

Westfield

NEWSLETTER OF THE WESTFIELD CENTER, VOLUME XXV, NUMBER 3

*A National Resource for the Advancement of Keyboard Music,
Serving Professionals and the Public Since 1979*

Summer 2014

Tilman Skowroneck, Editor



A warm welcome to the summer edition of the Westfield Newsletter 2014! Westfield's conference and festival [Sensation and Sensibility at the Keyboard in the Late Eighteenth Century: Celebrating the Tercentenary of C. P. E. Bach](#) is almost upon us. It will take place at Cornell University, Ithaca, NY, October 2–4, 2014, and this issue of the Westfield Newsletter is strongly inspired by our happy anticipation of this exciting event.

It will begin, however, on a more serious note: this week the sad news reached us of the passing of *Christopher Hogwood*, celebrated conductor, keyboardist and scholar. In our opening article, *Annette Richards* remembers this great man.

Her reflection is followed by news about *Keyboard Perspectives*: guest editor *Tom Beghin* informs us about some recent additions to the upcoming issue of *Keyboard Perspectives*, volume VII. I have updated and expanded my own call for contributions for volume VIII and extended

the deadline for proposals to *November 15, 2014*.

Roger Moseley prepares us for the conference panel session about the *Technologies of the Keyboard* project, a joint initiative of the Westfield Center and the Cornell Music Department. I contribute with an e-mail interview with one of the presenters at this session, the composer and inventor *Andrew McPherson*. I ask Andrew about his inventions: the magnetic resonator piano and the TouchKeys musical keyboard.

David Yearsley has sent us his highly readable program notes for his opening concert *Bach & Sons at the Organ* (Thursday, October 2, Anabel Taylor Chapel, 1:00 p.m.)

The newsletter concludes with the call for papers and performances for the 2015 International Conference of the Historical Keyboard Society of North America, which will take place May 21–24, 2015 at the Schulich School of Music of McGill University.

-Tilman Skowroneck



CONTENTS

Remembering Christopher Hogwood (1941–2014)	2
A Preview of <i>Keyboard Perspectives</i> VII (2014).	3
<i>Keyboard Perspectives</i> VIII (2015): Deadline Extended!	3
Technologies of the Keyboard by Roger Moseley	4
An Interview with Andrew McPherson.	5
Program Notes for the <i>Bach & Sons at the Organ</i> Opening Concert . . .	8
Call for Papers: HKSNA International Conference	10

REMEMBERING CHRISTOPHER HOGWOOD (1941–2014)

BY ANNETTE RICHARDS

It is with great sadness that we mourn the loss of Christopher Hogwood. He was a performer and a scholar, a doer and a thinker. Throughout his career he combined the pursuit of artistic excellence with research, experimentation and original thought. His pioneering work wrought profound changes to our understanding of music of the past, and transformed the music industry today. His contribution reached beyond music to the history of instruments and technology, to English and German cultural studies, to connections between music and the visual arts, and to the politics of music in society, and in education. Mr. Hogwood was a dedicated communicator, who, while working with the greatest performers and musical experts of his time, was generously interested in the amateur music lover and concert-goer. At the same time, he was deeply committed to young people and to students—he was a teacher and scholar as much as he was a musician.

Christopher Hogwood was best known as a leading figure in the Early Music movement. One of the early advocates of the use of old instruments, or historically accurate copies, for the performance of music composed before 1800, he was one of the pioneer explorers of the then-exotic territory of historically informed performance. As a keyboard player, he urged the re-discovery of historical construction techniques for harpsichords and clavichords—a project still ongoing and now with enormous international scholarly momentum, that involves scientific inquiry into historic materials, processes of decay, conservation and restoration methods and philosophies, as well as into technologies and handcraft techniques of earlier periods. Eager to try out his ideas in practice, Mr. Hogwood established his own ensemble of like-minded musicians, the Early Music Consort of London, and later the ground-breaking and internationally acclaimed Academy of Ancient Music, which he directed until 2006.

A musician whose powerful interpretive talent was matched by a charismatic personality, Mr. Hogwood has

not limited himself to ‘period’ instruments. He was in demand the world over as a conductor, and had guest residencies and directorships at, among others, the Saint Paul Chamber Orchestra in Minnesota (1987–92, 1992–98), the Basel Kammerorchester in Switzerland (2000–2006), the Orquesta Ciudad de Granada, Spain (2001–2004), and at the prestigious Handel and Haydn Society in Boston (1986–01). As artistic advisor he worked for the Australian Chamber Orchestra (1989–93), the Mozart Summer Festival at the National Symphony Orchestra, USA (1993–2001) and the Beethoven Academie, Antwerp, Belgium (1998–2002).

Many of his activities, both in a hands-on capacity and in an advisory one, were dedicated to making things change: to promoting new ideas, even when dealing with music and thought from the past—indeed, he made the old come to life in important new ways. His association with many arts organizations was never accidental or peripheral, but carefully reflected his own interests and passions; he was a very active supporter of his chosen causes, whose sheer diversity reflected the breadth of Mr. Hogwood’s intellectual reach. These include

the Terezin Chamber Music Foundation in Boston, London’s Research Centre for the History and Analysis of Recorded Music, and the New York Experimental Glass Workshop. Perhaps more obviously in line with his professional activities as a performer was his involvement with the new *C. P. E. Bach: Complete Works* edition whose distinguished advisory board he chaired—but there too, there was no sitting back and taking the glory: Mr. Hogwood was actively involved, editing his own volumes for the series, overseeing the direction of the whole (a mammoth project, which will result in around 110 volumes of music by C. P. E. Bach, much of it appearing in print for the first time ever, and most of it being made accessible to performers and audiences—in print and online—for the first time since the later 18th century).

An Honorary Professor at the University of Cam-



bridge and an A. D. White Professor at Large at Cornell University, he was closely involved with musical and student life at a number of other institutions. He held doctorates from the University of Keele and the University of Cambridge, and an honorary doctorate from the University of Zurich; his relationship with Harvard was a long-standing and close one, and he often gave masterclasses and mentored students—including at the International Centre for Clavichord Studies, which he co-directed, at Magnano, Italy.

Christopher Hogwood was also a longtime friend of Cornell, and more recently of the Westfield Center. He worked closely with Professors Neal Zaslaw and Malcolm Bilson for many years, he was the keynote speaker at a conference on C. P. E. Bach at Cornell in 1998, and he was a valuable jury member for the Westfield International Fortepiano competition in 2011. For me personally he was a generous colleague, always warm and engaged, and

always encouraging about the next project. In spite of an extraordinarily busy schedule of international conducting, recording and speaking engagements, as well as ongoing scholarly projects of his own, Chris Hogwood always treated our collaborations as if they were as important as his many other simultaneous pursuits, replying immediately to queries, always incisive in his responses and ideas. He brought to our exchanges a comprehensive knowledge not just of music, but also of history, literature and visual arts. While he was an excellent speaker and lecturer, he also an expert in conversation: challenging from the lecture podium and engaging at the dining table.

Christopher Hogwood's pioneering and constantly developing contribution to musical performance and scholarship was unparalleled. His publications and discography were of the widest range and the highest quality. We will greatly miss this exceptional musician, scholar and teacher.

A PREVIEW OF *KEYBOARD PERSPECTIVES VII* (2014)

Tom Beghin, guest editor of this year's volume VII of *Keyboard Perspectives*, announces some further additions to this volume: Erin Helyard will review two books: *Four-Handed Monsters*, by Adrian Daub (Oxford University Press, 2014) and *Romantic Anatomies of Performance* by James Davies (University of California Press, 2014).

We're also trying to include a CD-review, most likely by *Eric Wang* on a selection of recent harpsichord recordings that use mean-tone temperament to heighten the dramatic effect. *Tilman Skowroneck*, finally, will remember his father, the flute and harpsichord maker Martin Skowroneck.

KEYBOARD PERSPECTIVES VIII (2015): DEADLINE EXTENDED!

We have extended the deadline for proposals for contributions. The new deadline is:

15 November 2014

The success story of the piano has long led us to believe that louder, sturdier and technically more reliable keyboard instruments have always been the ideal. The historically informed performance movement has helped to revise this picture and has opened our minds, ears and playing techniques to other concepts, timbres and touch sensations. Today, performers and audiences are ready to appreciate all sorts of keyboard instruments: new, old, loud, soft, brilliant, mellow, mainstream and weird. On the other hand, this list shows that we still often think in contrasts and instrument families: we find it important to know which instrument was called what, how one mechanism was distinct from another, and how the instruments' sounds differed.

Were these distinctions as important for the musician of the 18th century, when players longed to learn how to become proficient enough to be able to play "sensibly"? Was not their quest one for instruments that would support them in these efforts—and did the exact nature of their sound-producing mechanism maybe matter less?

Perhaps the most successful keyboard instruments, then, were those that were most responsive and offered most tonal variety. Instead of dividing 18th-century instruments into evolutionary successes or failures, we could say that the tangent piano, the harpsichord-piano combination instrument, the *Clavecin Royal*, the *Vis-à-vis* with keys at both ends, the *Bogen-Hammerclavier*, or any other regular or odd harpsichord or fortepiano-like invention all represented the most central artistic concern of the keyboardist of the 18th century (though perhaps with different degrees of success). They were meant as tools for making keyboard playing a more intimate, more direct

and more personal experience; they added depth to the keyboard experience by introducing shadow and light.

Keyboard Perspectives VIII will pay special attention to the combination instruments of the late eighteenth century (such as organ-harpsichords and organ-fortepianos), and to keyboard instrument inventions that had a name and a meaning at the time although they did not make it into the pantheon of mainstream keyboard culture. Why were these instruments made, who paid for the time it

took to invent them, who was willing or able to purchase them, who played them and in which musical contexts could they be heard?

Contributions that address this topic area are especially welcome, but please do not hesitate to submit proposals that address other keyboard-related topics as well. Proposals can be addressed to tilman@skowroneck.de. They should reach us no later than November 15, 2014.

- Tilman Skowroneck

TECHNOLOGIES OF THE KEYBOARD

ROGER MOSELEY

In the terms of music scholar Veit Erlmann, keyboards mediate between “reason and resonance.” At the keyboard, thought, sensation, and affect are rendered digitally available. From the fourteenth-century organ to the Moog synthesizer and beyond, every keyboard interface is embedded in specific historical and cultural milieus and affords particular modes of play. Each can nonetheless stage encounters between disparate repertoires, materializing old ideas in new ways—and vice versa. Moreover, operations at the keyboard have been integral to communication and computation as well as to the practices of composition, performance, and improvisation. The *Technologies of the Keyboard* project, a joint initiative of the Westfield Center and Cornell’s music department, sets out to trace these lateral relationships by seeking out points of contact between keyboard instruments of all kinds. In short, the Technologies of the Keyboard project is devoted to exploring the myriad ways in which keyboards have enabled people to come to know the world musically.

The Westfield Center’s upcoming conference on the music of C. P. E. Bach and sensation in eighteenth-century keyboard culture will feature a *Technologies of the Keyboard* panel session that will consider Bach’s clavichord alongside the contemporary keyboard interfaces and modifications engineered by *Andrew McPherson*. McPherson’s work draws attention to the mediation of immediacy, which is to say, ways in which the tactile contact between digits and keys has been made audibly expressive from C. P. E. Bach’s day to our own.

Placing McPherson’s instruments within a revolutionary tradition of musical inventions that harks as far back as the eighteenth-century *clavecin électrique*, *Emily Dolan* will consider the historicity of new instruments as well as the novelty of “old” instruments. The persistence of the keyboard as a default interface raises questions about the

resistance and obstinacy of musical interfaces, as well as what one might describe as their legibility. In this light, McPherson’s TouchKeys, sensors that transform any keyboard into a multi-touch surface, could be understood to restore the expressive potential of *Bebung* to modern instruments as well as affording new possibilities in terms of vibrato-style effects, modulation, and pitch-bending.

In addition to the TouchKeys, McPherson will demonstrate his *Magnetic Resonator Piano*, which pursues similarly expressive goals via different technological means: it deploys electromagnets that induce the strings of a grand piano to vibrate, enabling the performer to shape notes after they have been struck. McPherson will then introduce a performance of his *Secrets of Antikythera*, a large-scale work for the Magnetic Resonator Piano, by Cornell DMA student *Ryan MacEvoy McCullough*. The session will conclude with an open discussion in which the members of the panel and all others in attendance will be invited to participate.

Future avenues for the activities of Technologies of the Keyboard include the study of the keyboard’s (pre-) history as an input device, its materialization of notational concepts, the different types of play it affords, the ways in which it cultivates subjectivity through pedagogy and practice. By “pass[ing] on to the senses of others what would otherwise fade away,” in Friedrich Kittler’s words, historical keyboard instruments allow us to construe musical recreation as praxis in the present, and vice versa. In this spirit, we welcome the input of anyone who would like to contribute to the Technologies of the Keyboard project, whether in the form of specialized expertise in particular aspects of keyboard practice or in broader conceptual or theoretical terms. Interested parties are encouraged to contact Roger Moseley (rsm253@cornell.edu).

AN INTERVIEW WITH ANDREW MCPHERSON

Andrew, at the upcoming C. P. E. Bach conference you are presenting two inventions—at least in the 18th century that would have been the term—the magnetic resonator piano, an acoustic-electronic hybrid, and the TouchKeys multi-touch capacitive sensing musical keyboard, which is a fully electronically device. Before we talk about what they are and do, please tell me how you, a composer, came to be an innovator in musical technology.

As an undergrad, I studied both music and electrical engineering, and I did a master's in engineering at the MIT Media Lab. But at the time it wasn't really clear to me how the two areas would come together in my own personal way. So my work on the magnetic resonator piano didn't begin until the last year of my PhD at the University of Pennsylvania. People often ask me if I'm a pianist, but actually the original motivation comes partly from the fact that I'm *not* a pianist (viola is my primary instrument). At the time, I found composing for piano singularly challenging, much more so than even writing for full orchestra. Partly it's a challenge to understand what falls naturally under the fingers, but also any composer has to confront the weight of existing repertoire for the instrument.

So in essence, I thought that by changing what the piano was about, I would give myself a new creative entry into composing for piano. But in the course of building and writing for the instrument, I ended up falling in love with the piano as it already exists (without any electronics). It's a remarkable instrument for its versatility, richness and nuance. Adding new techniques to the piano is not about correct any deficiency: rather, it's about building on such an amazing acoustic foundation.

Could you in very few words outline what the resonator piano is, and what possibilities it offers to the player?

The magnetic resonator piano (MRP for short) is an electronic augmentation of the acoustic piano, which uses electromagnets to make the strings vibrate in new ways, whether or not they have been struck with the hammers.

The MRP lets the pianist continuously shape every note on the instrument as a violinist might, while maintaining the natural polyphony of the piano. New techniques include infinite sustain, crescendos from silence, harmonics, pitch bends, and new timbres. All sound is still produced acoustically by the strings and soundboard, without any speakers, so the instrument retains the subtlety and nuance of the acoustic piano.

A desire to provide sustain to, and control over the tone of keyboard instruments while also creating possibilities to shape the tone after the touch is something that brings us back all the way to the 18th century. In which context would you like to place your invention? Was a historical perspective originally part of your inspiration?

In fact, the history seems to date further back to da Vinci's sketches for the "viola organista," which appears to tackle a similar problem of sustain and polyphony. The sketches, which have been the basis for some modern recreations, appear to show a circular bow and a keyboard. Polyphonic note-shaping seems to be something of a historical holy grail for instrument designers, but I actually wasn't aware of most of this history when I started. I'm happy to be part of that long tradition, of course, but personally, connecting to the acoustic piano as it already exists is important. There are many approaches to sustain and polyphony, which electronics make possible, but I think it's useful for performers and composers to also connect to (and extend) a familiar instrumental design.

One 18th-century sensitive instrument we know about was J. A. Stein's so-called melodica, which is described as a touch-sensitive single-stop organ-like device that allowed for variations in tone strength and pitch even after the touch. But it seems that it was quite difficult to play while controlling all its features properly. The performer of the expressive keyboard is forced to pay attention to the tone longer than usual for keyboard players—and still, the melodica was only a melody instrument. If, in contrast, one of the goals of the MRP is



to maintain polyphony, how does a player manage to keep track of everything? Are we still experimenting in terms of playing technique, or are there some hacks for pianists to get used to performing on this instrument?

I would compare playing MRP to a cross between playing organ and piano, with a few extra techniques thrown in. Like the organ, it's not too difficult to keep track of the notes sustaining because for the most part, holding the keys down maintains a constant volume and timbre. Controlling the timbre is possible by changing the pressure on the keys, but the range of timbres is such that most of the time, you don't have to think about it unless you want to create a deliberate effect. Likewise, bringing notes in gradually from silence can be done by slowly pressing the keys, but this too stays out of the way until you need it. The same is true for a few of the other techniques, including pitch bends and harmonics.

Composers (including myself) sometimes want an additional layer of control over the instrument, where different registers or notes behave differently in ways that might even change over time. It's possible through the software to change how the resonators work, for example to only engage the electromagnets on particular notes, or changing the timbre of the notes. It's analogous to changing stops on an organ, except that the control can be note-by-note.

A typical problem of keyboard players is the mental and physical distance between player and the music-producing mechanism. How do the MRP's added "sensitive" options influence this feeling? What do players say about the experience of playing the instrument?

I've tried to keep the feeling of playing MRP as close as possible to playing piano. Even though there is a distance between player and production mechanism, pianists are used to this, so engaging with existing technique makes it easier to learn. The biggest changes are that the sound can begin before the keys reach the bottom of the keyboard (so a light touch can engage only resonator, with



The magnetic resonator piano. From Andrew McPherson's website <http://andrewmcperson.org>

no hammer), and also that holding the keys with the fingers produces a different effect than holding with the pedal. When the keys are held, the notes sustain indefinitely, whereas the pedal lets the vibrations gradually decay as they traditionally would. That difference is probably the biggest adjustment for pianists, but players adjust reasonably quickly.

And what do the listeners say?

The sound of the MRP is hard to describe or place, even for myself. Listeners have compared it to the piano (of course), organ, synthesizer, bowed vibraphone, and glass harmonica, among many others. Because the resonator sound can coexist with traditionally hammer-based piano playing, the way it's used can make it sound more or less like the traditional piano. A lot of people comment that it doesn't sound "electronic," but that there's a sort of organic quality to it. To some extent, it helps to hear it live to get the full effect. It turns out to be quite difficult to effectively capture the subtlety on a recording!

You are surely not traveling with an entire piano. What are the logistics of moving and installing the MRP?

The equipment installs in any grand piano. I've worked with instruments from 5' baby grands to a Bösendorfer 290 Imperial. The kit packs up into two road cases, which can be taken on a plane or train. It's heavy and takes a couple hours to set up in a new instrument, but it's not too difficult to move from one piano to another.

Let's turn to another invention of yours which you also will present during the conference: TouchKeys, which could be seen as an enhancement of the electronically keyboard along the same lines as the magnetic resonator piano. Is this view correct, or is there something else?

The TouchKeys are aimed at letting electronic keyboard players continuously shape every note without having to take the hands off the keyboard. Traditionally, keyboards

have had external control wheels to do things like pitch bend, but it's inconvenient to lose a whole hand just to modulating the notes. Also of course, external wheels modulate all the notes together in the same way. Like the MRP, the TouchKeys focus on taking existing piano technique and extending it, without requiring the player to forget everything they have spent years learning.

So for example, while moving the fingers on the key surfaces can add vibrato and pitch bends to each note, there's no right or wrong place to touch the key. It's the relative motion of the fingers that controls the pitch, which means the extra techniques stay out of the way until they're needed.

What are the musical differences between working with the MRP and TouchKeys?

The main difference is that the MRP produces its own distinctive sound, where the TouchKeys are a controller for other sounds. The TouchKeys assume you have a synthesizer setup that you want to control, so they sound like whatever you configure them to do. They don't have a distinctive "voice" of their own, but they aim to be as flexible as possible in letting a keyboardist expand the range and subtlety of their playing. A particular use for the TouchKeys is to emulate other instruments from the keyboard, for example strings or brass, but they are also suited to a variety of synths. All the mappings on the TouchKeys are assignable, so the same action could be used to control pitch in one context and timbre in another. They can also be used to split each key into multiple sections, for example to play microtonal music.

One problem with 18th-century inventions was the economy. Instrument makers often had little time to spare, and not many customers were able or willing to pay for experimental instruments of great intricacy. Is your invention also a way to make the sensible keyboard accessible and affordable?



Electromagnetic actuators above a piano's strings. From Andrew McPherson's website <http://andrewmcpherson.org>

The TouchKeys began as a research project, which I subsequently launched on Kickstarter. It's important to me to get these new instruments out of the lab and into the hands of musicians. After all, that's the reason to build musical instruments to begin with. I suppose the hope is that what begins as an experimental project will, with the help of the right musicians, become something that lots of people want to use. And of course, as distribution gets wider, it's also possible to bring the costs down.

What are your plans for the future, in composing, in inventing?

At the moment I'm really interested in studying the ways that musicians use and misuse technology for creative ends. The way that musicians play instruments often differs substantially from what the designer intended: jazz

sax players use techniques which go well beyond the original 19th-century practices; distortion on the electric guitar was originally an engineering limitation before it became the sound of rock and roll; and of course the turntable is a classic example of a home appliance turned into a musical instrument when placed in the right hands.

There are lots of new electronic instruments being developed, but I haven't seen a lot of attention

on the part of the designers to the fact that musicians will come up with unusual creative uses for these new devices. So my ongoing project, which I call "hackable instruments," looks first at how musicians react to unfamiliar and sometimes very constrained technology, and secondly tries to build instruments which can be modified and completely repurposed by the performer in a way the designer didn't intend. It's a challenge to design something specifically to be "misused" but so far we've had some interesting results with the new instruments we're building!

Thank you very much for taking the time to answer my questions Andrew!

PROGRAM NOTES FOR THE *BACH & SONS AT THE ORGAN OPENING CONCERT*

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 2, ANABEL TAYLOR CHAPEL, 1:00 P.M.

BY DAVID YEARSLEY

While Johann Sebastian Bach trained all of his sons to be organists, not one of them left behind a significant corpus of organ music. Wilhelm Friedemann Bach in particular was praised as the greatest organist of his generation, a master improviser who carried on the magisterial learned style of his father. But even during Friedemann's lifetime at least one devotee, Johann Samuel Petri, gave vent to frustration at this lack of a notated legacy: "The Halle Bach (Friedemann) is the strongest organ player I have ever heard. It's just too bad that of his extremely artful and profound compositions so little has been published." Petri studied with Friedemann in Halle in the early 1760s, so perhaps his complaint testifies to a trove of now-lost works in manuscript. Whatever the case, as good as no pedaliter music comes down to us from Friedemann. The handful of chorale preludes once ascribed to him was hardly "profound," and David Schulenberg briskly dismissed them as spurious in his landmark monograph devoted to Friedemann's music.

While Friedemann seems to have been the most revered organist of his generation, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach also received plaudits for his mastery of the instrument from the likes of Berlin man of letters, publisher, and musical enthusiast Christoph Friedrich Nicolai: "If you want to have an example of how one can combine the deepest secrets of the art with everything that taste treasures, then listen to the Berlin Bach on the organ." This tribute comes from a letter of 1755, two years after both Emanuel and Friedemann had unsuccessfully applied, along with several other Bach

students, for the organist's post in Zittau. But by the time Emanuel had settled in the greatest of organ cities, Hamburg, and was encountered there by Charles Burney in 1772, he had, as the English visitor put it, "lost the use of his feet" at the organ and could not demonstrate any of the city's mighty instruments—an embarrassing

situation for a Bach to find himself in. But while still entertaining the possibility of a career as an organist into the 1750s, Bach produced a slender catalog of organ music, most of it without pedal. Two of these efforts are on my concert's program: a setting of his father's plaintive chorale prelude *Ich ruf zu dir* (BWV 639) from the *Orgelbüchlein*, expanded by Emanuel with a framing ritornello of galant cast and through the insertion of small interludes between each line of the chorale melody. Emanuel's *Fantasia and Fugue in C minor* asserts a more robust claim to the Bachian tradition with its searching harmonies and virtuosic flourishes, and the fugue subject's dramatic downward leap of a major seventh and subsequent chromatic ascent. But here too the use of the pedal is



David Yearsley. Photo: Len Levasseur

unclear, and can hardly be called obbligato. It is therefore ironic that this Bach son who never worked as an organist and eventually gave up playing the instrument entirely left behind the more organ music any of his brothers. With Annette Richards, I've edited these works for the ongoing C. P. E. Bach complete edition, a project continuing to march forward in this, Emanuel's tercentenary year.

One year younger than Emanuel, Johann Gottfried Bernhard Bach briefly held a pair of organist posts, but

died young, leaving debts and no music. From Sebastian's second marriage came two more organists. The Bach devotee and seminal historian Johann Nicolaus Forkel listed not only Friedemann, but also his younger half-brother Johann Christoph Friedrich at the top of the dwindling list of Germany's legitimate organists. Finally, the youngest of the Bach sons, Johann Christian, served as one of the organists at the Milan Cathedral before his eventual move to London; as recipient of his father's pedal clavichord he had the chance to develop a solid organ technique, yet we have nothing of note from him either. Other Bach students, Johann Ludwig Krebs and Gottfried August Homilius left far more organ music of substance than all the Bach sons combined.

Faced with such scarcity what is an organist of today to do? My answer is to do what organists have always done: make transcriptions. Friedemann's *Sinfonia in D minor* is his best-known orchestral work: after the breathy elegance of the opening movement, the four-voice fugue rips along with tremendous gusto. With a certain amount of rearranging, its four-part counterpoint can be made to fit under the hands and feet; the pedal even gets to open with the subject alone, and in several later passages sprints through bass passagework that, while not set in a typical organ idiom, is a real workout for the feet. What results is Friedemann's best organ fugue—never mind that it wasn't originally composed for the instrument. I play the piece from Peter Wollny's excellent recent edition of the orchestral score (Carus, 2013).

In his important book on Friedemann, Schulenberg presents insightful comparisons between the fugue of the *Sinfonia* and that in the first movement of Vivaldi's Concerto in D for two violins and continuo, transcribed by Sebastian for the organ when Friedemann was but a toddler. Aside from the possible indebtedness of Friedemann's fugue to Vivaldi's, the sumptuous chains of seventh chords in the Adagio of the *Sinfonia* recall the Venetian master's slow movements. Friedemann infamously wrote his own name on his father's autograph score of the transcription, falsely claiming his own authorship. Putting Schulenberg's line of thought into practice, I have held Friedemann to his plagiaristic word and joined Vivaldi's vibrant fugue with Friedemann's *Sinfonia* to make a hybrid, contrapuntally rich three-movement concerto. What I

find remarkable is not simply that Friedemann would try to pass off the work as his own, but that he believed Vivaldi's music retained its currency after mid-century and could be considered a new work by a contemporary organist: this says as much about Friedemann's encompassing—and possibly self-serving—view of baroque/galant style as it does about his own character.

Orchestral music also provides the source for my setting of Johann Christoph Friedrich Bach's *Romanza* from his late piano concerto of 1792, now available in a fine modern edition prepared by the indefatigable Ulrich Leisinger (Carus, 2010). The transcription is a long way from the profound, sacred style that this Bach most have demonstrated in order to win a job he eventually turned down as organist at the Hauptkirche in Altona near Hamburg in 1758. Nonetheless, its periodic phrases, poised cantabile lines, and outbursts of virtuosic runs imported from the opera stage recall some of the decadent innovations of other, younger descendants of the Bach school around 1800. It seems a bit unfair, however, to let this light, even decadent, fare to stand in for J. C. F. Bach's organ art; even if all his fugues have been lost, I've tried to add a bit of heft his reputation as organist with my own evolving elaboration of a subject that survives in a nineteenth-century catalog.

While in search of new "organ" music, I've also transposed the second movement of the *Musical Offering* trio sonata down a minor third to get it to fit safely on the organ's compass: the range is about the only thing that's comfortable in this limb-stretching, mind-bending exercise in multi-tasking. Johann Christian Bach's string trio from a Genoa manuscript written only a few years after his father's *Musical Offering* serves up the lightest of aperitifs to calm fears of the *Musical Offering* exertions to follow, a relentlessly strenuous adventure that should somehow sound easy.

Does this imagined program of "organ" music by Bach his sons cohere or does it simply offer up unruly contrasts? I'm not sure, but what strikes me is how different the music is not only amongst the brothers but also between father and sons. Often obsessed with control in his own music, J. S. Bach seems to have fostered among his boys a diversity that is a challenge and pleasure to revive and to explore.



CALL FOR PAPERS: HISTORICAL KEYBOARD SOCIETY OF NORTH AMERICA INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE

MAY 21–24, 2015, THE SCHULICH SCHOOL OF MUSIC OF MCGILL UNIVERSITY

The Historical Keyboard Society of North America (HKSNA) and the Schulich School of Music of McGill University (Montreal, Canada) are pleased to invite submissions of proposals for the Fourth Annual Meeting of HKSNA: “French Connections: Networks of Influence and Modes of Transmission of French Baroque Keyboard Music.”

The conference will be held at the Schulich School of Music, McGill University, from May 21 to 24, 2015.

The conference aims to deepen understanding of French baroque keyboard music, its style, influence, transmission, and the different teaching traditions that nourished it. Although it is difficult to speak of a single French baroque keyboard style, it remains true that the *grand siècle* generated a musical classicism cultivated by keyboardists not only in France but transnationally. Often, the terms ‘baroque’ and ‘classical’ are used interchangeably in relation to both the repertoire and instruments of the period.

The programme committee encourages submissions of individual papers, round-table discussions, group sessions, lecture-recitals, mini-recitals, and multimedia demonstrations on the following topics as they relate to French baroque keyboard music and historical keyboards:

- Networks of influence within and beyond France;
- Pedagogical treatises and other sources of transmission;
- Legacies and influence of composers or groups of composers and performers;
- Repertoires, genres, and contexts of performance;
- Connections with other media such as literature and art;
- Instruments and builders;

- Patronage and politics;
- New perspectives or insights into *le goût français*.

Although the principal theme for this year’s international conference is French baroque keyboard music, proposals of presentations outside or peripheral to this theme, including contemporary repertoires and issues for historic keyboard instruments, are also welcome and will be accommodated if possible.

Submission procedure: Abstracts of no more than 400 words excluding titles must be received by **5 p.m. EST on 30 September, 2014**. Only one proposal per presenter or group of presenters can be chosen.

Lecture-recital, mini-recital, and multimedia demonstration proposals must also include a sample recording, provided via internet link or as an attached MP3 file.

All proposals, whether they be for papers, lecture-recitals, mini-recitals, multimedia demonstrations, round tables or group sessions, must include short biographical statements for all presenters. Presentations should last no longer than 25 minutes.

Presenters must be members of HKSNA. Presenters must also register for the conference and cover their own

travel and other expenses.

Presenters whose proposals are chosen will be invited to revise their abstracts for the conference program. Results will be transmitted to presenters by 30 October, 2014. Please send your proposal abstracts directly via email to hksna2015@gmail.com. Full information available at <http://historicalkeyboardociety.org>.

Of special note: This year, HKSNA hosts the Ninth Aliénor International Harpsichord Composition Competition. For more details: <http://historicalkeyboardociety.org/competitions/alienor-competition/>.





The Westfield Center relies on donations from its members. Please consider making a donation towards our program of conferences, festivals, publications and the support of young keyboard artists.

<http://westfield.org/donate/>

Submissions and questions may be directed to:

Tilman Skowroneck, Editor (tilman@skowroneck.de)

Westfield Center for Historical Keyboard Studies

Department of Music
Cornell University
101 Lincoln Hall
Ithaca NY 14850

info@westfield.org / www.westfield.org

WEST *f* **FIELD CENTER**
FOR HISTORICAL
KEYBOARD
STUDIES



© Westfield Center for Historical Keyboard Studies, 2014

