

# INTRODUCTION

---

The five fascicles of CPEB: CW, I/6 contain forty-six keyboard sonatas and six sonatinas composed by C.P.E. Bach that were not published during his lifetime (see the appendix to this introduction for a discussion of sonatas falsely or questionably attributed to Bach). Table 1 lists these works in the order they appear in NV 1790, identifies the five fascicles of CPEB: CW, I/6 in which they are published, and provides information about place and date of composition as well as catalogue listings.

The six sonatinas constitute section 64 (*Sechs Sonatinen für das Clavier*) of Alfred Wotquenne's catalogue of the works of C.P.E. Bach, while the keyboard sonatas (not including the organ sonatas) that were not published during Bach's lifetime constitute sections 65 (*Vollständige Sammlung aller ungedruckten Clavier-Sonaten*) and 69 (*Sonata per il Cembalo a due Tastature*);<sup>1</sup> these works are thus collectively referred to as Wq (for Wotquenne) 64, 65, and 69. Wotquenne relied, however, on a catalogue compiled about a century earlier by the Schwerin organist and music collector Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal (1756–1825), who obtained copies of nearly all of C.P.E. Bach's instrumental music and much of his vocal music (Cat. J.J.H. Westphal). Westphal corresponded with Bach directly during the last years of Bach's life, and with his widow and daughter after Bach's death, in an attempt to ascertain the completeness and correctness of his collection. He was greatly aided in this task by the publication of Bach's estate catalogue, NV 1790, which also allowed him to arrange his C.P.E. Bach collection chronologically. Westphal's collection, including its handwritten catalogue, was eventually sold to the Belgian musician François-Joseph Fétis (1784–1871), from whom it passed to the Brussels Conservatory. It was there that Wotquenne, serving as librarian, used the Westphal material to publish his own catalogue of C.P.E. Bach's works in 1905. Thus Wotquenne's section 64 corresponds exactly to section 3:13 of Westphal's catalogue "Claviersachen," and Wotquenne's section 65 corresponds to Westphal's section 3:15, with the sole exception of the sonata for a two-manual instrument, Wq 69, for which Wotquenne created a separate section. The anomalies in

table 1, therefore, are to be traced back mostly to Westphal, rather than to Wotquenne. For example, Westphal included the Suite in E Minor in his section 3:15, although it more properly belongs in an earlier section, "Vermischte Clavierstücke," and Wotquenne followed him by including the suite as the fourth item in his corresponding section 65. CPEB: CW publishes this suite in I/8.2, which explains the gap in table 1 where Wq 65/4 would have been. Similarly, Westphal failed to notice a duplication in his catalogue, where the Sonata in A Major (NV 1790, p. 14, no. 100) is listed both as a clavier sonata in section 3:15 and as an organ sonata in section 3:10. Wotquenne perpetuated this mistake by also listing the sonata twice, as Wq 65/32 and Wq 70/1. Since the "clavier" version of the sonata was published during Bach's lifetime, it is included in CPEB: CW, I/5.2 and is accordingly also missing from table 1. In another case, while Westphal recognized that two manuscripts containing sonatas in C major did not transmit independent sonatas, but rather embellished versions of the first sonata from the collection *Fortsetzung von sechs Sonaten fürs Clavier mit veränderten Reprisen*, published in 1761, he still gave them separate entries, an error that Wotquenne again perpetuated. Thus Wq 51/1, 65/35, and 65/36 are all versions of the same sonata, and these three versions are published together in CPEB: CW, I/2, which explains why Wq 65/35 and 65/36 are missing from table 1.

Despite the remarkable breadth of Westphal's collection, he acquired many of his keyboard manuscripts (now mostly in B-Bc, 5883 MSM) through indirect or unknown means. Those that he did acquire through the Bach family were copied from manuscripts closer to the composer. They are therefore either not as reliable as sources that were demonstrably under Bach's direct control, or they are derivative from the so-called house copies. Such house copies were copies of his works that Bach kept and maintained (i.e., that were in his personal music library) from which further copies could be made for interested third parties when necessary. Table 1 in the critical report lists the principal manuscripts in which house copies of Bach's unpublished sonatas have survived. Even though remarkably few of them are autograph, such house copies do carry

---

1. Wotquenne, 20–25.

TABLE I. CONTENTS OF CPEB: CW, I/6 IN NV 1790 ORDER

No. in NV 1790	No. in CV 1772	Wq	H	Key	Date of Composition/Revision	Place of Composition/Revision	CPEB: CW
2	19	65/1	3	F major	1731/1744	Leipzig/Berlin	I/6.1
3	16	65/2	4	A minor	1732/1744	Leipzig/Berlin	I/6.1
4	17	65/3	5	D minor	1732/1744	Leipzig/Berlin	I/6.1
6	3	64/1	7	F major	1734/1744	Leipzig/Berlin	I/6.1
7	4	64/2	8	G major	1734/1744	Leipzig/Berlin	I/6.1
8	5	64/3	9	A minor	1734/1744	Leipzig/Berlin	I/6.1
9	6	64/4	10	E minor	1734/1744	Leipzig/Berlin	I/6.1
10	7	64/5	11	D major	1734/1744	Leipzig/Berlin	I/6.1
11	8	64/6	12	C minor	1734/1744	Leipzig/Berlin	I/6.1
13	10	65/5	13	E minor	1735/1743	Frankfurt/Berlin	I/6.2
14	9	65/6	15	G major	1736/1743	Frankfurt/Berlin	I/6.2
15	13	65/7	16	E-flat major	1736/1744	Frankfurt/Berlin	I/6.2
16	11	65/8	17	C major	1737/1743	Frankfurt/Berlin	I/6.2
17	12	65/9	18	B-flat major	1737/1743	Frankfurt/Berlin	I/6.2
18	15	65/10	19	A major	1738/1743	Frankfurt/Berlin	I/6.2
20	20	65/11	21	G minor	1739	Berlin	I/6.2
22	22	65/12	23	G major	1740	Berlin	I/6.2
32	29	65/13	32.5	B minor	1743	Töplitz	I/6.2
36	36	65/14	42	D major	1744	Berlin	I/6.2
42	44	65/15	43	G major	1745	Berlin	I/6.3
45	45	65/16	46	C major	1746	Berlin	I/6.3
46	46	65/17	47	G minor	1746	Berlin	I/6.3
47	47	65/18	48	F major	1746	Berlin	I/6.3
48	n/a	65/19*	49	F major	1787?	Hamburg?	I/6.5
49	49	65/20	51	B-flat major	1747	Berlin	I/6.3
51	52	69	53	D minor	1747	Berlin	I/6.3
52	53	65/21	52	F major	1747	Berlin	I/6.3
54	54	65/22	56	G major	1748	Berlin	I/6.3
56	56	65/23	57	D minor	1748	Potsdam	I/6.3
58	57	65/24	60	D minor	1749	Berlin	I/6.3
59	58	65/25	61	A minor	1749	Berlin	I/6.3
63	63	65/26	64	G major	1750	Berlin	I/6.4
67	66	65/27	68	G minor	1752	Berlin	I/6.4
76	75	65/28	78	E-flat major	1754	Berlin	I/6.4
81	79	65/29	83	E major	1755	Berlin	I/6.4
86	84	65/30	106	E minor	1756	Berlin	I/6.4
92	89	65/31	121	C minor	1757	Berlin	I/6.4
114	105	65/33	143	A minor	1759	Berlin	I/6.4
118	106	65/34	152	B-flat major	1760	Berlin	I/6.4
128	123	65/37	174	A major	1763	Berlin	I/6.4
130	125	65/38	175	B-flat major	1763	Berlin	I/6.4
131	126	65/39	176	E minor	1763	Berlin	I/6.4
132	127	65/40	177	D major	1763	Potsdam	I/6.5
133	128	65/41	178	C major	1763	Berlin	I/6.5
147	146	65/42	189	E-flat major	1765	Potsdam	I/6.5

TABLE I. (CONTINUED)

No. in NV 1790	No. in CV 1772	Wq	H	Key	Date of Composition/Revision	Place of Composition/Revision	CPEB:CW
148	148	65/43	192	A major	1765–66	Potsdam and Berlin	I/6.5
151	149	65/44	211	B-flat major	1766	Berlin	I/6.5
152	150	65/45	212	B-flat major	1766	Berlin	I/6.5
155	153	65/46	213	E major	1766	Potsdam	I/6.5
174	n/a	65/47	248	C major	1775	Hamburg	I/6.5
195	n/a	65/48	280	G major	1783	Hamburg	I/6.5
205	n/a	65/49	298	C minor	1786	Hamburg	I/6.5
206	n/a	65/50	299	G major	1786	Hamburg	I/6.5

\*Although Wq 65/19 is listed as no. 48 in NV 1790 with Berlin 1746 as the place and date of composition, it is likely that NV 1790 is in error and that the sonata was composed (or at least compiled) very late in Bach's life; in fact, it might be his very last sonata. See CPEB:CW, I/6.5 introduction and critical report for more information.

Bach's own catalogue numbers—usually the CV 1772 number in Bach's own hand, or the NV 1790 number in the hand of his daughter Anna Carolina Philippina, or both—and many of them contain further entries (corrections and revisions) in Bach's hand. For most of the sonatas in CPEB:CW, I/6 at least one house copy has survived (indicated by "hc" in table I in the critical report), and these have been used as the principal sources for the edition. The majority of Bach's house copies were sold at auction after A. C. P. Bach's death in 1804, and nearly all of them eventually made their way to the Königliche Bibliothek in Berlin (present-day SBB), where most of them are still to be found. A more detailed discussion of Bach's house copies is in the critical report.

The two volumes CPEB:CW, I/6.1 and I/6.2 contain all sonatas and sonatinas that C. P. E. Bach composed before moving to Berlin in 1738, as well as four sonatas which he composed in Berlin between 1739 and 1744. Of the pre-Berlin works, only the sonata in B-flat Major (Wq 62/1) appears in another volume (CPEB:CW, I/5.1), since it was published in Bach's lifetime (1761). According to NV 1790, the sonatas Wq 62/1, Wq 65/1–3 and Wq 64/1–6 were composed between 1731 and 1734 in Leipzig, while the sonatas Wq 65/5–10 were composed in Frankfurt an der Oder between 1735 and 1738.<sup>2</sup>

2. See NV 1790, pp. 1–6; NV 1790 has been published twice in facsimile editions: CPEB:CW, series VIII supplement: *C. P. E. Bach's Nachlaß Verzeichnis (1790)*, facsimile with an introduction by Peter Wollny (Los Altos, CA: The Packard Humanities Institute, 2014); and *The Catalog of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach's Estate*, annotated and with a preface by Rachel W. Wade (New York and London: Garland, 1981). The systematic organization of NV 1790 is based on Bach's own prepa-

Bach presumably became an official member of the court orchestra of Frederick the Great in 1741 at the earliest; obviously, he was not a member of Frederick's orchestra in Rheinsberg.<sup>3</sup> In his autobiography Bach dates his move to Berlin to 1738,<sup>4</sup> and this is reflected by places and dates in NV 1790: the Sonata in A Major, Wq 65/10, was composed in "F[rankfurt/Oder]. 1738," and the Keyboard Concerto, Wq 4, was composed in "B[erlin]. 1738." Notwithstanding Bach's nebulous professional situation between 1738 and 1741, this move was a crucial event in his career, since in Berlin he could socialize with many more musicians than in Frankfurt/Oder, which is evident even if we have no documents about his contacts during these years.

Of the two authoritative work lists containing Bach's earliest sonatas that name the place and date of composition, CV 1772 gives only the "first dates," which may be due to the somewhat preliminary character of this list.<sup>5</sup> Most of the incipits in CV 1772 were written by a Hamburg copyist, which means the year 1768 is a *terminus ante quem non*; Bach himself added the information about the place and date of composition. An oft-quoted sentence on the

ratory work; therefore it is almost certainly an authentic work list that includes nearly all of his compositions.

3. See most recently Christoph Henzel, "Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach und die Formierung der preußischen Hofkapelle 1740–1741," *BJ* (2017), 219–25.

4. *Autobiography*, 199–209, esp. 199.

5. See Wolff 1999, 217–35. See also *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. Clavierwerke-Verzeichnis (1772)*, facsimile with an introduction by Christoph Wolff (Los Altos, CA: The Packard Humanities Institute, n.d.).

first page of CV 1772 reads: “All works before the year 1733 I have scrapped because they were much too youthful” (alle Arbeiten, vor dem Jahre 1733, habe ich, weil sie zu sehr jugendlich waren, caßirt). Nevertheless there are two sonatas with the entry “L[eipzig]. 1731” (Wq 62/1, 65/1) and two with the entry “L. 1732” (Wq 65/2, 65/3). It is clear that CV 1772 is not a diary in which Bach entered works as he composed them, but a cumulative list written in hindsight, with the incipits showing the state of the music as of its compilation.

In NV 1790, nearly all of Bach’s pre-Berlin keyboard works share a common feature: after place and date of composition, the additional remark “E. B.” appears, which is an abbreviation for “Erneuert in Berlin” (renewed in Berlin), along with a date, with the year 1743 given for most of the sonatas composed in Frankfurt/Oder, and the year 1744 for the sonatas composed in Leipzig (see table 2). The term “renewed” indicates a substantial reworking of the compositions in question. Therefore it seems problematic to speak simply of, say, “the composition of Wq 65/1 in 1731” as long as it is not clear which version of the work is contained in a certain source.

Apart from three pieces, NV 1790 marks only works with roots in Leipzig and Frankfurt/Oder as renewed,<sup>6</sup> and, correspondingly, the remark is included for nearly all of the compositions from Leipzig and Frankfurt/Oder which have made their way into NV 1790.<sup>7</sup> It seems as if the renewal was a precondition for Bach’s later acceptance of these works.<sup>8</sup> The dating of all reworkings of Leipzig compositions to “Berlin, 1744” and of Frankfurt compositions mostly to “Berlin, 1743” in NV 1790 may lead to the suspicion that these dates mark the end of a long process rather than indicating a specific point in time where Bach reworked each piece independently.<sup>9</sup> In any case, the term “renewal” was reserved for a special part of Bach’s production and obviously had the function of saving pieces which the mature Bach otherwise would no longer have accepted.

6. The exceptions are Wq 5, 21, and 138. See CPEB: CW, III/9.7, p. xii for a list of all of the works that are marked as *erneuert* in NV 1790.

7. Only four works of this group are not so marked: the “Menuet pour le Clavessin” (Wq 111), the “Variationen über ein Menuett von Locatelli” (Wq 118/7), and two sonatas for flute and basso continuo (Wq 123 and 124).

8. It is well known that Bach burned many of his old manuscripts; see his letter to Johann Joachim Eschenburg, 21 January 1786: “I recently burned a ream and more of old works of mine and am glad that they are no more” (doch habe ich vor kurzem ein Ries u. mehr alte Arbeiten von mir verbrannt u. freue mich, daß sie nicht mir sind.) CPEB-Letters, 243–44; CPEB-Briefe, 2:1133–37.

9. See also Leisinger/Wollny 1993, 166–67.

Therefore the term “renewal” means not just revision, but thoroughgoing revision. Table 2 lists the seventeen keyboard works showing the remark “E. B.” in NV 1790.<sup>10</sup>

The manuscripts of these works, all of them undated, are not of equal value or significance. Three groups stand out among the manuscripts: sources written by copyists who are known to have worked for Bach, even if not every copy shows entries in Bach’s hand; house copies showing annotations and/or corrections in Bach’s hand; and, in a few cases, autographs in the proper sense.<sup>11</sup> Although the two sets of dates given in NV 1790 suggest that there can be two considerably different versions of a sonata—an original and a renewed version—there is, in addition, a third category of versions, resulting from a late revision process which is not mentioned in NV 1790. Some manuscripts copied by Berlin scribes that were later clearly reworked by Bach in Hamburg are a testimony of this final stage of reworkings. Most important, however, are the copies by Bach’s principal copyist of the Hamburg years, the tenor singer Johann Heinrich Michel (1739–1810); many of these served as house copies.<sup>12</sup> It was obviously the systematic examination of many of his works that led Bach to add the remark “renewed in Berlin” to most of his earliest compositions.<sup>13</sup> Michel’s copies are for the most part fair copies; they show only slight musical revisions by Bach, and therefore were clearly made after the work of revision had already been done. It seems that Bach usually destroyed older and perhaps heavily annotated manuscripts once a new copy had been made.

Thus, an early sonata may once have existed in three versions: the original version (Leipzig or Frankfurt/Oder),

10. As already mentioned, Wq 62/1 was printed in 1761; apparently only the renewed version has survived (see CPEB: CW, I/5.1). For the “Suite” Wq 65/4, see CPEB: CW, I/8.2). CV 1772 does not mention renewal for any works. The addition of this remark to his early works in NV 1790 was obviously the result of Bach’s intense engagement with all of his compositions in the run-up to NV 1790.

11. For the works shown in table 2 there are autographs for Wq 65/2 and mvt. ii of Wq 65/1 (included in the present volume), for Wq 65/7 and 65/8 (in CPEB: CW, I/6.2), and for Wq 65/4 (in CPEB: CW, I/8.2).

12. For many years, “Michel” was just a name in connection with the profession as a “Tenorist.” Only recently has his biography taken shape; see Neubacher 2005, 109–23, esp. 121–22, and Paul Corneilson, “C.P.E. Bach’s Evangelist: Johann Heinrich Michel,” in *Er ist der Vater*, 95–118.

13. Perhaps the contact between Bach and the organist J.J.H. Westphal may have had an influence on Bach’s renewed interest in his old works; the first letter from Bach to Westphal is dated 2 January 1787 (CPEB-Letters, 255; CPEB-Briefe, 2:1187–89). The copies once forming the Westphal collection, primarily in Michel’s (but sometimes in Westphal’s) hand, today in B-Bc, regularly show the latest versions of nearly all of Bach’s keyboard works.

TABLE 2: KEYBOARD WORKS MARKED AS “RENEWED” IN NV 1790

Wq	Title	NV 1790	CV 1772	CPEB: CW
62/1	Sonata in B-flat Major	1: L. 1731 E. B. 1744	18: L. 1731	I/5.1
65/1	Sonata in F Major	2: L. 1731 E. B. 1744	19: L. 1731	I/6.1
65/2	Sonata in A Minor	3: L. 1732 E. B. 1744	16: L. 1732	I/6.1
65/3	Sonata in D Minor	4: L. 1732 E. B. 1744	17: L. 1732	I/6.1
65/4	Suite in E Minor	5: L. 1733 E. B. 1744	1: L. 1733	I/8.2
64/1	Sonatina in F Major	6: L. 1734 E. B. 1744	3: L. 1734	I/6.1
64/2	Sonatina in G Major	7: L. 1734 E. B. 1744	4: L. 1734	I/6.1
64/3	Sonatina in A Minor	8: L. 1734 E. B. 1744	5: L. 1734	I/6.1
64/4	Sonatina in C Minor	9: L. 1734 E. B. 1744	6: L. 1734	I/6.1
64/5	Sonatina in D Major	10: L. 1734 E. B. 1744	7: L. 1734	I/6.1
64/6	Sonatina in C Minor	11: L. 1734 E. B. 1744	8: L. 1734	I/6.1
65/5	Sonata in E Minor	13: F. 1735 E. B. 1743	10: F. 1735	I/6.2
65/6	Sonata in G Major	14: F. 1736 E. B. 1743	9: F. 1736	I/6.2
65/7	Sonata in E-flat Major	15: F. 1736 E. B. 1744	13: F. 1736	I/6.2
65/8	Sonata in C Major	16: F. 1737 E. B. 1744	11: F. 1737	I/6.2
65/9	Sonata in B-flat Major	17: F. 1737 E. B. 1743	12: F. 1737	I/6.2
65/10	Sonata in A Major	18: F. 1738 E. B. 1743	15: F. 1738	I/6.2

the renewed version (Berlin) and the final version (late Berlin or Hamburg). If today there are only two extant versions, as is often the case, the question is whether these represent stages one and two or stages two and three of the work. The dating of the sources, mostly through the identification of scribes, shows a clear preference for the latter possibility. In other words: the earlier version of a sonata preserved in two versions is in most cases the already renewed version (for the present volume: Berlin, 1744), whereas the later version represents the final Hamburg version.<sup>14</sup>

The systematic collation of all sources leads to the recognition of the different versions of a piece. The identification of the scribes relies to a great extent on Kast.<sup>15</sup>

14. Sonatas preserved in three different versions are included in CPEB: CW, I/6.2 (Wq 65/5–7). For the sonatas Wq 65/9–10, also edited in CPEB: CW, I/6.2, only two authentic versions are extant, which seem to represent the Frankfurt and the Berlin versions, since there are no remarkable variants to be found in sources written in Hamburg. The only sonata with a single version—minor variants aside—in the present volume is Wq 65/1.

15. Unfortunately, for the revised second edition (München: K.G. Saur, 2003), for which Kast was not responsible, the editors decided not to include unidentified scribes in the index (“Namentlich unbekannte oder nicht bestimmbare Schreiber (Su) werden nicht aufgeführt.” 205). This results in the elimination of such important scribes as Anon. 301 and Anon. 303 from the index; the original edition of 1958 remains indispensable.

Even though we do not know every important copyist by name, it is possible to say which of them worked on behalf of Bach in Berlin or in Hamburg. The copies written by Bach’s authorized copyists normally can be taken as testimony for a certain version: the Berlin copyists Anon. 301, Anon. 303, and a certain Schlichting copied the renewed Berlin versions of the sonatas and sonatinas, whereas copies by Michel almost always (and in the case of house copies without exception) represent the final version of a piece.<sup>16</sup> Disregarding the copyists ignores the historical context of the sources, and thus easily leads to an incorrect allocation of the versions.

### The Sonatas Wq 65/1–3

The many sources of the Sonata in F Major (Wq 65/1) show only a few for the most part insignificant variants; this is the only piece in the present volume of which there exists only one version. The small differences between the sources might be the result either of imperfect copying or of revisions made in passing. The house copy of the piece

16. This method was first applied to the repertoire in question by the present author; see Horn, esp. 115–277. The plausibility of the method and its results is proven by the fact that the finding of new sources (including CV 1772) after the completion of the study has always supported or improved, but never contradicted, the hypotheses formulated on the basis of a smaller sample of sources available in earlier years.

was written by Anon. 303. To judge from the surviving sources this sonata was rather popular; the sources show the renewed version (Berlin, 1744), otherwise Bach would not have kept it as his house copy. Unfortunately we cannot reconstruct the original Leipzig version (the same is true of the contemporaneous Sonata Wq 62/1, printed in 1761). The surviving version must have satisfied Bach, as he did not rework the piece in later years.

There is a remarkable source of Wq 65/1 in B-Bc (not from the Westphal collection) containing the outer movements in the hand of an unknown copyist, and the middle movement in C.P.E. Bach's own hand.<sup>17</sup> This second movement is a strict trio, of a type often encountered in the music of the late baroque period, and perhaps could already have been composed in this manner in the year 1731. But the more interesting thing about this autograph is the fact that it contains no fewer than forty-seven ornament signs: a few trills and turns, and many short trills and mordents, mostly in the second movement. All other sources of Wq 65/1, including the house copy, have only around four ornaments in this movement. In the present edition the unornamented version is printed in the main text, edited on the basis of the house copy, while the ornamented version appears in the appendix. Bach and the unknown copyist entered music on the recto and verso sides of the same sheet, indicating that they must have had personal contact. But the case is even more mysterious, since Peter Wollny has identified the former possessor of this source as Johann Sebastian Bach, who also wrote most of the additional ornaments.<sup>18</sup> If the manuscript was sent from C.P.E. Bach to his father, who then used it to demonstrate his method of ornamentation, it would be interesting to know who copied the outer movements; the handwriting is acceptable, but there are many inaccuracies regarding the vertical alignment of the notes, indicating a copyist without much experience. C.P.E. Bach certainly could have found other scribes who would have done a better job.

The Sonata in A Minor (Wq 65/2) exists in two versions, which differ only in the first movement in a considerable, but not drastic way. Bach's surviving autograph shows the reworking of the earlier version into the later one. Of both versions there are also copies of high quality, written by Anon. 301 and Michel (house copy), so the versions can be identified as the renewed (Berlin, 1744) and the final, created in Hamburg. This is in keeping with the appearance of Bach's own handwriting in the autograph:

17. The source is B-Bc, 27911 MSM; see Leisinger/Wollny, 518–19.

18. Wollny 2012, 181–201.

the older layer shows the lively characteristics of the 1740s, whereas the handwriting of the revisions is rather shaky. Again, we cannot reconstruct the original version (Leipzig, 1732) of this sonata. The surviving Berlin version did not undergo significant changes during later years; the second and the third movements remained mostly untouched. The revisions in the first movement do not concern matters of form. Rather, Bach sometimes added a middle voice to smooth out the texture, he replaced literal repetitions of motives with varied reprises, and he altered a recurring passage which was awkward to play in order to enable an easier performance. These variants are typical of the relationship between an already renewed version and a final version. Even if they may not be profound, the changes are significant enough to justify the additional printing of the earlier version of the first movement at the end of the main text.

There are also two versions of the Sonata in D Minor (Wq 65/3), and again only the first movement differs significantly. Bach's house copy was written by Schlichting.<sup>19</sup> The version of Wq 65/3 contained in the house copy is virtually identical with the text of another copy in the hand of Anon. 301, so the dating is clear: the earlier version represents the renewed version (Berlin, 1744). The house copy was reworked by Bach, presumably later in Berlin, or more probably in Hamburg during his systematic review of his works. Only the changes in the first movement are significant, though they do not alter its formal design; the early version of the movement is included at the end of the main text in the present volume. This movement, with its uniform motion, resembles similar pieces by J.S. Bach, like the *Allemande* from the first French Suite, BWV 812, or the *Prelude in D Minor* from the first part of the *Well-Tempered Clavier*, BWV 851.<sup>20</sup> C.P.E. Bach's revisions of Wq 65/3 do not affect the overall character but rather single notes. Sometimes he inserted short rests to avoid the repetition of fast notes, and in one place he eliminated a whole measure at the end of a sequential pattern which

19. The identification of "Schlichting" as a copyist apparently comes from Kast. However, no known manuscript carries such a name and it is unclear upon what evidence Kast based his identification. For a list of Schlichting's copies of C.P.E. Bach's music see Horn, 178 (where the entry for Wq 5 should read "B. 1762" instead of "H. 1762").

20. Movements following older models, like trios, allemandes, or other pieces of a suite, or pieces in a uniform prelude-like motion, may have been more resistant to renewal than more *galant* pieces. This is demonstrated in the two versions of the Suite in E Minor, Wq 65/4, in CPEB: CW, I/8.2, where the dances do not differ much, but the *Cantabile* has been altered considerably.

he may have thought redundant.<sup>21</sup> An elaborated passage in the bass line of the second movement aside, the middle movement and especially the last movement remained virtually unchanged. In this sonata, Bach again has improved details on the surface without altering the basic outlines of the pieces. And again there is no documentation of the original Leipzig version, so we cannot know exactly what Bach wrote down in 1732. The reliable history of the early sonatas Wq 65/1–3 starts only with the renewed versions, completed by 1744 in Berlin.

### The Sonatinas Wq 64/1–6

According to both CV 1772 and NV 1790, Bach composed six keyboard works in 1734, which, surprisingly, seem to make up a collection of six sonatinas, although the manuscripts do not agree on whether to call the individual pieces “sonatina” or “sonata.”<sup>22</sup> The early works which found their way into CV 1772 and NV 1790 are only a selection of favorite pieces from a repertoire that was once much greater, but the output of the year 1734 raises special questions. Did the young C.P.E. Bach, shortly after finding the form of the sonata, really plan a cycle of six pieces, perhaps emulating the famous collections of his father, the English and French Suites and the Partitas? Or is this “cycle” only the result of a later construction, binding together six works that were composed as individual pieces?

The keys of the six works Wq 64/1–6 produce a somewhat plausible pattern: F Major, G Major, A Minor, E Minor, D Major, C Minor. A pattern like this could be the result of previous planning; it uses all six degrees of the hexachord (here the tones of the *hexachordum naturale* from c to a) in a kind of symmetrical disposition: major third up stepwise, major third down stepwise. Three sonatas are in a major key, the other three in a minor key.

Fortunately, all six works survive in two versions. The earlier and the later versions differ considerably, so they are

21. The earlier version of this movement has 44 measures, the later one 43, (not 45 and 44, as erroneously stated in Horn, 172, although the numbers used in the musical examples are correct).

22. NV 1790 gives no special title for these pieces, but provides a general naming convention: “When no title appears above the incipits of the *Clavier-Soli*, the respective piece is a sonata” (Wenn über dem Thema der Clavier-Soli kein Titel stehet, so ist es eine Sonate); the analogous remark in CV 1772 reads: “Where there is no title, these are sonatas” (Worüber nichts stehet, das sind Sonaten). In both lists the space above the incipits for the sonatinas is empty, so the pieces would thus be sonatas. But Wotquenne, following Westphal, and both relying on the titles transmitted in the sources, created a separate category (Wq 64) for these pieces, calling them “Sechs Sonatinen für das Clavier.”

all printed completely in the present volume. According to the principles of this edition, the later version appears before the earlier version of each work. The last movements were the least altered (with the exception of Wq 64/5/iii); the differences are so minimal that they do not need to be addressed further. In contrast, the first movements vary considerably, and are discussed below.

The most obvious difference between the earlier and later versions of Wq 64/1–6 is the exchange of middle movements. Bach took the middle movement of one sonatina and exchanged it with the middle movement of another sonatina. This exchange was a reciprocal procedure between three pairs of sonatinas (see table 3). This presupposes the conception of the six works as a closed group at the time when the exchanges took place, which of course does not exclude that this conception existed much earlier. Together with the reworked first movement and the mostly unchanged third movement, the new arrangement formed the later version of a sonatina. In the earlier versions, all three movements of each sonatina are in the same key; in the later versions the middle movement is in a different key, forming a major/minor contrast with the outer movements. Obviously Bach chose the pairs of sonatinas with the aim of creating this contrast.

It would be tempting to associate these clearly discernible versions with the two dates 1734 and 1744, given in NV 1790. But this would be a mistake, since there are convincing arguments for identifying the earlier versions as the renewed versions (Berlin, 1744) and the later versions as final versions, dating from Bach’s Hamburg years.

To begin with: all but one of the earlier versions survive in copies by one of Bach’s principal Berlin scribes, Anon. 301 and Anon. 303. Presumably they had access to the master copies only through Bach himself, who would certainly not have let them copy outdated versions, but only the current renewed versions of the sonatinas. The later versions survive in perfect house copies in the hand of Michel, thus showing their Hamburg origins.<sup>23</sup>

The fact that in the earlier versions of Wq 64/1–6 all three movements are in the same key is no argument against dating them to 1744 or even later. It is true that in Bach’s “Prussian” and “Württemberg” Sonatas the middle

23. There are copies of the earlier versions of Wq 64/2–4 and 64/6 in the hand of Anon. 301 and of Wq 64/1, 64/4 and 64/6 in the hand of Anon. 303. Only Wq 64/5 does not survive in a copy from either hand. Perhaps there once was the full cycle of six sonatinas in the hand of both copyists. In the Anon. 301 copies the pieces are labeled “Sonatina,” whereas the Anon. 303 copies have the title “Sonatina” only once and “Sonata” twice.

TABLE 3. WQ 64 SONATINAS: MOVEMENT EXCHANGE BETWEEN EARLY AND LATE VERSIONS

Berlin 1744 (early version)				Later Berlin or Hamburg			
	TS*	KS*	Tempo		TS	KS	Tempo
Wq 64/1				Wq 64/1			
i	<b>C</b>	F	Allegro	i	<b>C</b>	F	Allegro
ii	$\frac{2}{4}$	F	Andante	ii	$\frac{3}{4}$	c	Andante
iii	$\frac{3}{8}$	F	Presto	iii	$\frac{3}{8}$	F	Presto
Wq 64/6				Wq 64/6			
i	$\frac{2}{4}$	c	Allegretto	i	$\frac{2}{4}$	c	Allegretto
ii	$\frac{3}{4}$	c	Andante	ii	$\frac{2}{4}$	F	Andante
iii	$\frac{2}{4}$	c	Presto	iii	$\frac{2}{4}$	c	Presto
Wq 64/2				Wq 64/2			
i	<b>C</b>	G	Moderato	i	<b>C</b>	G	Allegretto
ii	$\frac{6}{8}$	G	Adagio non molto	ii	$\frac{2}{4}$	e	Largo
iii	$\frac{2}{4}$	G	Allegro	iii	$\frac{2}{4}$	G	Allegro
Wq 64/4				Wq 64/4			
i	$\frac{3}{4}$	e	Allegretto	i	$\frac{3}{4}$	e	Allegretto
ii	$\frac{2}{4}$	e	Largo	ii	$\frac{6}{8}$	G	Adagio non molto
iii	$\frac{3}{8}$	e	Presto	iii	$\frac{3}{8}$	e	Presto
Wq 64/3				Wq 64/3			
i	<b>C</b>	a	Allegro	i	<b>C</b>	a	Allegro
ii	<b>C</b>	a	Andante un poco	ii	$\frac{3}{4}$	D	Andante
iii	$\frac{2}{4}$	a	Presto	iii	$\frac{2}{4}$	a	Presto
Wq 64/5				Wq 64/5			
i	$\frac{2}{4}$	D	Allegro	i	$\frac{2}{4}$	D	Allegro
ii	$\frac{3}{4}$	D	Andante	ii	<b>C</b>	a	Andante un poco
iii	$\frac{2}{4}$	D	Allegro ma non troppo	iii	$\frac{2}{4}$	D	Allegro ma non troppo

\*TS = time signature, \*KS = key signature

movement is never written in the key of the outer movements. But Bach often used the parallel key, which provides a major/minor contrast on the basis of the same tonic (see Wq 48/1, 49/1, 49/3, and 49/5–6). The early sonatas Wq 65/6, 65/7, and 65/9 use the same key for all three movements even in their latest versions, so the identity of keys in the sonata cycle was acceptable to Bach even in later years. This is also proven by Wq 65/26 (Berlin, 1750) and Wq 65/39 (Berlin, 1763; both published in CPEB: CW, I/6.4), to cite only two further examples.

To be sure, the mere exchange of movements between

sonatas constitutes different versions, but this work could have been done by a scribe following Bach's instructions, as long as it didn't involve changes to the music itself. In fact, the comparison of the middle movements before and after their exchange yields very few musical differences. This supports the dating suggested above, since a primarily scribal activity could hardly be called a renewal. Similarly, the clearly differing incipits of the first movements in the earlier and later versions are not followed by an essential reworking of the movements as a whole (with the exception of Wq 64/5). By and large, the differences are not

greater than the normal differences between renewed and final versions as can be observed elsewhere. CV 1772 shows the incipits of the earlier versions, NV 1790 the incipits of the later versions. As has been said above, CV 1772 was not a running diary but a list written down more or less in one sitting. It shows only the dates of the first conception of the pieces: "L. 1734." Nevertheless, the incipits can only reflect the state of the pieces current in 1772, which was the state of the renewed versions of 1744. Furthermore, it can be said that the final versions, which led to the later incipits reflected in NV 1790, must have been produced sometime after 1772.

The last doubts about this dating can be dispelled by reconstructing the history of the middle movement of Wq 64/4 (early version), which finally became the middle movement of Wq 64/2 (later version). The chronology begins with a very simple piece of 12 + 14 measures in binary form, which originally was the middle movement of the earliest version of Wq 65/5 (in D-Hs, ND VI 3191; see CPEB: CW, I/6.2). This sonata was composed in 1735 in Frankfurt/Oder and is preserved in a source by a Frankfurt scribe who might have been a pupil of Bach, and therefore was allowed to copy this work soon after its composition. Once it left Bach's possession, this copy could not be controlled, suppressed, or altered by the composer, making it one of the very few documents showing Bach's unchanged style of the 1730s. When Bach renewed Wq 65/5 in 1743, he replaced the original middle movement with another one. Instead of throwing away the older piece, he used it as the harmonic basis for an immensely expressive elaboration. The repetitions of the binary form were omitted, and the newly designed movement was incorporated in the sonatina Wq 64/4 (early version). The fate of the original middle movement of Wq 64/4 is as unknown. Since this middle movement is later in origin than the original composition of Wq 64/4 (Frankfurt/Oder 1735 vs. Leipzig 1734), it is clear that the surviving early version of Wq 64/4 can by no means represent the original version of 1734; rather, it represents the renewed version, restructured in Berlin in 1744. The musical differences between the simple piece from Wq 65/5 and the elaborate version in Wq 64/4 (early version) are enormous, which makes it easy to associate them with the notion of a renewal. However, when Bach decided to incorporate this movement into the final version of the sonatina Wq 64/2 sometime after 1772, he left the music almost unchanged.<sup>24</sup>

24. See the synopsis in Wolfgang Horn, "Neue Wege um 1740. Die Etablierung der Claviersonate in den Preußischen und Württembergischen Sonaten von Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach," in *Leipzig 2014*, 187–216, esp. 214–16.

Hitherto the title "sonatina" was used with a certain non-chalance. It was mentioned in passing, and some sources—even sources written by Bach's principal scribes—still used the designation "sonata." It is indeed difficult to imagine that Bach, as early as 1734, soon after he began composing sonatas, should have designated his complete annual output of keyboard music with the diminutive "sonatina." This term would only have made sense if there already was an established form of a sonata, of which the sonatina was the little sister. Only ten years later, in the context of the "Prussian" and "Württemberg" Sonatas, could the title be understood in this way: Wq 64/1–6, though by no means miniature pieces, are a little shorter, a little easier to perform, and in many respects more straightforward than the sonatas of Bach's prominent printed collections. If the renewal of Wq 64/1–6 was completed in 1744, this would be the same date as the publication of the "Württemberg" Sonatas. Anon. 301, and in one case also Anon. 303, used the designation "Sonatina" in their manuscripts, so C.P.E. Bach must have coined the term in connection with the process of renewing the pieces; the designation cannot have been a scribe's idea. It is curious to see that Michel, in his late house copies (perhaps automatically) wrote "Sonata," which was later corrected by the insertion of the syllable "in" between the last two letters. The term "sonatina" for a "little sonata" seems not to have been very common even in Bach's later years.<sup>25</sup>

The grouping of six pieces strongly suggests that Bach may have planned for the publication of the sonatinas as a set. Perhaps he got the idea already around 1744 after the publication of the demanding "Württemberg" Sonatas, which may have been attractive for the highly skilled *Kenner*, but not so much for the *Liebhaber* with more modest musical abilities. As it turned out, Bach's next publication of an independent set of six keyboard sonatas was the "Reprises" Sonatas (Wq 50), which appeared in 1760, sixteen years after the "Württemberg" Sonatas.<sup>26</sup> But the plan of

25. Yet it is clear that C.P.E. Bach means "little sonata." His use of the term has nothing to do with the general designation of an instrumental piece as used by J.S. Bach for the introduction of his "Actus tragicus" (BWV 106), for instance. Also, C.P.E. Bach's Sonatinas for various instruments (Wq 96–110; CPEB: CW, III/11–13) are of a totally different kind.

26. Although the eighteen *Probestücke* published in 1753 were described on their title page as being grouped together in six sonatas, their open-ended key relationships and their close association with the *Versuch* means that they are not an independent set of sonatas in the sense used here. This is corroborated by the fact that nearly all extant

publishing the six sonatinas could have persisted until Bach's last years. In a letter to Sara Levy, dated 5 September 1789, Bach's widow Johanna Maria wrote: "There are 209 Clavier-Soli, of which 6 are completely unknown and designated for print, 138 have already been printed and the rest are more or less known through manuscript copies."<sup>27</sup> There seems to be no other group of six "unknown" sonatas in Bach's estate. The later versions of the sonatinas, again reworked and preserved in Michel's house copies, were indeed completely unknown at the time of J.M. Bach's letter. It might seem strange that there could have been plans to publish pieces first conceived forty or fifty years earlier, but at first sight the final versions of the six sonatinas do not appear outdated. Of course they cannot compete with the works in the "Kenner und Liebhaber" collections, but many admirers of Bach surely would have been happy if the composer had offered them some pieces which were not too difficult to play. In the end, however, a print of the six sonatinas was never realized in Bach's lifetime.

### Conclusion

The final versions of C.P.E. Bach's early keyboard sonatas are on the whole very well preserved. They form the basis of the present edition; earlier versions are only printed if they show significant variants. With the help of his wife and his daughter, Bach himself saw to it that his works were handed down to posterity in the most perfect shape possible; during his Hamburg years he comprehensively revised his compositions. Therefore, the final versions of Bach's early sonatas consist of older music with revisions from the 1770s or 1780s. As far as can be established, the basis for these late revisions of the early works was not the original versions, but the renewed versions, which are dated in NV 1790 to Berlin 1743 or 1744 (the latter date pertains to all pieces in the present volume). Since the original versions have mostly disappeared,<sup>28</sup> we obviously cannot say what actually happened during the process of

---

copies of the *Probestücke* survive together with copies of the *Versuch* (see CPEB: CW, I/3).

27. "An Clavier Soli sind 209, wovon 6 ganz unbekannt und dem Druck bestimmt sind, 138 sind schon gedruckt und die Uebrigen durch Abschriften mehr oder weniger bekannt." *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1310.

28. The famous quotation of the "burned ream" of old manuscripts is relevant here, especially in regard to the scarcity of autographs. The lack of copies of the early versions is not surprising, given the fact that a young composer is not an established musician whose compositions are requested by customers and copied by professional scribes. It is pure chance if a pupil once made a copy of an early version, and it is almost a miracle if such a copy has survived.

renewal. The only thing we can do is establish a reliable chronology of the surviving versions.

The results are simple and sobering: it is not possible to trace one single source—or the contents of a source possibly written later—back to the Leipzig roots of a sonata composed there between 1731 and 1734. In each case we can only know with certainty the versions that Bach renewed in Berlin in 1744. In many cases we have additional final versions which are based on Berlin models and show various degrees of revisions. Of course there is "old substance" even in the renewed and final versions of the pieces. But since it is not possible to isolate the pristine material from later changes, historians should be careful when they refer to these works.

Concerning sonatas composed after 1734, CPEB: CW, I/6.2 provides three examples of Frankfurt/Oder sonatas that do survive in three versions: Wq 65/5 (1735, 1743, final version), Wq 65/6 (1736, 1743, final version), and Wq 65/7 (1736, 1744, final version). Also Wq 65/9 (1737, 1743) and 65/10 (1738, 1743) offer glimpses into Bach's workshop in Frankfurt/Oder. Thus it seems that the middle of the 1730s is as early as we can get if we want to study the beginnings of C.P.E. Bach as a composer of sonatas. But even so he remains the central figure in the process of creating and establishing a formal model that belongs to the most influential templates in the history of instrumental music. It is only with the "Prussian" and the "Württemberg" Sonatas, published in 1742 and 1744, that the problem of varying versions diminishes.<sup>29</sup> With these famous prints, both the history of the sonata and the historiography dealing with its development eventually find solid ground.

### Performance Practice

The sources for the sonatas used to establish the musical texts in the present edition universally designate "cembalo" as the instrument for which they were written. By that time the term was generic enough to allow for performance on a variety of commonly available keyboard instruments—not just harpsichord, but also clavichord or fortepiano—or

---

29. Although there can be variants in some manuscripts, an authorized print almost always dominates the transmission of a piece. Before and around the "Prussian" and the "Württemberg" Sonatas there are four further sonatas which were never printed. They are the first sonatas produced in Berlin and they are not marked as renewed in NV 1790. The sonatas Wq 65/11–14 (Berlin 1739, 1740, 1743, and 1744) are edited in CPEB: CW, I/6.2. Thus it and the present volume contain all Bach's sonatas transmitted only in manuscript sources from the beginning of his compositional career to the publication date of the "Württemberg" Sonatas.

even on less commonly encountered ones, such as the *Bogenclavier*, or even on the organ. Although Bach discussed the relative merits of the harpsichord and clavichord in his *Versuch*, he would not have wanted to limit his potential audience to performers of just one or the other.

After the publication of the *Versuch* in 1753, Bach's notation of his ornaments in keyboard music became more precise than had previously been the case. The earliest sources which transmit the sonatas in the present volume predate the *Versuch* by as much as a decade, during which time Bach presumably was formulating his ideas that would eventually appear in the *Versuch*. Thus, many of the sources here employ a more generic approach to ornamentation that used fewer symbols with less consistency than do sources from after the mid-1750s. In particular, the trilled turn (*prallender Doppelschlag*)—a favorite device in Bach's later keyboard music—is very rarely encountered in sources that predate the *Versuch*. Indications for trills can vary from “+” to “t” to “tr” to “w” to “w” to something resembling a combination of a turn and mordent. These have been rendered as either *tr* or *w* in the edition. When

*w* is used in contexts where a mordent is disallowed by the *Versuch*, it has been changed to *tr*. The notated length of appoggiaturas never became entirely consistent even after the *Versuch* (the rather lengthy explanations there still leave much ambiguity in play, especially with regard to the length of short, or non-variable, appoggiaturas). Some sources follow the practice (which Bach simply describes as the “earlier” practice) of notating all appoggiaturas as eighth notes, while others use a combination of notated lengths, sometimes with little obvious meaning or consistency.

Table 4 presents an overview of the ornaments used in the present volume.

### Acknowledgments

I would like to thank the members of the editorial team at CPEB: CW for their patience and encouragement during the editing of this volume, especially Peter Wollny, Darrell M. Berg, and Mark W. Knoll. Kathryn Zerenbergen of the Musikwissenschaftliches Institut of the Uni-

TABLE 4. ORNAMENTS USED IN I/6

Symbol	Name	<i>Versuch</i> Reference	Execution
tr, +, w	Trill, regular trill (Triller, ordentlicher Triller)	I:2.3, § 1–21, and Tab. IV, Figs. XIX–XXXIII	
Qw	Trill from below (Triller von unten)	I:2.3, § 22, and Tab. IV, Fig. XXXIV	
Cw	Trill from above (Triller von oben)	I:2.3, § 27, and Tab. IV, Fig. XLI	
w	Short trill (halber Triller, Pralltriller)	I:2.3, § 30–36, Tab. IV, Figs. XLV–XLVIII, and Tab. V, Fig. XLIX	
∞, z	Turn (Doppelschlag)	I:2.4, § 1–27, and Tab. V, Figs. L–LXII	
∞	Trilled turn (prallender Doppelschlag)	I:2.4, § 28–34, and Tab. V, Figs. LXIII–LXVIII	
s	Inverted turn (Schleiffer von dreyen Nötgen)	I:2.7, § 5, and Tab. VI, Fig. LXXXIX	
w, w	Mordent and long mordent (Mordent, langer Mordent)	I:2.5, § 1–15, and Tab. V, Figs. LXXII–LXXV	

versität Regensburg assisted with the translation from German to English. Thanks are also due to the libraries and institutions who provided access to and copies of the sources required, especially the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv; the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin; the Conservatoire Royal de Bruxelles, Bibliothèque; and the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C.; and the Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Carl von Ossietzky, Musikabteilung in Hamburg.

Wolfgang Horn

Wolfgang Horn passed away in May 2019 while this volume was in production. Darrell M. Berg and Peter Wollny oversaw the completion of the work.

## APPENDIX

### Doubtful and Spurious Sonatas

A number of sonatas for solo keyboard may have been ascribed to C.P.E. Bach because the name of their true composer was not immediately or unequivocally forthcoming—or perhaps, as in the case of the string quartets of Haydn’s “Opus 3,” because it was hoped that attribution to a famous composer would attract buyers. The following list, taken from the catalogues of C.H. Bitter, Erich Beurmann, Paul Kast, and Eugene Helm, includes sonatas attributed to Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, or simply to “Bach,” that are not included in CPEB: CW, I/6.<sup>30</sup> The decision to omit these works is based not only on their absence from Bach’s two authoritative catalogues, NV 1790 and CV 1772, but also on a lack of compelling evidence of Bach’s authorship.

It should be noted that two sonatas perceived and classified by Kast as uncatalogued by Wotquenne (p. 113; the abbreviation there, “Wq n.v.,” stands for Wq *nicht verzeichnet*) and therefore of questionable authenticity, are in fact early versions of sonatas by Bach and are found in the present volume:

Sonata in F Major: Kast, Wq n.v. 31, in D-B, Mus. ms. P 1001; also found in D-KII, Mb 52 and US-Wc, M23, B13.W.64(1) = a version of Wq 64/1 from the 1740s

Sonata in D Major: Kast, Wq n.v. 32, in D-B, Mus. ms. P 789; also found in D-B, SA 4780 = a version of Wq 64/5 from the 1740s

Helm 371.I, similarly, classifies as “Doubtful” a work genuinely by C.P.E. Bach: excerpts from two movements of the Sonata in D Minor Wq 65/24, in D-B, Mus. ms. P 1151 (possibly in the hand of Anon. 303), the *Andante* (mvt. i) and the *Alla breve* (mvt. iii). The entire sonata is found in B-Bc, 5883 MSM (in the hand of Michel), D-B, Mus. ms. P 369 (a MS prepared for Gähler), and D-B, Mus. ms. P 776 (an autograph); it is published in CPEB: CW, I/6.3. On the other hand Helm 377 correctly lists a “Sonata in a minor” by Bach as spurious, citing Stephen Roe’s note (and B.A. Mekota’s previous assertion) that this work is “an arrangement of the two lower parts” of Bach’s Trio Sonata in A Minor, Wq 148 (H 572).<sup>31</sup> But even though the two parts of this “sonata” for keyboard are by Bach, there is no evidence that he made the arrangement.

A sonata in the “Doubtful” section of the Helm catalogue must be mentioned, but cannot be evaluated. H 358 lists a sonata described by Bitter (2:325) as a keyboard solo: no. 14 in C major composed in 1732. Because Bitter’s reference to this sonata does not include either an incipit or a source, it cannot be identified further; possibly it was one of the early sonatas that Bach destroyed in 1786.<sup>32</sup>

Several attributions to C.P.E. Bach are from Beurmann’s dissertation, which includes a catalogue of all keyboard sonatas verifiably by Bach and an appendix (*Anhang*) containing sonatas attributed to Bach that are not listed in NV 1790. All belonged formerly to the collection of Friedrich August Gotthold (d. 1858) in Königsberg, Prussia (now Kaliningrad, Russia).<sup>33</sup> These sonatas, listed with incipits by Beurmann, were formerly in RUS-KAn, Rf b 55 or RUS-KAn, Rf b 3. They were designated by Helm as inaccessible, and most are now presumed lost. The existence of concordant sources, however, has permit-

31. Stephen W. Roe, “The Keyboard Music of J. C. Bach” (Ph.D. diss., Oxford University, 1981); B.A. Mekota, “The Solo and Ensemble Keyboard Works of Johann Christian Bach” (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1969).

32. See Bach’s letter of 21 January 1786 to Johann Joachim Eschenburg in Braunschweig, CPEB-Letters, 243–44; CPEB-Briefe, 2:1133–37.

33. Incipits for several items in the Gotthold collection appear in Hermann Killer, “Zur Musik des deutschen Ostens im 18. Jahrhundert,” *Königsberger Beiträge: Festgabe zur vierhundertjährigen Jubelfeier der Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek zu Königsberg Pr.* (Königsberg: Gräfe & Unzer, 1929), 228–43. This article is the source of the incipits in Beurmann’s *Anhang*.

30. Bitter, 2:325–44; Erich Beurmann, “Die Klaviersonaten Philipp Emanuel Bachs” (Ph.D. diss., Georg-August-Universität, Göttingen, 1952); Kast; Helm.

ted examination and classification of all works in the Beurmann *Anhang* except two:

Beurmann Anh. 2, H 362 = Sonata in C Major  
Beurmann Anh. 12, H 365 = Sonata in G Major

Since no concordances to these sonatas have been found, they cannot be evaluated. Remaining attributions are in the Helm catalogue.

\* \* \*

Each of the following works attributed to Bach is omitted from CPEB: CW, I/6 because it has been attributed to more than one composer and there is no strong evidence that it is by Bach.

H 18, Sonata in B-flat Major, Wq 65/9, version 3, with a middle movement headed *Larghetto*; published in *Six Sonates pour le Clavecin composées par M<sup>r</sup> C.P.E. Bach, Œuvre I* (Paris: Huberty [1761]), 20–24 and copied in D-B, P 673, pp. 29–37. It is transmitted as a sonata by Christlieb Sigismund Binder in US-CAh, fms Mus 162.<sup>34</sup>

H 344, Sonata in E-flat Major, Wq n.v. 26, Beurmann Anh. 6; published in *Collection récréative contenant VI sonates pour le clavessin*, op. 2 (Nürnberg: J. Ulrich Haffner, 1761–1762), 30–34, as a sonata by Christian Gottfried Krause.<sup>35</sup>

H 346, Sonata in C Minor; the last three movements of a four-movement sonata by Giovanni Benedetto Platti, published c. 1742 by Haffner of Nürnberg as no. 5 of his Opus 1: *Sonates pour le Clavessin sur le Gout Italien*.<sup>36</sup>

H 361, *A Favourite Overture of sig. Bach of Berlin for Piano*; arrangement of a symphony attributed to Johann Christian Bach in a MS in Einsiedeln, Switzerland (CH-E, M 678, p. 22). See Terry, 277.

H 363, Sonata in E Minor, Beurmann Anh. 8, formerly in RUS-KAn, Rf b 3, Bd II; a sonata by Wilhelm Friedemann Bach catalogued in *Bach Repertorium: Wilhelm Friedemann Bach* as A 9.<sup>37</sup> This sonata, formerly in the Gotthold collection, transmitted in a copy in the hand of Johann Christian Bach (the “Hallische Clavier”

Bach) is presently in LT-Vn, Mk Gr-7. It is also transmitted in a copy in the hand of Johann Friedrich Hering in D-B, Mus. ms. anon 1554.

H 364, Sonata in F Major, Beurmann Anh. 11, formerly in RUS-KAn, Rf b 55; a version of the middle movement, *Allegro ma cantabile*, is found in Jena attributed to Carl Heinrich Graun (D-Ju, Ms. Conc. Acad. 27a).<sup>38</sup>

H 366, Sonata in G Major, Beurmann Anh. 13, formerly in RUS-KAn, Rf b 3; a concerto for solo keyboard by W.F. Bach. See Falck, p. 10 = Fk 40.<sup>39</sup>

H 367, Sonata in B-flat Major, Beurmann Anh. 15, formerly in RUS-KAn, Rf b 55; by Johann Heinrich Rolle; see Cat. Voß, p. 133/171, no. 28, in which it is designated as a concerto by Rolle,<sup>40</sup> and concordances: D-B, Mus. ms. anon. 1580 and Mus. ms. 30267, in which it is also attributed to Rolle.

H 368, Sonata in F Major, Wq n.v. 29; in *Œuvres mêlées*, V, pp. 14–17, attributed to Johann Ernst Bach.<sup>41</sup>

H 371, Sinfonia per il clavicembalo, transmitted anonymously in D-LEm, Poelitz Mus. ms. 50; attributed to Johann Gottlieb Janitsch in the Hessische Landes- und Hochschulbibliothek, Darmstadt; attributed correctly to Johann Gottlieb Graun in Carl Mennicke, *Hasse und die Brüder Graun*, (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1906), p. 544, no. 86.<sup>42</sup>

H 378, VI Sonate; a copy of Georg Benda’s *Sei Sonate per il Cembalo* (Berlin: Winter, 1757), attributed to C.P.E. Bach in D-GOL, 2° 21a/3, Anh. 2.

H 379, Sonata in F Major, Wq n.v. 30; this is the keyboard part of J.C. Bach’s Sonata for Harpsichord, Violin, and Cello, op. 2/1.<sup>43</sup>

H 381, Sonata in C Major; in *Musikalisches Vielerley*, 164–71, attributed by the editor (C.P.E. Bach) to Johann Christoph Friedrich Bach, and duly included by Georg Schünemann in his *Thematisches Verzeichnis der Werke von Johann Christoph Friedrich Bach* in DDT, vol. LVI (1917), Neuauflage, ed. Hans Joachim Moser (1959), pp. ix–xvii.

H 382, 5., 4., 6. *Sonate*; 3 parts, the third of which consists of movements from C. P. E. Bach’s *Probestücke* of 1753:

34. I am indebted to Peter Wollny for information about the attribution to Binder.

35. On the identification and style of this sonata see Peter Wollny, “Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs Berliner Schüler,” in *Frankfurt/Oder 2001*, 69–81.

36. Identified in Leisinger/Wollny 1993, 203. See also RISM A/I, P 2854.

37. Classified as Fk-Add. 204 in Peter Wollny, “Studies in the Music of Wilhelm Friedemann Bach: Sources and Style” (Ph.D. diss., Harvard University, 1993), 430.

38. I am indebted to Peter Wollny for this information.

39. Fk 40 is classified as Fk-Add. 209 in Wollny, “Studies in the Music of Wilhelm Friedemann Bach,” 428.

40. See also Faulstich, 431, no. 2522.

41. See Darrell M. Berg, “Towards a Catalogue of the Keyboard Sonatas of C. P. E. Bach,” *JAMS* (1979), 276–303, particularly 296.

42. I am indebted to Peter Wollny for this information.

43. See Warburton B 43; see also Roe 1989, 21–22, where Roe asserts that the manuscript consists of the keyboard part (unarranged) only and that there is no evidence of C.P.E. Bach’s involvement.

1. J.C. Bach, Sonata in E Major, Op. 5/5, pp. 1–7<sup>44</sup>
2. J.C. Bach, Sonata in C Minor, Op. 5/6, pp. 8–12
3. Movements from C.P.E. Bach's *Probestücke* (incorrectly listed by Helm): Wq 63/6/ii in A-flat Major (pp. 13, 20); Wq 63/4/i in B Minor (pp. 14–15); Wq 63/4/ii in D Major (pp. 16–17); Wq 63/5/ii in B-flat Minor (pp. 18–19)

H 383, Sonata in A Major, a manuscript in D-GOL, Mus. 2° 21a/3, Anh. 5 containing a solo keyboard arrangement of a concerto; published c. 1775 in Riga by Hartknoch and attributed to J.C. Bach. See Terry, 297, and Wade, 15 and 272–73.<sup>45</sup>

H 384, a variant of item 383, printed for C. and S. Thompson, London, c. 1775 (see H 383 above).

H 385, Sonatas in B-flat Major and D Major, III and IV of *Due Sonate per il cembalo solo del sigl. Daniele Türck*, in D-GOL, Mus. Mus. 2° 21a/3, Anh. 8.

H 387, Sonata in A Minor; J.C. Bach is named as the author in Terry and on the first page of the sonata in D-B, Mus. ms. 30385.<sup>46</sup>

\* \* \*

The remaining sonatas attributed to Bach are unlikely to have been written by him for stylistic reasons.

H 339, Sonata in E Minor, Wq n.v. 27, Beurmann Anh. 7: this work is based on an interesting melody, which occurs in some form as the initial idea in all three movements; but the continuation of the melody in all movements does not maintain the same degree of variety as in many of Bach's works. The melodic sequences have too many repetitions to be characteristic of Bach's works. Moreover, the slow two-measure introduction to the *Andante* is not typical of Bach's style in 1762 (the year it appeared anonymously in *Musikalisches Mancherley*), and the style is too late to be one of the early sonatas that Bach attempted to destroy in 1786.<sup>47</sup>

44. This and the second sonata are in a published set by J.C. Bach. See Terry, 338–39.

45. See also Warburton YC 91, *A Favourite Concerto for the Harpsicord or Piano Forte (unaccomp.)*; see also Mark W. Knoll, "Which Bach Wrote What? A Cumulative Approach to Clarification of Three Disputed Works" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1998). Warburton notes that this work, falsely attributed to J.C. Bach, is also attributed to C.P.E. Bach and J.C.F. Bach.

46. See Terry, 358, and Berg, "Towards a Catalogue," 298.

47. It is significant that since C.P.E. Bach's authorship of two other sonatas in *Musikalisches Mancherley* is noted, there would have been no reason *not* to identify him as the author of this sonata and the *Garten-Sonata*, H 359. Peter Wollny has suggested Johann Otto Uhde (1725–66)

H 341, Sonata in C Major, Wq n.v. 23, Beurmann Anh. 1, in A-Wn, 5669 (an unreliable source): the style is too late to be one of the early works that Bach destroyed.

H 342, Sonata in C Minor, Wq n.v. 24, Beurmann Anh. 3, in A-Wn, 5669 (see above), unattributed in D-B, Mus. ms. P 364. Too many perfunctory repetitions give the work a square aspect not characteristic of Bach's writing.

H 343, Sonata in D Major, Wq n.v. 25, Beurmann Anh. 5, unattributed in D-B, Mus. ms. P 364 and P 371. The style is not characteristic of Bach: the phrasing is rather square, and the melody of the first movement is more typical of J.C. Bach's generation than of C.P.E. Bach's.

H 345, Sonata in F Major, Wq n.v. 28, Beurmann Anh. 9, unattributed in D-B, Mus. ms. P 370. The melody and phrasing do not have the fluency characteristic of Bach, but proceed in a rather blocklike manner.

H 347, Sonata in B-flat Major, in D-GOL, Mus. 2° 21a/3, Fasz. 62. The initial theme of the first movement, *Allegro moderato*, is not particularly original, and although it appears frequently in the movement, its treatment lacks variety. Alternating with this melody are frequent passages of rapid notes, ostensibly intended to display the technical prowess of the performer; Bach's technical insertions are generally more original and interesting. The melody and rhythm of the *Adagio* are repetitious. The *Vivace* has an unusual structural feature: the development section, which cadences on a G minor chord immediately before the retransition, is set off by repeat signs. This movement also lacks rhythmic variety.

H 359, *Garten-Sonata*, in D Major: the style is very different from Bach's works, as is the title of the work.

H 362, Sonata in C Major, Beurmann Anh. 2, attributed only to "Bach" in D-B, SA 4770: possibly an imitation of the style of C.P.E. Bach by a contemporary in Berlin, but too square rhythmically to be characteristic of Bach.

H 369, Sonata with movements in A major, C minor, and G major in US-Bp, M200.9, no. 8. The sequence of keys of the three movements of this work is unconventional. It seems likely, as Helm surmises, that this "sonata" is an anonymous pastiche.

Darrell M. Berg

as a possible author of these two sonatas; the author of Uhde's obituary in Johann Adam Hiller's *Wöchentliche Nachrichten*, 2:146 (9 November 1767), claims that some of Uhde's works are published anonymously in *Mancherley*.