

## ANHANG

### Resümees der Beiträge

(englisch, französisch, russisch, tschechisch)

#### Englische Resümees

Gregory G. Butler: Leipzig Engravers in Bach's Original Prints.

Comparative investigation of music engravings issued in Leipzig during the 1730's shows that the workshop of Johann Gottfried Krüger was involved in producing original plates for the partitas, the Schemelli Song Book, and Clavierübung, part III. Some important conclusions can be drawn with regard to Bach's precise share in the Schemelli publication and the genesis of part III of the Clavierübung.

Hans-Joachim Schulze: A Spurious Handel Concerto in J. S. Bach's Autograph.

In 1872 Wilhelm Rust discovered in the Berlin Royal Library a set of orchestral parts for an anonymous concerto in f minor, written – in his opinion – by J. S. Bach. The piece was later hypothetically ascribed to G. F. Handel. For several decades the manuscript could no longer be traced in Berlin. It has now been possible to ascertain that its present location is Leipzig, that it was once in Bach's possession, and that it represents the work of an Italian contemporary.

Z. Philip Ambrose: „Weinen, Klagen, Sorgen, Zagen“ and the Art of Rhetoric in Antiquity.

The text for BWV 12, evidently written by Bach's Weimar librettist S. Franck is discussed with regard to its rhetorical substance and its specific relationship to a verse by the Roman poet Quintus Ennius („fientes, plorantes, lacrimantes, obtestantes“). A number of connections emerge between the work of Franck and rhetoric of antiquity; presumably these were also of importance for Bach's understanding of Franck's cantata texts.

William H. Scheide: Bach and the Picander Jahrgang – a Reply.

In BJ 1975. Klaus Häfner has presented a hypothetical conclusion to the effect that Bach did not use all of the Picander cantata texts published in 1732 (PJ II) but that he did use the complete original edition of 1728 (PJ I), which had been designed for the Leipzig church year 1728/29. A comparative estimate of text lengths in the lost source PJ I (based on Wustmann's discussion of 1913) with the later edition PJ II shows that the two prints must have been practically identical. Thus Häfner's theory becomes doubtful.