Italian Instructive Editions of The Well-Tempered Clavier: A Useful Resource for Performance Practice Studies

CHIARA BERTOGLIO

This article considers the utility and importance of instructive editions (IEs) for performance practice studies in the field of Bach interpretation at the piano. By ‘instructive edition’ I mean a particular edition of a musical work prepared for publication by a musician other than its composer, using different editing criteria from those used for Urtexts or critical editions. An IE should include the advice on performance elements which is generally missing from an Urtext’s normal sources and is likely to have been added by the editor; it may have pedagogical purposes as a help and/or substitute for traditional teaching; and its editor is normally a musician, rather than a musicologist, in most cases a concert pianist and/or piano teacher, often at a conservatory.

Although their use in music education may pose crucial problems,1 for example regarding the development of the student’s awareness in the field of notational contextualisation, IEs may profitably be studied as witnesses of past performance practice, alongside recordings, treatises, performers’ memories and annotated scores. In fact, an IE is a written record of its editor’s interpretive idea of the work, as well as, partially and consequently, of his/her time, epoch, style and school.2 IEs may also be objectively studied for the effects of their use, the influence they exerted in transmitting—and sometimes creating—traditions of

performance practices to subsequent generations.\(^\text{3}\) The role of IEs as witnesses to performance traditions is easier to study and to demonstrate; their influence on actual performances can mostly only be inferred, although the comparisons of IEs below will provide significant evidence of the transmission of performance elements from one edition to another.

This article presents, compares and discusses some Italian IEs of Bach’s *Well-Tempered Clavier* (WTC) from the viewpoint of performance practice history; its aim is not to find an ‘authentic’ version of the text, to establish the value of sources or to discuss textual problems, in the fashion of critical editing. In the case of Bach’s WTC, these problems have been thoroughly discussed elsewhere, and will continue to provoke musicological debate.\(^\text{4}\) Nor is the principal aim to discuss the ‘textual’ relationships among editions. Although this has already been done,\(^\text{5}\) an important aspect has often been neglected. In most cases, IEs have been evaluated by the same parameters as Urtexts and critical editions, principally

---


from the viewpoint of textual authenticity. This article studies IEs from the performer’s viewpoint: it examines how IEs can transmit information about past performance practices, and how they influence each other, from the particular perspective of interpretation conveyed through performance indications.

Italian Bach editions

Before discussing those features that are common to several Italian editors of the WTC, reflecting an ‘Italian’ approach to Bach performance, I will describe briefly the popularity of Bach in Italy. In eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Italy, appreciation of Bach’s works was mostly linked to specific individuals who fostered the circulation of manuscript copies and the promotion of private/semi-public performances. These admirers of Bach included Padre Martini in Bologna, Mayr in Bergamo, Landsberg in Rome, Lanza in Naples, and Rossini in Pesaro.

Notwithstanding the interest in Bach’s music shown by these professional and distinguished amateur musicians, Italian editions of Bach’s works appeared comparatively late and at first consisted largely of excerpts from collections or larger works: Table 1 lists the editions published in Italy to show the editorial history of the WTC in Italy until the first half of the twentieth century. Table 2 describes the other editions—either non-Italian editions of WTC or other works by Bach—that are referred to in this article.

A short observation should be added concerning the 1856 Naples edition. Vincenzo Vitale maintains that Sigismund Thalberg edited both the WTC and Clementi’s Gradus for the publishing house Stabilimento Musicales Partenopeo, formerly Eredi Girard, during his residence in Posillipo (1864–71). Stabilimento was founded by Bernardo Girard, a Swiss-born musician; in 1828 the French composer Guglielmo (Guillaume) Cottrau became a commercial partner of the company and consequently established a relationship with the French publishers Troupenaes, Latte and Launer. Although this supposed ‘Thalberg’ edition of the WTC is mentioned by Pugliese Carratelli and Lablache (following Vitale), no trace of it can be found either in library catalogues or in Stabilimento’s catalogues; the Thalberg Foundation in Naples has not been able to find any trace

---

6 Most of these editions fully qualify as IEs, as the editor’s interventions include added fingerings, expression, dynamic and sometimes metronome indications (since no copy of Lanza’s edition could be consulted, I am not in a position to make statements about its editing criteria). Limitations of space prevent a full discussion of each edition; for more details, cf. Bertoglio, ‘Instructive Editions of Bach’s Wohltémperiertes Klavier’, Chapter Six.


8 Therefore, this Girard should not be mistaken with the Girard (or Gérard) who owned a publishing house in Paris, which issued the WTC between 1839 and 1845. This edition was an offshoot of Czerny’s edition, bearing the inscription ‘revised by a committee of artists’. This ‘committee’ may have included Thalberg, of course, but it is unlikely that Vitale’s reference was to this publication.


10 Clarissa Lablache Cheer, The Great Lablache: Nineteenth Century Operatic Superstar: His Life and His Times (Bloomington: Xlibris, 2009), p. 505; here, however, the publisher’s name is misspelt as Giraud, and the other work supposedly edited by Thalberg is the Gradus ad Parnassum by Fux instead of that by Clementi, as correctly maintained by Vitale.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editors (abbreviations)</th>
<th>Title-Page Description</th>
<th>Publication Information</th>
<th>Works Included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stefano Golinelli</td>
<td><em>L’arte antica e moderna: scelta di composizioni: volume secondo</em></td>
<td>Milan: Ricordi, [1864], Pl.-No: 35137</td>
<td>WTC I/1-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edoardo Bix</td>
<td><em>Scelta sistematica e progressiva delle composizioni per pianoforte / di G. S. Bach. Corredate di note, diteggiatura, indicazioni di metronomo, etc., da Edoardo Bix</em></td>
<td>Scelta sistematica e progressiva delle composizioni per pianoforte di G. S. Bach, vol. II–III – Milan: Ricordi, [1874], Pl.-No: 43441, 43442</td>
<td>vol. II: WTC I/1-2, 4-7, 9-10, 16, 19, 21; WTC II/12 vol. III: WTC I/3, 8, 15, 18, 22; WTC II/1, 4, 6, 11, 13, 17, 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Czerny</td>
<td><em>Le Clavecin bien tempéré ou Préludes et Fugues dans tous les tons et demi-tons sur les modes majeurs et mineurs / par Jean Sebastien Bach. Edition nouvelle soigneusement revue, corrigée et doigtée ainsi que pourvue de notifications sur l’exécution et sur les mesures des temps (d’après le métronome de Maelzel) et accompagnée d’une préface / par Charles Czerny</em></td>
<td>Milan: Ricordi, [1892], Pl.-No: 95452, 95453</td>
<td>WTC I + II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>PL-No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Boekelman</td>
<td>Otto fughe dal Clavecin bien tempéré / di J. S. Bach. Con esposizioni analitiche in colore ed annessi schemi armonici per cura di Bern. Boekelman</td>
<td>Milan: Ricordi, 1894-5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruno Mugellini (Mugellini 1908)</td>
<td>Il clavicembalo ben temperato / Johann Sebastian Bach. Edizione critico-tecnica a cura di Bruno Mugellini</td>
<td>Milan: Carisch, 1908, PL-No: 22001, 22002</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editors (abbreviations)</td>
<td>Title-Page Description</td>
<td>Publication Information</td>
<td>Works Included</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Tausig (Tausig 1869)</td>
<td><em>Das wohltemerirte Clavier. Ausgewählte Präludien und Fugen / J. S. Bach. Bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Carl Tausig mit einem Vorwort von Louis Ehlert</em></td>
<td>Berlin: M Bahn, [1869], Pl.-No: 2500</td>
<td>WTC I/1–6, 8, 10–11, 13, 15, 21–22; WTC II/1, 4, 6, 10–12, 18, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Francis Tovey (Tovey 1924)</td>
<td><em>Forty-Eight Preludes and Fugues / J. S. Bach. Edited by Donald Francis Tovey, fingered by Harold Samuel</em></td>
<td>London: The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music, 1924, Pl.-No: A.B.99; A.B.100</td>
<td>WTC I + II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of it either. We are forced to conclude, therefore, that (contrary to legend) it is unlikely that the Thalberg edition ever existed.

However, Stabilimento did issue both the WTC and Clementi’s Gradus in an edition by Francesco Lanza.\(^\text{11}\) Evidence of Lanza’s interest in Bach’s music is demonstrated by his composition of twenty-four ‘pedagogical preludes’ in all major and minor keys\(^\text{12}\) as a part of his method for the piano. Unfortunately, no copy of Lanza’s edition of the WTC has been found, although exemplars of his Gradus still survive.\(^\text{13}\) It is therefore quite possible that Vitale erroneously attributed Lanza’s edition to Thalberg.\(^\text{14}\)

In the remainder of this article I will focus on later editions; namely those by Busoni,\(^\text{15}\) Mugellini,\(^\text{16}\) Casella/Piccioli\(^\text{17}\) and Montani.\(^\text{18}\) I will compare their versions of the Prelude and Fugue 8 of WTC I with the BGA’s text, which was their reference text and formed the basis for their editorial additions. My concern is not with the authenticity of the IEs’ text,\(^\text{19}\) but rather with the interpretive approach conveyed by the editors’ additions to the given text. These will be superimposed in different colours on the BGA, showing the similarities and differences between IEs.

The editors and their editions

Bruno Mugellini (1871–1912), a celebrated pianist and conductor, edited the WTC in 1908 for both Carisch and Breitkopf.\(^\text{20}\) Two years later, he was asked to

---
\(^\text{11}\) I am particularly grateful to Professor Francesca Seller (Conservatory of Salerno) for her help on this point.
\(^\text{12}\) Cf. Francesco Lanza, La Scuola del Pianoforte nel Conservatorio di Napoli: 24 preludi in tutti i toni maggiori e minori (Naples: Stabilimento Musicale Partenopeo and Antica Casa Girard, 1874).
\(^\text{13}\) For example in the Library of the Conservatory ‘San Pietro a Majella’ in Naples, SBN identification code IT\(\backslash\)ICCU\(\backslash\)NAP\(\backslash\)0364162.
\(^\text{15}\) Busoni 1894; Busoni 1916.
\(^\text{16}\) Mugellini 1908.
\(^\text{17}\) Casella/Piccioli. Giuseppe Piccioli, a former student of Casella, added several modifications and changes to Casella 1946.
\(^\text{18}\) Montani 1952.
cooperate with Busoni and Petri on the so-called ‘Busoni Ausgabe’ (BA).\textsuperscript{21} It should be emphasised that, although the title-pages of many volumes of the BA mention Petri’s and Mugellini’s cooperation, this edition is a collective work only inasmuch as the three editors each contributed individual volumes. Busoni’s edition of WTC I had been published by Schirmer (1894–95) in English; German versions were issued both by Fr. Hofmeister in Leipzig (following an agreement with Schirmer) and by Universal Edition in Vienna.\textsuperscript{22} At first, Breitkopf suggested that their publication of Mugellini’s edition of WTC should be incorporated within the BA; however, Busoni argued that no collection of Bach’s keyboard works under his own name could include a WTC edition by another musician.\textsuperscript{23} Only in 1910 did Mugellini actually begin his cooperation with the BA, on Busoni’s suggestion,\textsuperscript{24} and the WTC edition of the BA is by Busoni himself in 1916.\textsuperscript{25}

After Mugellini’s untimely death in 1912, Breitkopf feared that publication of the BA would be interrupted and asked Busoni to divide the works originally assigned to Mugellini between Petri and himself in order to issue eighteen volumes of the edition as soon as possible. Busoni was not enthusiastic about this proposal, since he was more interested in composition at that time; nevertheless, after prolonged discussion, it was agreed that Busoni and Petri would complete the work, but—as compensation—Breitkopf would also publish Busoni’s Bach arrangements and elaborations.\textsuperscript{26} This was to be the ‘Bach-Busoni. Gesammelte Ausgabe’ (BBGA), which was published by Breitkopf & Härtel in six volumes in 1916. The seventh volume was added in 1920. This edition comprises the two volumes of the WTC plus five other volumes of transcriptions, arrangements and compositions after Bach.\textsuperscript{27}

Of the twenty-five volumes of the BA, only nine were edited by Busoni;\textsuperscript{28} his supervision of the remainder was very limited. To Vianna da Motta’s enquiries about the extent of Petri’s and Mugellini’s cooperation with Busoni for their

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{22} However, Busoni claimed in his letter dated 14 June 1910 that the Universal Edition had been issued ‘behind his back’. See Eva Hanau (ed.), Ferruccio Busoni im Briefwechsel mit seinem Verlag Breitkopf & Härtel (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 2012), vol. I, p. 418, letter 556.
  \item \textsuperscript{23} See his letter dated 17 February 1913 repr. in Hanau (ed.), Ferruccio Busoni im Briefwechsel, vol. I, p. 572, letter 757.
  \item \textsuperscript{25} Giannetti, ‘Il Clavicembalo ben temperato’, p. 51.
  \item \textsuperscript{26} Cf. Weindel (ed.), Ferruccio Busoni, pp. 368–9. Since Petri’s enthusiasm for editing was particularly scanty, as the letters show, it seems slightly unfair that he had to pay for Busoni’s publications with his share of editing.
  \item \textsuperscript{27} Weindel (ed.), Ferruccio Busoni, pp. 346–7. Cf. the letters between Busoni and Breitkopf & Härtel, February/December 1913.
  \item \textsuperscript{28} I.e. vols. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16 and 18.
\end{itemize}
‘joint’ edition, Busoni replied that he claimed no right to Petri’s work, and that each one of the three editors was the only one responsible for the pieces he had edited. Busoni added that the larger print adopted for his own surname on the title-page was a ‘trick’ of the publisher. Moreover, some letters from Busoni to Petri (1916–17) demonstrate that Busoni did not see Petri’s editions before they were printed.

The long time which elapsed between Busoni’s editions of WTC I and WTC II is just one of the discontinuities between the two volumes. The former had in fact the objective of providing a kind of a school of piano technique, with added studies and exercises which ‘surpass what is necessary to play Bach’, the latter dealt rather with compositional technique (or ‘mechanism’, as Busoni once wrote). Fingering and technical suggestions are very rarely found in Busoni’s edition of WTC II, whereas it has ‘richer material as concerns compositional and aesthetic information’.

The elements of proximity between Busoni and Czerny have often been pointed out. Although Busoni appreciated both Kroll’s and Bischoff’s editions, Giannetti’s most direct source of inspiration is Czerny’s. For Carruthers, ‘more than remnants of Czerny’s style are evident’ in Busoni’s edition, and he ‘adopts and even amplifies some of Czerny’s suggestions’.


Beirão (ed.), Ferruccio Busoni, José Vianna da Motta, p. 125, letter from Busoni to Vianna da Motta, 8 June 1917.

Cf. Busoni’s letters to Petri (5 October 1916 and 11 July 1917 respectively). Moreover, once Breitkopf & Härtel asked Busoni to translate into Italian some footnotes to Petri’s editions, but without sending him either the edited score, or the musical references/examples to which Petri’s commentaries referred. Cf. Weindel (ed.), Ferruccio Busoni, p. 260.

There has been a wide-spread misunderstanding among Busoni scholars that Breitkopf published the Busoni edition of WTC I in 1894, the confusion originating from the dates given in both the preface and the copyright statement on p. 2 of the Breitkopf edition claiming the use of Schirmer’s text. The actual publication date of 1916 can be established from studying the series number of Edition Breitkopf (4301), plate number (27451), an entry in Hofmeister’s Monatsbericht (June 1916) and a letter from Breitkopf & Härtel to Busoni dated 10 August 1916 that notifies the shipment of a bound copy of WTC I to him. Hanau (ed.), Ferruccio Busoni im Briefwechsel, vol. II, p. 158, letter 1145. Note that Busoni’s WTC II volume was published in 1916 for the first time by Breitkopf & Härtel as part of BA.


Giannetti, ‘Il Clavicembalo ben temperato’, p. 53. For Vianna da Motta, Czerny’s edition was the ‘botching’ invariably brought to piano lessons by students; he therefore complained about the unavailability of Busoni’s edition in French. Beirão (ed.), Ferruccio Busoni, José Vianna da Motta, p. 82, letter from José Vianna da Motta to Busoni, 26 September 1916.

Busoni’s Bach editions are part of the Czerny/Tausig tradition, of which Busoni is both a ‘qualified continuer and [an] innovator’.39 Levy expresses a similar opinion: for him, Busoni’s understanding of Bach’s keyboard music is based on his perception of a chain of tradition linking Bach to Beethoven, Beethoven (via Czerny) to Liszt and hence to Wagner, and finally, Liszt and Wagner to Busoni himself, and to the pianism of his own time. 40

The most important similarity between Czerny and Busoni, in my opinion, is their quest for a truly pianistic rendition of Bach’s works,41 seeking a middle way between excessive objectivity and subjectivity42 and aiming at an interpretation for listeners, for the audience. For Bottoni, the difference in style between Czerny’s and Busoni’s editions represents an evolution rather than a revolution: ‘[Busoni’s] indications suggest the same interpretive ideals, although they are made extreme’.43 In my opinion, this is a slightly simplistic statement. Indeed, both Busoni and Czerny share the concept of a public rendition of the WTC;44 nevertheless, their opinions differ on how to realise an enhancement of Bach’s effect in public performance: Busoni’s codas are mostly in f whereas Czerny prefers ritardando and piano.45 Another important difference lies in Czerny’s extensive use of legato, whereas Busoni was the first to use frequently the expression ‘non troppo legato’.46

Busoni’s edition finds justification for its interpretive choices in the score and in its analysis. It is not mere objectivity, since the analysis is partially subjective in turn—and in contrast to Riemann47—both analysis and creative interpretation coexist in Busoni. Thus his interpretations anticipated many discoveries of the authenticity movement: for example, Busoni’s treatment of rhythm and dynamics was much straighter than Leschetizky’s,48 and Busoni’s IE was appreciated by Albert Schweitzer49 and Ralph Kirkpatrick,50 two musicians whose approach to baroque performance was radically different from his own.

47 Rattalino, Ferruccio Busoni, pp. 82–3; Busoni’s edition is ‘lively’, Riemann’s is ‘tiresome’.
49 Schweitzer appreciated Busoni’s editions, as his ‘interpretation’ of the works, although their respective ideas on ‘the permissible limits of modernisation of Bach’s music’ were different.
Although Busoni’s editions were not as frequently used as others in Italy, they were enormously influential on subsequent Italian IEs, as the graphical analyses show. Later editors often admitted their appreciation of Busoni’s edition: for Casella, it ‘dominates’ all other editions and Busoni’s interpretive suggestions were largely transferred into Casella’s edition. It is also interesting to observe that the quantity of shared indications between Busoni’s and Mugellini’s editions changes substantially between WTC I and WTC II: Mugellini’s WTC I was in fact published after Busoni’s, whereas Busoni’s WTC II was issued after Mugellini’s death. The influence of Riemann’s theories and graphic solutions is recognisable in Mugellini’s (and Busoni’s) occasional rebarring of Bach’s original scoring.

In the WTC edition by Alfredo Casella (1883–1947), which was one of the most used in Italy during the twentieth century, the interpretive concept is indebted to Busoni’s, whereas the notes are (declaredly) taken from the BGA. Casella believed this to be ‘infallible’ and ‘perfect as regards authenticity’, making therefore his own edition ‘irreproachable [... in this respect’. Casella often used pre-existing Urtexts as the basis for his additions, partly because the absence of added indications left space (even from the physical viewpoint) for his own remarks.


53 In his letter to Petri of 12 April 1915, Busoni states that he consulted Riemann’s edition ‘out of scruple’ while preparing his own edition of WTC II, and that it ‘enthralled’ him. However, he added a German equivalent of ‘the higher you climb the harder you fall’. Weindel (ed.), *Ferruccio Busoni*, p. 237.

54 Giannetti ‘Il Clavicembalo ben temperato’, pp. 25 and 27.


57 ‘Preface’ in Casella 1946. When Giuseppe Piccoli edited a reprint (with his own metronome indications) of Casella’s WTC IE in 1955, he added that the text had been ‘compared with the original edition of the Bach-Gesellschaft and in certain places with Altnickol’s manuscript copies. Therefore, no doubt about its authenticity’.

Indeed, for Casella the BGA could be used for performance only by ‘fully mature musicians’.\(^5^9\) Bach’s ‘mere text’ was ‘evidently insufficient’ for the students (and for most teachers, apparently);\(^6^0\) it had therefore to be ‘equipped’ with editorial indications, which are ‘indispensable for a pupil’s studies’;\(^6^1\) among them, fingering, ornamentation, pedalling, dynamics and expression indications.

With regard to performance elements, Casella did not wish to add too many dynamic marks: in Bach, he stated, these are determined by ‘architecture’ and not by ‘sentiment’ as in Beethoven.\(^6^2\) On the other hand, Casella deplored the misleading pedalling indications of ‘popular editions’, and not their presence per se: ‘precise’ pedalling indications are the ‘starting point for flying on one’s own wings’, and the ban of pedalling from Bach performance on the piano is a ‘false tradition’.\(^6^3\)

For Casella, Bach’s works were the best training for legato, as in no other music had the legato style a comparable ‘function, expressivity and eloquence’,\(^6^4\) and the aim of his IE’s fingering was to be ‘complete and such as to make a perfect organ-like legato’.\(^6^5\) Therefore, and rather paradoxically, legato indications are not numerous in his edition: since the ‘legato style […] always predominates in Bach [and] is self-evident’, the editor suppressed many slurs for the sake of readability.\(^6^6\)

Indeed, Casella admitted that this ideal legato could be obtained with the help of pedalling: ‘therefore, much freer fingerings become possible, with fingers strictly adhering to the melody’s phrasing requirements’.\(^6^7\) Nonetheless, in his IE, the editor’s fingering is ‘deliberately arduous and pedagogical’,\(^6^8\) since it has the educational objective of providing a phrasing model. Similarly, Casella showed through fingerings the ‘correct’ realisation of ornaments, although on very empiric criteria (since tradition is ‘dim’, ‘living art’ should be favoured to ‘cold and hypothetic archaeology’):\(^6^9\) the editor’s duty is to leave neither ‘uncertainty’ nor ‘excuses’ to students using his edition.\(^7^0\)

For the purposes of this article, however, a further element of Casella’s fingering approach should be pointed out. In the ‘Preface’ to his WTC, he admits that ‘most of this fingering is similar to Busoni’s’, adding that it is also his ‘own

---


\(^{6^0}\) ‘Preface’, in Casella (ed.), *Sonate per pianoforte di L. van Beethoven*.

\(^{6^1}\) ‘Preface’, in Casella 1946. Scalvati remarks that Casella’s IEs are rather ‘didactical’ than ‘interpretive’, since they are useful for both ‘teacher and student’, and both on ‘the pedagogic and the aesthetic field’: Scalvati, ‘Alfredo Casella revisore e le edizioni Curci’, p. 26.


\(^{6^3}\) This and the preceding quotations are taken from Casella, *Il pianoforte*, p. 135.


\(^{6^5}\) ‘Preface’, in Casella 1946.

\(^{6^6}\) ‘Preface’, in Casella 1946b.

\(^{6^7}\) Casella, *Il pianoforte*, p. 143.

\(^{6^8}\) Scalvati, ‘Alfredo Casella revisore e le edizioni Curci’, p. 27.

\(^{6^9}\) ‘Preface’, in Casella 1946b.

personal fingering, resulting from years of experience’. This statement is highly significant: as a pianist, Casella was so influenced by Busoni’s edition that the fingerings it suggests became his own; later they passed into his own edition. Casella’s statement demonstrates how IEs may influence performance and even the creation of subsequent IEs. It should be mentioned that Casella’s edition enjoyed its greatest success in a later reprint with additions by his student Giuseppe Piccioli. In Piccioli’s words, his interventions consist ‘only in certain practical details’, including the realisation of embellishments and the insertion of metronome markings ‘following the best German tradition’. Piccioli also claims to have ‘confronted … again’ the text with ‘the original edition of the Bach-Gesellschaft and in certain places [] with Altnikol’s manuscript’.

On the other hand, the pianist, teacher and editor Pietro Montani (1895–1967) had a very different approach to editing. His criteria are highly subjective, as stated in his own ‘Preface’ to the WTC: his edition is the result of ‘personal experience’ in consultation with the ‘best-known Bach experts’. All elements of editing were ‘compared’ with the ‘original’ (Montani does not explain what he means by ‘original’) and ‘eventually established according to the least questionable aesthetic and pedagogical rules’, a statement which may simply mean that the editor’s taste had the last word.

This was not uncommon, of course; however, the most problematic aspect of Montani’s edition is its terminological ambiguity. In the editor’s words, it is free from the ‘usual sea of dynamic and agogic signs, footnotes […] and descriptive affectations such as swaying, pensive, affettuoso’, mirroring the modern Urtext trend. He continues by stating that the original text needs the addition of nothing but ‘proven fingerings, precise tempo and metronome indications, well-considered phrasing and what is really necessary for a good school’ which is a very long list for an edition with Urtext ambitions, especially since Montani’s text is actually very unreliable.

Montani aimed at a ‘neutral edition’, which could suit both pianists and harpsichordists without ‘preventing personal interpretation’ as other IEs did; users of his edition were given a ‘frame’ within which to exploit the peculiar resources of their instrument. From the interpretive viewpoint, Montani had a rationalistic concept of Bach, claiming that Bach’s ‘abstractedness […] avoids any sensory gratification’ in dynamics, and that ‘every good drawing has the right colour inside itself’, which accounts for Bach’s ‘supremely intellectual sound geometry’.

72 Piccioli’s ‘Preface’ to Casella/Piccioli.
73 Montani 1952, p. i.
76 Perhaps Montani was quoting the Italian artist De Pisis here; cf. Filippo De Pisis, All’ombra delle modelle in fiore, available online at archiviostorico.corriere.it/2001/giugno/30/PISIS_All_ombra_delle_modelle_co_0_01063011040.shtml (accessed 13 October 2013).
Prelude and Fugue n. 8 (WTC I)

In order to highlight the relationships between different IEs of the same work, all added indications by the four editors under analysis are quoted on the BGA’s text (see Figures 1–4): this allows immediate comparison and—sometimes—the identification of tradition genealogies.

The following graphs and tables provide a short summary of some data gathered from the graphical analyses: a detailed discussion is available in my dissertation. Table 3 and Graph 1 relate the tempo and metronome indications found in the IEs with those resulting from Scarpellini Pancrazi’s and Palmer’s comparisons:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Prelude Absolute or average value</th>
<th>Range limit</th>
<th>Fugue Absolute or average value</th>
<th>Range limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mugellini 1908</td>
<td>[84] (42 for the minim)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casella 1946</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montani 1952</td>
<td>[116] (58 for the minim)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarpellini</td>
<td>(ca. 95.2)</td>
<td>72-116</td>
<td>(ca. 70.5)</td>
<td>54-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer: Harpsichordists</td>
<td>(ca 86.8)</td>
<td>72-96</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>48-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer: Pianists</td>
<td>(ca. 63.4)</td>
<td>50-80</td>
<td>(63.4)</td>
<td>56-72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Metronomic ranges for Prelude and Fugue 8, WTC I

Graph 1: Metronomic ranges for Prelude and Fugue 8, WTC I

As shown by the tempo comparisons, rather predictably, metronomic tempi in recordings made by harpsichordists are normally quicker than in those realised by pianists; surprisingly, tempi in IEs are even quicker.

---


79 The reasons for this predictability are (a) acoustical (the sound vanishes more quickly on the harpsichord and therefore very slow tempi cannot be applied) and (b) cultural (although pianists might decide to choose quicker tempi to pay homage to historically informed performance, their knowledge in this field is normally inferior to the harpsichordists’).
Figure 1: Bach, WTC I, Prelude 8, page 1
Figure 2: Bach, WTC I, Prelude 8, page 2
Figure 3: Bach, WTC I, Fugue 8, page 1
Figure 4: Bach, WTC I, Fugue 8, page 2
As concerns the interpretive style, Hamilton rightly points out how this Prelude brings Busoni’s theories to a contradiction: whereas he seemed to be a ‘complete opponent of the striving after cantabile effects’ in his discussion of Prelude 6 of WTC I, in this instance he goes so far as to state that ‘the soprano ought fairly to “sing”’. Casella’s passionate remarks try to convey the editor’s admiration for and concept of this piece through superlatives (‘sublime’, ‘complete and perfect’) and examples taken from other cultural fields—philosophy, religion (‘mystical and religious atmosphere’; a ‘biblical’ procession), visual art (‘Grecian’ purity of lines, Giotto’s ‘Descent from the Cross’ at Padua’s Scrovegni chapel) and theatre (‘tragedy’ of the ‘unusual and gloomy key’, ‘pathetic and dramatic recitation’).

In the four editions under analysis, trills and mordents are almost always realised from the main note; however, the peculiar musical qualities of this Prelude, which was very often seen as an anticipation of romanticism, may have fostered romanticised interpretations in a much earlier work (Busoni mentioned Chopin explicitly in his remarks to this Prelude). The Fugue is transposed by all but Mugellini into E-flat minor; for Busoni, it is the most important of the first eight of WTC I and possibly of the entire first volume. Casella’s commentary is descriptive and reveals the editor’s agreement with a ‘teleological’ concept of the Fugue, oriented ‘towards the final catharsis’. This concept inspires Casella’s dynamic choices, as the ‘one real forte of the piece is only reached in the final thematic synthesis (bar 77ff.’): the ‘catharsis’ must be draped with adequate solemnity. Curiously, in a contrapuntal work such as a fugue Casella suggests stressing ‘the Wagnerian chord’ (bar 83), which ‘gives one a glimpse, in the germ, of the scene of the Norns in the Prologue to the Göttterdammerung (which is both an anachronistic and a harmonic concept).

---

82 Busoni 1894, p. 48. Cf. Tovey, for whom one should not approach Bach through Czerny and Clementi but rather through Mozart and Chopin, because the only other way to phrase Bach naturally is to sing it. ‘Preface’, in Tovey 1924.
83 ‘Preface’ to Prelude 8 of WTC I in Casella 1946.
84 Mugellini 1908, bb. 14 and 29; Mugellini 1908 and Montani 1952, b. 19: from the upper note.
85 For Casella, it would be a ‘pointless trouble’ for the student were the piece printed in the original key (‘Preface’ to Fugue 8, WTC I, in Casella 1946).
86 Casella quotes Busoni’s statement, but imprecisely translates Busoni’s ‘Heft’ as ‘volume’: volume I (WTC I) of Busoni’s edition was issued in four separate booklets. Busoni actually states that Fugue 8 of WTC I was ‘the most important in the volume − perhaps in the whole volume 1’ (die bedeutendste des Heftes und vielleicht des ganzen ersten Bandes überhaupt). Busoni 1916, p. 50.
88 ‘Preface’ to Fugue 8, WTC I, in Casella 1946.
The expressive quality of this Prelude and Fugue encouraged the addition of many interpretive indications by the editors, as summarised in Table 4 and Graph 2. Dynamic trends are shown in Graph 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Tempo</th>
<th>Dynamics</th>
<th>Slurs</th>
<th>Articulation</th>
<th>Pedal/1c</th>
<th>Expression</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Busoni 1894</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mugellini 1908</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casella/Piccioli</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montani 1960</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Number of added indications in Prelude and Fugue 8, WTC I

In Busoni, almost all melodic fourths and fifths have *appoggiatos*, especially but not exclusively in the subject, these intervals therefore acquire a motivic value. In bar 39, left hand (lh), he highlights the characterising fourth (Figure 5).

Figure 5: Bach, WTC I, Fugue 8, bar 39 (Busoni)

---

This introduces a fourth part in the texture and produces an odd syncopation; however, it makes clear the thinly disguised inversion of the answer, already identified in his analysis. At the end (bar 86ff.) he doubles the bass in lower octaves, adding a chordal filling in the last bar: this combination with ff and allargando produces a powerful, effective and Busonian conclusion. His phrasing, sometimes hardly realisable, is, however, consistently deduced from formal analysis.

Mugellini always highlights the subject with slurs (except at bar 36), both to help with visualisation of the form and for musical reasons: his slurring of WTC Fugues is always abundant, corresponding to the shared concept of Bach’s polyphony as the best training in legato. His slurs cross often (because of the coincidence of concluding and starting notes), resulting in a continuous legato. Casella/Piccioli’s slurs are similarly numerous, but much shorter and more articulated.

### Comparing IEs

The most interesting contribution of graphical analyses to the study of performance practice trends comes from the attempt to trace the IEs’ influence on each other. When identical or very similar indications are present, it is likely that an IE became a model for the others, or that there is a general consensus about that detail (determination of the correct option is not always possible). Similar verbal expressions are symptomatic of interdependence:

![Slur Example](image)

Figure 6: Bach, WTC I, Fugue 8, bar 1 - Dynamics

Mugellini and Montani’s senza coloriti (an uncommon expression) corresponds to Casella/Piccioli’s incolore; Busoni’s mezza voce is ‘quoted’ by Casella/Piccioli (sotto voce).

---

90 Other textual variants, more important for philology but less relevant for the study of performance style and interpretation: at b. 30, rh, Busoni changes Bach’s B (=C-flat) into B-sharp (C), following Czerny’s edition (this variant is not cited in Philippsborn, ‘Die Frühdrücke der Werke Johann Sebastian Bachs’). At b. 48 Busoni and Casella (as an ossia) follow the autograph’s reading (possibly through Czerny’s edition), whereas the other editors follow the textual variant adopted in the BGA. For a thorough discussion, cf. Philippsborn, ‘Die Frühdrücke der Werke Johann Sebastian Bachs’, pp. 124–8.


93 Similarly, both Busoni and d’Albert used the word ‘flebile’ for Prelude 22 in WTC I: this is a rather uncommon word even among Italian native speakers, and it is very rarely found as a
Here too (Figure 7) Casella/Piccioli simply translate Busoni’s German indication, making their connection clear; although only general agreement can be assumed, it is also determined by performance tradition.

In Figure 8 the light nuance is unsurprising, and so is the cantabile/all-legato understanding of the soprano’s melody (especially in the early twentieth century). Sometimes the situation is debatable, and editors’ interdependence hard to define; some help may come from quantitative comparisons. To this end, the Prelude and Fugue were thoroughly analysed to establish which indications were shared and by whom. In doubtful cases, for example:

appoggiatos (−) and accents (>) were considered as non-identical, although this does not exclude Mugellini’s possible influence on Montani (Figure 9).

Data regarding editorial additions are very different for the Prelude and the Fugue, although some common elements recur. Moreover, three performance elements are present in the Prelude but missing in the Fugue: pedalling (only in Busoni and Mugellini), realised embellishments, and added arpeggios.

Although the Fugue is twice as long as the Prelude (87 rather than 40 bars), they have similar numbers of indications on tempo and expression. Slurs and articulation are very dissimilar: 68 slurs and 62 articulations in the Prelude, 156 and 192 in the Fugue. This is typical of all-legato, organ-like polyphony, particularly unsurprising in a cantabile fugue like this. Articulation is functional to musical indication. As regards the possible influence of Busoni on Bartók, cf. Somfai, ‘Nineteenth-Century Ideas Developed in Bartók’s Piano Notation’ (e.g. p. 195); cf. Denijs Dille, ‘Dokumente über Bartóks Beziehungen zu Busoni’, in Dokumenta Bartókiana, 2 (Mainz: Schott, 1965), pp. 62–76.

polyphonic clearness: it marks the subject, or highlights the conclusion of long phrasing, besides indicating interesting details for students, such as imitations or syncopations in hidden voices (Figure 10).

![Figure 10: Bach, WTC I, Fugue 8, bars 21–22, Busoni (above) and Casella (below)—coloured rectangles added](image)

It should be pointed out, however, that Busoni consistently highlights both ‘motivic’ intervals of the subject, whereas Casella normally adds *appoggiato* marks only on the subject’s syncopation, which is also the summit of the ascending interval.

The Prelude has more dynamics (97) than the Fugue (53), perhaps due to its perceived expressiveness (the Fugue requires more sobriety); dynamic differentiation of polyphony was entrusted more to *appoggiatos* than to dynamics, as seen here in the alto subject:

![Figure 11: Bach, WTC I, Fugue 8, bar 27–8, Busoni](image)

Data analysis\(^95\) shows Casella/Piccioli’s large (and declared) debt towards Busoni: 63 identical indications in the Prelude (11 slurs, 10 articulations, and 19 dynamics), 79 in the Fugue (43 slurs, 24 articulations). Mugellini and Montani share 17 slurs and 9 dynamics (Prelude) and 13 articulations (Fugue).

Busoni’s edition of WTC I is the only one in which pedalling is indicated frequently in the Preludes, although Prelude 8 is rather exceptional even for his standards—this piece is one of the few to have pedal indications in Mugellini.\(^96\)

Agogic alterations are rare and always connected with formal elements (in most

\(^95\) See Bertoglio, ‘Instructive Editions of Bach’s Wohltemperirtes Klavier’: Tables A25–A27 and Graph A17, pp. 327–8 for the Prelude; Tables A29–A31 and Graph A18, pp. 334–5 for the Fugue.

\(^96\) Casella explicitly admits this possibility, and not only for ‘musical’ reasons. Cf. Casella, *Il pianoforte*, p. 143.
cases *ritenutos* towards the end of pieces, although sometimes editors explicitly forbade them (at climaxes, cadential passages, or at section changes in fugues etc.). The Prelude’s ‘romantic’ quality fosters a more flexible treatment of tempo, especially in the older editions.

Symmetry is always favoured over variety for articulation and phrasing: elements with the same structural function must always be performed in the same manner. Mugellini ensures this by simply covering repeated elements with long slurs; Casella/Piccoli’s subtler and shorter phrasing and slurring are constantly repeated, for example at each fugue subject entry. However, the main articulation or phrasing is often combined with optional *appoggio* or *marcato* indications. Variety was rather created through dynamics and (rarely) agogic, sometimes strictly determined by the piece’s form (climaxes or section changes) and sometimes only by the editor’s creativity. Dynamics louder than *mf* are indicated more often, perhaps to emphasise climactic passages (Graph 4).

![Graph 4: Distribution of dynamics in Prelude and Fugue 8 of WTC I](image)

Realisations of ornaments are arbitrary and irregular: Busoni’s are quick and rich, starting mostly with auxiliary notes; Casella/Piccoli’s are slow and rhythmically regular; Montani prefers short and quick mordents with stops and syncopations. Sometimes realisations are rather pedantic, using irregular groups (such as triplets) in a binary context, without suggesting the possibility of a more flexible performance. In many cases, however, editors did suggest starting embellishments from the principal note.

---

97 As Scarpellini Pancrazi points out, Busoni (and Casella: probably not by chance!) prescribes *ritardandos* at the end of almost half the pieces in WTC I, whereas Mugellini does so in ‘most’ cases and Montani in ‘precisely’ half of the pieces. Busoni and Casella (paired again…), plus Montani, further enhance this effect with *forte* or *crescendo* conclusions. Cf. Scarpellini, ‘Edizioni a confronto’, pp. 142, 160, 151 and 168.

All this demonstrates the unquestionable influence of Busoni’s IE on the later editions, both explicitly (for example, the statements about fingering in Casella’s preface) and implicitly (transfer of indications from his IE to the later ones). However, many interesting features of his interpretation were progressively reduced to a standard Bach performance: subtly differentiated articulation was replaced by long slurs or uniform *staccatos*; rather modern tempi were tempered by later editors; Busoni’s analytical concept was not imitated, and only his conclusions were enthusiastically adopted.

**Conclusion**

The main editing approaches described in this article can be related to the principal steps of Bach performance and reception; moreover, the peculiarities of the Italian IEs studied here can define particular stylistic approaches consistent with the prevailing aesthetics of their time.

At the end of the nineteenth century, the objectivist interpretive trend (fostered, among others, by Ehler), promoted the utmost tempo regularity in Bach performance, with the only exception being cadential passages; consistency in dynamics and articulation were encouraged, with dutiful highlighting of subject and countersubject. Against this, Bülow proposed a late-Romantic approach to agogic, dynamics and expression, highlighting the modern qualities of Bach’s music; this approach is found in other IEs. Moderate objectivism, already oriented towards the authenticist approach, was preached by Rubinstein, for whom Bach’s music was far from the arid and soulless architecture described by another editor, d’Albert. Such a structuralist attitude was fostered by the increasing interest in analysis and analytic interpretation.

---


100 Louis Ehler, ‘Preface’ to Tausig 1869.


Busoni’s approach was unique, as it unified subjectivism with structuralism, and was marked by his concert experience. His interpretation involved ‘terraced’ dynamics and a focus on endings; it was inspired by organ sonorities and reduced rubato, asynchronisation and legato, adding a ‘gestural’ component\(^\text{106}\) and favouring articulation and staccato: all of these elements can be found in his WTC edition.

A further approach to Bach performance is suggested by analysis of the Italian IEs, and is typical of the Italian context, marked by the philosophical features of Gentile’s neo-idealism. The rejection of textual philology, historicism and historically informed performance as scientific ‘contaminations’ of art excluded the authenticist approach from the Italian editors’ horizon. Bach was seen as the model of objectivity, rigour, order and architectural balance.\(^\text{107}\) At the same time, their approach was not a mere abstract objectivism: the copious ‘sentimental’ indications did not represent the typical Romantic expression of the self, but expressed the feelings of a community. The standardised Bach performance found by Scarpellini in Casella’s IE\(^\text{108}\) is therefore not only a pedagogic option but also the appropriate expression of a super-individual feeling, defined by Pestalozza as ‘sentimental nationalism’.\(^\text{109}\) the musical expression of ‘Italian-ness’ could not clash too strongly with the lyrical values traditionally associated with the country’s music.\(^\text{110}\)

It should be clear by now that the value of IEs for performance practice studies is undeniable, with the proviso that they should be constantly contextualised: their relationship with performance is bidirectional and their study can be highly profitable and illuminating, not least to shed light on a work’s reception. Obviously, it is fundamental to clarify as much as possible the peculiarities of IEs in order to mould exegetic tools tailored specifically to them. In comparison with other editing methodologies, it can be said that critical editions aim at the fixing of a ‘final’, ‘untouchable’ and definitive text; critical editions properly relate to the text’s history (the \textit{Wirkungsgeschichte} of the text in its written identity) and IEs deal with the work’s reception history. In other words, critical editions (and the whole approach behind them) aim at ‘editing a text’, whereas IEs aim at ‘presenting a work’. Thus IEs are part of the ‘dynamic net’ of relationships, influences and creative processes that constitutes the work’s \textit{Wirkungsgeschichte}. As such, they are formidable interpretive tools for understanding the evolution in the concept of Bach’s music through the centuries.


