

# INTRODUCTION

---

Of the eighteen symphonies firmly attributed to Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, at least eight were arranged for solo keyboard in the eighteenth century.<sup>1</sup> While all eight of the symphonies he composed between 1741 and 1762 in Berlin or its environs (Wq 173–181; for the orchestral versions see CPEB: CW, III/1) survive in keyboard arrangements, the two sets he wrote in Hamburg, the *Symphonies for Baron van Swieten*, Wq 182, and the *Orchester-Symphonien mit zwölf obligaten Stimmen*, Wq 183, are known only in orchestral versions (see CPEB: CW, III/2 and III/3). The eight extant arrangements span a broad spectrum in terms of quality and authenticity. For example, it is clear that Bach wished to capitalize on the lucrative market for solo keyboard works by publishing two of his arrangements almost a decade after their orchestral versions were composed—Wq 112/13 in *Clavierstücke verschiedener Art* (1765) and Wq 122/5 in *Musikalisches Vielerley* (1770). Yet the only other work in the present volume to be published in the eighteenth century, Wq 122/2, was almost certainly not authorized by Bach. Of the remaining arrangements that exist exclusively in manuscript, only Wq 122/1 can be confidently ascribed to the composer; the unique arrangements for solo keyboard of Bach's symphonies found among the materials of the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin recovered in 1999 are of doubtful authenticity.<sup>2</sup>

## Origin and Authenticity

Three arrangements of the symphonies from Bach's Berlin years—Wq 122/1, 112/13 (duplicate item Wq 122/4), and 122/5—are recorded in the section of the “Nachlass-Verzeichnis” (NV 1790) devoted to music for solo keyboard:

---

1. Several symphonies at one time attributed to C.P.E. Bach but of doubtful authenticity also exist as keyboard pieces. H 361, for instance, was declared a work by “Bach of Berlin” in some published English editions but is actually an arrangement of J.C. Bach's overture to Florian Leopold Gassmann's opera *Gli uccellatori*. Similarly, H 371 is an arrangement of Carl Heinrich Graun's Symphony in B-flat Major, Graun WV B:XII:66. See CPEB: CW, III/1 for further information.

2. On the rediscovery of the Sing-Akademie collection, see Christoph Wolff, “Recovered in Kiev: Bach et al. A Preliminary Report on the Music Collection of the Berlin Sing-Akademie,” *Notes* 58 (2001): 259–71.

[p. 6:] “No. 43. B[erlin]. 1745, eine aufs Clavier accommodirte Sinfonie.”<sup>3</sup>

[p. 15:] “No. 107. B[erlin]. 1758. Eine Anno 1765 in P[otsdam]. aufs Clavier gesetzte Sinfonie, ist in den Clavierstücken verschiedener Art gedruckt.”

[p. 15:] “No. 108. B[erlin]. 1758. Eine Anno 1766 in B. aufs Clavier gesetzte Sinfonie, ist im Musikalischen Vielerley gedruckt.”

All three of these arrangements are also listed in Bach's “Clavierwerke-Verzeichnis” (CV 1772), where dates and places of composition correspond identically to those in NV 1790.<sup>4</sup>

The Symphony in G Major, Wq 173, represents Bach's earliest surviving foray into the symphonic genre. According to NV 1790, Bach composed the work for two violins, viola, and bass in 1741 at Berlin. The arrangement, Wq 122/1, followed four years later, although the motivation for its creation is unclear.<sup>5</sup> Since the early 1730s Bach had produced a steady stream of keyboard works, and beginning in 1742 he would meet the growing demand for sonatas by ushering his so-called “Prussian” Sonatas, Wq 48, into print. Although Bach composed the Symphony in G Major initially as an orchestral work, his brilliant arrangement would have had no problems masquerading as a keyboard sonata. Indeed, in D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 369 (source B 2), the work is presented as a “Sonata”; the porous boundaries between symphony and sonata are similarly visible in the popular Symphony in E Minor, Wq 178, which shares its

---

3. Wotquenne (p. 52) erroneously states that this arrangement appeared in Breitkopf's *Raccolta della migliore sinfonie . . . of 1760/61* (see below).

4. A description and complete facsimile of this catalogue can be found in Christoph Wolff, “Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs Verzeichnis seiner Clavierwerke von 1733 bis 1772,” in *Über Leben, Kunst und Kunstwerke: Aspekte musikalischer Biographie. Johann Sebastian Bach im Zentrum*, ed. Christoph Wolff (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1999), 217–35.

5. Bach would not compose another orchestral symphony until 1755, the same year in which dissatisfaction with his post at the court of Frederick the Great prompted a dispute between Bach and Christoph Nichelmann. See Thomas Christensen, “Nichelmann contra C.P.E. Bach: Harmonic Theory and Musical Politics at the Court of Frederick the Great,” in *Hamburg 1988*, 189–220.

middle movement with the Sonata in G Minor, Wq 62/18, for keyboard.<sup>6</sup> On the other hand, Bach may have planned to include the arrangement as part of an unpublished collection of works that would demonstrate his mastery of contemporary—and in this case, experimental—styles and compositional techniques. He would realize such a goal twice in his career, preparing the Symphony in G Major, Wq 112/13, for the *Clavierstücke verschiedener Art* in 1765 and the Symphony in F Major, Wq 122/5, for the *Musikalisches Vielerley* five years later. (Commentary on the Symphony in G Major, Wq 112/13, can be found in CPEB:CW, I/8.1.)

The Symphony in F Major, Wq 122/5, an arrangement of Wq 181, was released over a period of three weeks in the summer of 1770 as part of *Musikalisches Vielerley*, a collection edited by C.P.E. Bach and published in Hamburg by Michael Christian Bock that contained pieces by several contemporary composers. The collection was not limited exclusively to keyboard works, but rather pieces “for voice, as well as keyboard and others instruments.” According to an early advertisement, “For the most part a typical performer will be able to execute these pieces alone and without assistance.”<sup>7</sup> It seems that Wq 122/5 was an exception to the general rule of audience accessibility that accounted for the success of *Musikalisches Vielerley*, however, for an August 1770 review of Wq 122/5 could not move beyond the arrangement’s technical difficulties, noting in particular “the fiery and ever-busy Allegro” of the first movement.<sup>8</sup> That notwithstanding, numerous extant manuscript copies of Wq 122/5 indicate that it was by far the most popular of Bach’s orchestral arrangements for solo keyboard.<sup>9</sup>

The authenticity of the remaining five arrangements not produced under Bach’s keen editorial eye is more difficult to establish. Only one, the Symphony in F Major,

Wq 122/2, was published during Bach’s lifetime, but in a letter of 5 March 1787 Bach explained to Johann Jacob Heinrich Westphal that he had never encountered such an arrangement: “I have not seen [the Symphony in F Major] set for the keyboard; I composed it for instruments.”<sup>10</sup> The situation is complicated by a payment dated 10 June 1761 of 15 Reichsthaler to Bach from the Leipzig printer and publisher Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf.<sup>11</sup> Although Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg had introduced Bach to Breitkopf in 1756, Breitkopf would not become Bach’s principal publisher until the 1770s. The existence of a bill of payment from the early 1760s, a period in which Breitkopf issued only a handful of Bach’s compositions, raises the possibility that Bach may have been remunerated for a version of his Symphony in F Major, Wq 175, that appeared in 1760 in a collection of keyboard arrangements entitled *Raccolta delle migliori Sinfonie di più celebri compositori di nostro tempo, accomodate all’ Clavicembalo*. The collection was edited by Marpurg, who also saw to the arrangement of several symphonies contained within. Johann Adam Hiller, the composer and music writer well known and respected for his practical approach to music making, also participated in arranging some portion of the symphonies contained in *Raccolta*.<sup>12</sup> Bach most likely did not arrange Wq 175 himself, but rather relied on one of these musicians—or perhaps another unknown arranger—to undertake the task of reduction on his behalf.

Released in four sets of six symphonies each in 1760 and early 1761, *Raccolta* was clearly designed to introduce musicians to the diversity of Breitkopf’s impressive musical offerings. (For the complete contents of *Raccolta*, see the critical report in the present edition.) Addressing the discerning “Liebhaber,” a notice in the inaugural set of *Raccolta* explains:

6. According to NV 1790, p. 43, the Symphony in E Minor was composed in 1756, with the Sonata in G Minor following one year later. On Wq 62/18, see CPEB:CW, I/5.2.

7. Wiermann, 154–55. “Es werden darinn Stücke von keinem weitläufigen Umfange, sowol für die Stimme, als auch für das Clavier und andere Instrumente, vorkommen. Ein mäßiger Ausüber wird meist allein und ohne Beyhülfe diese Stücke ausführen können.”

8. “Musikalisches Vielerley. Hamburg: Bock,” *Unterhaltungen* 10/2 (August 1770): 158–60. “Eine Sinfonie fürs Clavier von unserm Herrn Bach wird im 37sten Stück angefangen, und geht bis ins 39te; sie ist nicht leicht, sonderlich das erste feurige stets geschäftige Allegro.” Cited in Wiermann, 172.

9. C.P.E. Bach’s inclusion of an arrangement in *Musikalisches Vielerley* may also have been prompted by the success of his younger brother’s *Six Overtures [Symphonies] Composed and Addapted [sic] for the Harpsichord*, op. 3, which had been published in London the year prior.

10. CPEB-Briefe, 2:1197. “Die 1 Sinfonie bey No. 6 habe ich fürs Clavier gesetzt nicht gesehen; für Instrumente habe ich sie gemacht.” The “No. 6” in Bach’s letter refers to a list of works that Westphal had sent the composer. It is no longer traceable but likely contributed to his prodigious thematic catalogue of Bach’s music, which in turn provided a model for Wotquenne. On Westphal and his catalogues of CPEB’s works, see Leisinger/Wollny 1997, 25–74.

11. The receipt is reproduced in CPEB-Briefe, 1:67.

12. See Hermann von Hase, “Johann Adam Hiller und Breitkopfs,” *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 2/1 (October 1919): 1–22, esp. 17–18. As Anna Amalie Albert and Thomas Bauman have noted (“Hiller, Johann Adam,” *NG<sup>II</sup>*, 11:514), Hiller had no reservations about rearranging scores of Handel and Mozart in order to suit the tastes of his audiences.

Not only can you acquire these and future symphonies arranged for the keyboard, but symphonies by different masters are also available in parts and full score, cleanly and correctly reproduced in manuscript copies and, for some, in prints. Should they be needed, copies of the first or second violin parts to these keyboard symphonies can also be provided.<sup>13</sup>

Indeed, during the publication of *Raccolta*, Breitkopf began issuing the first of his thematic catalogues, and a little over a year later Bach's Symphony in F Major, Wq 175, was available for purchase (Cat. Breitkopf 1762, col. 2). Bach's tacit participation in the *Raccolta* project may have been motivated by the prospect of his symphonies reaching a wider audience through Breitkopf's innovative marketing practices.

The remaining four symphony arrangements—Wq 174, 176, 178,<sup>14</sup> and 179—exist in a source unique to the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin (D-B, SA 4200; source B 3).<sup>15</sup> Although its paper probably dates from the final quarter of the eighteenth century, the manuscript is in the hands of two anonymous scribes, making confident ascriptions to Bach and his circle particularly difficult. Even more problematic, however, is the mixture of negligence and subsequent scribal intervention that has produced several corrupted passages in the manuscript. This issue is especially

---

13. "Es wird denen Liebhabern hierdurch bekannt gemacht, daß Sie nicht allein diese und künftige auf das Clavier gesetzte Sinfonien, sondern auch noch viele andere, von verschiedenen Meistern, vollstimmig, in Stimmen oder Partitur sauber und richtig abgeschrieben, oder zum Theil auch gedruckt bekommen können. Sollte man zu einer oder der andern dieser Clavier-Sinfonien nur die erste oder zwote Violin-Stimme in Abschrift verlangen, so kann auch damit gedient werden. Der Preis wird nach den geschriebenen Bogen à 4 gl. berechnet, und nächstens ein weitläufiger Catalogus über die vorrätigen geschriebenen Musicalien ausgegeben werden."

14. Wotquenne (p. 52) lists this arrangement as 122/3 but gives no further evidence for its existence. Helm (p. 31, H 115) cites Wotquenne's incipit and incorrectly adds that the arrangement was published in Breitkopf's *Raccolta delle migliore sinfonie . . .* of 1760/61. Wotquenne's description was based on a catalogue entry by Westphal of the orchestral work that Westphal may have planned to arrange. If Westphal did execute an arrangement of Wq 178, it is no longer traceable to him, nor is it likely that the arrangement of Wq 178 contained in source B 3 is related to Westphal. See Ulrich Leisinger and Peter Wollny, "Altes Zeug von mir: Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs kompositorisches Schaffen vor 1740," *Bach-Jahrbuch* 79 (1993): 127–204, esp. 203.

15. This source also contains the Symphony in F Major, Wq 122/5, which was undoubtedly copied from *Musikalisches Vielerley*. These four symphony arrangements make up a handful of compositions that represent completely new additions to Bach's composition catalogue. See Darrell M. Berg, "Sources of C.P.E. Bach's Solo Keyboard Works in the Sing-Akademie Archives," in *C.P.E. Bach Studies*, ed. Annette Richards (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 67–83.

prevalent among Wq 122/5, 174, and 179, that is, the works copied by the first unknown scribe, although all of these arrangements suffer from numerous errant readings.

In the first movement of Wq 179, m. 65, for example, the arranger gives the left hand an ostinato of eighth notes on a $\flat$  while the right hand plays a scalar figure that clearly outlines an E-flat major chord. Bach's full score calls for the ensemble to perform this scalar figure in unison octaves, thus obviating any harmonic dissonance; the same gesture returns toward the end of the movement (mm. 101–2). The arranger's solution is so jarring that it has been emended in the present edition. Errors in this scribe's arrangement of Wq 174 inspired at least one contemporary to make changes. The accompaniment figures were modified in several passages in the first movement, in which a tendency to substitute tremolos with Alberti figurations (see, for example, mm. 60–65, staff II) predominates. Several bars in the second movement were also revised, almost all concerning the inner voice of the right hand (cf. mm. 5, 6, 14, etc.). Finally, additions to the third movement chiefly involve fleshing out of the chords in opening and closing phrases.<sup>16</sup> The high number of revisions to this arrangement suggests that Wq 174 was a rather popular piece, at least for the owner of this manuscript. Similarly, the numerous errors in Wq 179 that remain untreated speak to the relatively poor reception of that arrangement.

### The Market for Keyboard Arrangements

The growing market for solo keyboard arrangements of large ensemble works—particularly symphonies and opera overtures—in the second half of the eighteenth century largely accounts for C.P.E. Bach's own contributions as well as the sizable number of unauthorized keyboard reductions of his symphonies. With the exception perhaps of the Symphony in E Minor, Wq 178, the keyboard arrangements of C.P.E. Bach's symphonies eclipsed their orchestral progenitors in popularity.<sup>17</sup>

Breitkopf's *Raccolta* was one of the first in what would be a long line of publications aimed at bringing large ensemble works into the amateur market. Westphal, for

---

16. These later additions may reflect an attempt by the second scribe to make the arrangement conform more closely with the orchestral version after Bach augmented its scoring to include two flutes. See CPEB: CW, III/1. A complete list of discernible changes made to the arrangement of Wq 174 can be found in the commentary to the present volume.

17. The fact that this was the only symphony from his Berlin years that Bach ever published also contributed to its familiarity beyond a North-German orbit.

instance, offered “Clavier-Sinfonien, mit 1 Violin und Hörner, ad libit.” of works by the Silesian composer Johann Schobert in his catalogue from 1770, and keyboard arrangements were routinely featured as part of keyboard collections such as the *Musikalische Unterhaltungen* of 1775 or Georg Benda’s self-published *Sammlung vermischter Clavierstücke für geübte und ungeübte Spieler* of 1780.<sup>18</sup> Nor did arrangements find receptive audiences only in Northern Germany—in 1778 the *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek* reviewed “L Année Musicale, ouvrage periodique contenant diverses Pièces nouvellement: composées et arangées pour le clavecin,” a collection of works published simultaneously in Paris, Bern, Berlin, and Leipzig and designed for the burgeoning population of musical dilettantes.<sup>19</sup>

Although Breitkopf had devoted roughly half of his *Raccolta* to arrangements both of symphonies and overtures from operas, interest in keyboard reductions of operatic overtures exploded in the 1780s and 1790s, with works by Gluck, Grétry, and Mozart being well represented. Among symphonies, only Haydn’s continued to be arranged for solo keyboard with any frequency after the 1780s. The importance of arrangements to the musical market can be illustrated by the catalogues of the publisher Johann Carl Friedrich Rellstab, who by 1790 could boast more than a dozen pages of “Opern, Operetten, Oratoria, Cantaten, Choräle und Choralvorspiele, Sinfonien und Tänze fürs Clavier ausgezogen.”<sup>20</sup>

On account of their versatility and ability to render more accurately the nuances of an increasingly large and sophisticated orchestral ensemble, keyboard arrangements with separate *ad libitum* parts came to eclipse solo keyboard arrangements in popularity toward the end of the century. And as the piano became a cornerstone of the bourgeois experience, the medium of choice for arrangements throughout the nineteenth century was the four-hand piano.<sup>21</sup> Bach’s works, however, played an in-

significant role in this development. Indeed, after the 1770 publication of Wq 122/5 in *Musikalisches Vielerley*, C.P.E. Bach’s symphonic works would not appear in arrangements for solo keyboard until August Stradal, a pupil of Franz Liszt, released the Symphonies in D Major and F Major (Wq 183/1, 183/3) in virtuosic piano renditions toward the end of the nineteenth century.<sup>22</sup>

### The Process of Arrangement

The choices made by C.P.E. Bach and most other arrangers in the second half of the eighteenth century revolved around two main principles: clarity of idea and technical accessibility. An early review of the Symphony in F Major, Wq 122/5, from *Musikalisches Vielerley* underscored the importance of the former:

Everything in this piece is new, noble, and beautiful. Certain composers who assemble their stertorous symphonies out of ten hackneyed ideas could here learn what a main idea is; how these ideas can be put to use, in whole and in part, through different keys; and what kind of relationship secondary ideas that subsequently appear should have to this main idea.<sup>23</sup>

Of course, it was incumbent upon the original symphony to offer novel ideas, but it was left to the keyboard arrangement to present those materials in a way that would not undermine the composer’s intentions and confuse the performer or listeners.

In Wq 122/1 and 122/5 Bach achieved this high level of compositional clarity by paying careful attention to the hierarchy of voices. While no composing drafts exist that document Bach’s arrangement process, he probably

18. See *Verzeichniß von Musicalien so bey Johann Christoph Westphal und Compagnie in Hamburg . . . zu haben sind* (Hamburg, 1770), 32. The first *Musikalische Unterhaltungen* began with an arrangement of an unidentified Symphony in E-flat Major.

19. *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek* 35/2 (1778): 515–16. The reviewer, Johann Friedrich Reichardt, was highly critical of this collection.

20. *Vollständiges Verzeichniß aller gedruckten, gestochenen u. geschriebenen Musicalien wie auch musikalischen Instrumenten welche zu Berlin bey dem Musik- und Instrumentenhändler J. C. F. Rellstab . . . zu haben sind* (Berlin, 1790), 1–13.

21. See Thomas Christensen, “Four-Hand Piano Transcription and Geographies of Nineteenth-Century Musical Reception,” *JAMS* 52/2 (1999): 255–98.

22. *Erste Sinfonie (D-dur) für Orchester von Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. Für Pianoforte zu zwei Händen*, ed. August Stradal (Leipzig: J. Schuberth & Co., [n.d.]), pl. no. 7591; *Dritte Sinfonie (F-dur) für Orchester von Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. Für Pianoforte zu zwei Händen*, ed. August Stradal (Leipzig: J. Schuberth & Co., [n.d.]), pl. no. 7590. On the reception of Bach’s symphonies in the eighteenth century and beyond, see Günther Wagner, “Die Sinfonien C.P.E. Bachs in der Bewertung von Zeitgenossen und Nachgeborenen,” in *Frankfurt/Oder 1998*, 481–95.

23. “Musikalisches Vielerley. Hamburg: Bach.” *Musikalische Nachrichten und Anmerkungen* 4/44 (29 October 1770): 344. “Sodann folgt eine für das Clavier gearbeitete Sinfonie vom Herrn Capellmeister Bach. Alles in derselben ist neu, prächtig und schön. Gewisse Componisten, die aus zehnerley abgedroschenen Gedanken ihre rasselnden Sinfonien zusammen setzen, können hier lernen, was ein Hauptgedanke sey, wie sie in den Wendungen durch verschiedene Tonarten, bald ganz, bald zum Theil, Gebrauch davon machen, und was für ein Verhältniß die neu hinzu kommenden Nebengedanken zu diesem Hauptthema haben sollen.”

approached the melody and bass line as a single unit that constituted the “idea.” If necessary, quickly repeating notes in the melody were changed into turning or tremolo figures, and the bass line would be refashioned to provide maximum forward momentum. Bach would then add inner voices to this unit only if the resulting texture continued to showcase the main idea. Thus in Wq 122/1 Bach chose not to include the viola’s line at mm. 16–21 in the first movement or mm. 9–11 in the second movement, despite the fact that each line would have been technically feasible to reproduce at the keyboard. He may have decided that adding these extra voices would diminish the effect of his main idea. Moreover, when Bach did include inner voices, he usually refrained from transposing them up or down the octave, regardless of whether it produced a more playable result.

Bach was keenly aware of the technical difficulties that some of his keyboard works posed. Prescriptive titles such as the “Damensonaten” (Wq 54) and sonatas “für Kenner und Liebhaber” (Wq 55–59, 61) were meant to aid musicians in selecting appropriately graded keyboard music. Most eighteenth-century arrangers of ensemble works for solo keyboard targeted the largest possible audience by erring on the side of simple tunefulness, but many passages within the outer movements of Bach’s authentic arrangements consciously resist such a trend. Indeed, Wq 122/5—with its huge accretions of sound, treacherous double stops, and delicate passage work—was considered by most reviewers to be beyond the abilities of the average keyboard student.<sup>24</sup> Similarly, the syncopations, wide leaps, and relentless drive of the unpublished Symphony in G Major, Wq 122/1, appeal more to the virtuoso than the dilettante. If the unauthorized arrangements preserved in the Sing-Akademie collection fail to “sound” like Bach, it is due in large part to their lack of technical finesse and intelligent and clear progression of musical ideas.

In the estimation of Charles Burney, these two elements were inseparable and fundamental to Bach’s musical style:

24. The mixture of accessible and overwhelming arrangements in *Raccolta* prompted one reviewer to muse that “Man arbeitet vor Liebhaber, die von verschiedener Fähigkeit sind, die sich aber alle ein gleiches Recht anmaßen, nach ihren Einsichten, oder besser zu sagen, nach ihren Fingern, davon zu urtheilen. Wenn wir nun sagten, daß diese Sinfonien einigen zu schwer, und andern zu leichte, einigen zu leer, und andern zu voll, vorkommen würden, so würden wir es vielleicht getroffen, aber damit gerade nichts anders gesagt haben, das daß sie eben so wären wie sie seyn sollten.” See “Sinfonien-Sammlung. Klavierauszug. Leipzig: Breitkopf,” *Neue Zeitungen von gelehrten Sachen* 104 (28 Dec. 1761): 864–65.

*Easy* and *difficult*, are relative terms; what is called a hard word by a person of no education, may be very familiar to a scholar: [Bach’s] works are more difficult to *express*, than to *execute*. As to their being *fantastical*, and *far-fetched*, the accusation, if it be just, may be softened, by alleging, that his boldest strokes, both of melody and modulation, are always consonant to rule, and supported by learning; and that his flights are not the wild ravings of ignorance or madness, but the effusions of cultivated genius. His pieces, therefore, will be found, upon a close examination, to be so rich in invention, taste, and learning, that, with all the faults laid to their charge, each line of them, if wire-drawn, would furnish more new ideas than can be discovered in a whole page of many other compositions that have been well received by the public.<sup>25</sup>

Wq 122/1 and 122/5 perfectly illustrate Burney’s observations; Wq 122/2 and the arrangement of Wq 176 somewhat less so. The arrangements of Wq 174, 178, and 179 exhibit these qualities to a far lesser degree, reinforcing the idea that they probably did not originate from Bach or his circle.

### Performance Considerations

None of the sources specifies the preferred type of instrument for any of the arrangements in the edition. The early date of composition for Wq 122/1, coupled with the limited number of dynamic markings, might suggest a harpsichord. The later arrangements exhibit an “empfindsam” style that would be well suited to a clavichord or fortepiano. However, since the intended audience of these keyboard arrangements was the at-home music connoisseur, any of these instruments would be more than up to the task.

The transferal of orchestral material to the keyboard also generated several ornaments, all of which Bach discusses in his *Versuch*:

- tr, +, Trill, regular trill (Triller, ordentlicher Triller; see *Versuch* I:2.3, § 1–21, and Tab. IV, Fig. XIX–XXIII)
- ♯ Trill from below (Triller von unten; see *Versuch* I:2.3, § 22, and Tab. IV, Fig. XXXIV)
- ♭ Trill from above (Triller von oben; see *Versuch* I:2.3, § 27, and Tab. IV, Fig. XLI)
- ♯ Short trill (halber Triller, Pralltriller; see *Versuch* I:2.3, § 30–36, Tab. IV, Fig. XLV–XLVIII, and Tab. V, Fig. XLIX)

25. Burney, 2:267.

- ∞, ℓ Turn (Doppelschlag; see *Versuch* I:2.4, § 1–26, and Tab. V, Fig. L–LXI)
- ∞ Trilled turn (prallender Doppelschlag; see *Versuch* I:2.4, § 27–36, and Tab. V, Fig. LXIII–LXX)
- ∞ Inverted turn (Schleiffer von dreyen Nötgen; see *Versuch* I:2.7, § 5, and Tab. VI, Fig. LXXXIX)
- ∞, ∞ Mordent and long mordent (Mordent, langer Mordent; see *Versuch* I:2.5, § 1–15, and Tab. V, Fig. LXXII–LXXV)

Where ∞ appears in the orchestral version, it is often rendered as ∞ in the keyboard reductions. However, this practice is by no means consistently employed throughout the eight arrangements.

Sometimes one of these ornaments is implied in the arrangements but not transmitted in any of the sources. For instance, in the first movement of the orchestral version of the Symphony in G Major, Wq 173, m. 21, a ∞ is given; in the arrangement, Wq 122/1, no ornament appears in either source B 1 or B 2, but a termination is written out.

The ∞, while not explicitly stated, should be executed. The present edition includes inserted ornaments where parallel passages transmit them, but the performer should feel free to add other embellishments that correspond to accepted practices of mid- to late-eighteenth-century performance (see, e.g., Wq 122/1/i, m. 72).

### Acknowledgments

My sincere thanks go to Dexter Edge, Ellen Exner, Stephen C. Fisher, Jason B. Grant, Matthias Röder, and Peter Wollny for their help with earlier versions of this edition. Mary Sue Morrow kindly provided me with a number of hard-to-find and illuminating primary documents. The staff of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv, facilitated consultation of their holdings. For his advice and counsel at all stages of this edition's evolution, I owe a debt of gratitude to Paul Corneilson.

*Jonathan Kregor*