

INTRODUCTION

According to the “Nachlaß-Verzeichnis” (NV 1790, pp. 43–44), Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach composed the eight symphonies Wq 173–181 while serving at the Prussian court from 1740 to 1768. These works rank among the finest contributions to the genre from mid-eighteenth-century North Germany.

Origin and Dissemination of the Symphonies

The origin and reception history of these symphonies is closely bound up with the flowering of musical life in Berlin following the accession of Frederick II to the throne in 1740 and the subsequent revival of the Prussian *Hofkapelle*. The new emphasis on music at the court soon stimulated the development of many aspects of aristocratic and bourgeois musical culture. Encouraged by the many-sided concert activities at and around the court, the musicians of the *Hofkapelle* created a large repertory of concertos, overtures, symphonies, and chamber music oriented toward the style of modern Italian opera and instrumental music. This process, which began in Frederick’s *Kapelle* in Rheinsberg before his accession to the throne, led to new developments in several genres, including the emancipation of the concert symphony from the overture.

As cembalist of the *Hofkapelle*, C.P.E. Bach devoted most of his compositional activity to instrumental music, particularly keyboard music and keyboard concertos. Compared with Bach’s extensive oeuvre in these genres, the total of eight symphonies composed between 1741 and 1762 seems small indeed; but these are the only Berlin symphonies listed in NV 1790 and the only ones that can be authenticated. Bach states in his 1773 *Autobiography* (p. 207) that he had composed “a few dozen” (ein Paar Duzend) symphonies, but only the eight Berlin works and the six of Wq 182 are known; the four orchestral symphonies Wq 183 were written later in 1775/76. While one cannot be certain how literally to take Bach’s statement, it suggests that additional works may have been lost—perhaps sacrificed to the sense of self-criticism that caused him to destroy a significant portion of his early work.¹ Additional symphonies

with attributions to C.P.E. Bach appear in contemporary sources and catalogues, but the available documentary or stylistic evidence does not allow any of them to be confidently ascribed to him. The section “Lost, Doubtful, and Spurious Symphonies” below discusses the issue in more detail.

NV 1790, 43–44, gives the dates and places of origin and the scorings of the symphonies as follows (all but No. 5 also have thematic incipits):

- No. 1. B[erlin] 1741. 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß. [Wq 173/H 648]
- No. 2. B[erlin] 1755. Mit 3 Trompeten, Pauken, 2 Hörnern, 2 Hoboen und 2 Flöten. [Wq 176/H 651]²
- No. 3. P[otsdam] 1755. Mit Flöten und Hörnern. [Wq 174/H 649]
- No. 4. B[erlin] 1755. Mit Flöten, Hörnern und 2 Bassons. [Wq 175/H 650]
- No. 5. B[erlin] 1756, ist gedruckt, es sind aber nachher mehr Stimmen dazu gemacht. [Wq 178/H 653]³
- No. 6. B[erlin] 1757. Mit Hörnern und Hoboen. [Wq 179/H 654]
- No. 7. B[erlin] 1758. Mit Hörnern und Hoboen. [Wq 180/H 655]
- No. 8. B[erlin] 1762. Mit Hörnern, Flöten und Hoboen. [Wq 181/H 656]

In contrast to his practice in other genres, Bach did not number the Berlin symphonies in any of the extant sources. Some sources bear numbers in the hand of his daughter Anna Carolina Philippina corresponding to the numbering in NV 1790. It is not certain whether that ordering comes directly from Bach or was made when his library was reorganized after his death, but since the NV 1790

Kurzem ein Ries u. mehr alte Arbeiten von mir verbrannt,” *CPEB-Briefe* 2:1135. See Leisinger/Wollny 1993, 133–34.

2. Wotquenne’s reason for numbering this symphony out of order is not obvious.

3. Though NV 1790 lists this symphony only once, Wotquenne assigned it two numbers: Wq 177 for the original version for strings, which was printed, and Wq 178 for the later version including winds, which survives in manuscript sources. Likewise, Helm gave the work the numbers 652 and 653. The work is referred to as Wq 178 in the present edition.

1. Bach to J.J. Eschenburg, 21 January 1786: “doch habe ich vor

numbering was used in Bach's circle, the present edition presents the symphonies in that order.

Only the Symphony in C Major, Wq 174, survives in an autograph score that can confirm its date and place of composition.⁴ This score, however, differs in instrumentation from the listing in NV 1790, lacking the flute parts mentioned there. Such differences between the instrumentation given in NV 1790 and that found in the sources occur with all these symphonies except the early Symphony in G Major, Wq 173, which exists (at least in the more authoritative sources) only as a work for string orchestra. The surviving materials from Bach's library show that Bach enlarged the scorings of these works, primarily after his move to Hamburg in 1768, when larger performing forces became available to him.⁵ The instrumentations listed in NV 1790 represent the final states of the Berlin symphonies. The history of each work, including possible intermediate stages, is discussed in detail in the critical report. Table I summarizes the changes.

If the time and place of composition of these symphonies can be established, little of a concrete nature can be said about their origin or about their early reception. This is a consequence of our limited biographical knowledge about Bach in his Berlin years. We have only sparse documentation about his roles in the diverse musical institutions of the court. Further, we lack what would be the most important source of information for a reconstruction of the court's musical repertory, the *Hofkapellarchiv*. Detailed programs of concerts survive only in exceptional cases.

From secondary sources it is possible to reconstruct a general description of concert life in Berlin under Frederick II.⁶ Symphonic performances at the court primarily took place in the so-called *Grosses Konzert*—performances by the *Hofkapelle* for the dowager queen Sophia Dorothea, the reigning queen Elisabeth Christine, and princess Anna

Amalia, usually performing in the Berlin Stadtschloss or in the summer residences Monbijou or Schönhausen. On occasion these events also occurred at the Berlin residences of the princes August Wilhelm and Heinrich.⁷ These concerts differed from the chamber concerts that the king held every evening in their generally larger forces and their broader repertory. In 1755, the year of composition of the symphonies Wq 174–176, nineteen such concerts were announced in the Berlin newspapers. The actual number of concerts was doubtless considerably larger; the newspapers usually covered only those performances of particular interest to the public due to appearances by traveling virtuosi, or festivities at the court such as those for birthdays or Carnival.⁸

Archival sources yield only isolated bits of information about the repertory of the *Hofkapelle*. An eighteenth-century manuscript catalogue of symphonies in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin appears to contain traces of the repertory of the *Grosses Konzert*.⁹ The sixty-two incipits with composer attributions are in the hand of a scribe who also compiled the catalogues of flute concertos and sonatas for the Neue Palais and Sanssouci in Potsdam¹⁰ and who was active at the court for many years.¹¹ If, as the content, layout, and scribe all suggest, this document catalogues part of the library of the *Hofkapelle*, it confirms that Bach's symphonies were performed at the court, for Wq 173–176 and Wq 178 appear in it as nos. 49–51 and 54–55, respectively. The role of the Grauns in this catalogue, with a total of forty-three works, reflects their dominant position in the concert life of Berlin.

Compositions by members of the *Hofkapelle* also appeared in the repertory of the *Kapellen* of the Schwedt branch of the Hohenzollern line. Margraves Friedrich Wilhelm (1700–71), Karl Albrecht (1705–62), and Friedrich Heinrich (1709–88) of Brandenburg-Schwedt had their own musical establishments in Schwedt and Berlin. The latter two both stood godfather to Bach's son Johann

4. D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 351 (no. 1), dated "Potsd[am] [17]55 / Mens. Majo"; see description in the critical report for Wq 174, source A.

5. Bach similarly enlarged the scorings of the sonatinas; details about the individual works appear in CPEB: CW, III/11, III/12, and III/13.

6. Schwinger, 443–56, discusses concert life in Berlin with particular regard to Bach's situation. The former standard account was E. Eugene Helm, *Music at the Court of Frederick the Great* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1960). Schwinger contains a substantial bibliography. Particularly important recent studies include a series by Christoph Henzel, including *Quellentexte zur Berliner Musikgeschichte* (Wilhelmshaven: Noetzel, 1999); "Studien zur Graun-Überlieferung im 18. Jahrhundert" (Habilitationsschrift, Universität Rostock, 2000); "Das Konzertleben der preußischen Hauptstadt 1740–1786 im Spiegel der Berliner Presse (Teil 1)," *JbSIM* 2004: 216–91; and *Graun WV*.

7. On the constitution of the *Grosses Konzert*, see Henzel, *Quellentexte*, 103–4.

8. Henzel, "Konzertleben," 252–53.

9. D-B, Mus. ms. theor. Kat. 584. See Schwinger, 445–46, and Henzel, "Graun-Überlieferung," 209ff.

10. D-B, KH M, 1572, 1573, 1574, 1575.

11. This scribe is known as Thulemeier VI in Schwinger; as Berlin 7 in Henzel, "Graun-Überlieferung"; and as B 2 in Horst Augsbach, *Johann Joachim Quantz. Thematisch-systematisches Werkverzeichnis (QV)* (Stuttgart: Carus, 1997). Augsbach's facsimiles illustrate this hand c. 1772.

TABLE I. SCORING OF THE BERLIN SYMPHONIES

Work	Original Scoring	Bach's Additions
Wq 173	strings	none
Wq 176	strings (or 2 horns, strings)	3 trumpets, timpani, 2 horns (if not in original), 2 flutes, 2 oboes
Wq 174	2 horns, strings	2 flutes
Wq 175	strings	2 horns, 2 flutes, 2 bassoons
Wq 178	strings	2 horns, 2 flutes, 2 oboes
Wq 179	strings	2 horns
Wq 180	strings	2 horns, 2 oboes
Wq 181	2 horns, 2 flutes, strings	2 oboes

Sebastian in 1748,¹² and Bach dedicated the second of his *Kenner und Liebhaber* collections, Wq 56, to Friedrich Heinrich in 1780. The *Kapelle* of Friedrich Heinrich, which Marpurg in 1754 reported to consist of eleven musicians, was large enough to have performed Bach's symphonies.¹³ The catalogue of Friedrich Heinrich's estate lists seventy musical instruments and refers to a large collection of symphonies in the musical archive of his *Kapelle*, among them works by "Bach."¹⁴

The surviving musical sources from the Berlin *Hofkapelle* and its environs document the increasing role that circles outside the court played in the musical life of the city after 1740. The majority of the known sources for this repertory, including those of Bach's symphonies, owe their origin and preservation to the performing and collecting activities of aristocratic and bourgeois music lovers. As many court musicians also held positions in the rapidly growing private and semi-public musical societies of the city, they brought the musical repertory of the court to a wider audience. One of the most important of these societies, the *Musikübende Gesellschaft*, founded in 1749, stated in its by-laws that its repertory would be selected "only from the newest and choicest overtures, symphonies, and trios" (nur von den neuesten und auserlesensten Overturen, Sinfonien, und Trios).¹⁵ The professional copyist Holstein, who is known

to have worked for this society, copied several works by Bach, including the Symphony in G Major, Wq 173.¹⁶ Other copies of Bach's symphonies turn up in nearly every Berlin collection originating before the end of the century, as well as in those of other court *Kapellen* (details appear in the critical report).

A survey of the references in catalogues and the surviving sources makes it clear that the four symphonies of 1755–56 were much the best known of the Berlin works, at least in their orchestral guise. The Symphony in E Minor, Wq 178, was the most widely distributed of all. It was the only Berlin symphony to be published as an orchestral work in Bach's lifetime, or for that matter before the twentieth century. The print appeared in 1759, three years after the composition of the work, and was produced by Bach's usual publisher at the time, the Nuremberg firm of Balthasar Schmid. It presents the symphony in its original scoring for string orchestra. The symphony was well known outside North Germany; Charles Burney reports that when he met Johann Adolf Hasse in Vienna in 1772, the latter "desired me to enquire after a symphony of that author in E *la mi*, minor, which he thought the finest that he had ever heard."¹⁷ The G major *Andante moderato* of

12. Heinrich Miesner, "Aus der Umwelt Philipp Emanuel Bachs," *BJ* 34 (1937):132–43.

13. Marpurg 1754, 85ff and 156ff, reports on the *Kapellen* of Karl Albrecht and Friedrich Heinrich, respectively.

14. D-Bga, BPH, Rep. 36, Nr. 278. See *MGG*^{II}, s.v. "Hohenzollern," by Christoph Henzel.

15. See Marpurg 1754, 1:385–413 ("Entwurf einer ausführlichen Nachricht von der Musikübenden Gesellschaft zu Berlin").

16. D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 969, second set; see the critical report for Wq 173, source D 3b. On Holstein's connection to the *Musikübende Gesellschaft*, see Schwinger, 454. Other Holstein copies of works ascribed to Bach in the same collection are P 893 (the flute sonata Wq 131) and St 616 (the doubtful keyboard concerto H 484.8).

17. Burney, 1:344. Burney owned a manuscript score of one of Bach's symphonies; see *The Late Dr. Burney's Musical Library. A Catalogue* ([London:] 1814), 25, lot 629, purchased by Johann Baptist Cramer. As is indicated in the critical report, there are several Austrian sources and catalogue references for this symphony in its original version for strings; the Viennese music dealer Johann Traeg also advertised the version with winds among several of Bach's symphonies in his catalogue.

this symphony is the only movement in Bach's symphonies to appear as part of another work; Bach used it as the middle movement of the Sonata in G Minor, Wq 62/18, dating from 1757. As the symphony is dated earlier than the sonata, it is likely that the orchestral version of the movement is the original. All the Berlin symphonies circulated in the form of keyboard arrangements. Bach himself arranged and published Wq 173, 180, and 181 (Wq 122/1, 112/13 [or 122/4], and 122/5, respectively); these symphonies were much more widely known in their keyboard versions than as orchestral works.¹⁸

Musical Style

Involvement with crown prince Frederick's Rheinsberg *Kapelle* from 1738 and entry into the court *Kapelle* in 1740/41 began a new phase in Bach's compositional development. From this point he came to share in the aesthetic outlook of the court, which in no small measure reflected the views of Frederick,¹⁹ and which manifested itself in the genres that were cultivated and a preference for the modern Italian style. In Ruppín and Rheinsberg from 1732 to 1740 the future court musicians Carl Heinrich and Johann Gottlieb Graun, Christoph Schaffrath, Johann Gottlieb Janitsch, Johann Joachim Quantz, and Franz Benda—and of course the future king himself—created a substantial body of instrumental music in which the new genre of the concert symphony played a significant role. Quantz and Schaffrath represented the Dresden tradition, which reflected the influence of the Italian musicians working at that court, and J. G. Graun's style was also heavily indebted to Italian models.²⁰ The Ruppín/Rheinsberg symphonies are principally known from later sources that do not allow for a precise dating of their composition; a catastrophic fire in Rheinsberg at the beginning of 1740 may have destroyed many of the original manuscripts.²¹

Undoubtedly a significant portion of the ninety-two symphonies attributed to the Grauns (chiefly Johann Gottlieb) were composed in Rheinsberg.²² Indeed, the surviving sources clearly reflect the preeminent position that J. G. Graun held in the early history of the North German symphony. This is underscored by statements from his contemporaries, such as J. A. P. Schulz's remark that Graun "found the true spirit of the symphony in some of his chamber symphonies" (in einigen Cammersymphonien den wahren Geist der Symphonie getroffen).²³ Although details of the process remain to be established, it is clear that J. G. Graun and his associates founded an independent symphonic tradition.²⁴ The concert symphony, in fact, became established in Berlin (and in Dresden) before the Italian operatic overture—C. H. Graun did not convert from writing French overtures to Italian overtures until the mid-1740s.²⁵ On his entry into the *Hofkapelle* Bach would have looked to the symphonies of J. G. Graun as models in much the same way he took the keyboard concertos of C. H. Graun as models in that genre.²⁶ (In both instances, of course, Bach adapted the model to his own uses within his individual style.)

The main stylistic elements of the symphony in North Germany in 1740 reflect those of the contemporary Italian repertory. In both harmonic structure and formal design the North German symphony parallels the concerto, which remained the leading genre of instrumental music in the period. The symphonies are almost always in three movements and all are scored for four-part string orchestra.²⁷ Winds began to appear in these symphonies only after the expansion of the *Kapelle* in 1740, as the standard scoring of the symphony came to resemble that of the opera overture, with pairs of oboes (often alternating with flutes in the slow movements) and horns, and a bassoon reinforcing

18. See CPEB: CW, I/10.2.

19. See MGG^{II}, s.v. "Friedrich II," by Christoph Henzel.

20. Sources survive documenting the composition of symphonies for the court in Dresden and Warsaw as early as 1732. See Ulrike Kollmar, *Gottlob Harrer (1703–1755), Kapellmeister des Grafen Heinrich von Brühl am sächsisch-polnischen Hof und Thomaskantor in Leipzig* (Beeskow: ortus musikverlag, 2006), 178–96, and R. Todd Rober, "Form, Style, Function and Rhetoric in Gottlob Harrer's Sinfonias: A Case Study in the Early History of the Symphony" (Ph.D. diss., University of North Texas, 2003).

21. One surviving autograph from the repertory is that of Schaffrath's Symphony in E-flat Major (D-B, Am. B. 501,1), dated "13. Jun. 38."

22. The symphonies are Graun WV A:XII:1 to A:XII:30; Av:XII:31 to Av:XII:65; C:XII:68; C:XII:69; Cv:XII:70 to Cv:XII:92. One indication that some of these are early works is their survival in Pisendel copies in Dresden, e.g., Graun WV A:XII:30 in D-DI, Mus 2474-N-9.

23. Johann Georg Sulzer, ed., *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste*, s.v. "Symphonie," by Johann Abraham Peter Schulz.

24. See Stefan Kunze, *Die Sinfonie im 18. Jahrhundert. Von der Opernsinfonie zur Konzertsinfonie* (Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 1993), 122–28.

25. C. H. Graun's first Italian overture was written for *Artaserse* in 1743. In 1744 he composed an Italian overture for *Alessandro e Poro* but French overtures for *Catone in Utica* and *Lucio Papirio*; with *Adriano in Siria* in 1746 he began writing Italian overtures regularly.

26. On the keyboard concertos, see Schwinger, 484–89, 504–11.

27. One of the rare four-movement symphonies from the period is J. G. Graun's Symphony in F Major, Graun WV Av:XII:52.

the basso. The figured bass remains standard through the 1750s, as in Italian practice. The texture is dominated by the outer voices, violin I and basso, with the violin II and viola doubling or filling in between them. Oboes or flutes serve primarily to color the string parts, though they may have *obbligato* lines in slow movements. Horns, trumpets, and timpani serve to reinforce the *tuttis*, especially in *forte* passages. The winds thus may play a structural role in the composition by their contributions to orchestral color and dynamics.

Bach's first surviving work in the genre, the Symphony in G Major, Wq 173, clearly follows the pattern established by J.G. Graun and Schaffrath in its structure and its scoring for strings alone.²⁸ The first movement has four ritornello-like sections each introduced by a head-motif. The three intervening sections are modulatory, with a greater variety of material, each ending with a marked structural cadence. These sections, corresponding to the solo sections of a concerto movement, include stretches without the basso, sequences, harmonic intensification and contrasts, and *forte* unison passages. The second movement is in ternary form and the finale is a binary movement in $\frac{3}{8}$.

In Wq 174–176, written when Bach returned to the genre in the mid-1750s, notable differences are apparent. These can largely be explained by the great development of the concerto, especially the keyboard concerto, in Bach's hands in the intervening years. The individual movements, particularly the first movements, are longer. In the structure of the first movements the ritornello principle is less evident; there is a tendency for the movement to fall into three sections, the third of them a tonally prepared section in the tonic key that increasingly resembles the recapitulation of a sonata design. This is particularly clear in Wq 175, where the first movement originally had repetition signs for the two halves of a large binary or sonata design; Bach only took them out in Hamburg many years after composing the piece. The slow movements are most often in a rondo-like sectional design, but may unfold rhapsodically without a set formal plan. The finales are usually in binary design; the minuet finale of Wq 175 is exceptional.

A further innovation rooted in developments in the concerto and the operatic overture is a tendency to link the three movements of the cycle. Starting with the 1755 triptych, in Wq 176 and possibly Wq 174, and continuing until the final Berlin work, the Symphony in F Major, Wq 181, Bach provides transitions between at least one pair of movements in each symphony, ending one movement on

the dominant of the following movement and proceeding *attacca* into it. In this way Bach shows that he has gone beyond the formal model of Graun.

The tendencies just discussed continue in the symphonies Bach composed in Hamburg, which show an increasingly imaginative sense of form both in the individual movements and in their interrelationships. Despite the chronological gaps in Bach's production of symphonies, the line of musical development from Wq 173 of 1741 to the last of the Wq 183 symphonies of 1776 is clear, always moving toward greater mastery of the medium.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to all the libraries that provided source material for the edition, in particular the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv, which kindly gave permission to publish the plates. We would also like to thank Peter Wollny, Paul Corneilson, and Stephen C. Fisher for their assistance in the preparation of this volume.

Ekkehard Krüger
Tobias Schwinger

APPENDIX

Lost, Doubtful, and Spurious Symphonies

Besides the eighteen works of Wq 173–183, some two dozen other works appear in eighteenth-century sources as symphonies by C.P.E. Bach. This is in part a matter of terminology; *sinfonia* could refer to several types of instrumental works in the period in addition to the symphony as we understand it today. Bach composed two trios for violins and basso that he designated *sinfonia*, the Sinfonia in D Major, H 585 (also known as a work for violin and keyboard, Wq 74/H 507), and the Sinfonia in A Minor, Wq 156. These two works are sometimes listed in catalogues among the symphonies, but they are clearly chamber music and are treated as such in the present edition (see CPEB: CW, II/2.2).

Bach's own account of his production (see p. xi above) raises the possibility that he composed more early symphonies than are extant, presumably filling in at least part of the gap between Wq 173 of 1741, and the seven works of 1755–62. Bach could not exclude Wq 173 from his canon because he had published it in a keyboard arrangement

28. See Wagner, 251ff.

(Wq 122/1), and the other seven works figured in his performing repertory in Hamburg. He certainly intended these eight works to be included in his musical legacy. Perhaps he had written other symphonies that he then found unsuited to publication or revival. The quantity of his older music that he destroyed in 1786 presumably included many works that were little known and not up to his usual standards; one may only speculate as to whether any of those works were symphonies.

A consideration of the sources suggests that Bach had not put the symphonies in his library in the same kind of order as much of his other music. For most categories of instrumental music, Bach carefully kept lists of the works he considered canonical and numbered his house copies accordingly; NV 1790 was largely based on such records. The date and place of composition in the NV 1790 listing for each of the symphonies probably came from a document left by Bach, but we do not know precisely what it was or whether Bach considered it complete and definitive.²⁹ None of the surviving copies of symphonies from Bach's library bears an inventory number in his hand,³⁰ though his daughter Anna Carolina Philippina has given most of them numbers corresponding to their positions in NV 1790 (see critical report). These sources comprise a motley assortment. Where one might have expected a fairly uniform collection of performance parts with significant autograph contributions, as exists for the sonatas, such copies survive only for Wq 175 and 176; the other symphonies survive as scores, as mixtures of parts and autograph particelle, or as sets of parts without entries by Bach. While some performing material may have been lost after Bach's death, it is clear that the symphonies were never as well organized as other categories of music in his collection. Perhaps Bach had not fully made up his mind that the eighteen symphonies listed in NV 1790 were the only ones he wished to be known.

Bach composed at least one symphony in addition to the canonical eighteen. NV 1790 (p. 65) lists it separately

29. There is at least one minor error in the listings of symphonies in NV 1790: all four symphonies of Wq 183 are dated, "H[amburg] 1776" (p. 45). The autograph score of Wq 183/2 reveals that it was completed on 11 November 1775, suggesting that Wq 183/1 was written yet earlier. The set as a whole was finished the following spring. See CPEB: CW, III/3, xi–xii.

30. The original parts to Wq 182/1 and 3–6 have numbers in Bach's hand referring to their position within that set. The original parts to Wq 182/2 are missing and have been replaced by a later MS with no autograph entries (though it does have a number in ACPB's hand). See CPEB: CW, III/2.

from the others, without a musical incipit, as the second item under the heading "Einige vermischte Stücke." It is a "Sinfonie mit dem Fürsten von Lobkowitz, einen Takt nach dem andern, aus dem Stegreif verfertigt. B[erlin]. Mit Hörnern und Hoboen." Ferdinand Philipp von Lobkowitz (1724–84) was in Potsdam and Berlin several times in 1749–51, where he was active in artistic circles and became a friend of Bach.³¹ Presumably the work originated as a joint improvisation at the keyboard, and then Bach realized it for orchestra. Bach may have retained it because of its origin, even if he did not distribute copies of the work (even the avid collector Johann Jacob Heinrich Westphal seems not to have possessed it) and it did not serve any function in his Hamburg repertory.³² The symphony apparently remained in Bach's library after his death; his widow mentions it briefly in a letter to Sara Levy of 5 September 1789.³³ The manuscript of this work was probably part of lot 103 in AK 1805; the lot, under "Ungedruckte Sachen von C.P.E. Bach," consisted of "Trio mit 1 Violine, Bratsche und Baß, auch eine Simphonie." This probably refers to the first two entries under "Einige vermischte Stücke" in NV 1790: "Trio für die Violine, Bratsche und Baß, mit Johann Sebastian Bach gemeinschaftlich verfertigt," and the Lobkowitz symphony.³⁴ Neither manuscript has been traced and no source for either work has been identified.

In addition to the works discussed so far, about twenty more symphonies have been ascribed to C.P.E. Bach at one time or another, though none appears in a source that can be directly connected to the composer. The following discussion will briefly indicate the status of each as of 2007. Where a symphony is listed in a modern thematic catalogue of works by another composer, further details appear there; more information about other works mentioned here will appear in the forthcoming volumes of the *Bach-Repertorium*.³⁵

31. See Suchalla, 127–34.

32. Leisinger/Wollny 1993, 134, likewise speculate that Bach preserved the trio mentioned here because it had been composed with his father.

33. *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1311 (written by ACPB and signed by her mother Johanna Maria).

34. See Elias N. Kulukundis, "Die Versteigerung von C.P.E. Bachs musikalischem Nachlaß im Jahre 1805," *BJ* 81 (1995): 172. Possibly the failure of the catalogue to mention either Lobkowitz or J.S. Bach in connection with the lot caused prospective buyers to overlook it.

35. This discussion makes extensive use of material from Jan LaRue's unpublished catalogue of eighteenth-century symphonies, which Jan and Marian LaRue graciously made available to me.

The symphonies that have best claim to consideration as lost or suppressed works by C.P.E. Bach are four that appeared under his name in the Breitkopf thematic catalogue. In the original 1762 section of the catalogue dealing with symphonies, there is a set of six attributed to C.P.E. Bach (Cat. Breitkopf, col. 2), comprising the first four authenticated works (Wq 173–176) and two additional symphonies in C major and B-flat major. The first supplement to the catalogue, dated 1766 (col. 202), adds a pair of symphonies in F major and G major, neither of which can be authenticated. Except for Wq 174, which has horns (as in the autograph), all these works are scored for string orchestra. The only other symphonies ascribed to C.P.E. Bach in the Breitkopf catalogue are the published set, Wq 183 (col. 672); the Berlin symphonies composed after 1755 and the first group of Hamburg symphonies, Wq 182, never appeared in it. (Six additional symphonies discussed below also appear in the Breitkopf catalogue under the names of other composers.)

Bach told Johann Nikolaus Forkel that the manuscript music Breitkopf sold “is partly not by me, and in any case is old and incorrectly copied.”³⁶ Despite this, the attributions to C.P.E. Bach in the manuscript instrumental music listed in the Breitkopf thematic catalogue are by and large reliable. Of the fifty concertos, trios, and keyboard works listed as his in the catalogue, only three cannot be authenticated.³⁷ Thus it would seem possible that at least some of the symphonies listed under C.P.E. Bach’s name in the catalogue are “old and incorrectly copied” rather than not by him.

The Symphony in G Major, H 667, has received more attention as a possible work of C.P.E. Bach than any of the other doubtful symphonies. Kast assigned it the num-

ber Wq n.v. 69 (based on the attribution “de Bach” in D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 228). Ernst Suchalla thought it highly probable that this work was the Lobkowitz symphony, finding it musically plausible as a collaboration between Bach and a dilettante.³⁸ While the identification is not impossible, the argument for it is not compelling. The Lobkowitz symphony had oboes and horns, but in both surviving sources (St 228 and NL-Ur, Coll. Evangelische Broedergerne Zeist, without shelf mark; both are probably Breitkopf copies) H 667 appears as a work for strings alone. The first movement of H 667 has repetition marks for both halves; in their final versions none of the authenticated symphonies has repetitions in a first movement. To be sure, several of the Berlin symphonies were originally written for string orchestra and later expanded to include winds, and the Symphony in F Major, Wq 175 originally had repetition marks in its first movement (see critical report), but this does little to strengthen the case for H 667. The sources in fact do not support the attribution to C.P.E. Bach very well; while there is no conflicting ascription, the two manuscripts were originally attributed only to “Bach,” as is a listing of the work in the 1758 Meiningen thematic catalogue.³⁹ While the question must remain open, there is not at present sufficient reason to identify H 667 as the Lobkowitz symphony or to attribute it securely to C.P.E. Bach.⁴⁰

The situation is no better for the other three doubtful symphonies in the Breitkopf catalogue. The Symphony in F Major survives in a single copy with an original attribution to “Bach” (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 225, by the same scribe who made the copy of H 667, presumably a Breitkopf copyist). The Symphony in C Major also survives in a single copy (S-Skma, Od-R Anon.), made by a scribe named Schlichting, who was an associate of Bach’s during his early years in Berlin. There is, however, no original attribution on the manuscript, and a later hand has added “Graun”; the work has been assigned the designation Graun WV D:XII:94. The Symphony in B-flat Major does not survive. Its only known source was a score formerly in the collection of the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin (D-B,

36. Letter of 26 August 1774, *CPEB-Briefe*, I:433, “Die beschriebenen Sachen, die Breitkopf von mir verkauft, sind theils nicht von mir, wenigstens sind sie alt u. falsch geschrieben.”

37. The Concerto in F Minor, H 484.2/Warburton C 73 (col. 132), which appears under C.P.E. Bach’s name in several sources, is now attributed to Johann Christian Bach. The Sonata for Violin and Keyboard in G Minor, H 542.5/BWV 1020 (col. 126), is most likely by Johann Sebastian Bach. The Suite for Keyboard in B-flat Major, H 370 (col. 116), has not been fully authenticated but has a good claim to be considered a suppressed early work by C.P.E. Bach; it is published in *CPEB:CW*, I/8.2. In addition, the Concerto in A Minor, Wq 1 (col. 292) and the Trio in F Major, Wq 163 (col. 104) appear in the Breitkopf catalogue with misattributions to Johann Sebastian Bach; the Concerto in F Major, Wq 42, appears with a misattribution to Johann Georg Lang(e) (col. 518); and Wq 163 (col. 111) and the Trio in C Major, Wq 73 (col. 252) appear with attributions only to “Bach.” (Wq 163 also appears a third time [col. 92] with the correct ascription.)

38. Suchalla, 131–34.

39. D-MEIL, *Geh. Archiv Meiningen*, XV T 48, No. 89. This information was kindly supplied by Sterling Murray.

40. Like Suchalla, Helm assumes this work to be the Lobkowitz symphony, and he assigned it the number H 667 as a “possibly authentic” work. Helm assigned the number H 668 to all the other dubious symphonies collectively.

SA 1385),⁴¹ in the hand of C.P.E. Bach's close Berlin associate J.F. Hering; the work was there attributed to Wilhelm Friedemann Bach, though it is not entirely certain that the ascription was in Hering's hand. The attribution to Wilhelm Friedemann seems more likely, and the work is accordingly known as Falck 71.⁴² The F major and C major symphonies are musically routine. One cannot wholly rule out the possibility that they are by C.P.E. Bach, but the evidence for the ascription is slim.

Four other symphonies ascribed to C.P.E. Bach deserve consideration as candidates for suppressed authentic works. A pair of symphonies, one in E-flat major and one in B-flat major, appear in Berlin sources from the late eighteenth century (B-Bc, 27144 MSM and 27145 MSM; D-B, SA 1950 and SA 1951).⁴³ The Brussels copies were originally for strings and originally only the B-flat major symphony had an attribution, and that just to "Bach"; but the Berlin copies include winds and are both ascribed explicitly to C.P.E. Bach. The Berlin copy of the E-flat major symphony once belonged to Sara Levy. The scribes of the four MSS include two frequently found in her collection, designated Anon. Itzig 9 and 12;⁴⁴ the bass figures in the Brussels copy of the B-flat major symphony are in the hand of Hering. Stylistically, the works are not especially convincing; on the title page of the Berlin copy of the E-flat major symphony, Carl Friedrich Zelter has written, "cannot be by Emanuel Bach" (kann nicht von Em. Bach seyn). Another symphony for strings in E-flat major appears in two Swedish sources (S-L, Saml. Kraus 336 and S-L, Saml. Wenster C:3), the first with no original attribution, the second explicitly ascribed to "Emanuel Bach." Again, the music is so undistinguished that Bach's authorship seems unlikely. A symphony for strings in D major appears in a single Berlin source (D-B, SA 1957) with an original attribution to "C.P.E. Bach" and the surname later changed to "Sebastian." Musically this is one of the better dubious symphonies; Zelter, however, has remarked on the title page, "Hardly likely to be by one of the two

named masters, possibly a juvenile work" (Ist schwerlich von einem der beiden genannten Meistern, es müßte etwa eine Jugendarbeit seyn). The work has been assigned to W.F. Bach on stylistic grounds.⁴⁵

The remaining symphonies ascribed to C.P.E. Bach can rapidly be dismissed. The documentary evidence for them is tenuous at best, and the sources usually originated far from Bach's circle. While the works discussed so far are at least North German symphonies of Bach's era, most of the remaining ones are clearly the work of composers from the following generation working in other parts of Europe, including Bach's younger half-brother Johann Christian.

Helm includes two arrangements of orchestral pieces by other composers in his list of doubtful keyboard works by C.P.E. Bach. H 361, in D major, was arranged from J.C. Bach's overture to *Gli uccellatori*, Warburton G 23; it appeared as the work of "Bach of Berlin" in some London editions published after the actual composer's death. H 371 is an arrangement of the Symphony in B-flat Major, Graun WV B:XII:66, by C.H. Graun. There is no plausible reason to associate C.P.E. Bach with either arrangement.

Suchalla investigated a group of four symphonies formerly from Bad Aussee, now in Graz, two of which were attributed to C.P.E. Bach.⁴⁶ Two of them can securely be assigned to J.C. Bach (B-flat major, A-Gd, Bad-Aussee Ms. 342, Warburton C 4a; D major, A-Gd, Bad-Aussee Ms. 343, the overture to *Artasere*, Warburton G 1),⁴⁷ a third either to J.C. Bach or to Anton Fils (B-flat major, A-Gd, Bad-Aussee Ms. 351, Warburton C Inc 1),⁴⁸ and the fourth to Carl Ditters von Dittersdorf (G major, A-Gd, Bad-Aussee Ms. 347, Warburton YC 78, Grave G-7).⁴⁹

Two additional symphonies are ascribed to C.P.E. Bach only in the Austrian monastic catalogue Melk VII.⁵⁰ The first, a work in C major, Warburton YC 14, is widely dis-

41. The list of lost manuscripts from the Sing-Akademie collection appears in Axel Fischer and Mathias Kornemann, *Die Bach-Sammlung aus dem Archiv der Sing-Akademie zu Berlin* (Munich: Saur, 2003), 24–25.

42. Falck had only limited access to the source, but was able to publish a description of the piece (pp. 131–32) with incipits for all movements (catalogue, 16).

43. Full descriptions appear in Leisinger/Wollny 1997, 503–4, and Enßlin, 212–24.

44. See Peter Wollny, "Sara Levy and the Making of Musical Taste in Berlin," *MQ* 77 (1993): 651–88.

45. Enßlin, 219–20.

46. Suchalla, 283–86.

47. Cat. Breitkopf, col. 202, as J.C. Bach.

48. Cat. Breitkopf, col. 259, as Fils.

49. *The Symphony 1720–1840. Reference Volume: Contents of the Set and Collected Thematic Indexes*, ed. Barry S. Brook, (New York: Garland, 1986), 179–80; in the Garland index the work is numbered G4. The Grave catalogue appears in Margaret H. Grave, "First-Movement Form as a Measure of Dittersdorf's Symphonic Development" (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1977). This symphony appears in Cat. Breitkopf, col. 259, attributed to Dittersdorf.

50. Alexander Weinmann, *Handschriftliche thematische Kataloge aus dem Benediktinerstift Melk* (Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1984), Tafel 67–68.

tributed under the names of several composers, including Joseph Haydn (Hoboken I:C26) and František Adam Miča,⁵¹ though most often attributed to “Bach”; the Melk source itself (A-M, IV.8) lacks an attribution. The second work, in G minor, Warburton C 12, is by J.C. Bach,⁵² though it also is attributed to Miča; the source in Melk to which the catalogue entry refers assigns it to “Baach.”

Another Austrian monastery, Göttweig, contributes another misattribution of a work by J.C. Bach, the Symphony in E-flat Major, Warburton C 9.⁵³ The misattribution is on the source (A-GÖ, 2617) as well as in the corresponding catalogue.⁵⁴

Five additional symphonies were assigned to C.P.E. Bach in Jan LaRue’s catalogue of 18th-century symphonies on the basis of ascriptions in Italian and Austrian sources:⁵⁵

- Incipit 5675 (C.P.E. Bach)/5676 (Amandus Ivančič) refers to a D major work in a source in Melk that cannot now be located; Melk VII ascribes the work to “Anonymo,” and it occurs elsewhere (A-KR, H21/120) as a four-movement work, probably a string quartet, by Ivančič, Pokorn D7.⁵⁶
- Incipit 6483 (C.P.E. Bach)/6484 (Carl Joseph Toeschi) refers to the D major symphony Warburton YC 24, a work attributed to “Bacch” in a Roman source (I-Rdp, 168/3 [score], 171/B–D [parts]) but elsewhere convincingly ascribed to Toeschi.⁵⁷

- Incipit 7395 refers to Warburton YC 36, also in D major, which is ascribed in the only known sources (I-Rdp, 179/2 [score], 186/A–G [parts]) to “Giovanni Bacch,” who is more likely to be any of several people other than C.P.E. Bach.
- Incipit 9982 refers to an entry in the *Quartbuch* for yet another D major symphony, ascribed simply to “Bach,” not presently known to survive.⁵⁸
- Incipit 15049 (Johann Georg Lang)/15050 (C.P.E. Bach) refers to the Symphony in G Major, Warburton YC 75, ascribed to “Pach” in one Austrian source (A-KR, H 31/275) but in another (A-ST, MI 19) more convincingly attributed to Lang (Davis G5).⁵⁹

It is of course possible that additional sources relevant to the question of attribution will turn up, or that some material thought to be lost will be found. Certainly further research would lead to more confidently assigning some of the misattributed works to their correct authors. Whether any further concert symphonies will ever be securely ascribed to C.P.E. Bach is doubtful, however, and there is little likelihood that this would change the picture of his accomplishments in the genre.

Stephen C. Fisher

51. Cat. Breitkopf, col. 627, as Miča (this attribution is not corroborated elsewhere). The symphony appears as “Bach” in the *Quartbuch* 2:43, C63. The *Quartbuch*, a two-volume catalogue of an unidentified Austrian collection, had been in the Esterházy Archive in Budapest; it was destroyed in the Second World War and only a modern transcription was available for this study. The *Quartbuch* contained twenty-eight entries ascribed to “Bach,” mostly works by J.C. Bach. The authenticated works of C.P.E. Bach appearing in it were the trio Wq 151 (1:18, D52), the string version of Wq 177/178 (1:23, E53), and Wq 173 (2:55, G23).

52. Cat. Breitkopf, col. 340, as J.C. Bach.

53. Cat. Breitkopf, col. 380, as J.C. Bach (after a Hummel print).

54. No. 2617, dated 1762. *Der Göttweiger thematische Katalog von 1830*, ed. Friedrich W. Riedel (München: Katzschichler, 1979).

55. Jan LaRue, *A Catalogue of 18th-Century Symphonies*, vol. 1, *Thematic Identifier* (Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1988). Apparently these incipits should have received the composer code B112 (Bach) instead of the code B114 (C.P.E. Bach). In addition to those listed here, two further incipits assigned to C.P.E. Bach are too short to be useful: no. 9287 (possibly Wq 183/1 or any of several works by J.C. Bach) and no. 15335. Incipit no. 15742, ascribed to J.C. Bach, refers to Wq 173.

56. *The Symphony 1720–1840, Reference Volume*, 330.

57. Cat. Breitkopf, col. 339, as Toeschi.

58. *Quartbuch* 2:47, D59.

59. *The Symphony 1720–1840, Reference Volume*, 345.