

Dietrich Buxtehude: Sämtliche Orgelwerke. Vol. 1 & 2. Ed. Klaus Beckmann. Wiesbaden, Leipzig, Paris: Breitkopf & Härtel, rev. ed. 1997 (EB 6661–6662). \$25 each.

Introduce and Purpose

The lack of autograph manuscripts and the haphazard transmission of Buxtehude's organ works through generations of questionable copyists has plagued Buxtehude scholarship since its inception. In many cases, the poor text found in surviving sources of Buxtehude's music makes it difficult for editors to produce successful *Urtext* editions for performance. In the late 1960s, Beckmann bravely diverged from orthodox editorial practice and asserted that he would attempt to recover Buxtehude's lost voice through inference and, occasionally, pure conjecture.¹ Despite this controversial but necessary methodology, his 1971 edition of Buxtehude's organ works was rightly lauded by many as being thoroughly musical. Consequently, not only his edition became the most popular edition for recent generations of organists, but his method was successfully employed by his competitor Christoph Albrecht in the recent Bärenreiter edition. With the performer in mind, this article evaluates the first two volumes of Beckmann's 1997 edition of Buxtehude's complete organ works by comparing them to his earlier edition and to competing editions.

Brief Survey of Editions and Primary Sources

Beckmann attempted to remove the degradation of the musical text resulting from copyists who not only used a different musical notation than Buxtehude but were also removed from Buxtehude by region and one generation. In some cases, the scribe was simply inept or the surviving manuscripts clearly do not reflect Buxtehude's intentions. The eighteenth-century scribe of the *Toccata in d*, BuxWV 155, for instance, not only misunderstood the meter and where to place barlines; he was also clearly confused by the North German organ tablature he was transcribing. This magnificent work exists only in this one corrupt manuscript. In examples such as *Praeludium in A*, BuxWV 151, multiple corrupt sources contradict each other or even provide extra passages.²

Under an *Urtext* model for editing, most editors in the past attempted to reliably transmit extant sources with an emphasis on the most recently discovered manuscripts.³ In 1876–78, Philipp Spitta primarily drew from two sources available to him, the Berlin Manuscript and the Andreas Bach Book. In 1939, Max Seiffert augmented Spitta's work with the recently discovered Lowell Mason Codex of 1684 ("Codex E. B. 1688") and the Schmahl Tablature. Still using Spitta's work as a basis, Joseph Hedar depended heavily upon the Lindemann and

¹In his preface, Finn Viderø claims Beckmann's editorial practice derives from nascent ideas in Viderø's articles (Preface to *Diderich Buxtehude: Nine Organ Pieces* (København: Engstrøm & Sødring, 1985), V). Viderø also questions Beckmann's musicality (see footnote 10).

²When sources greatly disagree, some editions provide transcriptions of the relevant sources in addition to any attempts to make a convincing work by conflating sources. See these instances in the Concordance of Common Editions (Table 1): BuxWV 142, 149, 151, and 155.

³Belotti's preface provides a solid and up-to-date summary of sources. For an engaging and more detailed discussion of nearly every modern edition up to 1987, see Lawrence Archbold, "Why are there so many Buxtehude editions?" *The American Organist* 21 (May 1987): 87–88.

Engelhart Tablatures recently found in the Lund University library for his 1950 and 1952 edition.

More recent editions (after 1970) have attempted to approach all the available sources with more circumspection. But in his 1971 edition, Beckmann not only reevaluated the extant primary sources and conflated musical passages from multiple sources further than his predecessors, he took the revolutionary step of examining the musical context (“internal textual criticism”) to figure out what Buxtehude might have meant to say (his “*ipsissima vox*”).⁴ Albrecht’s 1994–95 edition embraces Beckmann’s methods, but with different musical results. In contrast to these recent approaches aimed towards a performable score, Belotti chose the least corrupt source (in his opinion) and essentially marked all other sources as variants in his recent 1998 edition. Unlike Albrecht’s and Beckmann’s editions, Belotti’s does not present an amalgamation of sources that attempts to find Buxtehude’s real voice.

In summary, nearly every edition emphasizes different sources, and the recent editions present opposing but equally legitimate approaches: Belotti’s volumes allow a scholar to reconstruct any of the sources with the help of his extensive (and easy-to-read!) critical notes; in contrast, Albrecht and Beckmann both present convincing interpretations that a performer can simply play without being forced into score study. Because the older and the newer editions represent different sources or approaches, I must say that they all still deserve consideration when seriously studying particular works.

Beckmann’s First Edition (1971): The Criticisms

Several criticisms of Beckmann’s 1971 edition motivated the publication of his 1997 revision. The primary objection to the original edition was that the critical notes were only located in the scholarly volumes (EB 6621–22) intended for scholars and libraries, whereas performers generally elected to buy the relatively inexpensive performance edition (EB 6661–62). Because few bought the expensive scholarly edition, it quickly fell out of print and became essentially inaccessible. Thus, performers who used Beckmann’s scores were entirely dependent upon his good musical judgement.

Furthermore, the conveniently “clean” appearance of 1971 scores gives the performer a false sense of security over the notes and musical issues. Alternative readings, suggestive indications in the primary sources, and labels marking Beckmann’s inferences were not on the scores, and thus the performer is kept in the dark concerning these issues. One could not know, for instance, whether ties on repeated notes were authentic or inferred. One had to guess whether directions in manuscripts or the editor’s preference determined the assignment of bass lines to the pedal or manuals. Without editorial marks, even a determined organist might not be able to

⁴For more on his methods, see Klaus Beckmann, “Textkritische Überlegungen zu Buxtehudes Orgelwerken,” *Musik und Kirche* 38 (1968), 106–113, and Klaus Beckmann, Introduction to *Nicolaus Bruhns: Sämtliche Orgelwerke* (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1972). For criticisms of Beckmann’s methodology, see Michael Belotti, *Die freien Orgelwerke Dieterich Buxtehudes: Überlieferungsgeschichtliche und stilkritische Studien* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang (*Europäische Hochschulschriften*, Series 36, Musikwissenschaft, vol. 136, 2nd ed.), 1997), 5–15. Note that despite Beckmann’s attempts at an objective methodology involving analogies to other works and the analysis of transmission, inferred musical logic, and musical context, his procedures continue to be necessarily subjective. Albrecht, who adopted Beckmann’s approach after all, produced a significantly different edition for Bärenreiter. Inner textual criticism has also enabled Beckmann to produce some of the most successful performing editions of music by other late seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century German composers such as Andreas Kneller (EB 8430), Georg Böhm (EB 8087), and Nicolaus Bruhns (EB 6670) from extremely corrupt or disfigured sources.

discover what was original to relevant manuscripts and what was purely Beckmann's.

Although most organ scholars now agree that Beckmann's methods are necessary for the performance of many late seventeenth-century organ works, any attempt to reconstruct Buxtehude's desires obviously invites disagreements over particular interpretations. The use of pedal can be contested throughout the repertory. The most frequent criticism is Beckmann's handling of the opening keyboard figuration in the G-minor prelude, BuxWV 149, in which Beckmann's groupings do not resemble those found in any source.⁵ (And, one of the sources suggests a more exhilarating effect.) The Toccata in D Minor, BuxWV 155, provides another common point of disagreement, because the manuscript source requires extensive editorial reconstruction—or "resurrection" as one reviewer put it. For this reason, reviewers often use this toccata to test an editor's merit.⁶ In the case of the Praeludium in E Minor, BuxWV 142, two sources dramatically disagree at the juncture between the last two sections.⁷ The quirky countersubject of the first fugue in the Praeludium in C Major, BuxWV 136, seemingly defies a consistent solution.⁸ When comparing the two editions, one need only spend a little effort to find many shorter instances of some import, such as striking chords and registers being normalized or inferred.⁹ Although alternatives to Beckmann's solutions may be better in several cases, Beckmann's 1971 interpretations are, for the most part, justifiable, musical, and convincing.¹⁰ (Other solutions found in other editions and in recordings can often be justified as well.) For this reason, I believe Beckmann preserved the spirit of most interpretations from 1971 in his 1997 edition.

⁵For a summary of this grouping issue, see Leon W. Couch III, "Review Feature: New Buxtehude Edition." *The Diapason* (October 2000): 10. After much praise of Beckmann's results, Archbold calls Beckmann's groupings in BuxWV 149 "simply terrible" (Archbold, "Why are there so many," 89).

⁶For an example comparison between Albrecht's and Beckmann's old editions using BuxWV 155, see Peter M. Marshall, "Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Orgelwerke, edited by Christoph Albrecht," *Early Keyboard Journal* 13 (1995), 153.

⁷See Couch, 10, for a fairly lengthy discussion of this junction and the use of pedals in BuxWV 142.

⁸Marshall, 152.

⁹In "Why are there so many," pp. 88–90, Archbold demonstrates the value of detailed comparison between different scores of BuxWV 149 as a model for students new to this repertory. With exhortations that still hold true today, Archbold encourages every performer of this repertory to become an "amateur musicologist." The striking differences he observes change the effect of several passages in BuxWV 149. He also briefly examines BuxWV 156 and 155.

¹⁰While promoting his own edition, Viderø criticizes Beckmann for not going far enough: "Beckmann, as a musicologist, contents himself with merely going over the whole of the source material – and that most meticulously – without commenting on a number of questionable passages, and finally when he does attempt an emendation he appears to lack a sense of style and an ear for musical structure" (Viderø, V). Viderø's 1985 edition of nine works certainly does present "radical reconstruction" (ibid.). Although most teachers would hesitate to recommend Viderø's edition for this reason, his edition seems more idiomatic to the organ and his wilder conjectures will fascinate and provoke those familiar with a more conservative approach. Viderø's critical notes are especially helpful here, because they clearly argue his reasoning in addition to avoiding abbreviations and using complete sentences—performers are likely to use such notes.

Beckmann's Revised Edition (1997): The Preface, Critical Notes, Bibliography, and Sources

The revised edition features a more in-depth preface, a bibliography, and the critical notes in addition to the scores of Buxtehude's free organ works. Beckmann's serviceable preface, despite its awkward translation, defends his goals and several of his editorial choices (more on this later)—its language and content seem aimed more towards scholars than performers using his edition. The bibliography is a wonderful addition: in one concise page, Beckmann compiles a list of recent seminal articles, along with significant editions and books. Beckmann corrected the most prominent flaw of the 1971 edition by appending the critical notes. As usual, critical notes will be a dense list of cryptic abbreviations and German phrases to the uninitiated. Although musicologists immediately feel at home, I suspect only determined, scholarly minded organists will use it. (Other editions, incidentally, do provide more accessible prefaces and critical notes.¹¹) With the addition of these three features (preface, bibliography, and critical notes), Beckmann has responded to scholars' chief criticisms.

In addition to discussing some noticeable changes in editorial procedures (more on this later), Beckmann reiterates the modern issue over genre names in his preface: titles such as "Tocatta" or "Praeludium" which can be found in the manuscript sources are preferred over the misleading anachronistic labels such as "Prelude and Fugue" found in older editions. Beckmann presses this point further than most by avoiding the inclusion of key centers in titles. The well-known "Praeludium in E Major" is simply "Praeludium" and indistinguishable by title from any others. Fortunately, this is not a major inconvenience, because key signatures can be read quickly, and the table of contents does list the modern keys (carefully separated from the titles). The order of pieces by BuxWV number (i.e., by key center!) in the first volume also makes the *pedaliter* praeludia easy to locate. The second volume, which contains the non-*pedaliter* and a few *pedaliter* free works, preserves the seemingly haphazard ordering of works in the Buxtehude Werke Verzeichnis (BuxWV). One would need to memorize the BuxWV numbers to avoid constantly referring to the table of contents. Worse yet, the rough division of *pedaliter* and *manualiter* works found in the BuxWV and reflected in distribution of works in the two volumes may make Beckmann's edition potentially misleading.¹² Except for BuxWV 162, in which an early eighteenth-century scribe indicated manuals only in the title, organists today may often choose whether to use pedals.

According to Beckmann, the 1997 revision reportedly benefits from recent scholarship

¹¹Only the luxurious Belotti edition provides immediately comprehensible critical notes. Not only are they in English, the amount of abbreviations is held to a minimum. Peter Williams harshly criticizes this wonderfully extravagant feature, because copiousness not only increased the printing cost, it forced Belotti's publisher to use two volumes rather than one for the *pedaliter* praeludia (Peter Williams, "Reviews of Music: *Dieterich* (sic) *Buxtehude, The Collected Works*, Vol. 15—Keyboard Music," *The Organ Yearbook* 49 (2000): 175). I would argue that the volume's easy-to-read introduction and notes will encourage performers, not just a minority of scholars, to consult them regularly. Albrecht's critical notes use even more abbreviations than Beckmann's 1997 edition, but the formatting of Albrecht's actually makes them easier for a determined scholar to navigate. The critical notes to Beckmann's 1971 scholarly edition are worse—one respected scholar commented that his dense abbreviations are "musicological hieroglyphics."

¹²Belotti also separates perceived *manualiter* and *pedaliter* works. Only Albrecht chooses a straightforward ordering sorted simply by key, which benefits the user and the publisher: popular works are distributed throughout all the volumes, necessitating purchase of them all.

(after 1971). Beckmann also points out that Albrecht's 1995 edition does not incorporate this scholarship, but in an addendum to his second edition (1997), Albrecht discounts the importance to his edition.¹³ (The scholarship found in three articles from the mid-1980s and the 1990s only argue that one manuscript source is derived from another one.)

Several new entries were added to the list of sources consulted by both Albrecht and Beckmann since Beckmann's 1971 edition;¹⁴ however only the interpretation of only four works was affected. The *Praeludium in F-sharp Minor*, BuxWV 146, experiences the largest change—all modern editions have switched to the recently discovered Werndt manuscript as a primary source. Beckmann 1997 also adds a late eighteenth-century secondary source beyond Albrecht's list of sources, but from what I can tell, its content of three pieces makes little difference to the interpretations. Belotti's edition, incidentally, surveys all these currently available sources. The additional sources discovered since 1971 affects only a handful of pieces.

Beckmann's Revised Edition (1997): The Scores

Although the layout of the 1997 edition is exactly the same as the 1971 one—measures and musical notes are placed in exactly the same physical location along with the convenient page turns that we remember—the scores now distinguish some types of editorial license. In the 1997 edition, for instance, Beckmann clarifies which ties are editorial (dotted bowed lines) and which are original to the sources (solid tie). Although I find the dotted lines focus my attention too heavily on Beckmann's consistently good judgement on this issue, other reviewers apparently feel this is a major improvement. The locations of ties, incidentally, rarely change between the old and new Beckmann editions. (An example can be found in mm. 96–100 of BuxWV 149, where the tenor now rearticulates notes.)

Critical performance directions found in the sources now occur on the score. In particular, performers can easily tell whether a source specified pedals. Thereby organists can identify ambiguous situations and choose to adopt Beckmann's educated guesses or to play alternative solutions instead. In several instances, a different choice might not only be more effective, but also be much easier to execute.¹⁵ The danger of Beckmann's (and Albrecht's) continued use of a separate staff for the pedal part, however, is that players may forget to

¹³“An initial investigation revealed that in almost all of these instances [where the relationship between the sources must be considered] the musical text would remain the same, the only difference being that Agricola's corrections [in the derivative manuscript] would now have to appear in the critical report as the work of the editor. The publishers and the editor have therefore agreed for the moment to draw attention to the altered state of the sources merely by publishing this addendum” (Christoph Albrecht, Introduction to *Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Orgelwerke*, vol. 1 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1994), xv).

¹⁴Simplifying comparison between their editions, Albrecht expanded Beckmann's 1971 sigla for sources and editions. With one addition in his 1997 edition, Beckmann used Albrecht's update.

¹⁵See Couch, 10–11, for a discussion of alternative solutions in the *gigue* fugue of BuxWV 142 and an echo passage in BuxWV 146. One might reasonably employ the pedal differently in the continuo section of BuxWV 149 and the opening of BuxWV 155 to great effect as well.

consider these alternatives.¹⁶

Although Beckmann directly warns that “the decision about how much of the bass part is to be attributed to the manual and the pedal must be taken even when the work is notated in three staves,”¹⁷ one wonders how many organ students really read and heed his caution. Even though a skilled organist should be able to rearrange the parts at sight, too many organists may be seduced into relying too heavily on Beckmann’s choices, however reasonable, to justify the ease that three-staff notation provides to the editor. Beginners will undoubtedly play what is on the page. In the preface, Beckmann also defends himself against those who claim that two-staff notation is better on historical grounds: Most sources of Buxtehude’s music, admittedly, use two-staff notation, but Buxtehude himself certainly used organ tablature and did not need to make this notational decision at all.

A number of editorial changes between the 1971 and 1997 publications involve subtle changes in musical notation: (1) In the old edition, Beckmann beams four eighth notes together in 4/4 meter. According to Beckmann, the new edition uses duplets instead in order to encourage a Baroque-performance-practice “microarticulation.” Although this change makes little difference to me when I use the scores, at least one reviewer found this subtle difference objectionably dogmatic, especially in the case of the three-eighth-note upbeat.¹⁸ (See Examples 1a and 1b.) In faster tempos, the more prominent layer of articulation probably lies on strong beats as quadruplets of the older edition would suggest. (2) Beckmann chooses to emphasize the use of dots over ties to lengthen notes. He believes that Buxtehude preferred this notation, perhaps because it reflects the act of playing more closely: If a note is struck once, one note head (with a dot) is used, rather than two note heads (with a tie). Perhaps Beckmann’s scores resemble the Baroque sources a little more closely, but, as a modern player, I find this archaic notation simply irritating in some passages—it has little, if any, effect upon performance. (See Examples 2a, 2b, 3a, and 3b.) (3) Like most sources, Beckmann’s edition no longer supplies rests in empty bars, leaving numerous staves entirely empty. (If he omitted these empty staves, would he be able to decrease the number of page turns?) The 1971 edition, incidentally, used a small font size for editorially supplied rests, but most users probably didn’t regard the difference. (4) Less significant details exhibit more consistency in notation, such as the addition of “6” above all the (controversial) sextuplets in BuxWV 149 and the breaking of a sixteenth-note beam in m. 152 of BuxWV 142. (Note that some notational changes do reflect significant changes, such as the changed incipit to BuxWV 142, which reflects the emphasis of an alternative source

¹⁶Belotti supplies the only edition that leaves the music on two staves—one of the major advantages of Belotti’s edition. See my review of Belotti’s edition for more details on this advantage (Couch, 10). Albrecht also follows the modern practice of three staves. The Toccata in D minor, BuxWV 155, incidentally, provides a case not solvable by the three-staff notation, for the scribe specifies that the organist herself should make the choice whether to use pedal! In m. 20, the source states “P: vel M:” (pedal or manual!).

¹⁷Klaus Beckmann, Introduction to *Dietrich Buxtehude: Sämtliche Orgelwerke*, vol. 1, (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1971–72), 8.

¹⁸Geoffrey Webber, “Through a glass darkly: *Dietrich Buxtehude: Sämtlicher Orgelwerke*, vols. 1 & 2,” *Early Music* 26:4 (November 1998): 678–79. This upbeat pattern of three eighths after an eighth rest is far less common than Webber suggests, but one may perceive a certain “choppiness” due to duplets in the scores. Webber also points out that the original beaming in cases such as BuxWV 158 seems to communicate something musical that standardized beaming conceals.

in the later edition.) In summary, the improved scores, once again, better approximate the original sources, but several notational improvements have little effect on the performer.

Although most players may generally find Beckmann's improvements somewhat subtle, the addition of pedal indications from the sources, altered stemming, or even ties in particular cases can make a great difference. Beckmann, for instance, works hard to reflect the voice-leading through stemming, and, in mm. 36–39 of BuxWV 143, the revised edition uses an additional change of register to untangle the confusion of counterpoint found in his 1971 edition. (See Examples 4a and 4b.) In a case where the reviewer Lawrence Archbold praises Albrecht's choice of a striking dominant seventh sonority in m. 8 of BuxWV 155 over Beckmann's 1971 "correction" to a major triad, Beckmann does revert to the dominant seventh that Spitta, Hedar, and Albrecht all read directly from the primary source.¹⁹ Such small but important differences are evident in numerous works, and, if one is familiar with the 1971 edition, one will notice a myriad of subtle changes in nearly every work. (See Examples 5a and 5b.) The publication of a revision is justified.

Recommendations

For organists buying Buxtehude's works for the first time, both Beckmann's and Albrecht's editions serve the purpose of a ready-made and relatively affordable interpretation excellently. Both are highly recommended. While I personally prefer Beckmann's familiar renditions, Albrecht's edition provides enough information both on the scores and in the critical notes to involve "the user whenever possible in the decision-making process [of what to play]."²⁰ (For this reason, Albrecht's edition might not be the best for beginners, but for more scholarly oriented players.)

From the above discussion, it is obvious that most Buxtehude enthusiasts will want to own several different editions. I should also mention that Dover has reissued Spitta/Seiffert's work (originally published by Breitkopf & Härtel in 1939). The publication is so inexpensive that it may be worthwhile to have it on one's shelves to consult occasionally, because their fine editing clearly reflects the sources that were available in 1939. In my opinion, upgrading from Beckmann's 1971 to his 1997 edition is simply too expensive, despite the countless improvements justifying the revision's printing—Beckmann's 1971 edition suffices for those who already own it (with the caveat that performers reference another score or access the separate critical notes). I would avoid the Hedar edition as a sole performing score—as in the case of Spitta's edition, organists would need to consult other editions too often. Yet, for those without financial constraints, the Hedar edition provides another interpretation worthy of consideration and is a useful reference tool on the Lund sources. This older edition, after all, marked an important milestone in Buxtehude scholarship. Because both the Spitta and Hedar

¹⁹Archbold provides several other good reasons for the B-flat major dominant seventh (Lawrence Archbold, "Music Reviews: Dietrich Buxtehude. *Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher freien Orgelwerke*. Hrsg. von Christoph Albrecht," *Notes—Quarterly Journal of the Music Library Association* 52:4 (June 1996): 1313).

²⁰Albrecht, xii. For a fine review of the Albrecht edition and a provoking discussion of two competing interpretations of the troublesome Toccata in D Minor, BuxWV 155, see Marshall, 153–55. Incidentally, I was unable to locate the error in Albrecht's *Quellenverzeichnis* that Marshall identified on p. 154 of his review, leading me to believe the editor corrected them in the revised edition of 1997, but the confusing labeling of BuxWV 167 and 169 persists.

editions derive so clearly from the sources, a comparison with modern performing editions will show how much Beckmann's procedures have changed our view of Buxtehude's music.

Avid fans of Buxtehude's music should own Belotti's fine reference edition to supplement their performing editions. It is the best companion for study of this music. The scholarly edition, however, is out of the price range of most students, and, if used as a sole source for performing, it requires organists to study pieces and sources before learning pieces—something that isn't appealing to everyone.²¹ Libraries should obviously own Belotti's reference edition, because performers will want to examine the easy-to-read details of all the "variants" in the extant sources. A good music library will want to offer several, if not all, the currently available editions, because each displays different merits. Such resources would truly allow organists to intelligently tailor their own convincing versions.

Without Buxtehude's autographed manuscripts, no definitive edition can exist. Whatever edition of Buxtehude's music one is using, one should consult the preface and critical notes. Albrecht's preface is particularly good in this regard, along with the alternative readings in the score itself. Belotti's provides for fascinating reading and surprising accessibility in a scholarly edition. I hope that, with this article, organists will be able to choose the editions that best fit their needs and that they will feel inspired to consult multiple editions when enjoying and performing Buxtehude's music.

Leon W. Couch III
College Station, Texas

²¹This conclusion obviously contradicts one reviewer who boldly states that Belotti's edition "renders all other editions superfluous" and that it "is the only one you will ever need" (David Pontsford, "Buxtehude Defined," *Choir & Organ* 8:2 (March–April 2000), 16 and 18). Pontsford praises Belotti's goal of "presenting a text representing as much of Dieterich Buxtehude's conception of the work as can be recovered by a conservative handling of the surviving sources" (Belotti, xxii), but forgets to remind performers that these volumes obligate them to not only read but contemplate the critical notes of the accompanying volume before playing a note. (See Couch, 10.)

Common Editions of Buxtehude Free Organ Works

Albrecht, Christoph, ed. *Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Orgelwerke*. Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1994–98.
(Edition BA 8221–23)

Beckmann, Klaus, ed. *Sämtliche Orgelwerke*. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1971–72.
(Performer's edition EB 6661–62)

Beckmann, Klaus, ed. *Sämtliche Orgelwerke*. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1971–72.
("Scholarly" edition EB 6621–22)

_____. *Sämtliche Orgelwerke*. Revised New Edition. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1997.
(Edition 6661–62)

Belotti, Michael, ed. *DIETERICH BUXTEHUDE: The Collected Works, Volume 15 (Part 1 A & B Preludes, Toccatas and Ciaconas for Organ (pedaliter))*. Kerala J. Snyder and Christoph Wolff, general editors. Williamstown, MA: The Broude Trust, 1998.
(ISBN 0-8540-7515-2)

Hedar, Josef, ed. *Sämtliche Orgelwerke*. København: W. Hansen, 1952.
(Edition 3921–22)

Spitta, Philipp. *Organ Works (1875/1939)*. Revised by Max Seiffert. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1952. Reprint edition. New York: Dover, 1988.
(ISBN 0-486-25682-0)

TABLE 1: Concordance of Common Editions

BuxWV	Title & Alternative Titles	Spitta/Seiffert 1939 (Dover)	Hedar 1952 (Hansen)	Beckmann 1 1971 (Breitkopf)	Albrecht 1994–95 (Bärenreiter)	Beckmann 2 1997 (Breitkopf)	Belotti 1998 (Broude)
136	Praeludium in C	1	II, 2	I, 1	I, 2	I, 1	15A, 2
137	Praeludium in C (Prelude, Fugue, and Chaconne in C)	2	II, 1	I, 2	I, 1	I, 2	15A, 1
138	Praeludium in C	-	-	I, 3	I, 3	I, 3	15A, 3
139	Praeludium in D	3	II, 11	I, 4	I, 8	I, 4	15A, 4
140	Praeludium in d	4	II, 19	I, 5	I, 9	I, 5	15A, 6
141	Praeludium in E	5	II, 14	I, 6	II, 13	I, 6	15A, 7
142	Praeludium in e ²¹	6	II, 9	I, 7	II, 14	I, 7	15A, 8 15B, App. 1
143	Praeludium in e	7	II, 10	I, 8	II, 15	I, 8	15A, 9
144	Praeludium in F (dubious)	8	II, 16	I, 9	II, 18	I, 9	15B, App. 4
145	Praeludium in F	9	II, 15	I, 10	II, 19	I, 10	15A, 12
146	Praeludium in fis	10	II, 13	I, 11	II, 22	I, 11	15A, 14
147	Praeludium in G	-	II, 7	I, 12	II, 23	I, 12	15A, 15
148	Praeludium in g	11	II, 22	I, 13	III, 31	I, 13	15A, 18
149	Praeludium in g	12	II, 24	I, 14	III, 32 III, App. 1	I, 14	15A, 16
150	Praeludium in g	13	II, 23	I, 15	III, 33	I, 15	15A, 17

151	Praeludium in A ²²	14	II, 12a II, 12b	I, 16 App. 1 (Sch. Ed.)	III, 36	I, 16	15A, 19 15B, App. 2 15B, App. 3
152	Praeludium in a (Praeludium in Phrygian) (Praeludium quarti toni)	15	II, 6	I, 17	III, 37	I, 17	15A, 10
153	Praeludium in a	16	II, 4	I, 18	III, 38	I, 18	15A, 20
154	Praeludium in B (fragment)	-	II, 21	App. 3 (Sch. Ed.)	III, 41	-	15B, App. 5
155	Praeludium in d ²³ (Toccatà)	17	II, 20	II, 19 App. 2 (Sch. Ed.)	I, 9	II, 19	15A, 5
156	Toccatà in F	18	II, 17	II, 20	II, 20	II, 20	15A, 11
157	Toccatà in F	19	II, 18	II, 21	II, 21	II, 21	15A, 13
158	Praeambulum in a	20	II, 5	II, 22	III, 39	II, 22	15A, 21
159	Ciacona in c-moll	21	I, 3	II, 23	I, 7	II, 23	15A, 23
160	Ciacona in e-moll	22	I, 2	II, 24	II, 17	II, 24	15A, 24
161	Passacaglia in d-moll	23	I, 1	II, 25	I, 12	II, 25	15A, 22
162	Praeludium in G	-	II, 8	II, 26	III, 24	II, 26	-
163	Praeludium in g	24	II, 25	II, 27	III, 34	II, 27	-
164	Toccatà in G	25	II, 27	II, 28	III, 25	II, 28	-
165	Toccatà in G	26	II, 26	II, 29	III, 26	II, 29	-
166	Canzona in C	27	I, 4	II, 30	I, 5	II, 30	-
167	Canzonetta in C	-	I, 5	II, 31	I, 6	II, 31	-

168	Canzona in d	28	I, 10	II, 32	I, 11	II, 32	-
169	Canzonetta in e	-	I, 9	II, 33	II, 16	II, 33	-
170	Canzona in G	-	I, 6	II, 34	III, 27	II, 34	-
171	Canzonetta in G (Canzona in G)	29	I, 7	II, 35	III, 29	II, 35	-
172	Canzonetta in G	-	-	II, 36	III, 30	II, 36	-
173	Canzona in g (Canzonetta in g)	-	I, 12	II, 37	III, 35	II, 37	-
174	Fuga in C	30	II, 3	II, 38	I, 4	II, 38	-
175	Fuga in G (Canzona in G)	31	I, 8	II, 39	III, 28	II, 39	-
176	Fuga in B (Canzona in B)	32	I, 11	II, 40	III, 42	II, 40	-
255	Canzonetta in a	-	-	II, 41	III, 40	II, 41	-

21. The Lindemann Tablature fuses the gigue fugue and the preceding free section, while the Codex E. B. and the Berlin Manuscript stop on a long chord before proceeding into the fugue. In the middle of the gigue fugue, the two later sources supply two extra beats of music. Approximately sixteen bars later, the Lindemann Tablature then supplies two extra beats. As a result, the metrical placement at the very end of the fugue finally agree!

22. The two principal sources, the Schmah Tablature and the Möller Manuscript, diverge dramatically. Neither by themselves is completely satisfactory. Seiffert's edition conflates the two. The Schmah Tablature contains 36 measures of somewhat dubious music not found in the Möller Manuscript. Here, Belotti writes that "a truly authoritative text is impossible" and that "it should be possible to produce a version [through conflation]" (Belotti, vol. 15B, 125). Both Beckmann and Albrecht offer possible solutions. Without the source, Hedar's versions, incidentally, are not trustworthy transcriptions.

23. As mentioned in this and other articles, BuxWV 155 derives from an extremely corrupt and, unfortunately, unique source. One should consult the critical notes and several editions when studying this work and tailoring an interpretation for performance. (One should go beyond Belotti's transcriptions of the sources.)

Examples 2a and 2b

EXAMPLE 2: Tied Notes changed to Dotted Notes



Musical score for Example 2a, showing three staves. The top staff is in treble clef with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a common time signature (C). It contains a melodic line with a tied note marked with an asterisk (*) and a final note marked with a '5' and a fermata. The middle staff is in bass clef with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a common time signature (C), containing a complex rhythmic accompaniment. The bottom staff is in bass clef with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a common time signature (C), containing a simple bass line.

(a) BuxWV 142, mm. 4, in Beckmann 1971



Musical score for Example 2b, showing three staves. The top staff is in treble clef with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a common time signature (C). It contains a melodic line with a tied note marked with an asterisk (*) and a final note marked with a '5' and a fermata. The middle staff is in bass clef with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a common time signature (C), containing a complex rhythmic accompaniment. The bottom staff is in bass clef with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a common time signature (C), containing a simple bass line.

(b) BuxWV 142, mm. 4, in Beckmann 1997

Examples 4a and 4b

EXAMPLE 4: Reworking of Counterpoint through Change of Register and Stemming

Musical score for Example 4a, showing a reworking of counterpoint through change of register and stemming. The score is in G major (one sharp) and 3/4 time. It consists of three staves. The top staff is in treble clef, the middle and bottom staves are in bass clef. The music features a complex counterpoint with various rhythmic patterns and stems. A measure number '40' is indicated at the end of the first staff. Dashed lines connect notes between the top and middle staves, highlighting the reworking of counterpoint.

(a) BuxWV 143, mm. 36–40, in Beckmann 1971

Musical score for Example 4b, showing a reworking of counterpoint through change of register and stemming. The score is in G major (one sharp) and 3/4 time. It consists of three staves. The top staff is in treble clef, the middle and bottom staves are in bass clef. The music features a complex counterpoint with various rhythmic patterns and stems. A measure number '40' is indicated at the end of the first staff. Asterisks (*) are placed above certain notes in the top staff, highlighting the reworking of counterpoint.

(b) BuxWV 143, mm. 36–40, in Beckmann 1997

Examples 1a and 1b

EXAMPLE 1: Beaming of Eighth Notes in Common Meter

The musical score for Example 1a consists of three staves. The top staff is in treble clef and begins with a measure number '40'. It contains a melodic line with eighth-note passages, including a triplet of eighth notes. The middle and bottom staves are in bass clef and provide accompaniment with eighth-note patterns. The notation includes various beaming styles for the eighth notes, such as straight beams and slurs, to illustrate different rhythmic groupings.

(a) BuxWV 138, mm. 40–44, in Beckmann 1971

This musical score is identical in notation to Example 1a, including the treble and two bass staves and the measure number '40'. However, the beaming of the eighth notes in the treble staff is different, illustrating an alternative rhythmic interpretation of the same passage. The accompaniment in the bass staves remains the same.

(b) BuxWV 138, mm. 40–44, in Beckmann 1997

Examples 3a and 3b

EXAMPLE 3: Archaic Dotting Practice in Beckmann 1997

The musical score consists of three staves. The top staff is in treble clef and contains a complex rhythmic pattern with various note values and rests. The middle and bottom staves are in bass clef and show simpler rhythmic accompaniment. The music is in common time. There are asterisks and a section sign (§) marking specific measures.

(a) BuxWV 149, mm. 27–29
Also notice the inconsistency in m. 29 (§)

(b) BuxWV 149, mm. 50–51

Examples 5a and 5b

EXAMPLE 5: Numerous Subtle Changes between Beckmann's 1971 and 1997 Editions

Musical score for Example 5a, Beckmann's 1971 Edition. The score is in 3/4 time, key of D major, and starts at measure 80. It features three staves: a treble clef staff at the top, a bass clef staff in the middle, and another bass clef staff at the bottom. The top staff contains a complex melodic line with many sixteenth and thirty-second notes, ending with a fermata and the word "etc.". The middle and bottom staves provide harmonic support with chords and bass lines. A measure number "80" is placed above the first measure of the top staff.

(a) BuxWV 146, mm. 79–84, in Beckmann's 1971 Edition

Musical score for Example 5b, Beckmann's 1997 Edition. This score is identical to the 1971 edition but includes several performance directions and alterations marked with asterisks. The top staff begins with the instruction "con discretione*" above the first measure. Asterisks are placed above specific notes in measures 80, 81, 82, 83, and 84. A dashed line above the final measure of the top staff indicates a change in phrasing. The measure number "80" is placed above the first measure of the top staff.

(b) BuxWV 146, mm. 79–84, in Beckmann's 1997 Edition

* Asterisks mark altered notes, rhythms, durations, or performance directions, and not the several minor changes in notation. Note that the crowded layout to save space is mine, not Beckmann's.