello Suites* and the Trio Sonata in C for Organ 395 *Wohltemperierte Klavier II* (c 1741)

395 It is interesting to note that this example, taken from the New Bach Reader: 276, has Johann Sebastian’s ‘Hakenform’ Clef form on the second stave. However, the music-calligraphy is clearly that of Anna Magdalena; this demonstrates the difficulty experienced in separating the work of Johann Sebastian from that of Anna Magdalena.
III.2. 3 CHARACTERISTICS OF ANNA MAGDALENA’S MUSIC-CALLIGRAPHY TAKEN FROM THE PRECEDING EXAMPLES WHICH SPAN SOME 20 YEARS

The following are general statements that describe the characteristics of Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy:

- The stem placement is towards the centre of the note-head, on the down-stem and to the right of the note-head, on the up-stem.

- The stem curves from the note-head into the up-stem stroke but not in the down-stem stroke, where the stem is straight.

- The note-head and the stem appear to be connected, in the upwards stem pen movement, but not in the downwards stem pen movement (see preceding examples).

- The note-heads are round or bobble-shaped, rather than elliptical in appearance.

- The stems often protrude through the outer beam.

- The penmanship appears to be of a deliberate and heavy nature.

- The note-heads are relatively large (see preceding examples).

- The music-calligraphy is concise.

- The crotchet rests are in a flattened ‘ess’ (S) form.

- The quaver rests are in a right-sloping standard ‘seven’ (7) form.

- The leger lines are relatively long.
The beaming is curvy. 

The beaming is parallel, when two or more beams are used (see preceding example).

### III.2.4 A COMPARISON OF MUSIC CALLIGRAPHY 5th CELLO SUITE/LUTE SUITE VERSION

Having established the characteristics of both writers, an opportunity to make a direct comparison of the music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena presents itself in the 5th Cello Suite, which Johann Sebastian transcribed for Lute. As the music is the same (leaving aside the matter of the scordatura), the manuscripts of both individuals can be placed side by side and differences in the music calligraphy, observed and noted. The evidence presented in Figure 3.49 demonstrates that each writer can clearly be identified, and this dispels the traditional view that Anna Magdalena copied Johann Sebastian’s music-calligraphy to a point where the two are virtually identical.

---

396 The 5th Cello Suite was chosen because it is an example of where the same music has been unequivocally written out by Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena
The examples below, clearly illustrate important stylistic differences between the music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena. All are taken from the 1st movement of the 5th Cello Suite/Lute Suite. In each case the upper example is in the music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian, the lower in the music-calligraphy of Anna Magdalena. As they clearly exhibit the characteristics previously described, there can be no doubt whatsoever that the two manuscripts were written by two individuals.

Figure 3.49 Music-calligraphy taken from the 5th Cello Suite/Lute Suite version

397 The manuscript images have been computer rescaled to make comparison easier
III.2. 5 Comparison of the Music-calligraphy in the Wohltemperierte Klavier II (c. 1741)

There is another opportunity in the Wohltemperierte Klavier II to make valid comparisons between the music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena. What we can see is the handy-work of two identifiable people, Anna Magdalena and Johann Sebastian. The time-signature is that of Anna Magdalena; the Soprano clef, however, is that of Johann Sebastian (the Hakenform); on the second line, the Soprano clef is that of Anna Magdalena Type 1. On the insert stave, at the bottom of the page, we see Johann Sebastian’s corrections, written in a different music-calligraphy style to the preceding style. (See examples on the following page)

On page two of the same Prelude we see a similar situation. (See examples on the following page)
Figure 3. 50 Praeludium 6 from *Wohltemperierte Klavier II*
Figure 3.51 Examples of the music-calligraphy of Anna Magdalena and Johann Sebastian

Example 3.51.1 Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy

Example 3.51.2 Johann Sebastian’s music-calligraphy

Example 3.51.3 Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy

Example 3.51.4 Johann Sebastian’s music-calligraphy

It is important to stress that the examples given, in the preceding text, of Johann Sebastian’s music-calligraphy, cover a wide range of writing situations, from the swift to the more careful, and also a fairly long period of time, about 20 years. However, all writings exhibit the same basic characteristics, which is consistent with the principles of writing stated at the very opening of this Chapter. Similarly, in the case of Anna Magdalena, the examples given, range across a number of writing situations and about
the same period of time. They, too, exhibit characteristics consistent with the principles of handwriting.

III.2.6 SUMMARY OF FORENSIC DOCUMENT EXAMINATION OF THE PERPETUAL CANON FOR 4 VOICES (1713)

Figure 3.52 is a graphic demonstration of the intersection of four sources of forensic evidence that support the conclusion that Anna Magdalena was likely to have been involved in the preparation of the 1713 Perpetual Canon for 4 Voices. Further evidence that Anna Magdalena might have been involved in the 1713 Perpetual Canon for 4 Voices comes from the text written on the document:

…”Dieses wenige wolte dem Herrn Besizer zu geneigtem Angedencken hier

     einzeichnen J S Bach Fuestlich Saechsischer HoffOrg. v. Cammer Musicus

     (...J S Bach, court organist of chamber music to the Count of Saxony wanted

     this little piece dedicated to the gracious memory of the owner of this book.)

The writer does not appear to be referring to him or herself and the use of the past tense suggests that the words might have been written sometime after 1713. Anna Magdalena’s possible involvement in the writing of the 1713 Perpetual Canon for 4 Voices does not necessarily imply that she was the composer, though that might indeed be the case. What is more likely, if the piece was, indeed, written in 1713, is that it was an exercise that she copied-out.

398 Wolff, Christoph. Kanons, BWV 1072-1078, BWV deest; Musikalisches Opfer, BWV 1079. NBA Serie VIII Band 1, (Kassel u.a.: Bärenreiter, 1974)
399 Translation by teacher of German Patricia Doyle – this translation has been verified by other native German speakers
Figure 3.52 Summary of Forensic Document Examination of the *Perpetual Canon for 4 Voices* (1713)

Questioned C.1713 AMB C.1725

Questioned 1713 AMB 1750

Anna Magdalena’s C Clefs

Anna Magdalena’s Handwriting

Anna Magdalena’s work?

Anna Magdalena’s Signatures

Anna Magdalena’s Music-calligraphy

Questioned 1713 AMB 1741/50

Questioned 1713 AMB 1726/41

Anna Magdalena’s work?
Wolff’s translation of the passage, in the New Bach Reader, P. 65, is slightly, but possibly, importantly, different. It reads as follows: *To contribute this little item at this place to the Honored Owner [of this book] in the hope of friendly remembrance is the wish of Joh. Seb. Bach Court Organist and Chamber Musician to His Saxon Highness.*

In his personal communications\textsuperscript{400} to me, Professor Wolff disagrees with the conclusion that Anna Magdalena could have been involved …*there is absolutely no way, none whatsoever, that the handwriting of the 1713 canon can be attributed to AMB…And questioning the writing of the date "1713" is philologically and contextually unjustifiable.* It is certainly difficult to explain how her writing could be present. However, the evidence appears fairly conclusive, so some explanation for the apparent presence of Anna Magdalena’s writing is required.

**III.2.7 ANNA MAGDALENA’S ROLE**

It has long been accepted that Anna Magdalena was probably a keyboard ‘student’ of Johann Sebastian and we have seen in the Literature review that Anna Magdalena is cast strictly in the role of copyist, mainly of Johann Sebastian’s music. It has been shown, in this Chapter, that there is a strong likelihood that Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy may well be present in a number of manuscripts, hitherto, ascribed to Johann Sebastian. Evidence has also been presented that indicates that Anna Magdalena’s handwriting appears to be on the title page of the *1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann Bach.* In the remainder of this Chapter, an investigation of a possible additional involvement of Anna Magdalena, in some of the other manuscripts, will be presented and interrogated.

\textsuperscript{400} Professor Wolff - email message 27/02/05
III.2.8 ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE OF ANNA MAGDALENA’S HANDWRITING & MUSIC-CALLIGRAPHY

The following are examples of evidence that may identify Anna Magdalena as scribe of manuscripts hitherto attributed to Johann Sebastian.
III.2.8.1 Evidence of Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy in the 1st Prelude of the Wohltemperierte Klavier I, the 1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann Bach and the 1725 Klavierbüchlein für Anna Magdalena Bach

As already shown, Anna Magdalena’s handwriting and music-calligraphy appear to be present in the 1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann Bach. Certainly, the early pieces in the 1720 Klavierbüchlein, and most of the rest of the manuscript, have been attributed, traditionally, to Johann Sebastian. However, what strongly appears to be Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy can be clearly seen in the Praeludium I (a version of the 1st Prelude of the Wohltemperierte Klavier I). (See Figure 3.53)

![Figure 3.53](image)

**Figure 3.53** The version of the 1st Prelude from Das Wohltemperierte Klavier I as it appears in the 1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann

A comparison of the known sources of Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy with that of the manuscript of the Praeludium I in the 1720 Klavierbüchlein, see Figure 3.53 above and Figures 3.54 and 3.55, suggests that the music-calligraphy, present in that manuscript, is that of Anna Magdalena; this is despite the fact that the C clefs shown, in Figure 3.53, with the exception of those found in the addenda, do not appear to be

---

401 See Kirkpatrick, 1958: xv
in her style. It is, of course, possible that Anna Magdalena could simply have been experimenting with C clef forms. (See Figure 3.54 for a direct comparison of the 1720 version with the version in the *1725 Klavierbüchlein*)

**Figure 3.54** The C clefs from the 1720 and 1725 *Klavierbüchlein*: the C Clef on the far right, AMB C clef Type 3, is taken from the *Six Cello Suites*. Note the circled “kink”, the structure of the double down-stroke, the placement of the upward “tick” and the hooking. The similarities strongly suggest the same writer, in all three cases.

**Figure 3.55** A direct comparison of the music-calligraphy in both the 1720, and the 1725 *Klavierbüchlein*: the upper examples are taken from the 1720 manuscript version, and the lower examples are taken from the 1725 version.

It can be seen that the minim note-heads in the ‘left-hand’ (bass-part) are all placed to the left of the down-stroke in the 1720 version, and are written and structured the same as they appear in the *1725 Klavierbüchlein*. (See Figure 3.56) Note, in each case, in Figure 3.55 (the middle two examples), one minim is ‘open’ and one is ‘closed’.

---

[402 See Chapter III]
In *Das Wohltemperierte Klavier I*, the minim heads are written, for the most part, using a slightly different technique to those in Figure 3.56. For a direct comparison, see Figure 3.57. However, there is an example of the same technique applied in the version of the Praeludium I in the 1720 *Klavierbüchlein*. (Compare the minim in Figure 3.57 with the minim on the far right of Figure 3.56) It is note-worthy that, towards the end of the movement in the 1st Prelude in the 1722 *Das Wohltemperierte Klavier I*, the music-calligraphy style for the minims returns to the same style as the latter parts of both of the 1720 and 1725 versions. (See Figure 3.58, the middle example is taken from 1st Prelude in the 1722 *Das Wohltemperierte Klavier I*)

Other possible evidence of what appears to be Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy can clearly be seen elsewhere in the notation, throughout the 1st Prelude in *Das Wohltemperierte Klavier I*. (See Figure 3.59)
In Figure 3.59:

- On the top row are three examples of notes and a C clef taken from the 1722 \textit{Wohltemperierte Klavier I} (taken from the penultimate bar and the 2\textsuperscript{nd} bar).

- The middle row is made up of the same three examples taken from the 1725 \textit{Klavierbüchlein},

- The bottom line, right (column b & c), are two examples of the same notes and the C clef, written in the addendum to the 1720 \textit{Klavierbüchlein} version. (See top row in Figure 3.55)

Note: The two outer examples (column a & c) from the 1725 \textit{Klavierbüchlein}, in the middle row in Figure 3.59, are enlarged from the hand-drawn stave of the addendum
shown on the lower line, far right, in Figure 3.55, hence the slight difference in appearance. However they exhibit the same handwriting characteristics. The image at the bottom left-hand corner of Figure 3.59 (column a) is a simulation of a similar passage, using notes taken from the *Six Cello Suites* – this has been presented to demonstrate the remarkable similarity and consistency in the execution of the music-calligraphy. The similarity in the music-calligraphy and the C clef forms, in Figure 3.59, is very suggestive of the same writer. And, based on the work of Dadelsen, if we are to assume that the middle line is in the hand of Anna Magdalena, then, the other two are highly likely to be in her hand also. From the perspective of the music-calligraphy, it would appear that the only significant difference between the three versions is that the ‘final’ version, in the *1722 Wohltemperierte Klavier I*, is written out with more care.

Notwithstanding my previous comments, regarding the traditionally accepted belief that Johann Sebastian composed most of the *1720 Klavierbüchlein*, it is very difficult to believe, given how it is presented, that Praeludium I is a copy of some other manuscript. It would appear, rather, that what is written is the evolution of a piece of music, where the student composer, having sketched out the piece, is making additions or changes, possibly under the guidance of the teacher. In this case, it is likely to have been Johann Sebastian.

---

403 See Dadelsen, 1988: 15
In addition to the material already mentioned in this Chapter, the *1720 Klavierbüchlein* contains other material that strongly suggests the involvement of Anna Magdalena. As already indicated, it would appear that Anna Magdalena’s ‘P’ graphemes appear throughout the text, to say nothing of her C clef forms. Compare the following examples in Figure 3.60, where the right hand example, in each case, is believed to be in Anna Magdalena’s handwriting:

![Figure 3.60 | Examples of handwriting and music-calligraphy. In each case the questioned material (from the *1720 Klavierbüchlein*) is to the left of each pair](image)

The similarity in the penmanship in Figure 3.60 makes it highly likely that the same writer produced all the examples. Further, the coincidence of the presence of all three types of C clef (AMB Types 1, 2 &3 – see Chapter III) provides additional evidence that the same writer was involved in all the examples.

If, indeed, the 27 bar version of the 1st Prelude in the *1720 Klavierbuchlein* is in the music-calligraphy of Anna Magdalena and the later, 30 bar version in the *1725 Klavierbuchlein* is already accepted as being in her music-calligraphy, then it would

---

404 Dürr argues that Franz Konwitschny’s version represents an earlier, 24 bar version of the Prelude than that in the version in the *1720 Klavierbüchlein* – see Dürr 1984: 15. However, the origins of that version are somewhat unclear and have no impact on my argument, which is to establish Anna Magdalena’s involvement in the process of the writing of the Praeludium I (WTK I 1st Prelude) as it appears in the *1720 Klavierbüchlein*.
follow, given the previous discussion, that the 35 bar version in Das \textit{Wohlfemperierte Klavier I}, is also in Anna Magdalena's hand.

What the relationship is, between all three manuscripts, is difficult to say. The fascicule structure, as described by Dadelsen\textsuperscript{405} in the Kritscher Berichte, leads to the conclusion that the 1725 \textit{Klavierb"uchlein} may well have been bound from separate manuscripts at some unknown time, possibly the year on the cover, 1725. It could also have been bound later.

\textsuperscript{405} Dadelsen, 1957: 42-45
III.2.8.2 Possible Evidence of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in the 1722 Klavierbüchlein für Anna Magdalena Bach

Figure 3.61 The title page of the 1722 Klavierbüchlein

Figure 3.62 The Sarabande in the 1722 Klavierbüchlein
What is of particular interest, in the case of the 1722 Klavierbüchlein, is that the word ‘Sarabande’, in Figure 3.62, appears to be in Johann Sebastian’s handwriting; likewise the C clef, which according to Kobayashi, is also of Johann Sebastian’s type, the …Three-way form or pretzel shape.406

However, there are examples of what appear to be Anna Magdalena’s C Clef Types in the Klavierbüchlein also; for example, on the 3rd stave of the Sarabande, the C Clef type changes to what appears to be a swiftly executed version of one of Anna Magdalena C Clef types (Type 3). (See Figure 3.63) This presents some possible evidence of Anna Magdalena’s involvement in this particular work. The ensuing Gavotte similarly begins with the …Three-way form or pretzel shape and then on the next line a C Clef Type of Anna Magdalena is written. This seems very strange, unless, of course, this is an example of a student receiving a lesson. Given that this book was Anna Magdalena’s own music-notebook, it can be assumed that she must have been the student in question. Indeed the whole book, or rather that which remains of it, gives the distinct impression of being a musical sketchbook, where the rough music-calligraphy and C clef types of at least two people are clearly present throughout. (See Figure 3.64)

406 Kobayashi, 1989: 13 – this might, of course, be incorrect as the Hakenform of Kobayashi’s appears on the same page in Figure 21
407 There are many other examples of Anna Magdalena’s C Clefs, particularly Type 3, in the 1722 Klavierbüchlein
It is also interesting to note, that the so-called Hakenform C clef (the middle in Figure 3.64 above), first appears in the 1722 Klavierbüchlein, in the Suite pour le Clavecin in G, on the 3rd stave. It is then used consistently until the ‘Jesu, meine Zuversicht’. From this point onwards, what appear to be both Anna Magdalena’s C clef and music-calligraphy can be found. (See the far right in Figure 3.64 above)
III.2.9 Possible Evidence of Anna Magdalena’s Music-Calligraphy & Handwriting in the Manuscript of the ‘1720 Autograph’ of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas

This section explores the possibility that Anna Magdalena was involved in the preparation of the so-called ‘1720 Autograph’. How this might have come about, is outside the scope of this thesis, and more research is required to resolve this question.

The *Six Violin Sonatas & Partitas* are one of the few complete works of Johann Sebastian to have survived; they are preserved in two manuscripts, one accepted as being by Johann Sebastian and the other as being in the hand of Anna Magdalena. However, so similar is the music-calligraphy, that at a casual glance, the two manuscripts appear to have been written by the same hand - one as possibly a rough version and the second as an autograph. This similarity is most surprising, as the age difference between Anna Magdalena and Johann Sebastian was 16 years, and this should have resulted in clear differences in their respective handwriting and music-calligraphy. Of course, in light of the discussion in Chapter III and in the present Chapter, it is possible that the music-calligraphy and handwriting of both Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena are present in both versions. This, if it were so, would certainly explain the remarkable similarity between the two manuscripts.

Figure 3.65, repeated for convenience from Chapter III, clearly demonstrates the remarkable similarity of the music-calligraphy in the two manuscripts. Close examination of the pages, clearly shows, at the very least, an attempt to closely mimic the music-calligraphy of whichever document came first. The flow of the beaming is, often, virtually identical, as are many of the features in the music in general. The level

---

408 See also the discussion of the relationship of the manuscripts in Chapter IV
of this almost uncanny accuracy of copying, casts doubt on the possibility that two people, whom tradition has it had known each other for such a relatively short period of time (at the time the manuscripts were written), could have possessed music-calligraphy that is almost indistinguishable, the one from the other. (See Figure 3.65)

Figure 3.65 The striking similarity of the music-calligraphy of the two manuscripts, traditionally by Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena - the passage is taken from the 3rd Movement of the 3rd Unaccompanied Sonata. The top example is believed to be in the hand of Anna Magdalena.

The extremely close similarity between the music-calligraphy, in the ‘1720 Autograph’ of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas, attributed to Johann Sebastian, and that of the supposed copy of manuscript of the same work, attributed to Anna Magdalena has, at least in part, given rise to the long accepted position: that Anna Magdalena became so expert in copying her husband’s music, the two music-calligraphies are virtually indistinguishable. However, the discussion, particularly with reference to the direct comparison of the music-calligraphy in the 5th Cello Suite with that in the Lute Suite, the further comparison with the music-calligraphy in Praeludium 6 from Wohltemperierte Klavier II, and the fact that distinguishing the music-calligraphy of the two is not a problem in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, calls the traditional position into question.
Using the techniques and principles of Forensic Document Examination, a rigorous investigation of the ‘1720 Autograph’ also reveals an alternative view.

Taking an example of music-calligraphy from the Preludio of the 5th Cello Suite and another from the Suite pour le clavecin, Figure 3.66 describes the method used to compare known specimens of music-calligraphy with a questioned specimen - in this case, from the ‘1720 Autograph’. What follows that, is a comparison between the music-calligraphy in the Six Cello Suites with the music-calligraphy in the ‘1720 Autograph’ of the Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas. And finally, for general comparison, examples of the music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian (from roughly the same period), are presented beside a few bars taken from the ‘1720 Autograph’ of the six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas. (See Figure 3.69.1)
Conclusion
Specimen A is more similar to the Questioned Document than Specimen B in the following ways:

- Placement of the straight stem towards the centre of the note-head
- Protrusions of stem through lower beam
- Note-head shape (generally more boble-headed than oval)
- Stem linkage to note-head,

Figure 3. 67 Examples of down–stem occurrence in the parallel works and other comparisons:

In the first 10 down-stems of the 1st Movement of the 1st Sonata, 9 are straight and centred

In the first 10 down-stems of the Prelude of the 1st Cello Suite, 10 are straight and centred

In the first 10 down-stems of the 2nd Movement of the 1st Sonata, 10 are straight and centred

In the first 10 down-stems of the 2nd Movement of the 1st Cello Suite, 10 are straight and centred

In Figure 3.68, the two examples on the far right (columns C & D) are, respectively left to right, from Anna Magdalena’s manuscript and Johann Peter Kellner’s manuscript of the Sonatas & Partitas. These examples are given, in order to demonstrate the significant difference in their music-calligraphy, a difference which would be expected between any two individuals. The other examples (columns A & B) are taken from Anna Magdalena's manuscript of the Six Cello Suites and the ‘1720 Autograph' of the Sonatas & Partitas. They clearly show how consistent Anna Magdalena is, in the execution of her penmanship.
Figure 3.68 Comparing the music-calligraphy of Anna Magdalena and the music-calligraphy in the ‘1720 Autograph’ (columns A & B):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The formation of the bobble-note-heads is indistinguishable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The stems often protrude through the outer beam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The crotchet rests are in a flattened ‘ess’ (S) form</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The leger lines are relatively long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The execution of separate down-stem quavers is indistinguishable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

409 Note that Kellner’s leger lines are continuous lines
Figure 3.69.1 Music calligraphy examples taken from the ‘1720 Autograph’, the 1720 and the 1722 Klavierbüchlein (roughly the same period as the ‘1720 Autograph’). All three examples are attributed to Johann Sebastian

Example 3.69.1.1 The ‘1720 Autograph’ of the Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas

Example 3.69.1.2 Fuga à 3 from the 1720 Klavierbüchlein

Example 3.69.1.3 The 5th French Suite from the 1722 Klavierbüchlein
A review of the music-calligraphy style of Johann Sebastian, as exampled above in Figure 3.69.1.1 - 3, and in material presented earlier in this section, reveals that the music-calligraphy, in the questioned manuscript of the ‘1720 Autograph’, has more in common with the music-calligraphy of Anna Magdalena than that of Johann Sebastian. In this Chapter, a discussion of the similarity of their music-calligraphy led to the suggestion that both Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena may have been involved with the preparation or writing of both the manuscripts and, despite what has just been said, this cannot be totally ruled out. What changes, as a result of the material presented from the Forensic Document Examination, is the relationship that Anna Magdalena had with the writing of the ‘1720 Autograph’, for there now appears to be very strong evidence of her substantial involvement in the production of that manuscript.

Further evidence for this hypothesis is exampled by the presence, in both the manuscripts, of G clef forms which exhibit characteristics that suggest that they may have been written by the same individual. (See Figure 3.69.2)

Similarly, the word ‘Sonata’, as written in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript before the C Major Sonata, exhibits many similarities to the word ‘Sonata’ as written in the ‘1720 Autograph’. (See Figure 3.69.3) The observable differences in execution may be due to the fact that in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, the word ‘Sonata’ had been written on a base-line (in this case the lines of a stave). This stave, itself, slants in an upwards
left to right angle, and, this appears to be as a result of the printing process. However, computer removal of the stave lines, re-alignment of the word, and substitution of the ‘t’ clearly shows a great similarity in the execution of the word. (See Figure 3.69.3)

**Figure 3.69.3** The word ‘Sonata’ written left to right, from Anna Magdalena’s manuscript and the ‘1720 Autograph’; on the far right, the same word ‘Sonata’, taken from Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, and, after computer removal of the stave lines and re-alignment, written out three times. In each case the letter ‘t’ has been removed and substituted with a letter ‘t’, written in a similar style of execution to that in the ‘1720 Autograph’, but taken from other sources of Anna Magdalena’s writing. (See Figure 3.69.4) The Williamson & Meenach cross-check patterns show great similarity in the execution of the words, which strongly indicates the same scribe.

The only particularly notable difference, in the execution of the word, is in the writing of the letter 't'. In Anna Magdalena's manuscript, it is executed in a single pen-stroke movement, and is written as a separate lower-case letter, rather than in a full cursive form. An examination of Anna Magdalena's writings elsewhere, however, reveals that she also uses, on occasion, a double pen-stroke action to construct the letter 't'. This can be seen, for example, in her writing of the word 'Correnta' in the B minor Sonata. Other examples are shown in Figure 3.69.4. Written free-hand, with no printed base-line, they show a similar pen-stroke action and angle of slope to the letter ‘t’, as it appears in the word 'Sonata’, in the '1720 Autograph'.

**Figure 3.69.4** Four examples of the letter ‘t’ taken from the ‘1750’ Petitions, showing similar structure and execution to the letter ‘t’ in the word ‘Sonata’ taken from the ‘1720 Autograph’ in Figure 3.69.3
Interestingly, and in the same context, the word ‘Sonata’ is also written on the opening page of the *Violin Sonata in G*, BWV 1021. In a similar, but more extensive exercise than that shown in Figure 3.69.3, the word ‘Sonata’, in Figure 3.69.5, has been simulated using letters from the ‘1750 Petitions’, plus the partial or severed ‘S’ from Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas & Partitas*. The striking similarity of the two writings is very clear, and the penmanship is strongly suggestive of the same writer, particularly in the shape and construction of the ‘a’ and ‘t’, and the relationship of the end effector of the ‘a’ to the ‘t’. (See Figure 3.69.5 far right)

![Figure 3.69.5](image)

The opening page of BWV 1021. In the middle, above, the word ‘Sonata’ written, with exception of the letter ‘S’, using letters in Anna Magdalena’s handwriting taken from the two ‘1750 Petitions’ and scaled to approximately matched proportions of the word ‘Sonata’ as it appears in BWV 1021. The letter ‘S’, which is taken from Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, as in Figure 3.69.3, has been severed to match the appearance of the ‘S’ in BWV 1021.

In her book ‘Anna Magdalena Bach Ein Leben in Documenten und Bindern’, Maria Hübner points out that the music-calligraphy in BWV 1021 has been attributed, by Schulze, to Anna Magdalena. The writing itself (*title, Record designations and numbering*), however, is attributed to Johann Sebastian. To explain this situation, it is suggested that this is an example of collaboration between the two. However, in the word ‘Cembalo’, see Figures 3.69.5 and 3.69.6, the letter ‘b’, and its relationship to the following letter ‘a’, bears more similarity to the execution of the letters ‘b’ and ‘a’ in Anna Magdalena’s handwriting than in that of Johann Sebastian. (See Figure 3.69.7) Compare the execution of the letters ‘b’ and ‘a’ in Figure 3.69.7, where the questioned material is on the left, two exemplars of Johann Sebastian’s writing, taken

---


411 See Hübner, 2004: 54 *Violinsonate G-Dur BWV 1021*, ...Diese Anfang der 1730er jahre entstandene Handschrift ist eine Gemeinschaftarbeit von Anna Magdalena (Notenschrift) und Johann Sebastian Bach *(Titel, Satzbezeichnungen und Bezifferung).*
from the two Sarabandes in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, are in the centre; and, two exemplars of Anna Magdalena’s writing taken from the 2nd French Suite in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein and the 3rd Cello Suite are on the far right.

Figure 3.69.6 ‘Cembalo’ as it appears in BWV 1021

Figure 3.69.7 The letters ‘b’ and ‘a’ from the word ‘Cembalo’ are on the far left, with Johann Sebastian’s letters ‘b’ and ‘a’ in the middle and Anna Magdalena’s ‘b’ and ‘a’ on the right

Predicated on the principle of habituation, shown in the two groups of exemplars to the right in Figure 3.69.7, the writer of the questioned material is more likely to be Anna Magdalena than Johann Sebastian. Additional similar examples of the letter ‘b’ and ‘a’ relationship in Johann Sebastian’s writing, can be found in the word ‘Sarabande’ in the ‘1720 Autograph’ of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas and in the 5th French Suite. (See Figure 3.69.8)

Figure 3.69.8 Examples of the letters ‘b’ to ‘a’ relationship in Johann Sebastian’s handwriting

It is also possible to compare the writing of the word ‘Cembalo’ in BWV 1021 directly with the writing of ‘Cembalo’ written, according to Dadelsen, by Anna Magdalena in BWV Anh. 129 in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein. (See Figure 3.69.9)

412 See also the writing of the word ‘Sarabande’ in Appendix H, where, in the case of Johann Sebastian’s writing, it is clear that the letter ‘b’, on no occasion, flows to the letter ‘a’, as it does in the word ‘Cembalo’ in Figure 3.69.6
413 See Dadelsen, 1988: 15
Figure 3.69.9 On the far left, the word ‘Cembalo’ as it appears in BWV 1021; on the right ‘Cembalo’, as it is written in BWV Anh. 129 in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein. The two examples to the far right show a direct comparison of the words ‘Sonata’, ‘per’, ‘il’, ‘e’ and ‘Cembalo’ – the lower examples, in Anna Magdalena’s handwriting, are taken from the documents listed previously and the 1725 Klavierbüchlein.

Whilst the words ‘Cembalo’ and ‘per’ are not written in exactly the same manner in both cases - the examples from BWV 1021 being full cursive, the other being essentially in separate lowercase letters - the great similarity in execution of the letters ‘C’, ‘e’, ‘b’, ‘a’ (plus the end-effector relationship of the ‘b’ to the ‘a’) and the open ‘o’ in Cembalo, plus the end-effector from the ‘e’ to the ‘r’ in ‘per’ make it very likely that the writer of ‘per’ and ‘Cembalo’ in both cases in Figure 3.69.9 was the same individual. The further similarity of the execution of the simulated words ‘il’ and ‘e’ in Anna Magdalena’s writing to the words in BWV 1021, add weight to this argument. Consequently, if Anna Magdalena wrote the word ‘Cembalo’ as it appears in BWV Anh. 129 in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, then she also wrote the word in BWV 1021, and, by extension, it is reasonable to assume that Anna Magdalena wrote the word ‘Sonata’ in BWV 1021. (See Figure 3.69.5) Further, she most certainly appears to have written ‘Volti cito’ and ‘volti’ in BWV 1021. (See Figure 3.69.10)

Figure 3.69.10 ‘Volti cito’ and ‘volti’ as they appear in both BWV 1021 (to the right of each pair) and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas and the Six Cello Suites.

Based on the above analysis, since the execution of the word ‘Sonata’ in BWV 1021 has strong similarities with the same word written in both the ‘1720 Autograph’ and
Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, it would seem likely that it is Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in both manuscripts of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas. (See Figure 3.69.11)

![Figure 3.69.11](image)
The word ‘Sonata’ is very likely to have been written by Anna Magdalena.

In addition, assuming that Anna Magdalena is the writer of the BWV 1021 manuscript, the tantalising possibility presents itself that she also wrote…di J S Bach. (See also Figure 3.69.5) Certainly, there are characteristics in the word ‘Bach’, and its slope or slant down to right, that are consistent with Anna Magdalena’s writing of ‘Bach’.

Notwithstanding the preceding argument, if the same writer did write the word ‘Sonata’ in all three manuscripts, then either Anna Magdalena’s writing is in both manuscripts of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas and BWV 1021 or Johann Sebastian’s writing is present in all three manuscripts. Either solution conflicts with the traditionally accepted view of the relationship of Anna Magdalena and Johann Sebastian to all three manuscripts.

### III.2.11 Conclusion

As already stated, using the techniques of the Forensic Document Examiner, it can now be shown that it is highly likely that Anna Magdalena was musically involved with Johann Sebastian much earlier that has, hitherto, been known. What has been demonstrated in this Chapter profoundly challenges the received understanding of Anna Magdalena’s role in Johann Sebastian’s life and musical output, for her musical presence, as seen above, is shown to be in documents and manuscripts possibly dating as far back
as 1713 – i.e. 7 years before, tradition has it, that they met. It has also been established that their music-calligraphy, far from being identical, can readily be discerned, one from the other. Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy and handwriting are present in the *Orgelbüchlein*, the 1720 and 1722 *Klavierbüchleins* and in the *Wohltemperierte Klavier I* - all places where, according to tradition, that her handwriting should not be. Anna Magdalena’s handwriting appears to be present in other manuscripts examined by me but not discussed here. Whilst the conclusions that might be drawn from the preceding Forensic Document Examination are many, if my conclusions are correct, then Anna Magdalena’s involvement with Johann Sebastian and her role in his musical output must surely be reconsidered.

In the second section of Chapter IV the same scientific approach, will be applied to the morphological study of the *Six Cello Suites*, in the search for verifiable evidence of authorship.
CHAPTER IV

ISSUES OF QUESTIONABLE AUTHORSHIP
CHAPTER IV
ISSUES OF QUESTIONABLE AUTHORSHIP

...in questions of authenticity and historical chronology of the works of Bach, there will probably never be a last word –

Wolfgang Schmieder\textsuperscript{414}

...the existence of a Bach Autograph is by no means proof of his authorship -

Hans Vogt\textsuperscript{415}

...It must therefore come as a shock to realise that alas not a single word in the title ‘J. S. Bach’s Toccata and Fugue in D minor for organ’ can be trusted –

Peter Williams\textsuperscript{416}

IV. 1 THE TRANSMISSION OF THE SIX CELLO SUITES

IV.1. 1 PREAMBLE & BACKGROUND

In this Chapter, issues that call into question the authorship of the Six Cello Suites will be explored. The Chapter is split into two Sections. In Section One, material will be presented which challenges the accepted relationship between the manuscripts written by Kellner and Anna Magdalena (both the Six Cello Suites and the ‘1720 Autograph’ of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas), as well as the manuscripts of Sources C and D of the Six Cello Suites. In Section Two, material mostly of a morphological nature, will be presented that suggests that someone other than Johann Sebastian composed the Cello Suites.

\textsuperscript{414} Schmieder’s “Foreword” to Spitta’s ‘Johann Sebastian Bach’ 1949, see Vogt, 1981: 240 n.14
\textsuperscript{415} Vogt, 1981: 18/19
\textsuperscript{416} Peter Williams, “BWV 565: A toccata in D minor for Organ by J. S. Bach?” Early Music, Vol. 9, No. 3 (July) (1981): 330
IV.1.1. 2 Chamber works

Over the past 50 years or so, Bach scholars have attempted, by various means, to establish the chronology of the compositions of Johann Sebastian and to confirm or, in some cases, question, the hitherto accepted authorship of some of Johann Sebastian’s works. Vogt’s summary of the position with regard to the chamber works exemplifies this well (my emphasis is in bold type):

…Of all the chamber works of Johann Sebastian Bach, only the Trio Sonata from the Musical Offering (1747) was published during his lifetime. And that was not because a publisher happened to express interest in the work – which would have been conceivable, considering the reputation Bach enjoyed at the time – but rather because Bach wanted to dedicate to Frederick the Great a personal copy worthy of a king. So Bach supervised the engraving of the Musical Offering himself. Apart from that, however, handwritten copies sufficed for his chamber music. This does not mean that during his lifetime he was neglected as a composer of chamber music (even though others, such as Telemann were more “famous” than he was) – it was merely the custom of the times. Music publication was still in its infancy and very little music was printed.

Owing to these circumstances, dating and authenticating the manuscripts present substantial problems. The number of Bach’s chamber works in Autograph manuscript is small. Copies made by his students or colleagues are not always reliable. Copyists were not overly fastidious; often only individual

417 Williams, 1981: 330
parts were reproduced, not the complete score. Nobody was concerned about precision in the notation of phrasing, details of rhythm and dynamics. Copyists copied from each other, so that errors were perpetuated; many of them probably thought they understood the music better than the composer and introduced arbitrary changes. Bach himself did the same thing and may well have had reason to do so. The composer’s name was also treated in a cavalier manner: there was no such thing as copyright. Often the composer’s name was entirely omitted. Thus it sometimes happened that the signature of the copyist, which was affixed to the end of the copy according to the practice of the time, was later taken for the signature of the composer. It was also customary to bind copies of works by different composers together in one volume, without any concern that the sheets were of different sizes. True, we gain a vivid picture of the musical repertoire of the time from such collections; but they do not make it any easier to connect the pieces to a particular composer or a date of composition. Handwritten copies were scattered to the four winds: whoever copied a work or commissioned and paid for a copy considered the music his own property. Bach himself was no different, for this reason the existence of a Bach Autograph is by no means proof of his authorship.\footnote{Vogt, 1981: 18/19}
IV.1.1. 2 Organ Works

It has long been known that some of the early organ preludes and fugues, originally attributed to Johann Sebastian, were actually composed by Johann Krebs, one of Johann Sebastian’s pupils.

...The Eight Little Preludes and Fugues I take to be the work of Johann Krebs from when he was a pupil of Bach in Leipzig, as I explained in detail in the Bach-Jahrbuch for 1937.419

Further, in more recent years (1981), even the attribution of Toccata and Fugue in D minor BWV 565, one of Johann Sebastian’s most famous works, has been challenged;420 and furthermore ...there is even a question as to whether it was originally an organ piece.421

IV.1.1.3 Flute Works

Hans Eppstein has questioned the authorship of some of the Flute Sonatas:422 (my emphasis is in bold type)

For quite a long time, the sonatas for Flute contained in this volume [J.S. Bach Flotensonaten II, 1981] were thought to have been composed by Johann Sebastian Bach, an assumption that may well prove fallacious, though the sonatas BWV 1031 and 1033 have been attributed to Bach by his son Carl

421 Marshall, 2000: 521
Phillip Emanuel. This does not, of course, rule out the fact that they may have originated from J.S. Bach’s close circle of associates and may have been influenced by him to some extent or even have involved his personal cooperation. Bach’s authorship of the Sonata in C major with Continuo is insofar dubious as the first two movements hardly come up to the artistic standards displayed by the mature Bach; neither can this sonata be regarded as an early work since, according to our knowledge, the composer had no opportunity of writing for the transverse flute before assuming his duties at Cöthen.423

IV.1. 2 THE RELIABILITY OF C. P. E. BACH AS A WITNESS

The fact that Eppstein says that Carl Philipp Emanuel’s attribution of some of the flute sonatas might ...prove fallacious, draws attention to the possibility that Carl Philipp Emanuel might well be an unreliable source of information regarding Johann Sebastian’s other compositions. This, in turn, leads to the possibility that Carl Philipp Emanuel might also be considered unreliable as a source of accurate information about his father in other matters.424 Marshall adds to this work of Eppstein, with regard to the C major Sonata:

...The principal source for the C-major Sonata was written by C.P.E. Bach around 1731, that is, when he was about seventeen years old and still living in his father’s house. The manuscript ascribes the work to ‘Joh. Seb. Bach’. As Dürr observes, few works attributed to J. S. Bach have such clear and

423 J.S. Bach Flötensonaten II, 1981, Preface by Hans Eppstein: V
impeccable credentials...Both Dürr and Eppstein suggest that Emanuel ascribed the work to Sebastian in recognition of his helping, if limited, role in the composition.\textsuperscript{425}

This is a very important quotation, with regard to questioning ascriptions at that period, and is relevant to the business of the title page of Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the \textit{Cello Suites}.

The potential unreliability of Carl Philipp Emanuel as a witness is very important as the only known statement, from the period, naming Johann Sebastian Bach as the composer of the \textit{Six Cello Suites} is made by Carl Philipp Emanuel, in one of his letters to Forkel, thus:

\textit{...He understood the possibilities of all stringed instruments. This is evidenced by his solos for the violin and the violoncello without bass.}\textsuperscript{426}

Carl Philipp Emanuel also lists the \textit{Six Cello Suites} as the work of Johann Sebastian in the Obituary.\textsuperscript{427} It is also worthy of note, that Carl Pilipp Emanuel was only a very young boy (6 years old) in 1720, assuming that the traditional, approximate date of composition of the Suites is correct.\textsuperscript{428} He was, therefore, unlikely to have been aware of them at the time of composition. As has already been stated:

\textit{Emanuel had his own agenda… His obituary plants hardy seeds for the reverence that will practically choke Bach biography for 250 years and more}\textsuperscript{429}

\textsuperscript{425} Marshall, 1989: 203/204
\textsuperscript{426} NBA, 1998: 397
\textsuperscript{427} Ibid. 304
\textsuperscript{428} See Chapter I
Blume also questions the reliability of the Obituary, regarding the attribution of...the fourth and fifth annual series of cantatas made by Carl Philipp Emanuel (and J. F. Agricola). 430

Bearing in mind Eppstein’s and Durr’s interpretation of the ascriptions on the Flute Sonata, without any other independent witnesses, and bearing in mind the words of Vogt on the matter of authenticity quoted above, where even an ...Autograph is by no means proof of his authorship, the fact that the title page of the manuscript, containing the Six Cello Suites has the words... Composèe [sic] par Sr J S Bach written on it, means very little. I will have more to say about the date of their composition, later in this Chapter, and I will return to the matter of ascription, later in Chapter V.

As already stated by Vogt above, with regard to dates of composition, it must be remembered that virtually none of Johann Sebastian’s chamber music was published during his lifetime, and that establishing even the year of composition is, more often than not, well nigh impossible, on the evidence presently available. Even in those circumstances where an Autograph has a date, as in the case of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, the only thing that can be concluded is that, for the work in question, the particular date has some significance, which we would normally assume indicates that the work was completed before the date and not after the date. 431 On this subject, Vogt continues that Alfred Dürr was also of the same opinion as that of Schmeider:

430 See Blume, 1963: 219
431 Even this apparently obvious conclusion is sometimes open to challenge. In the case of the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, for example, it might well be that the year 1725 was added at a much later time and certainly nobody assumes that the content of the book was completed in that year – the same would also apply to the 1720 Klavierbüchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann; these issues will be taken up at greater length.
...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.432

So in raising the question of the authorship of the Six Cello Suites in some respects, at least, this thesis does not break entirely new ground.

IV.1. 3 ANNA MAGDALENA’S DOUBLE MANUSCRIPT433

It is understood that the Six Cello Suites and the Violin Sonatas & Partitas appeared together in the same double manuscript or Konvolut in or around 1727. The violin works formed ‘Pars 1’ and the Cello Suites ‘Pars 2’. It is accepted that both works in the manuscript are in the music-calligraphy of Anna Magdalena and it has long been assumed that she copied the Cello Suites from a no longer extant (or lost) fair copy or Autograph.435 Regarding her work as copyist:

...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 . . . accurately reflects the writing in the Autograph.436

432 Vogt, 1981: 20
433 The following discussion of the textural tradition is based on Hans Eppstein’s Kritischer Bericht (NBA VI/2 – Sechs Suiten für Violoncello, Kassel, 1990) and the more recent writings of Kirsten Beisswenger, Ulrich Leissinger, Bettina Schwemer and Douglas Woodfull-Harris
434 Beisswenger, 2000: 77
435 Ibid.
436 Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 4
IV.1.3. 1 Georg Heinrich Ludwig Schwanenberger

Apparently, the double manuscript containing the *Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas* and the *Six Cello Suites* came into the possession of the chamber violinist Schwanenberger (also known as Schwanberg) at the Kapelle of Brunswick Wolfbüttel.\textsuperscript{437} No explanation has ever been offered as to why Anna Magdalena made the copies for Schwanenberger.

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{438} as being in the hand of Schwanenberger. Eppstein argues in the ‘Kritischer Bericht VI/2’ that:

\textit{...Given that Schwanenberger was party to the creation [of the manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & 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.}\textsuperscript{439}

\textsuperscript{437} Wolff, 2000: 375
\textsuperscript{438} Smith personal communication see Appendix H
\textsuperscript{439} Eppstein, 1990: 12
As Eppstein points out, Schwanenberger also had some input into the preparation of the whole of the double manuscript, as his handwriting appears throughout the manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas and the title pages of both works, as demonstrated below in Figures 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4 & 4.5:

![Figure 4.1](image1) The word ‘Minuet’, as written in the ‘1720 Autograph’ of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas and in the Six Cello Suites

![Figure 4.2](image2) The word ‘Minuet’, as it appears in the Anna Magdalena manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas

In the case of the ‘Menuets’, in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, the handwriting is clearly different from either of the handwriting in the ‘1720 Autograph’ or Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Cello Suites, as shown in Figure 4.1. The word Menuet has also been misspelled with a double “t”. This, plus the obviously different construction and slant of the writing, suggests the involvement of someone other than either Johann Sebastian or Anna Magdalena in the preparation of the manuscript, possibly Schwanenberger himself, as is suggested by Hans-Joachim Schultze.\(^{440}\) Certainly, there are enough similarities in the formation of the letters and in the slant of the handwriting to conclude that the words were written by the same person who wrote the title page. (See Figure 4.2, above, and Figures 4.3 and Figure 4.6)

![Figure 4.3](image3) The words ‘Madame’ and ‘Musique’ as written by Schwanenberger on the title page of the manuscript containing the Violin Sonatas & Partitas and the Six Cello Suites

\(^{440}\) Eppstein, 1990: 12
Assuming Hans-Joachim Schultze to be correct that Schwanenberger wrote the title pages, then, the words ‘Gavotte en Rondeau’ would also appear to be written by him, given the slant of the writing and the shape of the letters.

![Gavotte en Rondeau](image)

**Figure 4.4** The words ‘Gavotte en Rondeau’ in the Anna Magdalena manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas

Further, it would also appear, given the slant of the lettering and the letter shapes that, with the exception of the 3rd Sonata, all the other titles of each of the Sonatas & Partitas were also added by the same person. (See Figure 4.5)

![Sonata & Partita](image)

**Figure 4.5** The words ‘Sonata’ and ‘Partita’ as they appear in the Anna Magdalena manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas.

It is unknown why Schwanenberger’s handwriting is in the body of the copy of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, written in Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy, as well as on the title page of the complete manuscript. However, Schwanenberger’s handwriting does not appear in the Six Cello Suites manuscript at all.

### IV.1.4 THE DATE OF COMPOSITION OF THE CELLO SUITES

The actual date of composition of the Cello Suites is simply unknown. It is presumed to be around 1720, mainly because the date, ‘1720’, is written on the Autograph of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, see Figure 4.6. There are, possibly, two other reasons:

---

441 I will discuss the title of the 3rd Sonata in Chapter V
442 Beisswenger, 2000: 76
1. The title page of the *Violin Sonatas & Partitas* states that they are *Libro Primo*; by inference, therefore, there should, at least, be a ‘Libro Secondo’, conforming to the *Pars 1* and *Pars 2* of the later double manuscript containing the manuscripts in Anna Magdalena’s handwriting; the assumption has always been that the ‘Libro Secondo’ was the *Six Cello Suites*, but this may not be the case; ‘Libro Secondo’ could just have easily been intended to be the *Six Accompanied Sonatas* for violin.

2. The date ‘1720’ was during the ‘Cöthen period’, a time when Johann Sebastian was writing music, mostly of a secular nature.

However, it is by no means established that the *Cello Suites* were written by 1720. Schweitzer says, *the six sonatas [sic] for cello come from the Cöthen period*, and he suggests that the *three partitas (suites) and three sonatas…for violin* were already in existence in 1720; however, he makes no mention of the existence of the *Six Cello Suites* at that time. *It is generally assumed that Bach wrote the Six Solo Cello Suites after the works for violin*, writes Vogt in his book ‘Johann Sebastian Bach’s Chamber Music’. He continues…*In fact, Eppstein believes that it was the other way around: first came the rather modestly conceived cello works, then the boldly fashioned violin pieces.*

---

446 1717-1723
448 Ibid.
450 Vogt, 1981: 178
The question of the order in which the two sets of works were composed is still unresolved, though given that a version of the 5th Cello Suite exists for Lute dated from around 1727 to 1732, and as Anna Magdalena’s manuscript dates from roughly the same period (see below), notwithstanding Epstein’s assertion that …the rather modestly conceived cello works came first, it is conceivable that the Cello Suites could have been written after the Violin Sonatas and Partitas rather than before. The actual date at which the double manuscript appeared is conjectural, and is based only on …studies of the handwriting and paper;\textsuperscript{451} the date is given as …some time between

\textsuperscript{451} Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 4
The dating provided by Göttinger Bach-Katalog for Anna Magdalena’s manuscript is somewhere between 17.10.1727 and 2.12.1731.

**IV.1. 5 WATERMARKS**

The work of Wisso Weiss and Yoshitake Kobayashi, on the subject of watermarks, published in the Neue Bach Ausgabe ‘Katalog Der Wassenzeichen in Bachs Originalschriften’, is invaluable as one tool, amongst others, in the preliminary dating the works of Johann Sebastian…*The primary criterion that determines the dating of a Bach manuscript is, in the majority of cases, the watermark and paper.*

However, Forensic Document Examiners do not see the use of watermarks and the examination of paper as a reliable means of dating a document; as Charles Hamilton, renowned Forensic Document Examiner, states …*the examination of paper or the watermarks proves little or nothing… With documents written before 1800, however, the value of watermarks for age detection is tenuous; at best…the paper [which might have been used much later] might easily be from the same batch.*

The watermark, in other words, provides nothing more than evidence that the writing in question took place after the paper was made.

In ‘The Sources of J. S Bach Works’, apart from the date of ‘1720’ that is given on the title page of the *Violin Sonatas & Partitas* (Mus. ms. Bach P 967), there is no firm evidence provided that ‘1720’ represents the completion date of the violin works.

---

452 Ibid. 4  
453 http://gwdu64.gwdg.de/pls/bach/queng$quellen.queryview?P_QSL=dbp0269&Z_CHK=18186  
454 These dates being based on watermarks  
456 Hamilton, 1991: 102. See also Wilson Harris, 1966: 212  
457 http://gwdu64.gwdg.de/pls/bach/queng$quellen.QueryViewByKey?P_QSL=dbp0269&Z_CHK=18186
The watermark information presented in the NBA Serie IX: Addenda, is as follows:

*Paper mill Joachimsthal/Buemen, started in 1589 by the Saxonian paper-maker Adam Abt; the paper-maker was probably Johann Berhard Apt, born 1679, and, from 1702, worked as a master-paper-maker at least until 1723 but possibly 1734. The Crossed Mallet and Hammer [WZ 107] symbol was, for very many years, the symbol of miners – and the mining industry. The use of the WZ 107-type was used at Leipzig and in other places from 1710 - 1722, very similarly 1715/1716 and 1722.*

(see Figure 4.7)

![Figure 4.7 The watermark in Mus. ms. Bach P 967](image)

So, clearly, there is no specific link between the date ‘1720’ and the watermarking. Hence, nothing in the watermark itself confirms that the ‘1720 Autograph’ was complete in 1720.

---

458 …Papiermühle Joachimsthal/Bümen, gegründet 1589 durch den sächsischen Papiermacher Adam Abt; Papiermacher wahrscheinlich Johann Berhard Apt, geb. 1679, getr. 1702, wirkte als Meister mindestens bis 1723 bzw. bis vor 1734. Gekreuzte Schlägel und Eisen seit alters das Bergmanns- und Bergbausymbol. Verwendung des WZ-Typs belegt Leipzig und andernorts 1710 - 1722, sehr ähnlich 1715/1716 und 1722
IV.1. 6 THE TRANSMISSION OF THE SOURCES OF THE SIX CELLO SUITES AND THE TRANSMISSION OF THE UNACCOMPANIED VIOLIN SONATAS & PARTITAS

As discussed, in detail, in Chapter I (Literature Review), four handwritten manuscripts of the Six Cello Suites, dating from the 18th Century, still exist. In this section the relationship between those manuscripts will be explored. However, for reasons which will become clear, before doing so, it is essential that the relationship between Anna Magdalena’s manuscript and ‘1720 Autograph’ of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas be fully interrogated.

IV.1.6. 1 The traditional position

As discussed previously, it is traditionally accepted that Anna Magdalena copied both the Violin Sonatas & Partitas and the Six Cello Suites from, in the former case, the ‘1720 Autograph’ and, in the latter case, a missing Cello Suite ‘Autograph’.459

459 See Beisswenger, 2000: 76
IV.1.6. 2 Manuscripts of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas

From the 1720s, there are three extant manuscripts of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas: the so-called ‘1720 Autograph’, an incomplete copy made by Johann Peter Kellner, see Figure 4.8, and dated 1726, and an undated manuscript in Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy.

Figure 4. 8 The title page of Kellner’s copy of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas

IV.1.6. 3 Kellner’s incomplete copy of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas

An examination of Peter Kellner’s copy of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas reveals a number of interesting matters that might have implications for Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas. They provide a new perspective on the possible dates of completion of the composition of the aforementioned

The work of Russel Stinson in ‘The Bach manuscripts of Johann Peter Kellner and His Circle – a case study in reception history’\textsuperscript{461} deals in depth with Kellner’s manuscripts, including the incomplete copy of the \textit{Violin Sonatas & Partitas}. Besides those passages listed below, which are also discussed in detail by Stinson,\textsuperscript{462} there are many other small divergences in the manuscript, not dealt with by Stinson, that bring into question our understanding of the relationship between all three manuscripts mentioned above. I will discuss some of these small divergences later.

The following represent the principal or major differences between Kellners’s manuscript and the ‘1720 Autograph’, given by Russell Stinson:\textsuperscript{463}

- The title page lists three of the \textit{Sonatas}, but only two of the Partie (sic)\textsuperscript{464}, the \textit{B minor Partita} is ‘missing’. (See Figure 4. 8 above)

- The three \textit{Sonatas} are listed together and, likewise, the two \textit{Partitas} - as opposed to the order in which they appear in either ‘1720 Autograph’ or Anna Magdalena’s manuscript (Sonata – Partita – Sonata etc). (See Figure 4. 8 above)

- The two listed \textit{Partitas} are given in the order E major and D minor (See Figure 4. 8 above). The order in which they appear, in the ‘1720 Autograph’, is: B minor, D minor and E major.

\textsuperscript{461} See Stinson, 1989
\textsuperscript{462} Ibid. 56 – 70
\textsuperscript{463} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{464} I will refer to them by their more usual name of Partita
• There are seven bars ‘missing’ from the middle section of the Fugue of the *G minor Sonata*. (See Figure 4.9)

![Figure 4.9 Kellner’s version of bars 33-35 above the ‘1720 Autograph’ of the same 3 bars](image)

• There are rhythmic deviations from the ‘1720 Autograph’ at the close of the first movement of the *C major Sonata*. (See Figure 4.10)

![Figure 4.10 Clear rhythmic discrepancies between Kellner’s manuscript of the 6th last bar of the 1st movement of the C major Sonata, on the right, and the ‘1720 Autograph’ version, on the left](image)

• There is a ‘Da Capo’ sign following the final chord of the C major Fugue that is not in the ‘1720 Autograph’.465 (See Figure 4.11)

![Figure 4.11 The Da Capo in the C major Fugue in Kellner’s copy](image)

• A four note chord completes the ‘Largo’ of the C major Sonata, as opposed to a three note chord in the ‘1720 Autograph’. (See Figure 4.12)

![Figure 4.12](image)

**Figure 4.12** A four-note f major chord completes the Largo from the C major Sonata in Kellner’s manuscript on the right as opposed to the three-note chord in the ‘1720 Autograph’, on the left

• The *E major Partita* has only three movements – the Loure, Menuet 2, Bourée & Gique are ‘missing’.

• The *D minor Partita* has only three movements – the Allamanda (sic) and Corrente, are ‘missing’. There are thirty-two bars ‘missing’ in the middle section of the Ciaccona (Chaconne). The major section is ‘truncated’ by some thirty bars with an additional eight bars ‘removed’ from the beginning of the final minor return. The final section also has three bars ‘missing’.

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.\(^{466}\)

Kellner’s version, although it appears to have some errors, is for the most part musically satisfactory. And where there is ‘absent’ music, as in the G minor Fugue,

‘new’ music has been added to facilitate linking the passages which are either side of the ‘absent’ material (e.g. Kellner’s final two beats of bar two in Figure 4.9 above). As far as the ‘absent’ passages are concerned, they are, in no sense, musically missing – though it is possible that the music might be considered lesser for their absence.467 It is also worthy of note that the ‘missing’ bars in Kellner’s manuscript are, for the most part, the virtuosic or more difficult sections, particularly of the G minor Fugue and the Ciaccona (Chaconne).468 Given that Peter Kellner was one of Johann Sebastian’s …most important copyists [and] …was probably personally acquainted with the composer,469 it is difficult to explain why he would have made such a copy. The explanation might be that Kellner’s manuscript is a copy of an earlier version of the Sonatas & Partitas,470 i.e. one that predates the ‘1720 Autograph’. However, this does not explain why Kellner, in 1726, was copying an incomplete version of a work that was ostensibly already complete in 1720, according to the date on the manuscript, at least.

Kellner appears to have known Johann Sebastian …I longed for the acquaintance of this excellent man. And I was, in fact, fortunate enough to enjoy the same.471 It is very unclear what his relationship to Johann Sebastian was,472 though they do appear, according to Stinson, to have been friends, even with 20 years difference in their ages. How they came to know each other is a mystery, as there is no reference to Kellner

467 See Braunlich: 3
468 See Moser’s theory in Stinson, 1989: 64
469 Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 4
470 See Hauswald and Gerger’s theory in Braunlich: 2
472 See Stinson, 1989: 14
spending any of his time at Leipzig, though it is possible that he did visit Leipzig and simply made no mention of it; they may have met elsewhere, of course.

What is intriguing is why and how Kellner came to make a copy of the *Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas* and the *Six Cello Suites*, as he was not a cellist and only, perhaps, a violinist of very moderate ability. As his copy bears the name of the town, “Frankenhayn” (modern Frankenhain), written on it twice (once on the title page and once at the end of the manuscript), it has been argued that Kellner made his copy of the above two manuscripts, in Frankenhayn, where he was resident in 1726. Stinson suggests that he made his copy from a, no longer extant, exemplar held outside the Bach household, and further, that Kellner’s version is not as a result of … unauthorized liberties. All of this is conjecture, as there is no proof, of the existence of the copy of the works that might have been Kellner’s exemplar.

There is also no evidence that the manuscripts left the Bach household and the fact that Kellner's manuscript has "Frankenhayn" written on it, see Figure 4.13 does not, of itself, prove that he made his copy in Frankenhayn. Though no reference is made by Kellner, in his autobiography, of any sojourn to the Bach household to undertake this work, it seems more likely that he travelled to Leipzig to make his copies; this position is reinforced by the fact that Kellner’s copy of the *Cello Suites* indicates neither date nor Frankenhayn.

---

473 Ibid. 13
474 For a full discussion of this issue see Stinson, 1989
475 See Stinson, 1989: 60
476 Ibid. 56 – 70
477 Ibid. 56
478 See Stinson, 1989: 14
If Kellner was indeed in the Bach household, why would he not have copied the final version? One possible and plausible hypothesis is that the date of ‘1720’, on the title page of the ‘Autograph’, was written when the works were finally complete, sometime later than 1726, i.e. after Kellner had copied his version.\textsuperscript{479} If it is the case that the \textit{Sonatas & Partitas} were completed after 1726, then the date ‘1720’ perhaps represents the date they were begun rather than the date they were completed.

The ramifications of this hypothesis are very significant. It has long been held that the \textit{Six Violin Sonatas & Partitas} are one of the exceptionally few manuscripts of Johann Sebastian to have a date of composition written on them …\textit{It is very seldom that one finds a dated manuscript, as in the case of the famous Autograph of the violin solo works, with inscription “1720”}.\textsuperscript{480} Further, it has always been believed that the \textit{Violin Sonatas & Partitas} were completed whilst Johann Sebastian was still working at the Cöthen Court. Additionally, if the hypothesis is correct, it would appear that the \textit{Sonatas & Partitas} were revised and the level of difficulty of some of the movements enhanced. This then raises other issues: for example, for whom were they technically revised? It also raises the question of the origins of Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the \textit{Violin Sonatas & Partitas} as, rather curiously, Kellner’s manuscript has written in it the genre (Sonata or Partita) titles and movement titles. However, as mentioned previously, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript was bereft of most of the genre titles, and

\textsuperscript{479} See the discussion of Watermarks on page 228
\textsuperscript{480} Vogt 1981: 17
some movement titles, until they were added by another person, probably
Schwanenberger. Interestingly, some of the movement titles in both Kellner’s
manuscripts of the *Violin Sonatas & Partitas* and the *Cello Suites* appear to be in
Anna Magdalena’s handwriting. This matter will be discussed later in the Chapter.

**IV.1.6. 4 Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas & Partitas***

Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas & Partitas* is striking, both in its
similarity to the music-calligraphy in the ‘1720 Autograph’ and the accuracy with
which it has been produced – examples of this were given in Chapter III. However,
there are some differences between the manuscripts which need exposition and some
discussion. (See Table 4.1.1 and Figure 4.14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corrected rhythms</th>
<th>Unclear rhythm</th>
<th>Incorrect rhythm</th>
<th>Other errors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AMB</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1720 Autograph</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.1.1 A comparison of the 1st Movement of the *G minor Sonata* of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas, as written in the ‘1720 Autograph’, with Anna Magdalena’s manuscript*

Figure 4.14, contains examples of the divergences in the 1st Movement of the *G minor Sonata*. Examples from Anna Magdalena’s manuscript are on the left of each pair.
**Figure 4.14** A Comparison of the 1st Movement in the ‘1720 Autograph’ of the *Six Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas* and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript

1. Trill missing 2nd beat of bar 2

2. Trill placed differently in bar 3

3. Clearer rhythm 1st beat of bar 5

4. Slur missing final quaver bar 6

5. Incomplete pen stroke 2nd crotchet bar 8

6. Clearer rhythm 2nd beat of bar 10
7. Clearer rhythm in 2nd beat of 12

8. Clearer rhythm in 4th beat of bar 13

9. Rhythmic error 2nd half of 3rd beat of bar 15

10. Correct rhythm in 2nd beat of bar 18

11. The beaming is reversed in bar 19

12. Slur missing between 3rd and 4th beat bar 20

13. Rhythm correctly written in 2nd beat of bar 21

14. Incorrect rhythm in the 4th beat of bar 21
It is clear that, in some cases, ‘copy’ errors have taken place, but those are invariably in the ‘1720 Autograph’; for example, in 8, 10, 13 & 14, where extra beams have been added to correct the rhythm. Interestingly, no corrections have been attempted in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript. As stated in Chapter III, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, as a whole, gives the impression of being somewhat rougher or cruder than the more polished ‘1720 Autograph’ and, the reversed beaming in bar 19 (no. 11) suggests that this manuscript may not have been prepared from the ‘1720 Autograph’.

IV.1.6. 5 A Comparison between Anna Magdalena’s manuscript & Kellner’s copy of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas and the ‘1720 Autograph’

An examination and comparison of Kellner’s copy and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript reveals that Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas has some important features in common with Kellner’s copy, which itself, as discussed above, diverges significantly from the ‘1720 Autograph’. In Figures 4.15 to 4.22, examples of the divergent readings are given. The ‘1720’ Autograph is to the far left in each example.

Firstly, and probably most significantly, it can clearly be seen in Figure 4.15 that both Anna Magdalena and Kellner have written a B natural (circled), placed in the adjacent C space above, preceding the 5th semi-quaver the bar.

![Figure 4.15](image)

**Figure 4.15** Bar 10 from the Sarabande in the D minor Partita (left to right) the ‘1720 Autograph’, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript and Kellner’s incomplete copy
However, in the example on the far left, in the ‘1720 Autograph’, the note in question is clearly written a B flat, which is placed in the adjacent space below the B. (See Figure 4.16) The striking similarity in their execution of this particular accidental strongly suggests that Anna Magdalena and Kellner have used a source containing a B natural rather than B flat; this case is further strengthened by the fact that two semiquavers previously, a B natural has already been stated, thereby making the B natural sign in question redundant. It is, of course, possible that both Anna Magdalena and Kellner misread the flat as a natural or believed that the flat was an error and corrected it. However, as will be seen in the following discussion, neither of those alternatives appears to be likely.

Figure 4.16 The very clearly written B ‘flat’, yet both Kellner and Anna Magdalena give B natural placed exactly in the C space

Frederick Neuman, in his article ‘Some Performance Problems of Bach’s Unaccompanied Violin and Cello Works’ discusses this issue and concludes that because, in the opinion of Russell Stinson, Kellner ... committed similar scribal transgressions in copying other Bach works he discounts Kellner’s copy. However, Neumann makes no reference to the fact that Anna Magdalena’s manuscript has the B natural as well. As there doesn’t appear to be any ambiguity regarding the B flat in the ‘1720 Autograph’, see Figure 4.16, and if, indeed, they were copying from the ‘1720 Autograph’, it is difficult to understand what process of copying could have involved

\[\text{References:}\]
\[\text{Ibid. 22}\]
both scribes in the same ‘misreading’—even down to the all but identical placement of
the natural sign in the two variant manuscripts.

Also, Neuman does not point out that, in the two other cases of doubtful notes he
discusses, on pages 21-22 of his article, both Kellner’s copy and Anna Magdalena’s
manuscript agree with the supposed notational …oversight\textsuperscript{483} in the ‘1720 Autograph’
on both occasions. That is to say,…the first movement of the G minor Sonata, measure
3, third quarter … should almost certainly be an E flat, yet all three have written an E
natural, and …In the Siciliano of the same Sonata in measure 9, eighth eight-
note…intended to be an F sharp,\textsuperscript{484} all three manuscripts have an F natural. This then,
begs the question of why Anna Magdalena and Kellner should differ from the ‘1720
Autograph’ at bar 10 of the afore-mentioned Sarabande?

IV.1.6. 6 Examples of coincident and divergent readings in the G minor
Unaccompanied Sonata\textsuperscript{485}

There are other coincident and divergent readings across the three manuscripts of the
G minor Unaccompanied Sonata that are summarised in Table 4.1.2 and detailed in
the text that follows. Whilst all effort has been made to identify every occasion of a
divergence or coincident reading in the G minor Sonata, it is possible that yet more
examples could be present.

\textsuperscript{483} Neuman, 1994: 20
\textsuperscript{484} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{485} A complete comparative analysis of all Six Unaccompanied Sonatas & Partitas is outside the scope
of this thesis and would not be of any particular additional value in the context of the Six Cello Suites.
For the purposes of this exercise the comparative examination of the manuscripts merely serves the
purpose of identifying a possible misrepresentation of the relation between the two works for
unaccompanied violin and cello.
Please note that some of the examples given contain more than one coincidence or divergence, see Figure 4.22, Example 4.22.3 for instance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples of Coincident and Divergent Readings in the G minor Sonata</th>
<th>Articulation</th>
<th>Pitch</th>
<th>Rhythm</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMB &amp; JPK agree but are different from the '1720 Autograph'</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMB &amp; '1720 Autograph' agree but are different from JPK</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMB &amp; JPK disagree and differ from the '1720 Autograph'</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>23</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1.2 Examples of Coincident and Divergent Readings in the G minor Sonata

In Figure 4.17 both Kellner and Anna Magdalena miss a slur that is very clear in the ‘1720 Autograph’. 486

![Image](image1.png)

**Figure 4.17** The missing slur in bar 5 of the 1st movement of the G minor Sonata

486 In all the following examples, the excerpts are presented left to right: ‘1720 Autograph’, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript and Kellner’s copy on the far right.
In Figure 4.18 there is an apparent divergent reading of the rhythm in bar 6, Anna Magdalena and Kellner have written the rhythm out clearly and correctly - note the erroneous ‘attempted rhythmic explanation’ in the up stems of Kellner’s copy.\footnote{The origin of these and similar markings in the same Movement is unknown to me, but are clearly by someone who was correcting the manuscript to match the more familiar version (perhaps for playing purposes?) Note the addition of a natural sign above the E in bar 6, for example.}

![Figure 4.18](image)

Figure 4.18 The apparent divergent rhythmic reading in bar 6 of the 1st Movement of the G minor Sonata

Figure 4.19 shows the missing trill in bar 2 (which has been added, along with other attempted ‘corrections’, by what appears to be a third party, see above and below).

![Figure 4.19](image)

Figure 4.19 The missing trill in bar 2 of the 1st Movement of the G minor Sonata

In the example in Figure 4.20, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript and Kellner’s copy are very clear; it is difficult to believe that either prepared their manuscripts from the very unclear writing of what simply looks like a ‘note-head’ placed before the penultimate F, in bar 10 of the 1st Movement of the G minor Sonata, in the ‘1720 Autograph’.

![Figure 4.20](image)

Figure 4.20 The ambiguous F sharp in the 1st Movement of the G minor Sonata
In Figure 4.21, rather curiously, Kellner has written the passage, at the last beat, in bar 3 of the 1st Movement of the *G minor Sonata*, down a 3rd relative to the same passage in the ‘1720 Autograph’; a different rhythm is also written, in the final semi-quaver of the bar.

NB The small dot at the end of the bar, in Kellner’s copy, appears to be a note-head associated with the sketched in notes/rhythm.488

![Figure 4.21](image)

**Figure 4.21** The apparent miscopying of bar 3 of the 1st Movement of the *G minor Sonata* in Kellner’s copy

In Figure 4.22, Examples 1 – 8 (left to right “1720 Autograph, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, Kellner’ copy) show other differences between the Kellner manuscript and both the ‘1720 Autograph’ and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript in the *G minor Sonata*.

---

488 Curiously, whilst on other occasions the indications/markings are there to correct the actual pitch, in this case the player (?) seems to have been content with the 3rd lower pitch.
Figure 4.22 8 examples of divergent readings in the *G minor Sonata*

Example 4.22. 1 Kellner has written an ‘f’ on the 7th quaver of bar 2 (corrected to a G)

Example 4.22. 2 In the bar 13, there is no B natural indicated in Kellner’s copy

Example 4.22. 3 In bar 19, in Kellner’s copy, there are two A naturals instead of an A and G
Example 4.22. 4 In bar 20, there are no slurs in Kellner’s copy and an E natural as the 3rd semi-quaver.

Example 4.22. 5 In bar 15 Kellner and Anna Magdalena’s manuscripts are both incorrect.

Example 4.22. 6 In bar 8 of the Siciliano neither Anna Magdalena nor Kellner have written an E flat circled in red in the ‘1720 Autograph’.

Example 4.22. 7 In bar 75 of the G minor Fugue, Kellner has written a G Clef, moved to the soprano position for one beat – this is not the case in either the ‘1720 Autograph’ or Anna Magdalena’s manuscript. In addition, both Kellner and Anna Magdalena have written the E natural, at the fourth beat, with the stem upwards.
Example 4.22. 8 In bar 30 of the G minor Presto both Anna Magdalena and Kellner have no bowings written

It is abundantly evident, from the preceding examples, that the convergence of Kellner’s copy with Anna Magdalena’s manuscript is problematic, vis-à-vis the idea that Kellner made his copy from the ‘1720 Autograph’. Notwithstanding Stinson’s conclusion that …Kellner’s copy of Bach’s sonatas and partitas for solo violin … preserves what appear to be early versions of two movements, it would appear, rather, that Kellner was working from an entirely different source.

Similarly, it would appear unlikely that Anna Magdalena could have created her manuscript from the ‘1720 Autograph’, and given the preceding discussion, the source must have been different from the one from which Kellner’s copy was derived. In other words, it appears that Anna Magdalena’s manuscript represents an early version of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, though, it must be said, a version very close to the final ‘1720 Autograph’.

---

490 Ibid. 210
491 It is outside the scope of this thesis to provide a full, comparative analysis of the three manuscripts. However, it is highly likely, as demonstrated by Neumann’s example in the Sarabande above, that there are more examples of convergent and divergent readings in the rest of the documents. It is worthy of note that Stinson makes no mention of the relatively minor, but very important, divergences in the 1st Movement of the G minor Sonata.
IV.1.6. 7 ‘Volti cito’

Further support for the hypothesis that Anna Magdalena did not copy her manuscript from the ‘1720 Autograph’ might also come from the fact that in the ‘1720 Autograph’ the words ‘Volti cito’ do not appear. Yet in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript the words appear on five occasions.

Notwithstanding the preceding discussion, it is presumed by scholars that Anna Magdalena copied the ‘1720 Autograph’. If this is the case, it is difficult to explain why she would have used words that are not present in her supposed exemplar. (See Table 4.1.3)

Table 4.1.3 The use of page-turning directions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Volti</th>
<th>V S Volti</th>
<th>V S volti presto</th>
<th>Volti cito</th>
<th>Volti s. volti p.</th>
<th>Vol s. volti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘1720 Autograph’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMB</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interestingly, on the first occasion that ‘V S Volti presto’ is written in the ‘1720 Autograph’, which is on the 2nd page of the A minor Fugue, Anna Magdalena writes ‘Volti s. volti p.’; on the second occasion, on the 2nd page of the Ciaccona, where ‘V S volti presto’ appears in the ‘1720 Autograph’, Anna Magdalena writes simply ‘Volti’. On both occasions, in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript and in the ‘1720 Autograph’, the actual layout of the music on the manuscript is very similar, such that if Anna Magdalena was copying, she would not have had any reason to deviate from the exemplar, by using words that are not written in the ‘1720 Autograph’. Similarly, on the third occasion when ‘V S volti presto’ has been written in the ‘1720 Autograph’, on the penultimate page of the Ciaccona, Anna Magdalena has written ‘Volti cito’. (See Figure 4.23)
This particular page-turn direction is made even more curious by the fact that, had Anna Magdalena used the final stave of the page, see Figure 4.23, her manuscript would have lined up with the ‘1720 Autograph’ almost perfectly. Why she did not use the final stave is not at all clear.

IV.1.6. 8 The Filiations of the handwritten manuscript Sources of the Cello Suites

The problems surrounding the transmission of the sources for the violin works bring into question the traditional understanding of the transmission and relationship of the four handwritten Sources of the Six Cello Suites; if for no other reason, it clearly undermines the idea that Anna Magdalena made a copy of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, along with the Six Cello Suites, from the supposed ‘Autographs’.

In what follows, some examples of coincidences in the four handwritten Sources of the Cello Suites, will be presented. These coincidences, which do not appear to have been commented on by Bach-scholars, possibly challenge the accepted relationship between the Sources.
IV.1.6.8. 1 The Bariolage in the Prelude of the 1st Suite

Figure 4.24 shows that in the second half of bar 33, in the Prelude of the 1st Suite, all four of the handwritten Sources have written the bariolage in an identical manner, i.e. all have written an additional down stem on the 3rd semi-quaver of the group in the 3rd crotchet of bar 33. In other words, Sources B, C & D are the same as Source A.

![Figure 4.24 Bar 33, 3rd crotchet, in Sources A, B, C & D](image)

Figure 4.25, shows how in the remainder of the passage, the music has been written, when the open ‘A’ string coincides with the stopped note of the same pitch.

![Figure 4.25 The mode of writing bariolage, when the open A string coincides with the stop note of the same pitch, taken from Sources A. C & D bar 34](image)

Whilst the writing out of the bariolage differs very slightly across the four manuscripts (Sources A and C are actually identical), it would seem highly unlikely that by sheer coincidence, all four writers, separated in time and space, would have written the same three semi-quavers identically if they were not using the same exemplar. This particular coincidence is very suggestive that all four manuscripts have come, directly or indirectly, from a single source. And, if we follow the accepted Source relationship, then, we are compelled to assume that Johann Sebastian wrote this particular passage in this manner in Source [X] – the original ...working copy.

We must go on to presume that he, then, copied the passage out, without noticing the

---

492 See Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 5
493 Ibid.
unnecessary, additional down stem, into Source [F], from which Anna Magdalena is
assumed to have made her copy. As both Anna Magdalena and Kellner have this
passage written in an identical manner, this hypothesis is the only explanation that
satisfies the traditional view, as described by Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris.494

Rather significantly, the bariolage passage in the Preludio of the 3rd Unaccompanied
Partita is written out quite differently to the Prelude of the 1st Cello Suite. In the
Preludio, see Figure 4.26, we see that the sustained note of the bariolage, in this case
an E, from the 4th semi-quaver of the bar in which the bariolage begins, has an
upwards tail, and, grouped in 6 from the 2nd bar (grouped in 4 for the remainder of the
first bar of the passage); this applies whether or not the oscillating melody notes are
higher or lower in pitch. The bariolage action is across 2 strings (open E string and
stopped notes on the A string) – the two upper strings, as in the Cello Suites (open A
and stopped notes on the D strings).

494 See Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 5
It is curious that the two works don’t use the same approach; interestingly, in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the same Preludio from the 3rd Unaccompanied Partita, the passage is written out in an identical manner to the ‘1720 Autograph’.

IV.1.6.8. 2 Courante vs Corrente

Unlike the use of Allemande vs Allemanda or Gique vs Giga, where the French and Italian terms equate with one another and are interchangeable, the terms Courante and Corrente are not so, as they represent entirely different dance forms. The correct use of these terms, then, is important and significant. Each of the Six Cello Suites has 'Courante' given as the title of the 3rd Movement, and yet, only the dance in the 5th Cello Suite is recognisable as a Courante; the others are all, musically, Corrente: (my emphasis is in bold type)

Bach used French courantes in the C major orchestral suite, in all the English suites and in the overture in the French style, as well as in the first and third French suites and second and fourth keyboard partitas;

...in the original engraving of the keyboard partitas (Clavier-Übung), movements are clearly labelled [sic] either ‘corrente’ or ‘courante’; this
distinction has often been omitted by editors. The first, third, fifth and sixth keyboard partitas all include correntes by Bach’s ascription, as do the second, fourth, fifth and sixth French suites, the first and second partitas for solo violin and the first, second, third, fourth and sixth suites for solo cello. These correntes are written either in 3/4 or 3/8 with a simple texture, clear harmonic and rhythmic movement and much triadic passage-work in the upper part.495

Little and Jenne, in their book ‘Dance and the Music of Bach’, are also unequivocal that all but the Courante in the 5th Cello Suite are indeed Corrente.496

The fact that all four handwritten manuscripts give the title of the 3rd Movement of each Cello Suite as “Courante”, gives rise to a number of possible propositions:

1. Johann Sebastian knew the difference between a Courante and a Corrente and made the distinction.

2. Johann Sebastian knew the difference between a Courante and a Corrente but didn’t care about the distinction.

3. Anna Magdalena, when copying them, always ignored the directions on the original manuscript and called them all Courantes

4. Anna Magdalena didn’t realise that there was a difference between a Courante and a Corrente

495 Meredith Ellis Little & Suzanne G. Cusick, Grove Music Online Music Online ed. L Macy (6.04.06), <http://www.grovemusic.com
Proposition 1, is known to be correct: Johann Sebastian made the distinction between Courante and Corrente (see the above opinion by Little & Jenne, and the quotation by Little & Cusick, in Grove Music Online); this, clearly, makes Proposition 2 incorrect, as a consequence.

Proposition 3 cannot be correct because, when preparing her manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, Anna Magdalena correctly writes them as Corrente. She did however, make a slight spelling error in the D minor Partita leaving out one ‘r’ and appears to have almost written Courante and changed the ‘a’ to an ‘e’. (See Figure 4.27)

![Figure 4.27](image)

Figure 4.27 The spelling correction in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas

This, then, makes the possibility that ‘Proposition 4’ may be correct: Anna Magdalena didn’t realise (at the time of preparing her manuscript of the Cello Suites) that there was a difference between a Courante and a Corrente.

As Proposition 1 (that Johann Sebastian knew the difference between a Courante and a Corrente and made the distinction), is true, and Proposition 2 (that Johann Sebastian knew the difference between a Courante and a Corrente but didn’t care about the distinction), as a consequence, is untrue, it is highly unlikely that the four handwritten Sources could have emanated, directly or indirectly, from a supposed Source [X],
related immediately to Johann Sebastian.\textsuperscript{497} Johann Sebastian would \textbf{not} have called them all Courantes.

\textbf{IV.1.6.8. 3 The Allemanda of the 4\textsuperscript{th} Suite}

Figure 4.28 shows the opening of the Allemanda of the 4\textsuperscript{th} Suite. The quaver upbeat is inconsistent with all the other Allemandes/Allemandas written for violin or cello attributed to Johann Sebastian; all the others begin with either a semi-quaver or three semi-quavers. This inconsistency appears to be an error, and the fact that all four handwritten manuscripts have this upbeat quaver suggests that:

a) no attempt was made to make a correction in Source [G] - if such ever existed

b) the manuscripts have been copied from a common source

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figures/allemande.png}
\caption{The Allemanda from the 4\textsuperscript{th} Cello Suite}
\end{figure}

Interestingly, with the exception of the 4\textsuperscript{th} Keyboard Partita BWV828,\textsuperscript{498} every other Allemanda of Johann Sebastian’s begins with either a semi-quaver or three semi-quaver upbeat.\textsuperscript{499}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{497} See Figure 4.42 the Tree Diagram by Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000
\textsuperscript{498} This could also have been unintentional
\textsuperscript{499} See further discussion on this matter below
IV.1.6.8. 4 The Chromatic Passage at the conclusion of the Prelude of the 1st Cello Suite

Figure 4.29 shows that Sources B, C & D contain the same unusual spelling of the chromatic passage in the final bars of the 1st Prelude of the 1st Suite as in Source A, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript. This is discussed, in detail, later in the Chapter. However, suffice it to say at this point, that, this appears to demonstrate a link between all four Sources.

Figure 4. 29 The chromatic passage showing the unusual spelling of the chromatic in the four handwritten manuscripts

---

*In Bach’s writing of chromatic passages he considered that the connection between two neighbouring notes should be accommodated harmonically – this particular passage does achieve this musical objective.*
IV.1.6.8. 5 The Title pages

Rather curiously, all four handwritten Sources have different title pages:

- Source A - 6 Suites a Violoncello Solo Senza Basso
- Source B – Sechs Suonaten Pour le Viola de Basso
- Source C - Suiten und Preluden Für das Violoncello
- Source D – 6 Suite a Violoncello

The significance of the title pages, particularly with reference to Kellner, is that it appears that Kellner had no title page from which to copy, and, as has already been discussed, the title page of Anna Magdalena’s manuscript was created by Schwanenberger; this leads to the possibility that Kellner may have copied from Anna Magdalena’s manuscript before it went to Schwanenberger. It is worth noting that Source D has, basically, the same title for the works as Source A; likewise, though to a lesser degree, since it is given in German, does Source C.

IV.1.6. 9 Similarities between Kellner and Anna Magdalena’s Manuscripts of the 5th Cello Suite

There is no doubt that, overall, Kellner follows Anna Magdalena’s model, more often than not, when compared to Sources C & D; in the following examples, there are places where Kellner follows Anna Magdalena’s model, rather than Johann Sebastian’s, in his arrangement of the 5th Cello Suite for Lute:

- Figure 4.30 are some typical examples of the rhythmic differences between Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, Peter Kellner’s copy and Johann Sebastian’s

501 Yet Kellner titles each as “Suite” – see discussion of this below
Lute Suite version of the 5th Cello Suite. In each case Anna Magdalena’s version is at the top, followed by Kellner’s and finally Johann Sebastian’s. Examples (a) and (b) are from the Allemande, and Examples (c) and (d) are from the Prelude. The rhythmic differences in examples (b), (c) & (d) are particularly striking. Note also, in Example (c), the construction of the rhythm by Johann Sebastian, and his use of the dot instead of the use of a tie, as in example (c), by Anna Magdalena. This is important, as it identifies the possibility that she was working from a different source from Johann Sebastian, when preparing her manuscript of the Six Cello Suites. If, indeed, she was copying from the same source, then this variation suggests the possibility that she was intelligently correcting rather than mindlessly copying.
Ex. a) The opening of the Allemande  Ex. b) The last bar of the Allemande

Ex. c) Prelude bar 7  Ex. d) Prelude bar 9

Figure 4. 30 Four illustrations (top to bottom in each example) of the differences between the manuscripts of the 5th Cello Suite/Lute Suite by Anna Magdalena, Peter Kellner and Johann Sebastian

There are similar types of variance in the Courante of the 5th Cello Suite.
• At bar 30 of the Prelude to the 5th Cello Suite, both Kellner’s copy, see Figure 4.31, middle example, and Anna Magdalena’s version, far right, have the same ‘error’, an A flat rather than an A natural, producing an augmented 2nd to the next note, a B natural. In the Lute version, far left, in G minor, the augmented 2nd is avoided by raising the E flat a semitone (tenor clef E natural and F sharp).

![Figure 4.31 Bar 30 in the Prelude of the 5th Cello Suite](image)

The significance of these connections is that it would seem more likely that, had Kellner copied from Johann Sebastian’s supposed Source [X], his copy would agree with Johann Sebastian’s version rather than with Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, particularly in bars such as bar 30 and bar 7 of the Prelude of 5th Cello Suite, Example (c) above.

IV.1.6. 10 Other possible connections between Kellner’s copy and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Cello Suites

The following identifies additional possible connections between Keller’s copy and Anna Magdalena’s Manuscript of the Cello Suites:

IV.1.6.10. 1 ‘Suite ‘or ‘Suitte’

One possible link between Kellner’s copy and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript is the fact that, even though, on the title page of his manuscript of the Cello Suites, he describes the content as “Sechs Suonaten”, Kellner refers to each of the individual works within his manuscript as a “Suitte”, using the same unusual spelling as Anna Magdalena in her manuscript.
This unusual spelling of the word ‘Suite’ as ‘Suitte’ is most curious as, in the Autograph of the 5th French Suite, which is in Johann Sebastian’s handwriting, the word is spelt ‘Suite’; and in Anna Magdalena’s copy of the 1st and 2nd French Suites, in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, the word is also spelt ‘Suite’. This seems to suggest that Anna Magdalena would have copied the word ‘Suite’, if it had been written as such, by Johann Sebastian, in his supposed Source [F], from which Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris suggest that she copied; and not “Suitte”, as she has actually written. Why Anna Magdalena used this spelling of the word is unknown. And it would seem unlikely that Kellner would have spelt the word identically to Anna Magdalena, if he was copying from the supposed Source [X] with, we assume, Johann Sebastian’s correct spelling.

Interestingly, the only difference between the Prelude of the 1st Cello Suites in Kellner’s copy and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript is that Kellner misses out a tie in bar 22. (See Figure 4.32)

![Figure 4.32](image)

Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris argue that Kellner’s manuscript is …closest to Bach’s lost Autograph in point of time and they assume that he must have had access to, and copied from, a source different from the …fair copy available to Anna Magdalena, for beside the multitude of divergent readings it also contains additions that Kellner is
unlikely to have added himself but probably incorporated from his model...in Bach’s own hand (source [X]). In light of the matters discussed above, it seems unlikely, that Kellner made his copy from the notional Source [X].

IV.1.6.10. 2 The Possibility of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in Kellner’s copy of the Cello Suites

Another possible link between Kellner’s copy and Anna Magdalena’s manuscript is what appears to be, at the very least, an emulation of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting, in Kellner’s manuscript. (See Figure 4.33)

If we examine the word ‘Prelude’ as it appears in Kellner’s manuscript, at the opening of the 3rd Cello Suite Prelude, and compare it with the execution of the same word in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Six Cello Suites, it can be seen that:

- The letter ‘P’ is formed by two pen-strokes
- The relationship between the letter ‘r’ and the letter ‘e’ is very similar with the end-effector of the ‘r’ leading to the loop of the ‘e’.
- The end-effector of the ‘e’ essentially leaves the paper and leads to an up-stroke flattened loop ‘l’.
- The letter ‘l’ end-effector is a light up stroke to the ‘u’.
- The letter ‘d’ is separated from the letter ‘u’, and is looped (though it is very flattened in the example on the far right)
- The letter ‘e’ is an upward loop

---

502 Ibid. 7
All writings of the word ‘Prelude’, in Figure 4.33, exhibit fluency and speed; there is no sense that, in the example on the far left, Kellner’s manuscript, that this has been ‘drawn’ rather than ‘written’; so emulation is not really plausible.

Figure 4. 33 On the far left, the word “Prelude” to the 3rd Suite as it appears in Kellner’s manuscript with six examples of Anna Magdalena’s writing, on the right, taken from the Six Cello Suites. Clearly, the word ‘Prelude’, as written on the far left, falls within the range of natural variation

Whilst it may be considered possible that this is some form of copybook style that both individuals had been taught at school, the fact remains that Kellner and Anna Magdalena were separated in age by four years; further, Kellner was from Gräfenroda, whereas Anna Magdalena came from Zeitz, and it is highly unlikely, therefore, that their handwriting could have been moulded to a point of such similarity. As Hilton states Only one person writes exactly the same way as the writer of the disputed material. This is the cornerstone of every identification Harrison says departure from the copybook standard of perfection begins at the very outset of the learning process. The likelihood of possible coincidence can therefore be discounted.

By the time they were both connected to Johann Sebastian, perhaps in the Bach household itself, their writings should already be exhibiting significant, though perhaps subtle, differences.

503 See Harrison, 1966: 291
504 Hilton, 1982: 160
505 See Harrison, 1966: 292
As a demonstration of the striking similarity between the handwriting in Kellner’s manuscript and that in Anna Magdalena’s, compare the word ‘Prelude’ written above in Figure 4.33, with the range of writing of the word ‘Prelude’ in Sources C & D in Figure 4.34, where at least three scribes were involved. 506

![Figure 4.34 The word “Prelude” as it appears in Sources C & D](image)

In Figure 4.35, on the left, there are two examples of the word ‘Prelude’ written by Kellner. It can be seen that Kellner’s writing of the word ‘Prelude’ exhibits a range of similarities to Anna Magdalena’s writing of the same word in Figure 4.33. These might, of course, be an example of emulation, that is to say, an attempt at copying her handwriting by Kellner. However, there are some important structural differences in the way in which the word is written out, particularly in the execution of the letter ‘e’, following the ‘r’ and its unusual looped end-effector. (See Figure 4.36 and 4.37) In Figures 4.36 and 4.37, note, also, the different relationship between the letters ‘r’, ‘e’ and ‘l’ in the two handwritings (the two examples on the left and the one on the far right) and also the different end-effector from the letter ‘e’ to the letter ‘l’, see Figure 4.36; this is particularly noticeable, in the example on the far left, when compared with the end-effector from the letter ‘e’ upwards to the letter ‘l’, in the questioned handwriting on the far right. The letter ‘r’ also exhibits some difference in its execution. (See Figure 4.36)

506 Ibid. 5
Ordway Hilton states that even ... *A single significant difference between the two [writings] is a strong indication of two writers*\textsuperscript{507}

**Figure 4. 35** The word ‘Prelude’ written elsewhere in Kellner’s copy of the *Cello Suites*. On the far right, the questioned handwriting

**Figure 4. 36** On the left, the enlarged letter ‘e’ in Kellner’s copy\textsuperscript{508} with the looped end-effector leading to the letter ‘l’; in the middle the enlarged letter ‘e’ from the questioned handwriting – note the different relationship between the letters ‘r’, ‘e’ and ‘l’ in the two handwritings, and the different end-effector from the letter ‘e’ to the letter ‘l’ (circled). The letter ‘r’ also exhibits some difference in its execution.

It is important to understand that the execution of any given letter - in this case the letter ‘e’- will vary according to its position within any given word. For example, it can clearly be seen in Figure 4.35 that the letter ‘e’ at the end of the word ‘Prelude’ is not structured in the same way as the letter ‘e’ between the letter ‘r’ and the letter ‘l’. However, an examination of Kellner’s copy of the *Cello Suites* reveals that there are other examples of this same form of letter ‘e’, and its end-effecter, in other movement-titles within the same manuscript; for example, see the word ‘Allemande’ in Figure 4.37, with the more standard letter ‘e’ as the final letter.

**Figure 4. 37** The word ‘Allemande’ showing the typical Kellner looped end-effecter leading to the letter ‘m’, with the upward looped ‘e’ at the end of the word.

\textsuperscript{507} Hilton, 1982: 153

\textsuperscript{508} Examples of this same letter ‘e’ can be found in Kellner’s copy of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas
However, there is also an example of Kellner using the same end-effector on a letter ‘e’ at the end of the word Gique in the 1st Cello Suite. (See Figure 4.38)

Figure 4.38 The word ‘Gigue’ very clearly showing the looped end-effector on the letter ‘e’

It can be argued, on the basis of habituation, that it is unlikely that Kellner wrote the word ‘Prelude’ in question. Similarly, when a comparison is made between the word ‘Prelude’, in question, and the writing of Anna Magdalena, see Figure 4.33, it is arguable 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.
IV.1.6. 11 Dating Kellner’s Copy of the Cello Suites

Kellner's incomplete copy of the Six Cello Suites, see Figure 4.39, forms part of a combined manuscript (Konvolut, P 804) that also contains his incomplete copy of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonata & Partitas.

![Image of the title page of Kellner’s copy of the Six Cello Suites](image)

**Figure 4.39** The title page of Kellner’s copy of the Six Cello Suites

As discussed previously, it is accepted that Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Cello Suites is dated sometime between late 1727 and 1731; Kellner’s copy of the Six Cello Suites, therefore, it would appear, must pre-date that of Anna Magdalena’s because his copy of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas has the year 1726 written on it. (See Figure 4.40)
However, the date “3rd July 1726”, see Figure 4.40, is written, by Kellner, on page 146 of the Konvolut manuscript, at the end of his copy of the violin works, some 110 or so pages before his copy of the Cello Suites\textsuperscript{509} (the violin works end at page 146 and the cello works begin on page 249), ... *Die Hs. Mit den Violoncellosuiten umfasst die Seiten 249 – 276 ( = Faszikel 40) des Konvoluts.*\textsuperscript{510} Of course, the physical location of the Cello Suites, with respect to the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, in the Konvolut, may or may not have a particular bearing on the actual date of the copying, and is mentioned here only insofar as the connection made between the two manuscripts is simply an hypothesis.

Stinson points out that Kellner also wrote, before the date on his copy of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, “Frankenhayn”(sic), see Figure 4.40, and that this indicates... not only the year it was made, but also where it was prepared\textsuperscript{511} It is assumed by Eppstein on the basis that ... *The writing forms in the main part resemble those in the*

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{509} This is significant, of course, only insofar as there is no apparent relationship between the two manuscripts, and therefore, the copies could have been made years apart.
\item \textsuperscript{510} Hans Eppstein. *Sechs Suiten für Violoncello Solo BWV1007 – 1012.* NBA Vol. 6, No. 2, (Kassel u.a.: Bärenreiter, 1990): 14
\item \textsuperscript{511} Stinson, 1985: 199
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
copy of the Bach Violin soli dated by Kellner “Anno 1726”;\textsuperscript{512} that Kellner’s copy of the Cello Suites dates from that same year of 1726… in the first half of the year 1726.\textsuperscript{513} Whilst it is an interesting proposition to suggest, as Stinson does, that one can date the two works to within the same year…On the basis of its script,\textsuperscript{514} it is important to point out that 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 simply not likely, in normal circumstances. Whilst it may, indeed, be possible, it would be …a somewhat unusual situation [as] …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.\textsuperscript{515}

Given the page separation, of over 110 pages, in the Konvolut manuscript and the fact that Kellner’s copy of the Cello Suites is not dated, it is not unreasonable, to suggest that Kellner might have copied the Cello Suites at a much later date; perhaps, more than a year after his copy of the violin works.

IV.1.6. 12 The Relationship between the Four Sources

The possible presence of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting in Kellner’s manuscript, plus the connections discussed earlier, could, plausibly, be explained if Kellner’s copy of the Cello Suites post-dates Anna Magdalena’s manuscript. Further, if Anna Magdalena was supervising when Kellner, who was only in his early twenties at the time, was making his copy, this would explain the presence of her handwriting. This

\textsuperscript{512} NBA Vol. 6, No.2: 14…Die Schriftformen im Hauptteil gleichen denen in der von Kellner “Anno 1726 datierten Kopie der Bachschen Violinsoli Faszikel 22 im sieben Konvolut). Nach Stinson ist die Hs. in der ersten Hälfte des Jahres 1726 Ibid.
\textsuperscript{513} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{514} Stinson, 1985: 201
\textsuperscript{515} See Hilton, 1982: 289 - 290
hypothesis could also explain some of the notational differences between the two manuscripts. In Kellner’s copy, for example, the C natural at the opening of bar 82 in the Prelude of the 4th Cello Suite has been changed (corrected?) from a C natural, in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, to an E flat in Kellner’s copy, and the mistake/omission in bar 5 of the Prelude in the 6th Cello Suite in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript is likewise corrected in Kellner’s copy.

There is also the question of the musical embellishments and ornamentation which are present in Kellner’s copy, but not Anna Magdalena’s manuscript. It seems odd to suppose that Kellner copied his embellishments from a supposed missing Source [X], when Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, which is a supposed copy of Source [F] – assumed to be a more finished manuscript, in the hand of Johann Sebastian – is, on the whole, less embellished. (See Figure 4.41)

Figure 4.41 On the left, an example of the ornamentation (trill) as in Kellner’s copy. On the right, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript is devoid of the trill.

Ornamentation is not a feature of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas. Where ornaments are present, they are limited, essentially, to the addition of trills.
IV.1.6. 13 Possible Transmissions of Sources

If we accept that the links between the four handwritten manuscripts demonstrate that they have a single originating Source, then the relationship between the four manuscripts could easily appear as shown in Figure 4.42, where Source [X] is the composer’s original working manuscript; Source A is the fair copy in Anna Magdalena’s hand; Source B is made with Anna Magdalena’s involvement in some way; and Sources C and D are as before. However, Source [G] now represents a copy of Source A, perhaps made by an unknown cellist, possibly with the assistance of Anna Magdalena, and perhaps, after Johann Sebastian’s death as suggested by Beisswenger,517 where some process of revision has been undertaken and changes made to a copy of Anna Magdalena’s manuscript (Source A) to produce Source [G].

Figure 4.42  Suggested Tree-diagram showing a possible transmission of the Sources (on the right Tree Diagram by Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris)

517 See Chapter I and Beisswenger, 2000: 78
IV.1.6. 14 The Changes in Sources C and D

An example of these changes could well be the changes made to bar 27 of the Prelude of the 1st Suite in Sources C, D and E.

At bar 27 in the Prelude of the 1st Suite, Sources C & D clearly give, as the final two notes of the bar, a B flat followed by a C sharp. (See Figure 4.43, far left) Yet in both Sources A and B there is no B flat but a D natural and a C sharp. (See Figure 4.43, far right top and bottom) It is also worthy of note that Sources C, D & E also give an F sharp as the fourth note of the penultimate semi-quaver group. (See Figure 4.43 – Source E is in the middle, whereas Sources A & B give a G natural) Clearly, it could be concluded, as Schwemer and Woodfull-Harris do, that Sources C & D used the same model (Source [G]), 518 - one, that is to say, which is different from Sources A & B.

However, in the ‘Performer’s Part’ of the Bärenreiter Edition, Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris give Sources C, D & E as having written a B natural, see Figure 4.44, when it is clearly and unambiguously a B flat in all three versions. Reference is

---

518 Source E also gives a B flat in the 1st printed edition
made to this change in their ‘Critical Report’ p.85 where they point out that Sources C, D & E actually have written a B flat, and not a B natural. In doing this, they follow Eppstein, in the NBA Kritischer Bericht, VI/2 p. 20.

Figure 4.44 The second half of bar 27 in the Performer’s Part to the Bärenreiter Edition showing the B flat in Sources C, D & E as a B natural

The commentary on this in Eppstein’s Kritische Berichte on the Six Cello Suites, assumes that the source for this odd sequence was Source [G] … C and D are independent from one another but come (directly or indirectly) from the same lost source [G].519 The B flat is treated, not unreasonably, as a copyist error in Source [G] as, clearly, the sequence with the B flat does not validate Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris’s claim that changes in Sources C & D…lends further credence to the supposition that we advanced in our evaluation of the sources, namely, that Bach himself again revised the cello suites toward the end of the first half of the eighteenth century.520 It is also worthy of note that in the Neue Bach Ausgabe521 performing part of the Six Cello Suites, the changes in Sources C, D & E are also ignored in favour of the version in the Anna Magdalena manuscript and Kellner copy, and it certainly is difficult to believe that the changes made in the second half of bar 27 in the Prelude in Sources C & D are the work of Johann Sebastian; a further point of interest is that

519 NBA Kritischer Bericht, Vol 6 No.2: 21 ...C und D gehen demnach unabhängig voneinander (direkt oder indirect) auf die gleiche verlorene Quelle [G] zurück.
520 Ibid. 10
521 Serie VI: Kammermusikwerke, Band 2, 1988
contemporary editions of the *Six Cello Suites* do not observe this revision of bar 27, supposedly by Johann Sebastian.\textsuperscript{522}

However, there can be little doubt that Eppstein is correct in his assertion that this lost manuscript, Source [G], forms the basis for Sources C & D (and later Source E). And the clearer bowing articulation in Sources C and D and then Source E leads to the possibility that the textural changes made to the *Cello Suites*, in Source [G] could have been undertaken by a cellist.

\textsuperscript{522} In the performing editions examined, including the Neue Ausgabe VI/2, all follow source A throughout bar 27, as exampled in the International Music Company Edition ed. Edmund Kurtz, 1984, ignoring the F sharp as well as the B flat, as given in Sources C and D, see Figure 4.44
SECTION II

IV.2 PECULIARITIES OF THE SIX CELLO SUITES

IV.2.1 PREAMBLE

The investigation in this section is principally focused on the solo string music attributed to Johann Sebastian, i.e. the Six Cello Suites, and the Six Unaccompanied Sonatas & Partitas for violin. It also investigates, as appropriate, the other chamber music repertoire of the suite and partita genre.

The purpose of the comparative study is to test the hypothesis that the Six Cello Suites are, in various ways, inconsistent with other works in the suite/partita genre attributed to Johann Sebastian. In order to do this, the examination of the works considered has involved, in part, a statistical analysis - notwithstanding the obvious dangers of such an approach.

In making the comparison between the Cello Suites and the other works in the same genre, I have divided the differences and inconsistencies discovered into the following categories:

Group A – General Differences

Group B - Genre Peculiarities

Group C - Peculiarities of Individual Movements

Group D – Editorial Problems and Disputed Readings
IV.2.2 Group A – General Differences

IV.2.2.1 The Uniqueness of the structure of the Six Cello Suites

It has often been remarked how unusual the movement structure of the Six Cello Suites is, within the context of Johann Sebastian’s other compositions. The Six Cello Suites follow a well-defined and clear structural pattern (see Table 4.2.1), with the only variation being the use of Menuets (Suites 1 & 2), Bourrees (Suites 3 & 4) or Gavottes (Suites 5 & 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cello Suite 1</th>
<th>Prelude</th>
<th>Allemande</th>
<th>Courante</th>
<th>Sarabande</th>
<th>Menuet</th>
<th>Gigue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cello Suite 2</td>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>Allemande</td>
<td>Courante</td>
<td>Sarabande</td>
<td>Menuet</td>
<td>Gigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello Suite 3</td>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>Allemande</td>
<td>Courante</td>
<td>Sarabande</td>
<td>Bouree</td>
<td>Gigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello Suite 4</td>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>Allemande</td>
<td>Courante</td>
<td>Sarabande</td>
<td>Bouree</td>
<td>Gigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello Suite 5</td>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>Allemande</td>
<td>Courante</td>
<td>Sarabande</td>
<td>Gavotte</td>
<td>Gigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello Suite 6</td>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>Allemande</td>
<td>Courante</td>
<td>Sarabande</td>
<td>Gavotte</td>
<td>Gigue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.1 The Movement Structure of the Six Cello Suites

Even though Johann Sebastian habitually grouped his works in six, particularly for the suites, it can clearly be seen in Table 4.2.2 that none of the other groups of either suites or partitas have the same morphological consistency as the Six Cello Suites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Prelude</th>
<th>Allemande</th>
<th>Courante</th>
<th>Sarabande</th>
<th>Menuet</th>
<th>Bourree</th>
<th>Gavotte</th>
<th>Gigue</th>
<th>Misc</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Cello Suites</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Violin Partitas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 French Suites</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 English Suites</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Partitas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lute Suites</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Flute Partita</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.2 Analysis by, movement type, of the Suites and Partitas attributed to Johann Sebastian

---

523 See Boyd, 2000: 94
524 Always spelt without the ‘e’ acute
525 See Vogt, 1981: 179
The most common dance-form movements, given in French, were: Allemande, Courante, Sarabande, Gigue, Menuet, Bourrée and Gavotte with their Italian equivalents for suites or partitas in the *Italian Style*. Many suites also have an introductory Prelude. Excluding Preludes, the basic ‘standard suite’, could be said to be structured as follows: Allemande, Courante, Sarabande and Gigue.

A survey of Bach’s works, during his time at Cöthen, reveals that Johann Sebastian’s suites and partitas do not follow a precise schematic layout; i.e. they do not all contain exactly the same movements. Table 4.2.3\(^{526}\) shows the works that do not contain the movements which David Fuller considers standard.\(^{527}\) Note: Table 4.2.3 omits the even more diverse Orchestral Suites.

As can clearly be seen, from the data provided in Tables 4.2.2 and 4.2.3, no precise structural uniformity of approach occurs anywhere else.\(^{528}\) The lack of any evidence of a planned layout, for any of the other groups, makes the *Cello Suites*, containing,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition in Question</th>
<th>Movement Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allemande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lute Suite in C minor</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard Suite BWV 819</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyboard Partita 2 BWV 826</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin Partita 1</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violin Partita 3</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2.3 Analysis of the suites and partitas - examining the ‘standard movements’

\(^{526}\) For the purpose of this Table and Table 4.4, I have ignored the difference between Courante and Corrente.

\(^{527}\) David Fuller, ‘Suite’, *Grove Music Online* ed. L Macy (accessed 7.viii.06)

\(^{528}\) For example: Violin Partita I has 6 movements; Partita II 5 movements and Partita III, 6 movements. Partitas II and III have a Gigue, but there is no similarity in its placement within the works. Partitas I and II both start with an Allemande, whereas Partita III has no such movement. In fact, structurally speaking, there is nothing to connect the three Partitas, as can clearly be seen in Table 4.2.2 and Table 4.2.3. On the other hand, Table 4.2.1, show that the *Cello Suites* are remarkably consistent in their structures; they are, essentially, structurally identical.
as they do, all of the ‘standard movements’, (See Table 4.2.1), stand out as structurally unique. 529

IV.2.2.2 The Exclusive Use of French Movement Titles in the *Six Cello Suites* Manuscript

An unusual feature of the *Six Cello Suites* manuscript is the consistent, and, in the case of the “Courante”, incorrect, use of the French language in the movement titles. 530 By contrast, in the manuscript of the *Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas* (composed, it has been argued, 531 during the same period as the *Six Cello Suites*, i.e. around 1720), the language used is appropriate to the dance form, in either Italian or French.

Table 4.2.4 shows the movement titles of the 3 *Unaccompanied Violin Partitas* and reveals Johann Sebastian’s approach to the use of the correct language.

---

529 See Boyd, 2000: 94
530 In the case of the 4th *Cello Suite*, the ‘Preludium’ is in a form of quasi-French. (Fr. prélude; Ger. Vorspiel; It., Sp. preludio; Lat. praeludium, praeambulum).
531 See Chapter I
Table 4.2. 4 Language analysis of the Violin Partitas (Partia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partia (sic)</th>
<th>Language Used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Partia</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allemanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tempo di Borea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Partia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allemanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrente</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sarabanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Giga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ciaccona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Partia</td>
<td>Preludio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. 4 Language analysis of the Violin Partitas (Partia)

By contrast Table 4.2.5, shows the exclusive use of the French language in the Six Cello Suites, the sole exception being the Preludium of the 4th Cello Suite.

Table 4.2. 5 The language used in the Six Cello Suites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cello Suite 1</th>
<th>Prelude</th>
<th>Allemande</th>
<th>Courante</th>
<th>Sarabande</th>
<th>Menuet</th>
<th>Gigue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cello Suite 2</td>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>Allemande</td>
<td>Courante</td>
<td>Sarabande</td>
<td>Menuet</td>
<td>Gigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello Suite 3</td>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>Allemande</td>
<td>Courante</td>
<td>Sarabande</td>
<td>Bourees</td>
<td>Gigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello Suite 4</td>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>Allemande</td>
<td>Courante</td>
<td>Sarabande</td>
<td>Bourees</td>
<td>Gigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello Suite 5</td>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>Allemande</td>
<td>Courante</td>
<td>Sarabande</td>
<td>Gavotte</td>
<td>Gigue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello Suite 6</td>
<td>Prelude</td>
<td>Allemande</td>
<td>Courante</td>
<td>Sarabande</td>
<td>Gavotte</td>
<td>Gigue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. 5 The language used in the Six Cello Suites

Generally speaking, Johann Sebastian used a mixture of Latin, Italian and French for movement titles. In the suites and partitas, for example, where an original manuscript is extant, we, typically, find Praeludium (most commonly) and Prelude. Johann Sebastian uses the Italian ‘Corrente’, when the movement is in the Italian style or
‘Courante’ when the movement is in the French style;\textsuperscript{532} he has a general tendency to use the appropriate language, rather than simply the French term.

It appears that, around 1720/21, Johann Sebastian began to write using the French language; for example, the \textit{Suite pour Le Clavecin} in the 1722 \textit{Klavierb"uchlein f"ur Anna Magdalena} and the “Dedication” to the Margrave of Brandenburg, from 1721. (See Figure 4.45)

\textbf{Figure 4.45} The title page and Dedication of the \textit{Six Brandenburg Concertos} 1721

However, it is worth noting that, even in the so-called \textit{French Suites} from the 1722 \textit{Klavierb"uchlein (Suites pour le Clavecin)}, not all the movement-titles are in French. For example, in 5\textsuperscript{th} \textit{Suite}, the Gigue is spelt apparently ‘Gigs’, though it was possibly intended to be Giga, as in the \textit{Unaccompanied Violin 3\textsuperscript{rd} Partita in D minor}. (See Figures 4.46 and 4.47 below)

\textsuperscript{532} See the discussion of this matter in the earlier part of this Chapter in the context of the filiations of the sources
IV.2.2.3 Unusual Details of Compositional Practice:

IV.2.2.3.1 The use of the symbol\textsuperscript{533} and the Use of Silence

This may seem a very minor detail. However, as it is unique to the Cello Suites, from the period (Circa 1720 – 1732), and the genre,\textsuperscript{534} it merits some discussion. In the Six Cello Suites, \textbullet\textsuperscript{s} are used mid-movement in three of the Preludes, those to Suites I, II and IV. This symbol is not used mid-movement in any of the other suites or partitas of Johann Sebastian.\textsuperscript{535} On three occasions the composer has used\textbullet\textsuperscript{s}, within each of the movements, for the purpose of halting the flow of the music; for example, in bar 22 of the Prelude to the 1\textsuperscript{st} Cello Suite, the\textbullet\textsuperscript{s} is used on the D, following the modulation to the dominant key, D; immediately following the\textbullet\textsuperscript{s}, the music returns to the tonic.

\textsuperscript{533} This symbol, the pause, is often referred to as a fermata. This is not strictly correct (see “Fermata” in Grove). The origins of the use of the\textbullet\textsuperscript{s} are unclear but according to Grove may have had some connection with the singing of chorales

\textsuperscript{534} There is a fermata at bar 80 in the A minor Fugue in the WTKI, but this not a suite or a partita

\textsuperscript{535} In the unaccompanied string music of Johann Sebastian there is only one other example of the use of a fermata within a movement, and that is in the 1st Movement of the 1st Unaccompanied Sonata in G minor, however, this is not a suite or partita but a sonata movement
(See Figure 4.48) The enables a smooth transition back to the tonic, following the cessation of the rhythmic movement.

![Figure 4.48 Bar 22 of the Prelude to the 1st Cello Suite](image)

In connection with the use of , but not always in association with the cessation of the rhythmic movement, is the use of silence, as a compositional device. In no other work or group of works from this period, and of the same genre, does Johann Sebastian use silence for deliberate musical effect. However, in the _Cello Suites_ examples of this compositional technique can be found, most notably, in the following:

- Prelude to the 2nd Suite at bar 48. (See Figure 4.49)
- Prelude to the 3rd Suite at bars 77, 79 & 80. (See Figure 4.50)
- Prelude of the 4th Suite at bar 49. (See Figure 4.51)
- Prelude to the 5th Suite at bars 217 and 219. (See Figure 4.52)
- Prelude to the 6th Suite at bars 98 and 99, though, perhaps, less dramatic than in the other examples. (See Figure 4.53)

536 Whilst this survey focuses on the genre of Suites/Partitas, it is noteworthy that there is an example of a single crotchet of silence (bar 80) of the A minor Fugue from Das Wohltemperierte Klavier I There are also examples of the use of silence in Das Wohltemperierte Klavier II from around 1741.
It is worth adding that, by implication, there is also a silence even in *Suite 1* bar 22. (See Figure 4.54)
In this case, although the silence is not given any rhythmic value it occurs, at the very least, as a result of a physical move by the cellist (usually, from the A string to G-string). Some performers make a substantial break at this point, as the music seems to require it.

The significance of the silence derives from the fact that, as a technique, within the **suite/partita** genre, there are no examples of this device being used elsewhere. Additionally, in the *Cello Suites*, the use and effect of the silence is quite different to that within the A minor fugue in *Das Wohltemperierte I*, a chronologically congruent example of the use of silence.

- In the 2\textsuperscript{nd} *Suite*, the two crotchets of silence follow a pause on a 3rd inversion of an implied Dominant 7th of A Major; the silence is followed by a G minor passage. See Figure 4.55

*Figure 4.55* Bars 48 and 49 of the Prelude to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} *Suite*
• In the 3rd Suite, the progression is as follows: a last inversion of a dominant 7th (on G), then two crotchet beats of silence; a C major scale/arpeggio passage ending on a chord E flat, G and A; two crotchets of silence leading to a second inversion of a dominant 7th (on G); two crotchets of silence then a C major chord, (See Figure 4.56)

![Figure 4.56 Bars 76 to 80 of the Prelude to the 3rd Cello Suite](image)

• In the 4th Suite, the C# fermata is followed by a crotchet and a quaver of silence; this is followed by some passage work in a mixture of D major/G minor. The C# itself forms an “interruption” to the G minor arpeggio that precedes it, (See Figure 4.57)

![Figure 4.57 Bars 48 to 50 of the Prelude to the 4th Cello Suite](image)

• The 6th Suite has a completely different appearance, in many respects. The silence, in the Prelude, occurs as a set of six block chords: a second inversion of an implied Dominant 7th of E; first inversion G minor; second inversion D major; G# Diminished 7th; a second inversion of a Dominant 9th (on D); A major. (See Figure 4.58)

---

537 It can also be described as a 4-3 suspension on A
IV.2.2.3.2 The use of the double flat

The use of the double flat, by inference or by implication, at bar 80 of the Prelude to the 4th Suite is a singular usage, within this musical genre of Johann Sebastian’s chamber music, from the period. (See Figures 4.59 & 4.60) There are no other examples of this in any of the other Suites or Partitas.

In the context of the Cello Suites, the appearance of such a note is more than extraordinary. Although the double flats occur, occasionally, in Bach’s keyboard works, as this particular music is for a stringed instrument, the B double-flat is literally that, and not an enharmonic A natural, as it would be for a keyboard. This makes it a very unlikely note to be written for the cello. Figure 4.61 shows the harmonic progression of bars 79 and 80.
IV.2.2.1.3. 1 The use of Scordatura in the 5th Suite

The 5th Cello Suite is the only place where scordatura is used by Johann Sebastian and, as such, is another example of the unique nature of the Cello Suites.

Dr Mark Smith describes the situation thus:

...It was unusual for Bach to use scordatura and his choice of the term “Suite Discordable” (as given by his new wife, in her manuscript of the suites) is also unusual and unnecessary because the word “accord” and the tuning with the top string tuned down from A to G are also given and these are sufficient to signify the change of cello.538

So perplexed is Smith with the title ‘Suite Discordable’ that he believes that there must have been an ...extra purpose539 behind the title.

538 Smith, 2000: 34
539 Ibid.
Vogt points out that *cellists do not like to change the tuning of their instruments, fearing that both scordatura and normal tuning will suffer* [as a consequence]\(^{540}\) clearly indicating that such tuning is not idiomatic to the cello.

### IV.2.2.3.4 Orthography & language Use

The spelling of words might appear to be a rather unimportant consideration in determining the authorship of the *Six Cello Suites*. However, in the same way that the handwriting characteristics of an individual become habitual, as described in Chapter III, so does their spelling. The consequence of this is that the spelling of words on a manuscript can help in the identification of the writer. The general principles of spelling are these: there is a tendency for people to spell simple words, consistently the same way. If spelling mistakes are made in difficult words, there a tendency to be consistent in making errors, though the actual mistake may vary.

...Not only are these difficult words often misspelled, but many writers do not use a consistent misspelling even in the same passage. It may very well happen that a correct spelling has been achieved by accident in a passage which includes several different misspellings of the same word. ... Spelling mistakes are sometimes found in simple words. These mistakes may be the result of habitual mispronunciation on the part of the writer; or of some personal misapprehension as to how these simple words should be spelled. The significance of such misspelling may be considerable because, unlike the misspelling of difficult words which is a failing common to the majority of

---

\(^{540}\) Vogt, 1981:182
persons, these misspellings of simple words are often personal idiosyncrasies and are likely to be restricted to a very small number of people.\textsuperscript{541}

In the \textit{Violin Sonatas \& Partitas}, there are spelling inconsistencies; for example, in the title of the violin works, the word \textit{Partita} is a misspelling of the Italian word ‘Partita’. Johann Sebastian uses \textit{Bouree (sic)} in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} \textit{Partita} but used the rather strange Italian spelling (\textit{Borea}), of the word ‘Bourrée’, in the \textit{Partita} in B minor. (See Figure 4.63) In Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the \textit{Cello Suites}, by contrast, the spelling of movement titles is consistent, with the exception of the Prelude to the 4\textsuperscript{th} \textit{Suite}, that is given as \textit{Preludium}.

\textbf{Figure 4.63} The rather unusual Italian spelling of the word Bourrée in the 1st Partita in B minor

\textbf{IV.2.2.3.4. 1 Courante versus Corrente}

Johann Sebastian consistently spells \textit{Corrente} as such, in the \textit{Violin Partitas} and in the 1725 \textit{Klavierbüchlein}. (See Figure 4.64) Yet, in the \textit{Cello Suites}, we find the word spelt, in each \textit{Suite} (and in the case of the 6\textsuperscript{th} \textit{Suite}, twice), as ‘Courante’, even when the movement in question is actually a Corrente.\textsuperscript{542}

\textbf{Figure 4.64} The word ‘Corrente’ from the \textit{Violin Sonatas \& Partitas} and from the 1725 \textit{Klavierbüchlein}

\textsuperscript{541} Harrison, 1966: 446
\textsuperscript{542} See also my comments about the inappropriate use of the title Courante above
IV.2.2.1.4. 2 Allemande versus Allemanda

Johann Sebastian spells the word ‘Allemande’ as both ‘Allemanda’ in the Violin Sonatas & Partitas and ‘Allemande’ in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein; however, we find that the word ‘Allemande’ is spelt consistently throughout the Six Cello Suites.

Figure 4.65 The words ‘Allemanda’ and ‘Allemande’ from the Violin Sonatas & Partitas and from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein

IV.2.2.1.4. 3 Gigue

In the Violin Sonatas & Partitas Johann Sebastian uses the word ‘Giga’, in the D minor Partita and ‘Gigue’ (possibly ‘Gique’) in the E Major Partita. In the 1725 Klavierbüchlein he uses the word ‘Gique or possibly ‘Gigue’. (See Figure 4.66)

Figure 4.66 The word ‘Giga’, and ‘Gigue’ or ‘Gique’ from the Violin Sonatas & Partitas and from the 1725 Klavierbüchlein

In Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, she copies Johann Sebastian’s spellings; in her manuscript of the Six Cello Suites the spelling Gique is used consistently. (See Figure 4.67)
IV.2.2.1.4. 4 Spelling Errors

Whilst there are a few, minor, spelling errors in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, e.g. ‘Doble’, on one occasion, for the word ‘Double’ and, on another occasion, ‘Corente’ for ‘Corrente’ (as commented upon earlier she has clearly corrected the ‘a’ into an ‘e’, see Figure 4.68), for the most part, she remains faithful the model provided. The only exceptions are found in the naming of movements: in the D minor Partita, she replaces Johann Sebastian’s ‘Sarabanda’ with ‘Sarabande’ and replaces ‘Allamanda’ with ‘Allemande’.

It is clear, from this, that Anna Magdalena was a reliable copyist, as already stated. However, it also follows that, had Anna Magdalena simply copied the Six Cello Suites from a no longer extant version of them in Johann Sebastian’s handwriting, some degree of difference might be expected in the approach to the spelling of movement titles, as exampled above. No such variation in spelling occurs. The complete opposite is the case: all the movement titles are spelt consistently throughout the Six Suites, with the exception of the Prelude (Preludium) to the 4th Suite, already discussed above. Two additional points are worthy of note: Firstly, Kellner’s copy is essentially identical to Anna Magdalena’s manuscript regarding the use of the French language. Therefore, whatever he copied from was written in the same manner as Anna Magdalena’s exemplar. Secondly, it should be noted that there is no known occasion
when Johann Sebastian uses the particular spelling ‘Preludium’; he, habitually, prefers Praeludium. (See Figure 4.69 & Figure 4.70)

![Figure 4.69](image1) The word ‘Preludium’ from the 4th Cello Suite

![Figure 4.70](image2) The words ‘Prelude’ and ‘Praeludium’, as written by Johann Sebastian, as they appear in sources taken from the ‘Neue Ausgabe Die Notenschrift Johann Sebastian Bachs’.

The constant use of French titles in the Six Cello Suites possibly suggests that the writer was biased towards such French terminology. And it would appear that in the extant examples of Johann Sebastian’s writings there is no evidence that he was skilled in French. For example, even the handwritten dedication of the Brandenburg Concertos exhibits many characteristics of Anna Magdalena’s handwriting, and could not, without doubt, be said to be the writing of Johann Sebastian.\(^{543}\) Whilst Malcolm Boyd discusses the matter of the music-calligraphy and points out that in Dadelsen’s view\(^{544}\) …that a second hand has shared the copying of the polonaise and the trio for horns and oboes on the last page (fol. 14) of the first concerto,\(^{545}\) no reference is made to the ‘Dedication’ being written by a third party.

---

\(^{543}\) See Discussion on Johann Sebastian’s ‘signatures’ in Chapter III

\(^{544}\) See Dadelsen, 1958: 84


Note 1
IV.2.3 Group B – Genre Peculiarities

IV.2.3.1 The ‘Menuets’ in the 1st and 2nd Cello Suites

The Menuets in the 1st and 2nd Cello Suites stand out as compositionally inconsistent with other Menuets attributed to Johann Sebastian. (See Figures 4.71 & 4.72) In all of the Suites and Partitas for Keyboard (or Lute) which were analysed as part of this study, Menuets I & II keep the same key signature. See Figure 4.73 Sometimes they move from the major to the relative minor; on other occasions, they remain either in the major or in the minor. The only possible exception to this is in Keyboard Suite BWV 819, in E flat major, where the 2nd Menuet is in E flat minor. However, in this case, Johann Sebastian has added the word “Trio” to the 2nd Menuet.

In the Cello Suites, on the other hand, Suite 1 moves from G major to G minor, and in Suite 2 moves from D minor to D major. (See Figure 4.71 & 4.72)
It may be noticed that the key signatures, in Menuet II in Figure 4.71 & 4.72, given in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, are incorrect (certainly in the case of the second part of Menuet II in the d minor 2nd Suite). However, as a similar thing occurs in the ‘Autograph’ of the G minor Unaccompanied Sonata, viz, G minor is given with one flat, either this is further evidence of Anna Magdalena’s involvement in that manuscript, i.e it was a habit of hers to leave out sharps and flats, or it was as a result the use of modal key signatures, a standard approach to the writing of key signatures at the time.
IV.2.3.2 The differences between the ‘Allemandes’ of the Cello Suites and the ‘Allemandas’ of the Unaccompanied Partitas

Both the Allemandas of the Violin Partitas begin with an up-beat semi-quaver, followed by a dotted quaver and semi-quaver. (See Figure 4.74) By contrast, the Cello Suite Allemandes begin in a number of different ways, with only the Allemandes of the 1st Suite and 5th Suites beginning in a similar way to each other. Their openings, however, are distinctly different from the Allemandas of the Violin Partitas.

The Allemandes of the 1st, 4th and 5th Suites also pose a stylistic problem; ‘Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians’, defines the Allemande or Allemanda as …a piece of moderate rapidity in common time.

Figure 4.74 The Allemandas of the 1st and 2nd Unaccompanied Partitas for violin

In the 1st, 4th and 5th Cello Suites, the music is marked ‘Alla Breve’, see Figure 4.75, which is out of keeping with the Allemande style, as defined by Grove and Walther.547 They are, in addition, inconsistent with the other string Allemandes by Johann Sebastian, which are in common-time.548 (See Figures 4.74 above & 4.76 below)

---

547 See Johann Gottfried Walther’s ‘Musicalisches Lexicon’ Leipzig, 1732
548 All other Allemandes, attributed to Johann Sebastian, begin with either a semi-quaver or three semi-quavers, with two exceptions, the 4th Keyboard Partita BWV828
Figure 4.75 The Allemandes from the 1st, 4th and 5th Suites

Figure 4.76 The Allemandes from the 2nd, 3rd and 6th Suites
Regarding the species used in both sets of works, these are consistent in both halves of the Allemandes of the *Violin Partitas* but are inconsistent in the Allemandes of the *Cello Suites*. For example, demi-semi-quavers are used in the first half of the D minor Allemande of the 2nd *Cello Suite* but not in the second half. (See Figures 4.77 & 4.78)

In all the other suites by Johann Sebastian, the Allemandes are in common-time.

**Figure 4.77** The Allemande from the 2nd *Cello Suite* showing the demi-semi-quavers in the 1st part of the movement

**Figure 4.78** The 2nd half of the Allemande from the 2nd *Cello Suite* with no demi-semi-quaver movement
IV.2.3. 4 The Gigues

The Gigues, from the *Cello Suites* and the Violin Partitas, are very similar in length. With the exception of the Gigue from the *6th Cello Suite*, the Gigues all fall between the extremes of length of the two in the *Violin Partitas*, assuming a similar pulse for all. Of the 8 Gigues contained in these works, the Gigue from the *3rd Partita* is the shortest and that from the 2nd Partita is the second longest. The Gigue in the *6th Cello Suite* is the longest of all. (See Appendix A)

The Gigues of the *1st* and *4th Cello Suites* contain a very basic and somewhat dull rhythmic content. The Gigues of the *2nd*, *3rd* and *6th Cello Suites* have a similar appearance to each other i.e. a bar (or bars) of quavers followed by a bar (or bars) of semi-quavers. The *5th Suite* has a Gigue with a unique dotted rhythm which is known as the *Canarie*.

The two violin *Partita Gigues* (Giga and Gique), in the *2nd* and *3rd Partitas* of the *Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas*, are, rhythmically, very similar in appearance, in as much as that they are, for the most part, in semi-quaver movement. As can be seen below, they are distinctly different in appearance from those in the *Six Cello Suites*. (See Figures 4.79 – 4.86)

---


551 Some additional structural comparison is given in Appendix A
Figure 4. 79 The “Giga” from the 2nd Partita in D minor

Figure 4. 80 The “Gigue” or “Gique” from the 3rd Partita in E Major

Figure 4. 81 The Gique from the 1st Cello Suite

Figure 4. 82 The Gique from the 2nd Cello Suite

Figure 4. 83 The Gique from the 3rd Cello Suite
IV.2.4 Group C - Peculiarities of Individual Movements

IV.2.4.1 The Chromatic Passage in the 1st Prelude

This was discussed, very briefly, earlier in this Chapter, but there are a couple of interesting musical points about the chromatic passage in bars 37 and 38 of the Prelude to the 1st Suite that are worthy of further examination.

Firstly, this type of chromatic passage does not occur in any other string music of Johann Sebastian’s. And the fact, alone, that it is over an octave in length makes it exceptional for the period.\footnote{See Peter Williams ‘Figurenlehre from Monteverdi to Wagner’, Musical Times, Vol. 120, No. 1636 (Jun., 1979): 467} Whilst the ‘bariolage’, beginning at bar 31, is reminiscent, in some respects, of the bariolage in the 3rd Partita at, for example, bar
13 forward, the chromatic writing of the Prelude to the 1st Suite is unique to the Cello Suites.

Secondly, in the strictest sense, the chromatic in question is not written out or ‘spelt’ as one might have expected. As a rising chromatic passage in G major, the notes should either move from natural to sharp and not include any flats, or follow the classical convention in the writing of a chromatic scale.\textsuperscript{553} The chromatic scale, as written out by Anna Magdalena, follows neither convention. (See Figure 4.88) And, interestingly, any attempt to ‘harmonically pair’ the chromatic notes throughout the passage also fails.

It appears that what has been written is a D chromatic scale, set against a D pedal, written out in the conventional manner and resolving, ultimately, to G major. However, as there are no other examples in Johann Sebastian’s music which use this method of writing a chromatic scale, it is impossible to test the hypothesis that Anna Magdalena has written the chromatic scale out ‘incorrectly’. All four handwritten

\textsuperscript{553} Chromatic scales are those in which each degree of a scale from the tonic is represented: minor second, major second, minor third, major third, perfect fourth, augmented fourth, perfect fifth, minor sixth, major sixth, minor seventh, major seventh. (See Grove ‘The Chromatic Scale’ ed. Blom: 280)
sources have written the chromatic passage out in the same manner as Anna Magdalena.

IV.2.4. 4 The Singular Nature of the Sarabande from 5th Suite

The Sarabande from the 5th Cello Suite stands alone in its compositional style. (See Figure 4.89) It is unique in two ways: its rhythmic structure, and, its harmonic conclusion.\textsuperscript{554}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure489.png}
\caption{The Sarabande from the 5th Cello Suite}
\end{figure}

The following are the points of uniqueness that are of particular interest:\textsuperscript{555}

- The final bar has a rising major 6\textsuperscript{th} from E flat to C natural. (See Figure 4.89) 
  Note that the part is scordatura, so the D must be read as a C. No other Sarabande in the Cello Suites, or the suites and partitas for keyboard, rises to the final note in this way. Figs 4.90-4.94 show typical final cadences for the Sarabandes:

\textsuperscript{554} See Vogt, 1981: 99 & 100, 184 & 185
\textsuperscript{555} The 5th Cello Suite is written for the Cello to be re-tuned (scordatura) to C, G, D and G; consequently the note on the A (upper G) must be read down a tone.
The Sarabande is devoid of any rhythmic embellishment, i.e. there is no addition of semi-quaver movement or trill. The keyboard examples, given
above, are typical of Johann Sebastian’s work in this genre and Figure 4.95 illustrates Johann Sebastian’s approach, in the Sarabande of the 1st Unaccompanied Violin Partita in B minor. By comparison, the Sarabande of the 5th Cello Suite is very stark indeed.

Figure 4.95 The Sarabande from the 1st Unaccompanied Violin Partita

- Johann Sebastian’s sarabandes are characterised, in general terms, by a dotted rhythm, occurring at some point within the movement. Often this is along the lines of bar 2, in the above Figure 4.95: a dotted crotchet and 3 quavers, or sometimes dotted quavers and semi-quavers, as in the example in Figure 4.94, above. Sometimes it is much less obvious, but without exception, the dotted rhythm is present at some point in the sarabandes. However, in the Sarabande of the 5th Cello Suite, no such dotted rhythmic relationship is present in any form. (See Figure 4.89)
It is tempting to assert that this particular movement is a Sarabande in name only.

IV.2.4. 5 The Harmonic and Formal Construction of the 4th Suite

Scholars agree that the Prelude to the 4th Cello Suite presents us with a very unusual and unBach-like harmonic structure.\textsuperscript{556} It is also rather odd in its formal construction.

The form of the Prelude is inscrutable. It is in two halves, divided by the fermata, and yet these two halves are not in the relationship that one would expect from binary form as it was understood at that period. What is, basically, a quaver movement is often, and oddly, juxtaposed with longish semi-quaver passages. Overall, there is a sense of musical uncertainty throughout the movement and the final climatic chromatic phrase, though very arresting, is somehow unmotivated by anything previous in the piece.

\textsuperscript{556} See Vogt, 1981: 181
IV.2.5 Group D – Editorial Problems and Disputed Readings:

IV.2.5.1 Wrong or doubtful notes

The issue of editorial problems and disputed readings, see Figure 4.96, may appear to be connected to the discussion, earlier in this Chapter, regarding the transmission and filiations of the Sources. However, the matter of the relationship between the Sources must not be confused with questions concerning the reliability of Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, as a copy of the composer’s original musical intentions. In other words, editorial problems and disputed readings are a separate issue from the question of the relationship between the four handwritten Sources and the existence or otherwise of a Source [G]. Therefore, as a distinct issue, the specific matter of the number of supposed errors in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Six Cello Suites deserves some detailed attention in itself.

The general acceptance, that Anna Magdalena’s manuscript contains many errors, has long been central to the perceived need for so many different editions of the Cello Suites. As Anner Bylsma puts it ... what a pity it is that Anna Magdalena's score ... is so full of mistakes. Yet a comparison between the Anna Magdalena manuscript of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas and the manuscript of the ‘1720 Autograph’ of the same works reveals that, in stark contrast to the number of supposed errors in the Anna Magdalena’s Cello Suite manuscript, there are very few differences between the two versions. In fact, as stated in Chapter III, the two manuscripts are, in effect, almost identical in their execution of the music-calligraphy; the accuracy is almost uncanny. (See Figure 4.97)

Figure 4. 96  The second page of the Prelude of the 1st Cello Suite as presented in the Bärenreiter Scholarly Critical Performing Edition of the ‘Six Suites a Violoncello senza Basso’

Figure 4. 97  A comparison of the music-calligraphic styles of Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena after computer re-alignment
Further, the similarity between the two manuscripts is such that there are very few pitch deviations between the two versions of the violin works, and even fewer occasions where, as a result of disputed readings, subsequent editors have suggested alternative pitches to those in the ‘1720 Autograph’.

The same cannot be said of the Six Cello Suites. The many editions that have been published, since the first printed edition was produced in France …in or around 1824, are littered with alternatives for many of the pitches, trills and articulations. The Bärenreiter Edition shows some 50 or more divergent readings in the 1st Suite alone (leaving aside any matters of bowing and articulation, which I will discuss later).

In Figure 4.96 (above), Bars 22, 27, 33 and 36 are just four examples of the recognised variants in the Prelude to the 1st Cello Suite. In bar 22, there are three alternative readings given: those of Sources A, C and E. Yet from a pitch point of view, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript is, for the most part, very clear, and, with very few exceptions, readable. (See Figure 4.98) In the passage in question, it is clear what her intention was: the notes in the first part of the bar are c, a, d, f, a, c sharp, d. Yet, in Sources C and D, changes have been made. (See Figure 4.96 above)

---

558 93 editions according to Dimitry Markevitch
559 Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 5
A few bars later, at bar 27, it can be seen that two of the handwritten versions (Sources C and D) have notes different from Anna Magdalena’s unequivocal and very clear manuscript. (See Figure 4.99 and 4.100)

There are a total of 18 such amendments (changes of pitch) in the 1st Suite alone, not including 5 disagreements regarding accidentals. The situation is much the same throughout the entire set of the Six Cello Suites. In fact, all movements have some suggested changes. The total variations (pitch-alterations, accidentals, trills etc) to Anna Magdalena’s manuscript are well in excess of 400 and pitch alterations alone account for over 200 of the changes.

The C sharp of bar 27, for example, of the Prelude to the 1st Suite, as in Figure 4.99 above, cannot easily be mistaken for any other note. In fact, in this particular case, the
editorial rewriting has, as can clearly be seen in Figure 4.100, altered the entire sequence. What caused so much mistrust of Anna Magdalena’s manuscript?

As stated above, a close examination of Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas reveals very few pitch divergent readings from the ‘1720 Autograph’ in what is, in many respects, far more complex music to copy than the Cello Suites. Even a cursory glance at Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Six Cello Suites reveals a well-presented, readable version. One would expect, therefore, that the rate of pitch copy-errors in the Six Cello Suites would be no more than the rate of pitch copy-errors in the Violin Sonatas & Partitas. According to Schwemer and Woodfull-Harris:

...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, and page turns in the Anna Magdalena Bach MS fairly accurately reflect the writing in the autograph.

This being the case, it can be assumed that, if Anna Magdalena copied the Six Cello Suites from a no longer extant original of Johann Sebastian’s, then the Six Cello Suites, as they appear in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, are virtually identical to Johann Sebastian’s model, in the same manner as the violin works are.

561 Eppstein, in the NBA Kritische Berichte, Volume 6 No. 2:20 suggests that this note B flat was an error in Source [G]
563 Schwemer and Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 6. They assume the ‘autograph’ to be no longer extant.
Given the missing note in the Gavotte of the 5th Suite, and a number of other related issues, it is unlikely that Anna Magdalena's manuscript of the Six Cello Suites is the original of the works; it is, most likely, a copy of some other workings. Earlier in this Chapter, evidence was presented to suggest that the relationship between the four handwritten Sources is possibly not as previously understood. In Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Six Cello Suites, there is evidence, through the many corrections/adjustments in notation etc, to suggest that the manuscript was not a poor attempt at copying, but rather, a work still in progress.

**Figure 4.101** Examples of corrections taken from the *Six Cello Suites*

- In the 3rd *Suite*, 1st Movement after bar 30 four notes are crossed out for no apparent reason, then re-written on the line below. (See Example 4.101.1)

  ![Example 4.101.1](image)

- Bar 5 of the 1st movement of the 6th *Suite*, has only 3 beats instead of 4. Anna Magdalena has corrected this, by adding additional notes above the end of the bar. She has also indicated f# as a correction. (See Example 4.101.2)

  ![Example 4.101.2](image)

There are also many examples of bars where notes have obviously been altered, see Figure 4.102 overleaf.
Key to Figure 4.102:

S=Suite, P= Prelude, A=Allemande, C=Courante, S=Sarabande, M=Menuet, 
B=Bouree Ga=Gavotte and Gi=Gigue/Gique b=bar number

It must be stated that there is no way of knowing who actually made the alterations to 
the notes given below – it assumed that it was Anna Magdalena.

Figure 4.102 Some of the many examples of bars where the notes have obviously been altered – these 
examples have been taken from the Kritische Berichte – Faksimile-Band

The number of pitch changes is quite extraordinary and well outside what can be 
found in, for example, the two French Suites in the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, or indeed 
the manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas. This suggests that either Anna 
Magdalena’s manuscript of the Cello Suites is an extremely bad copy, or that it was a
manuscript that was still being altered, as part of the compositional process, by the composer.

IV.2.5.2 Issues of Articulation/Bowing

One of the principal criticisms of Anna Magdalena’s manuscripts of both the *Cello Suites* and the *Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas* is the presentation of the articulation marks.\(^{564}\) It is assumed that Anna Magdalena did not know or understand much about string playing,\(^ {565}\) when making her “copies”, and that this is the reason why the articulation/bowing marks in her “copy”, are not as clear as they are in the ‘1720 Autograph’ of the *Violin Sonatas & Partitas*. Similarly, the articulation/bowing marks in the *Cello Suites* appear to be somewhat sloppy.

However, if Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas & Partitas* is not actually a copy of the ‘1720 Autograph’, then 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 1\(^{st}\) Movement of the *G minor Sonata* and the Sarabande of the *D Minor Partita*, discussed above, and the fact that her manuscript was devoid of genre titles, until they were added later by Schwanenberger.

A similar situation could also apply to Anna Magdalena’s *Cello Suites* manuscript, where the articulation marks were yet to be finalised. However, unlike the *Violin

---

\(^{564}\) See Besswenger, 2000: 77

\(^{565}\) See Leisinger: 4
Sonatas & Partitas, this final process does not appear to have taken place - unless, of course, this is what Source [G] represented.

With respect to the matter of articulation/bowing, in the 90 or so editions of the Six Cello Suites, a vast number of variations to the articulation/bowings occur for many passages. The net result of this situation is a sense of uncertainty about the correct approach to articulation in the Six Cello Suites.566

Opinions on how to approach Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, varied ... [and] cellists must try to respect the intent behind the manuscript bowings.567

It is true to say that there are some occasions where Anna Magdalena’s version of the articulations/bowings varies from that of ‘1720 Autograph’ or are ambiguous. The fact remains that, for a huge proportion of the manuscript, Anna Magdalena has a very high degree of accuracy. (See Figure 4.103) In many respects, Anna Magdalena’s manuscript is no less ambiguous than the ‘1720 Autograph’. (See Table 4.2.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ambiguous bowings</th>
<th>AMB Missing bowings</th>
<th>Equally ambiguous bowings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AMB</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1720 Autograph</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. 6 A comparison of the bowings in the 1st Movement of the G minor Sonata of the Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas, as written in the ‘1720 Autograph’, with Anna Magdalena’s manuscript

We should, on the balance of probabilities, therefore, be able to rely just as much on Anna Magdalena’s articulation/bowing marks in a general sense, in the Six Cello

566 See also, Daw, 1992: 905
567 Hanani, 1992: 228
Suites, as on Johann Sebastian’s articulation markings in the *Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas*. The complete first page of both manuscripts, with ambiguities and absent bowing circled, is given below in Figure 4.101. A summary of the bowing variations/ambiguities is given in Table 4.2.6 and some of the examples are given in Figure 4.102.

The purpose of this discussion is different from the comparison, made in Part 1 of this Chapter, of the three manuscripts dating from the 1720s.
Figure 4. 103 Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the 1st Movement of the 1st Violin Sonata & the ‘1720 Autograph’ of the same Movement
**Figure 4.104** Some examples of the bowing ambiguities and omissions in the 1st Movement of the *G minor Sonata* of the *Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas & Partitas*, as written in the ’1720 Autograph’ (on the right), with Anna Magdalena’s manuscript version (on the left)\(^{568}\)

1. **AMB** Ambiguous bowing in bar 3

2. **AMB** Slur missing final quaver bar 6

3. Equally ambiguous bowing bar 8

4. **AMB** Ambiguous bowing at bar 12

5. Equally ambiguous bowing 3\(^{rd}\) beat of bar 16

6. **AMB** ambiguous bowing 2\(^{nd}\) beat of bar 18

7. **AMB** slur missing 3\(^{rd}\) and 4\(^{th}\) beat, bar 20

To sum up: based on the above, the levels of ambiguity in each of the manuscripts are just about even.

\(^{568}\) See also Chapter V
The difference in the bowing/articulation marks between Anna Magdalena's manuscript of the *Violin Sonatas and Partitas* and her manuscript of the *Six Cello Suites* may be due to the fact that she was more comfortable writing for the violin than for the cello; as stated previously, she may well have been a violinist and consequently, less certain about the application of bowing to the cello.

**IV.2.5.3 The interpretation of the chords at the conclusion of the Prelude to the 2nd Suite in D minor**

A compositional curiosity which has always raised questions of interpretation is the sequence of the chords at the close of the D minor Prelude (the final 5 bars), see Figure 4.103. What is problematic about this passage is the lack of clear instruction from the composer regarding how it is to be interpreted. This lack of clarity has led to the many and various suggested interpretations. Furthermore, this is the only place that long chords appear in the context of florid music in the *Cello Suites*. By contrast, Johann Sebastian used this technique a number of times in the unaccompanied violin works and always with precise instructions. In the Ciaccona, for example, the similar passage in bars 88 forward, see Figure 4.105, is quite clearly marked to be played with arpeggios.

It is accepted that Johann Sebastian was meticulous about detail. The lack of instruction to ‘arpeggio’, which it must be noted is also missing in Kellner’s copy and in Source C and D, seems at odds with this meticulousness. If we accept that this

---

569 See Pratt, 1981: 813
570 See Schwemer & Woodfull-Harris, 2000: 11
571 Whilst it could be argued that this is a similar passage to BWV 846/1, which is possibly an early version of the WTK 1st Prelude in the 1720 Klavierbüchlein, the context is quite different as the arpeggiation is already established in the preceding bars in the Prelude; whereas in the *Cello Suite* no such arpeggiation is present, leaving a considerable degree of musical ambiguity
passage should be interpreted in the same way as the analogous passage in the Ciaccona of the Partita in D minor for violin, the absence of instruction might be seen as yet more evidence that Anna Magdalena did not copy from a lost ‘fair copy’ in Johann Sebastian’s hand.

Figure 4. 105 The final chords of the 2nd Cello Suite (above) with no instruction to ‘arpeggio’, and the “arpeggio” instruction in the Ciaccona (below)

From the discussion in this Chapter, it is clear that there is valid reason to doubt both the traditional view of the transmission/filiations of the four 18th Century Sources of the Cello Suites and the authorship of the Suites themselves. Who then wrote them and is there any evidence to indicate a possible alternative to Johann Sebastian? For example, is there any evidence that Anna Magdalena’s role was actually that of writer of the Cello Suites and not just that of copyist; these questions will be addressed in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS - WHO WROTE THE SIX CELLO SUITES?
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS - WHO WROTE THE SIX CELLO SUITES?

…we have only the shakiest understanding of the origins of or impetus behind some of Bach’s most important compositions – Joseph Kerman\(^{573}\)

…sticking to one version, such as Anna Magdalena’s, can result in strange playing (to my ears)… Uzi Wiesel\(^{574}\)

This thesis has presented material that challenges many accepted beliefs with regard Johann Sebastian Bach. Before setting out my conclusions, I wish to stress that much work remains to be undertaken, to clarify the implications of my findings.

There is no doubt that the Six Cello Suites are compositionally unusual, and that the music presented in the Cello Suites has characteristics that place them outside the parameters of other music normally attributed to Johann Sebastian. And, whilst it is of course possible that Johann Sebastian chose to write these cello works in a completely different style, as discussed in Chapter IV, it is possible, and indeed in some respects likely, that the Cello Suites were not written by him.

As discussed in Chapter IV, a remarkably large number of radically different editions/versions of the Suites have been produced since they were first published in the 1820s. The fact that these works give rise to such a plethora of editorial problems seems to indicate that musicians are ill at ease with the compositional hand of Johann

\(^{573}\) New York Review of Books, review of ‘Life of Bach’ by Peter Williams (re-printed in the Weekend Australian April 22 – 25, 2005: 10)

\(^{574}\) Wiesel, 1995: 284
Sebastian in the *Six Cello Suites*. The central problem seems to be that Anna Magdalena’s manuscript, the principal source, is believed to contain many variants and notational errors; also, many passages which don’t seem musically viable in Bach’s language and which have to be altered to make the music more Bach-like.\(^{575}\) It can, therefore, be said that the *Six Cello Suites*, as they appear in Anna Magdalena’s manuscript and in later manuscripts, have failed to convince musicians (cellists, in particular) of the accuracy of notation and articulation, despite the high regard in which the *Suites* themselves are, generally, held.

Despite this, no reason has ever been put forward to explain why Anna Magdalena should have made the many notational ‘errors’ that are believed to be present in her manuscript of the *Six Cello Suites*. If the manuscript is, indeed, a copy of a finished manuscript, then surely whatever the compositional source of the original material, it might reasonably be assumed that Anna Magdalena, known to be a very reliable copyist of material that formed her models, would have copied it accurately. Whilst a very occasional slip in copying might be expected, from time to time, the *1st Suite* alone contains some 25 or so notes that subsequent editors have deemed to be in need of alteration: on occasion, there is a complete change of note, on others, an alteration to an accidental. Every one of the *Six Suites* contains similar musical difficulties. This is, surely, well beyond any acceptable level of casual error, and some other explanation is required. There appear to be two possibilities: either the *Six Cello Suites* are an example of lesser quality music written by Johann Sebastian, or they were written by someone else.

\(^{575}\) See Uzi Wiesel’s comment at the opening of this Chapter
As discussed in Chapter I, Tatlow’s article ‘Collections, bars and numbers: Analytical coincidence or Bach’s design’, explores the possibility that there is an underlying mathematical proportion in some of Johann Sebastian’s works. In contrast to several other works, she identifies that …Anna Magdalena's copy of the Cello Suites lacks the parallel proportions characteristic of the works he published or copied in fair hand.  

Why? Tatlow suggests that they may have been inaccurately copied or copied before they were revised. Tatlow’s position contradicts the traditional view that Anna Magdalena copied from a fair copy. Why would Anna Magdalena copy the manuscript if it was not ready? At the very least, Tatlow’s theory raises questions about the Cello Suites, one answer to which might be that Johann Sebastian was not their composer.

This position is further supported by the evidence, presented in the first section of Chapter III, that points to the probability that Anna Magdalena’s manuscript is the earlier of the two versions of the Suites to have survived from the 1720s. Whilst it has long been accepted that Kellner's version of the Cello Suites, more often that not, follows Anna Magdalena's manuscript, it has been shown in this thesis that Kellner’s copy of the 5th Cello Suite follows Anna Magdalena's manuscript, rather than the Lute version of the same work in the hand of Johann Sebastian. This makes it most likely that Kellner copied Anna Magdalena’s manuscript of the Cello Suites.

576 Personal communication regarding her article via email 30/04/07
Further, evidence has been presented to show that there is a strong likelihood that Anna Magdalena’s music-calligraphy and handwriting are to be found in manuscripts hitherto believed to be in the music-calligraphy of Johann Sebastian. These include manuscripts dating back to 1713 (including the recently discovered manuscript of BWV1127, see Appendix L), and also the 1720 ‘Autograph’ of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas. A direct comparison of the music-calligraphy in the 5th Cello Suite with the Lute Suite version reveals that Johann Sebastian and Anna Magdalena’s styles of music-calligraphy are, contrary to what is accepted, quite distinguishable from each other. These findings suggest that there is a need to re-assess the traditional position regarding Anna Magdalena’s role in a number of important works attributed to Johann Sebastian.

All of these findings, I suggest, call for a re-think of our current understanding of the relationship between all four handwritten Sources, the adoption of an alternative view of their filiations, and a re-assessment of who composed the Six Cello Suites.

Within the Bach household alone, there are a number of possible candidates who may be considered to have been involved in writing the Six Cello Suites. Principal amongst these are the females who lived in the Bach household, and about whom we know very little – though there is no reason to doubt but that they were indeed musically gifted. There was Maria Barbara, a Bach in her own right; likewise her sister Friedelena Margaretha who lived with the family until her death in 1729. Both could quite easily have been composers. It is also possible that Johann Sebastian’s eldest child, Catharina Dorothea (1708 – 1784), was musically accomplished enough to have been involved, especially if the date of composition of the Cello Suites was more
towards 1726. And, of course there was Anna Magdalena, with whom the Cello Suites are most closely associated. Notwithstanding the possibility that the Suites were a collaborative effort between any of the above, and indeed Johann Sebastian himself, what evidence is there that could identify any one of these as the composer?

The simple fact is that there is no evidence, pointing directly or indirectly to any of the above women, other than to Anna Magdalena, as a potential composer of the Cello Suites. So what evidence is there that Anna Magdalena was the composer? As discussed previously, the Suites are in her handwriting and music-calligraphy, but this, in itself, is not evidence that she composed the Suites. Could, however, the … unusual\textsuperscript{577} words of Schwanenberger be a possible source of indirect evidence of her involvement?

V.1. THE UNUSUAL WORDS WRITTEN ON THE TITLE PAGE OF SCHWANENBERGER’S MANUSCRIPT CONTAINING THE SIX CELLO SUITES

\textbf{Figure 5.1} The title page of Schwanenberger’s Manuscript. In French, he states Johann Sebastian’s titles, and that “Sr. J Bach” composed the music.

\textsuperscript{577} \textit{ungewöhnlichen} - see Maria Hübner Chapter I
The title page of Anna’s manuscript is, as discussed in Chapter IV, in the handwriting of Georg Heinrich Ludwig Schwanenberger. It appears that Schwanenberger, for reasons as yet unknown, was presented with them sometime around 1726.578

In the bottom right hand corner, see Figure 5.2, Schwanenberger states that the writer is Mrs Bach (écrit par Madame Bachen. Son Epouse – that is to say, “Written by Mrs Bach his wife”). The usually accepted translation of the title page is that the works were composed by Johann Sebastian and copied by his wife, Anna Magdalena.579 There are, however, a number of problems with this traditional view.

Dr Rosalind Halton, a leading expert in the manuscripts of Alessandro Scarlatti and his circle, makes this observation about this matter:580

...It certainly is remarkable to mention the copyist (if this is the case) on the title page. In Italian mss one sometimes gets 'x scripsit' - i.e. much the same as 'écrite par'; but the prominent position of this in the title page here, rather

---

579 See Chapter I
580 See also Vogt’s comments on the placement of the name of the copyist at the end of the manuscript in Chapter IV
than at the end of the ms. is cause for thinking twice about what it may mean.\textsuperscript{581}

The most important issue, for our understanding of the words used on the title page, is the question of the interpretation or translation\textsuperscript{582} of the word “écrite” (sic). The verb ‘écire’ means ‘to write’ and 'écrite' is the past participle, meaning 'written'. As in the English language, the verb 'écrire' ('to write') can also imply 'to compose/create', and so its meaning is ambiguous. The French also have the verb 'copier' ('to copy') and its past participle is copié, meaning 'copied'. If Schwanenberger had wished to make it plain that Anna Magdalena was merely the copyist, he could have written 'copié par Madame Bachen...' or indeed, 'écrite a la main (handwritten), par madame Bachen'. Instead, his chosen wording leaves the question, tantalisingly, open.

Cécile Grand, Department Musicology and Analysis at the Paris Conservatoire, states in an email\textsuperscript{583} that it is very possible that the word “écrite” meant composed - depending on context, of course, the nature of the work, the hand-writing, the paper etc. She further adds that, to the best of her memory, the name of the copyist when it was put on a manuscript at that period, was usually preceded by the Latin word "fecit" or the French word "copié"

\textsuperscript{581} Dr Rosalind Halton, Newcastle University, Australia, personal communication
\textsuperscript{582} Advice on the use of the French language and references courtesy of French linguist, Barbara Rabbett MA
\textsuperscript{583} Personal communication, via Barbara Rabbett …Il est très possible que la mention "écrite" signifie "composé" mais seule l'analyse précise du contexte pourrait permettre d'être un peu plus affirmatif (nature de l'oeuvre, écriture, papier...). Il me semble que sur les manuscrits de cette époque la mention du copiste est introduite par le latin "fecit" ou par le français "copié".
Another occasion when the verb écrire is used to describe a composer is exemplified in David Fuller’s article ‘Observations on Couperin de Turin’. When discussing ‘Marc Roger Normand (“Couperin de Turin”) Livre de tablature de clavessin de Monsieur de Druent, écrit par Couperin’, Fuller has the following to say:

... The title of the collection, which states that it was “written by Couperin,” [écrit par Couperin] is in the same very French-looking hand as the titles of the individual pieces and the various directions for repeats written on the music, and there is no reason to doubt that both music and titles were written by Couperin (my emphasis).

In addition, a scan of ‘Le Petit Larousse, Grand Format’ 2006, makes it clear that the French word for ‘to compose’ music and the word ‘to write’ music are interchangeable. For example, under Sibelius we find Il écrit un concerto pour violon; under Mozart we find écrivant des symphonies; under Carl Philipp Emanuel we find à écrire des sonates and under Handel, we find Il écrit des opera. Interestingly, we find the words composant, composa and compositeur to describe a composer, but not the word composée, for the act of composing.

In light of the above discussion, as there is some degree of ambiguity in Schwanenberger’s use of the word écrite in this context, it would be overstating the case to say that there is no doubt about the meaning of the words attributed to him. However, it is not at all clear why Schwanenberger decided to write these words and why he would have wanted to identify or draw attention to ‘Madame Bach’, as, if she

---

585 Ibid.
was only the copyist, the words were non-essential. We can only assume that he had a reason for doing so.

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 écrite par Madame Bachen “Written by Mrs Bach…” may possibly offer a clue as to the identity of that composer.
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Appendix A

Comparative Structural Analysis of the Six Cello Suites and the Three Partitas

The Six Cello Suites are given as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Suite 1</th>
<th>Suite 2</th>
<th>Suite 3</th>
<th>Suite 4</th>
<th>Suite 5</th>
<th>Suite 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prélude</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allemande</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courante</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarabande</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menuet</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menuet</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourée</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourée</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
<td>3 &amp; 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavotte</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavotte</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>5 &amp; 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigue</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
<td>1,2,3,4,5 &amp; 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the Suites begin with a Prélude and conclude with a Gigue. The internal movements of the Suites vary only in the pairing of the 5th movement, that is to say, Menuets, Bourrées or Gavottes, the ordering is otherwise exact.

The Partitas are given as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement</th>
<th>Partita 1</th>
<th>Partita 2</th>
<th>Partita 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allemande</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courante</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarabande</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menuet</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourée</td>
<td>1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>1 &amp; 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavotte</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigue</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>2 &amp; 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expressed in movement order the Partitas are given as follows:

- **No 1 B minor**
  - Allemande
  - Courante
  - Double
  - Sarabande
  - Double
  - Tempo di Bourrée (Tempo di Borea)
  - Double
  - No. 3 E Major
    - Preludio
    - Loure
    - Gavotte en Rondeau
    - Menuets

- **No. 2 D minor**
  - Allemande
  - Courante
Spelling

Violin Sonatas
Adagio (Italian)
Fuga - Allegro (Italian)
Siciliana (Italian)
Presto (Italian)
Grave (Italian)
Andante (Italian)
Allegro (Italian)
Largo (Italian)
Allegro assai (Italian)

Violin Partitas
Sarabanda (Italian)
Ciaccona (Italian)
Arpeggio (Italian)
al riverso (Italian)
Preludio (Italian)
Loure (French)
Bourée (second “r” missing French)
Gavotte en Rondeaux (French)
Gigue (French)
Allemanda (Italian)
Double (French or English)
Courente (Italian)
Sarabande (French or German)
Tempo di Borea (Italian)

Lute Suite BWV 1006a (arrangement of the 3rd Violin Partita)
Prelude (French, not Preludio as in the Violin Partita)
Loure (French)
Bourée (sic) (French)
Gavotte en Rondeaux (French)
Gigue (French)

Lute Suite BWV 995 (arrangement of the 5th Cello Suite)
Prelude (sic) (French)
tres vite (sic) (French)
Allemande (French)
Sarabande (French)
Gavotte en Rondo (French) note: this is the 2nd Gavotte in the Suite, in the Cello Suite the words “en Rondo” do not appear
Gigue (French)

The Six Cello Suites
Prélude (French)
Allemande (French)
Courante (French)
Sarabande (French)
Menuet (French)
Bourée (French)
Gavotte (French)
Gigue (French)
Comparison between the Courante of the 2nd Cello Suite and the Courante of the 2nd Partita.

Number of Bars:
Cello Suite 32 bars
Violin Partita 50 bars

The Courantes of the Violin Partitas are basically single species, or at the very least minimal specie variation i.e. quavers for the Courante of the B minor Partita, for the D minor triplets and dotted quavers and semi-quavers. On the other hand the Courantes of the Cello Suites are mainly in semi-quavers and quavers, with triplets and other rhythmic patterns in the Courante of Suite 4. In addition, the Courante of Suite 5 is in 3/2.

Comparison between the Sarabande of the 2nd Cello Suite and the Sarabande of the 2nd Partita.

The most significant difference between the Sarabandas of the Partitas and those of the Suites is the level and complexity of the double stopping (see above).

Number of Bars:
Cello Suite 28 bars
Violin Partita 28 bars

A comparison of the Gigues of the 2nd and 3rd Partitas with the Gigues of the Six Cello Suites.

Gigue structure
The following shows the difference in the number of bars of the Gigues. In order to make a direct comparison of the material, I have indicated in the brackets after the equal sign (=) the number of dotted crotchet beats.

*The Cello Suites:* No 1 6/8 (34=68), No 2 3/8 (74=74), No 3 3/8 (107=107), No 4 12/8, (42=168) No 5 3/8 (72=72), No 6 6/8 (68=136)
*The Violin Partitas:* No 2 12/8 (40=160), No 3 6/8 (32=64)

Comparison between the Préludes and the Preludium of the Cello Suites and the Preludio of the 3rd Partita.

Number of bars:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suite</th>
<th>Number of bars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>49 bars of 4/4 = 4*49 = 196 beats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>63 bars of 3/4 = 3*63 = 189 beats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>88 bars of 3/4 = 3*88 = 264 beats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>91 bars of 2/2 = 4*91 = 364 beats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>223 bars (strictly speaking, the movement is not comparable with any others, as it has a unique structure i.e. two distinct sections)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>104 bars of 12/8 = 4*104 = 416 beats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Partita</td>
<td>138 bars of 3/4 = 3*138 = 414 beats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the exception of the 5th Suite, the Preludio of the 3rd Violin Partita is in bars somewhat longer than any of the Cello Suite Préludes. In particular, it is much longer than any of the other 3/4 Préludes.

A simple comparison between the G major Cello Suite and the E major Partita reveals a great difference in the compositional complexity.

Cello Suite no 1(A,B)
Violin Partita Binary form (A,A[sub Dom],B)
Key structure
Cello Suite G major relatively simple (Dominant and Sub-median) implied harmony
Violin Partita E major very complex implied harmony.
Appendix B

A Comparison between other Suites composed by Johann Sebastian and the Cello Suites
Below are the movements of Lutes Suites (BWV 996 & BWV 997), the Keyboard Suites the “French” (BWV 812-819), the “English” (BWV 806 - BWV 811) and the Orchestral Suites.

Cello Suites
BWV1007
Prélude
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande
Menuet 1 & 2
Gigue

BWV1008
Prélude
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande
Menuet 1 & 2
Gigue

BWV1009
Prélude
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande
Bourrée I & II
Gigue

BWV1010
Prélude
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande
Bourrée I & II
Gigue

BWV1011
Prélude
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande
Gavotte I & II
Gigue

Lute Suites
BWV 996
Praeludio
Allemande
Fuga
Sarabande
Gigue

BWV 997
Praeludio
Allemande
Fuga
Sarabande
Gigue

“French Suites”
Suite no 1 BWV 812
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande
Menuet I & II
Gigue

Suite no 2 BWV 813
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande
Air
Menuet
Gigue
Suite no 3 BWV 814
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande
Gavotte
Menuet
Trio
Gigue

Suite no 4 BWV 815
Allemande
Courante
Gavotte
Air
Gigue

Suite no 5 BWV 816
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande
Gavotte (one only)
Bourrée
Gigue

Suite no 6 BWV 817
Allemande
Courante
Sarbande
Gavotte
Bourrée
Loure
Gigue
Petit Menuet [“Younger Form, Embellished Version (Version B)”
Barenreiter Edition]

Keyboard Suite in A minor BWV 818
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande simple
Sarabande double
Gigue

Keyboard Suite in E major BWV 819
Allemande

Courante
Sarabande
Bourrée
Menuet I & II

“English Suites”
Suite no 1 BWV 806
Prélude
Allemande
Courante I
Courante II avec deux Doubles
Double I
Double II
Sarabande
Bourrée I
Bourrée II
Gigue

Suite no 2 BWV 807
Prélude
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande
Les agréments de la Même Sarabande
Bourrée I
Bourrée II
Gigue

Suite no 3 BWV 808
Prélude
Allemande
Sarabande
Les agréments de la même Sarabande
Gavotte alternativement
Gavotte II ou la Musette
Gigue

Suite no 4 BWV 809
Prélude
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande
Menuet I
Menuet II
Gigue

Suite no 5 BWV 810
Prélude
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande  
Passepied I en Rondeau  
Passepied II  
Gigue  

Suite no 6 BWV 811  
Prélude  
Allemande  
Courante  
Sarabande  
Double  
Gavotte I  
Gavotte II  
Gigue  

**Suite 1 avec Prélude BWV 806a**  
No title  
Allemande  
Courante 1re  
Courante 2  
Courante avec la Basse Simple  
Sarabande  
Bourée (sic)  
Gigue  

*Orchestral Suites (each suite has a different instrumentation)*  
Suite no 1 in C Major  
No title (Overture?)  
Courante  
Gavotte I  
Gavotte II  
Forlane  
Menuet I  

Menuet II  
Bourrée I  
Bourrée II  
Passepied I  
Passepied II  

Suite no 2 in B minor BWV 1067  
No title (Overture?)  
Rondeau  
Sarabande  
Bourrée I  
Bourrée II  
Polonaise  
Double  
Menuet  
Bandanerie  

Suite no 3 D major  
No title (Overture?)  
Air  
Gavotte I  
Gavotte II  
Bourrée  
Gigue  

Suite no 4 in D major  
Bourrée I  
Bourrée II  
Gavotte  
Menuet I  
Menuet II  
Rejouissance
Appendix C

A Survey of Partitas written by J S Bach
The following are the movements of three Keyboard Partitas and the Violin Partitas.

Keyboard Partitas
Partita no 1 BWV 825
Praeludium
Allemande
Corrente
Sarabande
Menuet I & II
Gigue

Partita no 2 BWV 826
Sinfonia
Allemande
Courante
Sarabande
Capriccio

Partita no 3 BWV 827
Fantasia
Allemande
Corrente
Sarabande
Burlesca
Scherzo
Gigue

The Violin Partitas (with the original spelling)
No 1 B minor
Allemanda
Corrente
Double
Sarabanda
Double
Tempo di Borea
Double

No 2 D minor
Allemanda
Corrente
Sarabanda
Giga
Ciacconna

No 3 E Major
Preludio
Loure
Gavotte en Rondeaux
Menuets
Boureec
Gigue

What is abundantly clear, from the above, is that there is no underlying scheme of movements. Once again, this is in sharp contrast to the highly structured and organised scheme of the Cello Suites.
## Appendix D

### A Survey of the movement titles of the *Unaccompanied Violin Sonatas* and the *Six Accompanied Sonatas for Violin & Clavier*:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unaccompanied Sonata no 1 in G minor</th>
<th>Sonata for Violin &amp; Clavier no 2 in A minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>No tempo indication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuga</td>
<td>Allegro assai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Siciliano</td>
<td>Andante un poco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presto</td>
<td>Presto</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unaccompanied Sonata no 2 in A minor</th>
<th>Sonata for Violin &amp; Clavier no 3 in E major</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grave</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuga</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andante</td>
<td>Adagio ma non tanto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unaccompanied Sonata no 3 in C major</th>
<th>Sonata for Violin &amp; Clavier no 4 in C minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>Siciliano (Largo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuga</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largo</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro assai</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sonata for Violin &amp; Clavier no 1 in B minor</th>
<th>Sonata for Violin &amp; Clavier no 5 in F minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>Largo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andante</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>Vivace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sonata for Violin &amp; Clavier no 6 in G major</th>
<th>Allegro</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>Allegro (Cembalo Solo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allegro (Cembalo Solo)</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

Dr. Mark M. Smith,
19 Wellington St.,
Kensington,
S.Aust. 5068

24.10.02

Associate Professor Martin W.B. Jarvis,
Northern Territory University,
Darwin

Dear Professor Jarvis,

I was very interested in your stimulating paper at the recent Newcastle musicological conference - it is unfortunate that the time allowed for each paper is often much too short. It would also have been valuable to have had a discussion afterwards, but that was not possible either. (Since then, I have also read your recent Stringendo article, Part 1.) Therefore, I hope you will forgive my one-sided response by letter, which is perhaps a poor substitute.

First of all, I appreciate your new ideas and your questioning of dearly-held beliefs. Secondly, from what you have said and written, I think at least we may agree that there still remains much that is unsettled in research about Bach's cello suites. I will be brief in my response to your paper and article Part 1, first with some general aspects that come to my mind. (1) For women of Anna Magdalena's time, the only opportunity in music for top pay and status was as a singer (indeed there were few other openings as a performer for female musicians), whether in a Court, or in public. Therefore, Anna Magdalena was clearly a top singer. (2) J.S.Bach was highly regarded as a keyboard teacher, and both of Anna Magdalena's notebooks (1722 and 1725) seem to follow at least to some extent the tradition of keyboard instruction. (3) One explanation for the similarity of music-writing between Anna Magdalena and her husband, may be that she modelled her writing on his because he was her teacher, and possibly before their marriage, she may have been well-trained in writing music, and prior to knowing Bach, she had not already formed her own style of writing.

One of the problems of Bach research, is that many of the best articles are scattered in a variety of publications, particularly German, so it is easy to miss information. A few relevant items which I have noticed are as follows. (1) Hans-Joachim Schulze found that Anna Magdalena's combined manuscript of the unaccompanied violin and cello works was written for the Braunschweig Chamber violinist Schwanberg. (See the Neue Bach-Ausgabe VI/2, Kritischer Bericht by Hans Eppstein, p.11). Schwanberg was in Leipzig in 1727 and 1728, in 1728 acting as Godfather for the Bach's child Reine Johanna, so it is most likely that Anna Magdalena's manuscript dates from that time. Schulze identified the three title-pages (one for the combined works, and one each for the violin solos, and the cello solos) as being in the hand of Schwanberg. Schwanberg gives J.S.Bach as the composer of both sets of works, and (on the combined title-page) he wrote "écrit par Madame Bach son Épouse" (i.e. in the handwriting of Anna Magdalena). (2) In a review of Schulze's study in the Bach-Jahrbuch 1987, p. 192, Georg von Dadelsen revealed that some of the words in this double-manuscript by Anna Magdalena, were written by Bach (indeed this seems to be true for the words reproduced in your Fig. 1 - probably they are all by Bach). (3) Because of differences between them, it is most unlikely that Kellner made his copy of the cello suites from Anna Magdalena's. (4) For a very brief outline of the most likely dates of composition of Bach's cello suites, see my article in Stringendo 22/1, 2000, pp.32-35.

Thank you for your useful String Players' Pocket Dictionary. Also, Vaike Aldridge sends her kind regards - she clearly found her time in your orchestra a most inspiring experience. Further, do you know the cellist Lambertus Shepherd? Many years ago he was a very enthusiastic student of mine, then he went to Darwin to become a lawyer. Lastly, I would be glad if we could maintain contact about Bach's cello suites.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

David Smith
Appendix F

Matters of Interpretation

An excellent example of the complexity experienced by cellists in interpreting the phrasing in the Six Cello Suites is the ‘Preface’ to Paul Tortelier’s editorial notes in the Stainer & Bell Edition 1983 – a summary is given below:

CHARACTER-GENERAL VIEW- TEMPI

It is for each person to discover the character of a work and it is better not to put a label to it. As for the binary form of the dances making up these Suites, who does not know it already? We propose therefore to limit ourselves here to a few simple observations regarding their structure.

The suite existed before the symphony which originated from it, and it is therefore possible to discover certain analogies between the two.

The most substantial part of the symphony is contained, with very few exceptions, in its first section (preceded by a broad Prelude in the case of the classics) and in its slow movement, while the Minuet to or Scherzo, which is intended to allow both the listener and the composer time to relax, serves as a transition between the latter and the Finale which is usually a brilliant composition.

In Bach's Six Suites, the Prelude and the Allemande correspond in importance and essence to the first movement of a symphony, and the Sarabande to the slow movement; but the latter is enclosed between two pieces of lesser importance, which are comparable to the Scherzo or Minuet to mentioned above. In the first two Suites, these are actually Minuets which are inserted after the Sarabande, while a closely-knit Gigue concludes the work in the same manner as a Finale.

The basic and always very delicate question of tempi is closely related to the character of the work. Once he has become imbued with the significance of these pages, the interpreter will inevitably find himself steeped in the tempo and more surely so than by reference to any such guide as a metronome.

STRUCTURE AND PHRASING

The power of the Cantor's music lies fundamentally in its unity. Played in fragments Bach ceases to be Bach.

Awareness of periods should help long phrases to emerge when singing the music before playing it. That is why it is recommended to look initially at numbers indicating the grouping of bars: and also the sub-division into smaller groups: 2.... 3... 2.

Afterwards, observation of the signs above the notation will make clear the outline and the key points of the music. These curves determine the musical super-structure:
As the length of the bow is often inadequate for playing complete phrases, these supplementary signs are printed above traditional bowing marks to indicate a larger phrasing than the bow can cover. The punctuation will be achieved either by dropping the tone slightly or resting a fraction on the terminal notes. By means of this sort of internal breathing, unwanted breaks will be avoided.

Later, in the same Preface, he gives an illustration of how his signs operate and
Tortelier also explains in the ‘Preface’, why he believes there to be such a difference between the music of the Violin works and the Cello works, as follows:

The difference, both in writing and in spirit, between the Violin Sonatas (Partitas) and the Cello Suites, are sufficiently pronounced to prove that Bach was at least partly inspired by the characteristics of the instrument he was writing for. Moreover, through his indications for bowing he makes the player feel the unwritten nuances.

He continues on the matter of bowings as follows:

“BOWING AND "PURISM" As far as possible I have tried to preserve what was in the original without however going so far as to forgo any alterations which seemed to me to be better. But even where I have felt compelled to alter or to add, I have nevertheless endeavoured in many cases to respect the principles of differentiation which I have perceived here and there among the various melodic elements, and to translate them as it were by other means.

"Purist" cellists play nothing but the original bowings marked in a Bach manuscript. The directions must, of course, be studied, for the player draws inspiration from them, and in many places he cannot do better than to follow them as, for instance, in the Prelude of the Suite in E flat major. One must admit, however, that the directions are not always grateful to the ear, as in the Prelude to the Suite in G major.

As for the bowing in the Berlin manuscript, there are three possible theories:

(a) Bach was more of an organist than a violinist and more of a violinist than cellist, and he therefore asked one of his colleagues in the service of Prince Leopold of Anhalt-Köthen to deal with it.
(b) He intended to it himself in collaboration with this cellist.
(c) He took the trouble to carry out the work himself.

In the first case, we are completely at liberty, whereas in the second, we too can take part in the discussion. There remains the third case which would appear the most plausible.
Appendix G

Samples of C Clefs written by staff and students of the Charles Darwin University School of Creative Arts & Humanities
Appendix H

Matters of Handwriting

Allemandes

Below: The word ‘Allemande’ believed to be in the handwriting of Anna Magdalena (the lowest two are from Kellner’s manuscript).

![Images of handwritten 'Allemande']

Below: The words ‘Allemande’ and ‘Allemanda’ believed to be in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian.

![Images of handwritten 'Allemande' and 'Allemanda']

In Anna Magdalena’s group we can detect two possible types of lower case “d” and in Johann Sebastian’s we can see four possible types of lower case “d”.

Questioned specimens from the 1720 Klavierbüchlein and Kellner’s

![Images of handwritten 'Allemande']

The word ‘Allemande’ in Kellner’s handwriting

![Images of handwritten 'Allemande']
Bourees

Below: The word ‘Bouree’ believed to be in the handwriting of Anna Magdalena

Below: The word ‘Bouree’ believed to be in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian

Below: The word ‘Boure’ as they appear in Peter Kellner’s copy of the Cello Suites
Courantes

Below: The word ‘Courante’ believed to be in the handwriting of Anna Magdalena.

Below: The words ‘Correnta’ and ‘Courante’ believed to be in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian

Below: The word ‘Courante’ as it appears in Kellner’s manuscript
Gigues

Below: The words ‘Giga’ and ‘Gique’ believed to be in the handwriting of Anna Magdalena.

Below: The words ‘Giga’ and ‘Gique’ believed to be in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian

Below: The word ‘Gigue’ as it appears in the manuscripts of Johann Peter Kellner
Menuets

Below: The word ‘Menuet’ believed to be in the handwriting of Anna Magdalena

Below: The word ‘Menuet’ believed to be in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian Bach. However, the placement of the cross strongly suggests that these words might in fact be in Anna Magdalena’s handwriting.

Below: The word ‘Menuet’ as it appears in the manuscripts of Johann Peter Kellner
Preludes
Below: The words “Prelude” Preludium” and “Preludio” believed to be in the handwriting of Anna Magdalena Bach

Below: The words “Prelude”, “Praeludium” and “Preludio” believed to be in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian Bach

Below: The word he word ‘Prelude’ as it appears in the manuscript of Johann Peter Kellner
Sarabandes
Below: The word “Sarabande” believed to be in the handwriting of Anna Magdalena

Below: The words “Sarabande” and “Sarabanda” believed to be in the handwriting of Johann Sebastian

Below: The word ‘Sarabande’ as it appears in the manuscripts of Johann Peter Kellner
Old German Script (Fraktur & Kurrent) forms

http://www.mun.ca/rels/morav/pics/tutor/mscript2.html
French Script Form

ABCDEFGLIFJKLML
OPQRSTUVWXYZ
abcdefghijklmnopqrstuvwxyz

abcdefgijklmnopqrstuvwxyz
Anna Magdalena’s Alphabet & Numerals
Graphemes taken from the Klavierbüchlein, the 1725 Klavierbüchlein, Anna
Magdalena Manuscript of the Violin Sonatas & Partitas, the Six Cello Suites and
the 1750 Petition

\[ \text{Aa} \quad \text{Bb} \quad \text{Cc} \quad \text{Dd} \quad \text{Ee} \quad \text{Ff} \quad \text{Gg} \quad \text{Hh} \quad \text{Ii} \quad \text{J} \quad \text{k} \quad \text{Ll} \]
Appendix I
Cutting a Quill (taken from www.regia.org/quill2.htm)

To actually cut a quill pen, a sharp penknife and much patient practice are needed. Select the feather from one of the first five flight feathers of any large bird such as a Goose, Swan or even a Peacock. Interestingly enough, feathers from the left wing fit the right hand best, and vice versa. Soak the feather in hot water until it is soft, harden it by pushing it into hot sand, then proceed as follows:

1: First shorten the plume (amount of shortening is optional). Then strip away the barb (which would otherwise rest uncomfortably against the knuckle of the index finger).

2: Cut away the tip of the barrel at a steep angle. Remove the membrane from inside the feather.
3: Make a slit in the top centre of the barrel. The best way to do this is to place the point of the knife inside the barrel, and lever the knife blade gently upwards, releasing pressure as soon as a crack occurs.

4: Slice a scoop from the underside of the pen, to about half its diameter, and centred on the slit.

5: Shape the nib on one side of the slit.
6: Shape the nib on the opposite side, making sure the two halves match.

7: If the underside of the nib is too concave, scrape it flat with a clean scooping cut, removing as little quill as possible.

8: To "nib" the pen, rest the underside of the point on a smooth, hard surface. Thin the tip from the top side by 'scraping' the blade forward at a shallow angle; then make a vertical cut, either at right angles to the slit or obliquely. On a very strong feather the last cut can be repeated to remove a very fine sliver, avoiding a rough underside on the tip of the nib.
Appendix J

Additional Documents with Anna Magdalena’s Handwriting & Signature

Figure 1. Leipzig, May 1757
Figure 2. Leipzig, October 1752
Figure 3. December 1749
Appendix K

Forensic Document Examination Glossary of Terms
The following terms are used in “Documentation of Forensic Handwriting Comparison and Identification Method: A modular Approach” by Found & Rogers. Some of them appear in the body of this thesis:

Allographs – Specific forms of graphemes e.g. the printed character ‘g’
Contamination – Any inconsistencies observed in the specimen handwritings
Comparability – Specimens that possess written material that can be subjected to means of analysis
End-effector choice – Gaps and/or joins between the letters in a given word
Font choice – The letter shape used
Force, friction, posture, reflex gain – The process of physically executing the writing of a given word
Grapheme – Images that represent individual letters; for example, the letter ‘g’ might be uppercase or lowercase, cursive or printed
Slant, size, position – The type of pen-stroke used
Spelling rules – The letter code
Text layout – The way in which the text appears on the written page
Appendix L

WHOSE HANDWRITING IS IN BWV1127?

...Only one person writes exactly the same way as the writer of the disputed material. This is the cornerstone of every identification - Ordway Hilton."
THE APPLICATION OF FORENSIC DOCUMENT EXAMINATION TECHNIQUES TO BWV1127 AND BWV1073

Preamble
The following document is a summary of a Forensic Document Examination carried out, in which the writings (script and not music-calligraphy) of two known individuals were compared with the writing in BWV1127. This examination was undertaken in an attempt to answer the question of whose handwriting is present in the recently discovered manuscript of BWV1127. Who the “two known” individuals were, is a matter of opinion, of course. They are assumed to be, based on the work of Dadelsen and Kobayashi et al, the writings of Johann Sebastian, and Anna Magdalena. And, based on the research to-date, this is very likely to be the case. However, it is plausible that they are wrong. So in order to avoid bias on the part of the reader, the writers will simply be identified as W1 and W2, and BWV1127 will be referred to as the Questioned Document (QD).

Method
The technique used to compare the writings is predicated on the accepted scientific principals of Forensic Document Examination, that:

- 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. Bryan Found

- …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

- 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

- ...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

The method described above is the ideal approach for the examination of a questioned document where the pool of possible writers is limited. In this example, when it is possible that either of two known individuals (Author A and Author B) could have been the writer of the questioned document. Through this method, one of them can be effectively identified and the other excluded.

592 These flow charts are based on Found & Rogers 2003: 20 and personal communications with Dr Found.
What will be assessed, therefore, is the probability of observing the dissimilar handwriting features (in comparison to known handwriting of W2) if W2 wrote BWV1127, over the probability of observing the dissimilar handwriting features (in comparison to known handwriting of W1) if W1 wrote BWV1127.

In terms of the case in question the specimens were taken from known sources of writers W1 and W2. The specimens illustrate the penmanship of both writers. Where possible, the same words have been examined, for example the word “Gott”. However, where this is not possible, words containing similar letter arrangements have been used.

Forensic Document Examiner’s comments on the word ‘Gott’

- It can clearly be seen in the word ‘Gott’, in the 12 examples of W2’s writing in Figure 1, that the allograph ‘G’ is structured consistently. Typically W2 end-loops the flattened, and angled, down-stroke to produce a ‘nose’ on the large upper ‘g’ loop, as shown in Figure 4.

The allograph ‘G’ on the left in Figure 5 is taken from W2 and juxtaposed to the comparable allograph associated with W1 on the right. Note the difference with respect to both structure and the pen movements, and that W1 does not add a loop to the large upper ‘g’ loop.

The allograph ‘G’ in Figure 6 is taken from the Questioned Document and shows features which are dissimilar to the allograph of W2 (see the comparable features in the allograph on the left in Figure 5). However, note the similarity in the construction of the allograph in the Questioned Document with W1, and the difference in the body of the allograph G compared to W2. (See Figure 5) In other words, W1’s allograph is more consistent with the G allograph in the Questioned Document than that of W2.
In Figure 3 it can be clearly seen, the vertical stroke in the double ‘tt’ allograph of writer W2 are typically formed from a pen-stroke that is angled to the right, double looped and executed in a single movement, and further, that the double ‘tt’s are crossed, consistently, in the upper third of the vertical (approximately) and have a strong right leaning slope. (See Figure 7)

However, W1’s double letter ‘tt’ is upright, is, typically, formed entirely by a single action pen-stroke. (See Figure 8)

In Figure 9 the double ‘tt’ of writers W1 and W2 are juxtaposed. It can be clearly seen that the execution of W2’s allograph is distinctly different from that of W1.
In Figure 10, the allographs from both the Questioned Document and W1 are juxtaposed clearly showing considerable consistency in execution.

![Figure 10](image)

- In Figure 3 it can be seen that W2’s allograph ‘o’ to allograph ‘t’ end-effector, typically enters the ‘t’ vertical below the ‘cross-bar’. (See Figure 11)

![Figure 11](image)

In Figure 3, above, it can be seen that the allograph ‘o’ to the allograph ‘t’ end-effector of W1, typically enters the ‘t’ vertical above the ‘cross-bar’. (See Figure 12)

![Figure 12](image)

In Figure 13, the allographs from both the Questioned Document and W1 are juxtaposed clearly showing considerable consistency in execution.

![Figure 13](image)

- When the whole words ‘Gott’, written by writers W1 and W2, are juxtaposed with the Question Document, as in Figure 14, overall, the word appears to be more in the style of W1 than in the style of W2.

![Figure 14](image)
The Application of the Williamson & Meenach ‘Cross-Check System’ Test

‘Slant Pattern’ analysis

Average slant angle = 83.1 degrees from the horizontal

Average slant angle = 83.0 degrees from the horizontal

Average slant angle = 65.7 degrees from the horizontal

‘Top & Bottom Letter Pattern’ analysis

Variance range in the ‘V’ = 20 degrees (60 – 80)

Variance range in the ‘V’ = 22 degrees (70 – 92)

Variance range in the ‘V’ = 50 degrees (60 – 110)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questioned Document</th>
<th>Samples of W1’s Handwriting</th>
<th>Samples of W2’s Handwriting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image9" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image10" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image11" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image12" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 15** - Examples of the word ‘ARIA’ and uppercase allograph ‘A’ taken from the questioned document and the specimens of W1 and W2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typical of Questioned</th>
<th>Typical of W1</th>
<th>Typical of W2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image13" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image14" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image15" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image16" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image17" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image18" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image19" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image20" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image21" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image22" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image23" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image24" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 16** - Examples of the individual allograph ‘A’ taken from the questioned document and the specimens of W1 and W2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><img src="image25" alt="Image" /></th>
<th><img src="image26" alt="Image" /></th>
<th><img src="image27" alt="Image" /></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image28" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image29" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image30" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image31" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image32" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image33" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image34" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image35" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image36" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 17** - Examples of the relationship between allographs taken from the questioned document and the specimens of W1 and W2.
Examiner’s comments on the word ‘Aria’ and the letter ‘A’

- In Figure 15, above, it can be seen that the allograph ‘A’ of W2 is typically formed by a single pen movement, via the arrow marks, as shown in Figure 18.

![Figure 18](image)

The juxtaposition of the allograph ‘A’ in the Questioned Document with the allograph ‘A’ of W1, as in Figure 19, shows that it is formed in the same manner, that is to say, typically in two distinct pen actions, as shown by the arrow marks.

![Figure 19](image)

- Figure 20 shows that execution of the allograph ‘a’ by W2 finishes with a definite upwards left curling tail.

![Figure 20](image)

Figure 21 shows that the allograph ‘a’ of W1 has a flattened tail. This is very similar in execution to the Questioned Document.

![Figure 21](image)

- When all three words are juxtaposed, as in Figure 22, in general appearance, W1’s execution of the word ‘Aria’ is more similar to that of the Questioned Document than that of W2.
Conclusion

In both the above cases, the execution of the words ‘Gott’ and ‘Aria’ by W1 is shown to be more similar to the Questioned Document than that of W2.

**IS THE HANDWRITING OF W1 IN THE QUESTIONED DOCUMENT?**

If it is hypothesised, on the basis of the above examination, that W1’s handwriting is present in the Questioned Document, then, based on the particular premise that …

*Only one person writes exactly the same way as the writer of the disputed material,* it should possible to re-construct some of the words in the Questioned Document, from the writings of W1 taken from elsewhere.

**Testing the Hypothesis using Reconstruction**

Via the following process, it is possible to further test the hypothesis that the handwriting of W1 is present in the document. The selected word for re-construction is: ‘Ritornello’. This word was chosen because it is the most complex word present, and it has a very a clear style.
Constructing an Alphabet

Figure 23, below, shows examples of the allographs in an incomplete alphabet of W1, alongside specimens of the same allographs taken from the Questioned Document. Some of the allographs are in ‘Old German Script’ (see Figure 24 below), others are in ‘French Script (see Figure 25, below), some of the allographs are given in both types of Script form, for example the allograph ‘d’; some are given in upper and lower-case, for example the allograph ‘G’ and ‘g’

**Figure 23**

**Figure 24** The ‘Kurrentschrift’, which is commonly known as “The Old German Script”
Stage 1. The word ‘Ritornello’, as shown above, is reconstructed using W1’s allograph taken from a known source.

Stage 2. The reconstructed word ‘Ritornello’ is converted to a black & white image to facilitate its re-sizing to approximately the same size as the word ‘Ritornello’ in the Questioned Document:

Stage 3. Using a pencil, the allographs ‘t’, ‘o’, ‘l’ and ‘r’ are over-written to simulate the over-writing and heavy pen-strokes in the Questioned Document:

Stage 4. The capital allograph ‘R’ is removed from both the original in the Questioned Document and the reconstructed example, revealing great similarity in execution of the lower-case allographs.
**Stage 5.** The capital allograph ‘R’ from the Questioned Document is used to replace the capital ‘R’ in the reconstruction

The Application of the Williamson & Meenach ‘Cross-Check System’ Test

‘Slant Pattern’ analysis

The Williamson & Meenach ‘Cross-Check System’ test confirms the great similarity in the execution of the word ‘Ritornello’.

**Examiner’s Comments**

It is clear that there is a definite and strong resemblance between the two writings of ‘Ritornello’. Some points of particular importance are as follows:

- The end-effector from the allograph ‘i’ to the ‘t’ is not reconstructed, but is formed of the actual end-effecters of the two allographs and demonstrates, therefore, the penmanship habits of W1.

- The end-effector of the ‘e’ to the ‘l’ is not reconstructed but is formed of the actual end-effector of the allograph ‘e’ and demonstrates, therefore, the penmanship habits of W1.

- The end-effector of the allograph ‘l’ to the ‘o’ is original; that is to say, it is not reconstructed; the two allographs were taken as a single unit and, therefore, demonstrate the penmanship habits of W1.
The only significant difference between the two writings is the capital allograph ‘R’ which, in the case of the simulation, is a better formed and more ornate allograph. When it is replaced by the capital ‘R’ from the Questioned Document, the words are strikingly similar, as shown:

![Ritornello]

It can, therefore, be concluded that the word ‘Ritornello’, written in the Questioned Document, is quite possibly, in the handwriting of W1.

**Testing for possible coincidence**

This could, of course, be a lucky coincidence, not withstanding the theory behind the use of the technique to examine the hypothesis. To check the conclusion of the presence of W1’s handwriting, further testing of this the hypothesis was undertaken as follows:
Fortunately, there is an example of the writing of W2, on a rare occasion, where the same words have been written out four times. See Figure 26. This also offers an opportunity to observe the writing habits of W2.

FIGURE 26
On the next page, in the same document, the same words as those of W2 are written in the handwriting of W1. See Figure 27

FIGURE 27
This fortuitous situation offers a number of opportunities; firstly, it presents an opportunity to compare the writings of the same words by the two writers. Secondly, it also offers an opportunity to observe, both the similarities and variations, in the manner in which W2 has written the words. The word ‘Gott’ has already been examined above, however, there are other uses of the same capital allograph ‘G’ observable in the writing in Figure 26. For example the word “Geistes” has been written four times. See Figure 26. On two occasions the capital ‘G’ uses exactly the same form of allograph as in the word ‘Gott’, previously discussed. See Figure 28
On two further occasions a similar form of uppercase ‘G’ has been used, though in a less obvious manner. See Figure 29

Figure 30 shows another example of the same consistent execution of the allographs in the word ‘ich’.

Likewise, in a similar mode, the word ‘ach!’ has been written in a consistent manner. See Figure 31

It should be noted, from these eight repetitions of the allograph ‘h’, that W2, executed the allograph ‘h’ as exampled in Figure 32.

There are an additional four occasions when the word ‘ich’ is written in this same work, using exactly the same ‘h’ form, giving twelve examples of its use in total.
W1 has also written the words ‘ich’ and ‘ach. See Figure 33

On the next page of the same document, W1 has written the word ‘ich’ on a further two occasions. See Figure 34

The use of the same ‘h’ formed, thus: can also be seen in the word ‘mich’. See Figure 35
However, elsewhere in the same source, in the aria “Schlummert ein, ihr matten Augen”, W1 uses an alternative ‘h’ form, on three occasions, for example in the word ‘ihr’. See Figure 36

Note also the execution of the double allograph ‘t’ in ‘matten’, compared with the double ‘tt’ in ‘Gott’ from page 3. See Figure 37

Ohn

In the Questioned Document the word ‘ohn’ is written, on four occasions, on the first page of the manuscript. See Figure 38 and page 1

The word ‘ohn’ is of particular interest and importance in this case, as it has been written using two forms of ‘h’. See Figure 39.

This use of both forms of ‘h’, as in ‘ohn’ and ‘ihn’, see Figure 40, is possibly a detectable habit of the writer.
It is worthy of note that the first of the pair of the allograph ‘h’ appears to be a corrupt form of the uppercase allograph ‘H’. See Figure 41 and Figure 24

**Testing the Hypothesis using Re-construction**

Using the technique, demonstrated previously, in a similar, but much less complex situation, the word ‘ohn’ from the Questioned Document, can be compared with the word ‘ohn’, reconstructed in W1’s handwriting, using allographs from the known source. The results are as shown (the reconstructed word is to the right of each pair), see Figure 42

**Re-construction using W2’s Allographs**

Interestingly, if the technique of re-construction is applied to examples of W2’s writing in the known source the result is as in Figure 43

**Re-construction using Allographs taken from other writings**

Figure 44 shows re-constructions from other sources: on the left, in the hand of another known scribe, on the right in an unknown hand.
By way of academic interest, the word ‘ohn’ can be reconstructed from the allographs in copybook-style given previously. See Figure 45

**FIGURE 45**

**W1’s Habits**

Importantly, there are a number of occasions when W1 uses both forms of ‘h’ within the same sentence, for example in the words ‘ich’, ‘nicht’, ‘mehr’ and ‘hier’ as in Figure 46.

**FIGURE 46**

This clearly suggests that the use of the two forms of ‘h’, in the same writings, was a habit of W1’s.

**A Reconstructed Non-sense Sentence**

The very strong similarity between the writing in the Questioned Document and W1’s writing, is well exampled, below, in a non-sense reconstructed ‘sentence’ written out using words in the handwriting of both the writer of the Questioned Document and W1. See Figure 47

**FIGURE 47**
Dating of the Sources

If the dating of the two source documents is correct, 1713 for the Questioned Document and 1725 for the known source, a period of at least twelve years separates the two writings.

Conclusion Regarding the Questioned Document - BW1127

On the balance of probabilities, it is my conclusion that the writer of the text in the BW1127 is more likely to be W1 than W2.
IS W1’S HANDWRITING IN THE 1713 CANON FOR 4 VOICES?

If the writer of BWV1127 is W1, then, according to Michael Maul, it is W1’s handwriting that is present in in Figure 48 BWV1073, the 1713 Canon for 4 Voices.593 Using the same procedure as previously described, if it is the case that W1’s handwriting is present in BWV1073, then it should be possible to demonstrate this in a similar manner to the preceding applying the same technique used to examine BWV1127, as follows:

Stage 1. The word Canon is reconstructed from letters in W1’s handwriting

Figure 48 BWV1073 the 1713 Canon for 4 Voices

Stage 2. The reconstructed word ‘Canon’ is converted to a black & white image to facilitate its re-sizing to approximately the same size as the word ‘Canon’ in BWV1073:

Stage 3. Using a pencil, the end-effecters are joined and the letters are over-written to simulate the heavy pen-strokes in BWV1073:

It is clear that the two writings, particularly after the comparison of the ‘Slant Patterns’, show remarkable similarity in execution.

Perpetuuo

Applying exactly the same process, as with the word ‘Canon’, the word ‘Perpetuuo’ (sic) can likewise be reconstructed, using letters taken from W1’s writing elsewhere in the 1725 Kalvierbüchlein. The similarity is most striking.

Figure 49

‘Bach’

An examination of the word ‘Bach’ reveals that the grapheme style is very similar to that of writer W1, see Figures 50, 51 and 52:
When the whole word is examined the similarity in style is very noticeable: the relationship of the letter ‘b’ to the letter ‘a’ and ill-formed letter ‘c’ as well as the end-effector from the letter ‘c’ to the letter ‘h’ is particularly worthy of note given that there is a separation of some 37 years between the writings (1713 to 1750 - assuming the date was written on the Canon at the time):

In the execution of the ‘A’, in an abbreviation for the word August, there are marked similarities with the execution of the ‘A’ in writer W1’s handwriting see Figure 53 (see also earlier the discussion on the structure of the letter ‘A’).
Figure 54 shows the execution of the numerals in the date ‘1713’ is very similar to the method of execution of the numerals in the writer W1’s handwriting, particularly the join between the number 1 and the adjacent number; note that both the numbers ‘1’ in the numeral eleven, have dots above them, and that there is a striking similarity in the execution of both the dots with the exemplar (the first being slightly oval shaped, with the pen stroke pulling to the right, and the second being a round dot) in writer W1’s handwriting. Also note the similarity of execution of the numerals ‘4’ and ‘2’, with the exemplar, to right of each pair.

The year ‘1713’ can be reconstructed, using W1’s writing, only to a point as in Figure 55. The truncated ‘7’ being originally the top part of the numeral ‘3’ in the numeral ‘13’ in Figure 54. However, when the ‘7’ from BWV1073 is substituted for the truncated numeral, it produces the result shown in Figure 56.

This is remarkably similar, in execution, to the original, see Figure 57.
Figure 58 shows other examples of graphemes executed in W1’s style compared with those found in BWV1073.

Note too that the slant of the grapheme ‘t’ and ‘g’ is virtually identical with the exemplars, at approximately 50 degrees from the horizontal.
Figure 59: Summary of the Forensic Document Examination of BWV1073, the Perpetual Canon for 4 Voices (1713)
Conclusion Regarding BWV1073

On the basis of the preceding examination, it can be concluded that W1’s handwriting is quite probably present in BWV1073, the *1713 Canon for 4 Voices*. However, there does appear to be evidence of contamination in the document; this evidence suggests that there are two writings present in BWV1073, and that the other writer is quite probably writer W2.

Overall Conclusions

In carrying out the above examination of BWV1127 two writers, W1 and W2, were clearly identified.

There does not appear to be any evidence that writer W2 was the writer of the text in BWV1127. This can be further demonstrated, as in Figure 60, through the examination of two samples of writer W2’s writings, in the *1725 Klavierbüchlein* and in BWV23 (the top two examples), and direct comparison made with BWV 1127 (the lowest example). It can be clearly seen that, for example, the word ‘Gott’, as examined previously, is executed, in the *1725 Klavierbüchlein* (BWV299) and in BWV23 in a manner quite different to the word ‘Gott’ in BWV1127 (the lowest example). There are other examples, such as the execution of the allograph ‘w’ and ‘h’, also discussed previously, which are consistent with each other in the *1725 Klavierbüchlein* and in BWV23 but inconsistent with BWV1127.
As previously demonstrated in the ‘reconstructed-sentence’ (repeated for convenience below in Figure 61), the evidence presented points strongly in the direction that writer W1 was the writer of BWV1127.

And, based on the words of David Ellen, quoted previously, the likelihood of two people possessing the same writing habits, particularly with reference, in this case, to the use of the two forms of ‘h’ as in ‘ohn’ as in Figure 62 is extremely small, so it is improbable that an additional third writer (W3) was involved.

Notwithstanding this point, the possibility that a third writer was involved cannot be totally discounted, therefore, no matter how likely it might be that W1 was the writer of BWV1127 and BWV1073, it cannot be said, with one hundred percent certainty, that W1 was the scribe involved. At the same time, it must be stressed that it is extremely unlikely that W2 was scribe in question.

The question then is who are W2 and W1? We are told, by scholars, that they are Johann Sebastian (W2) and Anna Magdalena (W1). If W1 is indeed Anna Magdalena, then it appears that her writing is in BWV1127 as well as BWV1073. This throws up a number of conundrums; most particularly, how can Anna Magdalena’s handwriting be present in two documents dated 1713?
If neither writer W1 or W2 was the scribe, who was writer W3? A possible candidate could well be Maria Barbara Bach. **This is very unlikely as W1’s writing habits have been defined using documents that post-date the deaths of both the writings of W2 and W3**

One other possibility is that our understanding of identity of writers W2 and W1 is not correct; that to say, it is actually Johann Sebastian’s writing that we usually assume to be Anna Magdalena’s and vice versa. Whilst this hypothesis supports the position of Michael Maul, i.e. that both BWV1127 and BWV1073 are in the hand of Johann Sebastian, if it were the case it would have very significant ramifications for Bach scholarship and would raise yet more questions about the origins of a great deal of the other manuscripts.