

INTRODUCTION

The three sets of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach's *Sonaten mit veränderten Reprisen*, Wq 50–52, first issued by Georg Ludwig Winter in 1760, 1761, and 1763, respectively, comprise—along with the “Prussian” and “Württemberg” Sonatas that preceded them and the “Kenner und Liebhaber” collections that followed—Bach's most substantial contributions to the keyboard sonata repertoire. (A complete list of contents of the three collections of “Reprisen” Sonatas is given in table 1.) The present volume includes, in addition to the eighteen sonatas of the three collections, an additional two versions of the C-major sonata, Wq 51/1, that are transmitted in manuscript copies (Wq 65/35 and 65/36) and will be discussed in greater detail below. The “Reprisen Sonaten” (Bach's term) unfortunately have not shared the renown of the other collections, and their importance, both as an insight into the norms of performance practice during Bach's lifetime, and their significance for composers and performers of the second half of the eighteenth century, to say nothing of those of today, has tended to be overlooked. That these sonatas were generally neglected is corroborated by the fact that they were not issued in modern editions until 1976 and 1984.¹ It should be observed that they are not the only case of Bach's furnishing works with recomposed variation (e.g., the *Kurze und leichte Clavierstücke mit veränderten Reprisen*, Wq 113–114, published in CPEB: CW, I/8.1).²

Sources

Bach's autograph manuscripts of the sonatas have not come down to us (with the exception of one leaf from

1. Wq 50 was edited by Étienne Darbellay (Winterthur: Amadeus, 1976), and all three sets were edited by Eiji Hashimoto (Tokyo: Zen-On Music, 1984).

2. Other works by C.P.E. Bach that contain varied reprises, a technique that permeates Bach's oeuvre, include several of the sonatinas (see CPEB: CW, III/11–13) and the Arioso in C Major with 9 Variations, Wq 118/10 (in CPEB: CW, I/7), an elaboration with varied reprises of the keyboard part of the trio Wq 91/4 (in CPEB: CW, II/4). The third of Nicola Porpora's *Sonate XII di violino e basso* (Vienna, 1754) contains a *Vivace* with written-out decoration of the reprises. I am grateful to Ulrich Leisinger for this information. For a summary of C.P.E. Bach's embellishments, see Berg 1983.

Wq 52/3/iii), but substantial embellishments in his hand do survive. Wq 50, the first of the three sets, bears a dedication dated 1 September 1759; the preface is dated July 1759. Winter prepared two printings: one with the title page, dedication, and C.P.E. Bach's preface in German; the other in French. The plates of the music are identical. Winter also issued the second set, Wq 51, with German and French title pages.³ The third set, Wq 52, was issued only with a German title page. The first two sets were published in new editions by Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf in 1785. Unauthorized (pirated) editions were issued by John Walsh in London in 1763 (the first two sets only; perhaps because the third, published the same year, had not yet appeared). Wq 50 was reissued by William Randall sometime in the 1770s, and Randall issued a pirated edition of Wq 52 before 1781. A pirated edition of Wq 50 was published by Johann Carl Friedrich Rellstab in 1786.

The circumstances underlying Rellstab's publication outraged Bach, whose ire is documented in extensive correspondence with Breitkopf.⁴ The difficulties began when Winter died. In an undated letter to Breitkopf received by the latter on 22 August 1772, Bach writes, “Most esteemed friend, please be so kind as to inform me how many copies of all three parts of my *Reprisen Sonaten* and of my Concerto III in E major [Wq 14] the late Winter left with you.”⁵ The next communication from Bach to Breitkopf on this subject is Bach's letter of 23 July 1785, which is in the

3. Of the surviving copies we examined, there is one copy of the Wq 50 print (labeled C 1a) where the first signature has a different font for the dynamics and a handful of variant readings. Similarly, two copies of the Wq 51 print (labeled C 2a) use a different font for the dynamics throughout the entire print, though the layout of the music is identical. Significant variants between the states of these prints are listed in the critical report.

4. For this and other information I am greatly indebted to Howard Serwer, “C.P.E. Bach, J.C.F. Rellstab, and the Sonatas with Varied Reprises,” in *CPEB-Studies 1988*, 233–43, and Darbellay's preface to his edition of Wq 50.

5. *CPEB-Letters*, 28–29; *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:274: “Theuerster Freund, seÿn Sie doch so gütig u. melden mir, wie viele Exemplare von allen 3 Theilen meiner Reprisen Sonaten u. von meinem Concerto III aus dem E dur, der seelige Winter bey Ihnen hat liegen laßen.”

TABLE I. CONTENTS OF BACH'S "REPRISEN" SONATAS

Collection / Caption Heading in Print	Key	Wq	H	NV 1790	CV 1772	Place, Date of Composition
Wq 50						
SONATA I.	F	50/1	136	p. 15, no. 109	97	Berlin, 1759
SONATA II.	G	50/2	137	p. 15, no. 110	98	Berlin, 1759
SONATA III.	a	50/3	138	p. 15, no. 111	99	Berlin, 1759
SONATA IV.	d	50/4	139	p. 15, no. 112	100	Berlin, 1759
SONATA V.	B \flat	50/5	126	p. 14, no. 102	101	Zerbst, 1758
SONATA VI.	c	50/6	140	p. 15, no. 113	102	Berlin, 1759
Wq 51						
SONATA I.	C	51/1	150	p. 16, no. 119*	107	Berlin, 1760
SONATA II.	B \flat	51/2	151	p. 16, no. 120	108	Berlin, 1760
SONATA III.	c	51/3	127	p. 14, no. 103	109	Zerbst, 1758
SONATA IV.	d	51/4	128	p. 15, no. 104	110	Zerbst, 1758
SONATA V.	F	51/5	141	p. 15, no. 115	111	Berlin, 1759
SONATA VI.	g	51/6	62	p. 9, no. 64	112	Berlin, 1750
Wq 52						
SONATA I.	E \flat	52/1	50	p. 8, no. 53	113	Berlin, 1747
SONATA II.	d	52/2	142	p. 15, no. 116	114	Berlin, 1759
SONATA III.	g	52/3	158	p. 16, no. 122	115	Berlin, 1761
SONATA IV.	f \sharp	52/4	37	p. 6, no. 41	116	Berlin, 1744
SONATA V.	E	52/5	161	p. 17, no. 123	117	Berlin, 1762
SONATA VI.	e	52/6	129	p. 15, no. 105	118	Zerbst, 1758

*The entry states, "Diese Sonate ist nachhero 2 mal durchaus verändert." This refers to the two embellished versions of this sonata, Wq 65/35–65/36 (H 156–157), but these were not published in the print.

context of Breitkopf's publication of new editions of the first and second sets. Bach wrote to Breitkopf, "I am now engaged in a nasty correspondence with a young smart alec and rude lout by the name of Rellstab in Berlin who is starting up a music printing business."⁶ In the extensive tirade that follows, Bach reveals that he had received a letter from Rellstab informing him that Rellstab had purchased all the remaining copies of the "Reprises" Sonatas from Winter's widow and that "the first part had already sold out a few years ago (this I do not believe)" (vom ersten Theile hätten schon seit einigen Jahren Exemplare gemangelt (dies glaube ich nicht)). Rellstab informed Bach that he was planning to publish three hundred copies of a new edition of Wq 50 and suggested that Bach should pay half of the printing costs (1 louis d'or per sheet). Instead Bach

6. *CPEB-Letters*, 229; *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1081: "Ich habe jetzt eine häßliche Correspondenz mit einem jungen Naseweiß u. groben Flegel, Namens Rellstab in Berlin, der mit einer neuen Noten Druckerey anfängt." The rest of the quotes in the present and following paragraphs are drawn from the same letter.

offered to sell Rellstab his remaining copies of the "Reprises" Sonatas, but Rellstab refused. Naturally, Bach was concerned that the issuance of a pirated edition of his "Reprises" Sonatas would jeopardize the sale of his remaining stock of the first edition. Bach told Breitkopf that he currently had "42 copies of the 1st part, 2 copies of the 2nd, and 260 copies of the 3rd" (vom 1sten Theile, 42 Ex., vom 2ten, 2 Ex., u. vom 3tten 260 Ex.).⁷

Bach then requests of Breitkopf that he put it in writing if he judges Rellstab's edition to be pirated. With the upcoming Michaelmas Fair, where music was offered for sale, Bach proposed that if he could not divest himself of his remaining copies, he would undercut Rellstab's price, making the latter's pirated edition uncompetitive. Bach even offered to "send a new sonata gratis right away to be printed,

7. Bach goes on to explain that "Winter was fickle and made unequal printings depending on whether he had paper or not." (Winter war ein Tändelmatz u. machte ungleiche Auflagen, nachdem er Papier, oder keins hatte.) Unfortunately, we have no information about the original print runs for the three sets.

so that it would be sold at the right time bound together with the first part. The title would then perhaps have to be changed” (so will ich gratis eine neue Sonate gleich zum Druck einschicken, damit sie mit dem ersten Theile zusammen-gehängt zur rechten Zeit mit verkauft würde. Der Titel würde alsdeñ vielleicht anders seyn müssen). Although Bach did indeed send a sonata, it was published separately by Breitkopf in 1785 (Wq 60; see CPEB: CW, I/5.2).

On 26 August 1785 Bach wrote again to Breitkopf, declaring that as the latter has not given him counsel in the Rellstab matter, he had to act, as the Fair was impending. Bach states:

Enough, I am not going to waste another word over this bad man. I am too proud to have anything further to do with him at all! Nevertheless, he must not remain unpunished; only I myself must not be involved. In a word: I cannot help you this time; you must do me a favor. I will pay you back. I must be rid of my *Reprisen Sonaten*, without explaining myself about it publicly at all. . . . Give me what you want for them, even if it is less than 50 rl. . . . These *Reprisen Sonaten* are more popular with many people than my collections *für Kenner und Liebhaber*. They are more serious than the latter and also easier.⁸

In a further letter to Breitkopf dated 14 September 1785, Bach states that he has shipped the copies of the “Reprisen” Sonatas to him and reiterates that Breitkopf pay him as much as he wants, but “my name must not be attached to this transaction. I have kept here for my own use 1 copy of each set. You will therefore find 41 copies of the first, 1 copy of the 2nd, and 259 copies of the 3rd set, together 301 copies.”⁹

The last substantive reference to the “Reprisen” Sonatas in the correspondence is Bach’s letter to Breitkopf of 20 September 1785:

8. CPEB-Letters, 232–33; CPEB-Briefe, 2:1091: “Genung ich verliehre nun kein Wort mehr wegen des schlechten Menschen. Ich bin zu stolz mich im geringsten weiter mit ihm abzugeben! Indesßen muß er nicht ungestraft bleiben, nur meine Person muß nicht darbey seyn. Mit einem Worte: ich kañ Ihnen diesmahl nicht helfen; Sie müßen mir einen Gefallen thun, ich bin wieder zu Ihren Diensten. Meine Repr. Sonaten muß ich loß seyn, ohne im geringsten mich öffentlich darüber zu erklären. . . . Geben Sie mir dafür, was Sie wollen, weñs auch weniger als 50 rl. sind. . . . Sind diese Reprisen Sonaten bey sehr vielen beliebter als meine Saml. f. K. u. L. Sie sind ernsthafter als die letztern u. auch leichter.”

9. CPEB-Letters, 233 (slightly modified); CPEB-Briefe, 2:1104: “Nur muß bey diesem Betrieb mein Nahme nicht seyn. Von jedem Theile habe ich für meinen Gebrauch 1 Stück hierbehalten. Sie finden also 41 St. vom ersten, 1 St. vom 2ten u. 259 St. vom 3tten Theile, zusammen 301 Stück.”

Most cherished friend, I am most obliged to you for accepting my sonatas. You are receiving herewith my relinquishment of them and the copies of my receipt for Frau Winter and of her receipt for Rellstab as it had been taken in the latter’s house. Keep all of this and also Rellstab’s rude letter to me. One cannot safeguard oneself enough against bad people. You are now lord and master. I am satisfied with everything, only you do not need to trouble yourself about the new edition of the 2nd part with Winter’s musical type and printing. Rellstab is also making changes in his new printing.¹⁰ You do not need to hide behind the mountain now. I sold you my property and you print and sell as you wish. One must not cause any suspicion. That which Frau Winter assigned to Rellstab, I have also assigned to you. We have the same rights.¹¹

On 19 October 1785 Bach wished Breitkopf luck in the sale of the “Reprisen” Sonatas and the aforementioned new sonata. Serwer’s account of these events theorizes that the embellishments that Bach entered into an exemplar of Winter’s edition of Wq 50 (discussed below) may represent an attempt by Bach to render Rellstab’s publication obsolete by creating a new text. The theory is intriguing, but must remain speculative.¹²

Although Bach was alive when the Breitkopf editions of Wq 50 and 51 were published in 1785, there is no evidence that he read proofs. Indeed, the number of errors in Breitkopf’s print speaks against Bach’s involvement. Nor is there source value for the many manuscript copies, themselves primarily prepared from Winter, whose text, though not error-free, is the most accurate source and therefore forms the basis of the present edition. (Rellstab’s edition is quite sloppy.) In the case of Wq 65/35 and 65/36, which are

10. Rellstab’s print of the first set contains a “Vorrede des Verlegers” (preface by the publisher) in which he proudly refers to the superior engraving of his edition—in particular, the use of segmented ledger lines rather than a single line connecting several notes, to aid in legibility.

11. CPEB-Letters, 234–35; CPEB-Briefe, 2:1108: “Liebwehrtester Freund, Ich danke Ihnen verbundenst für die Annehmung meiner Sonaten. Hierbey erhalten Sie meine Lossagung davon, u. die Copien meines Scheins an die Frau Winter und des Scheins dieser letztern an Rellstaben, so wie sie in des letztern Hause genomēn worden. Heben Sie dieses alles, u. auch den groben Rellstabschen Brief an mich auf. Man kañ nicht genugt sich vor schlechte Leute sicher stellen. Sie sind nun H. u. Meister. Ich bin mit allem zufrieden, nur wegen der neuen Auflage des 2ten Theils mit Winterschen Noten u. Druck haben Sie diese Umstände nicht nöthig. Rellstab ändert auch in seinem neuen Druck. Sie brauchen nun nicht hinterm Berge zu halten. Ich habe Ihnen mein Eigenthum verkauft u. Sie drucken u. verkaufen, wie Sie wollen. Man muß keinen Verdacht geben. Was die Winter Rellstaben abgetreten hat, das habe auch ich Ihnen abgetreten. Wir haben gleiches Recht.”

12. Serwer, 242. If this were correct, Breitkopf could have published Bach’s embellishments in his edition, but he did not.

varied versions of Wq 51/1, the sources are two manuscript copies in the hand of Johann Heinrich Michel, one in Berlin (with title page in Bach's hand), the other in Brussels.

Didactical Purpose of the Sonatas

Bach's preface to Wq 50 begins by acknowledging that decoration of repeats has become indispensable. Nonetheless, he charts a judicious course, defending those who confine themselves to the printed text but whose performances reflect "the rules of good performance" while finding fault with those who decorate excessively, though such players are more likely to receive bravos. Bach's aim is to provide works whose notated ornamentation at repeats will serve the needs of beginners and amateurs. His preface refers to a passage in his *Versuch*, in which he expresses himself even more completely on the practice of the embellished repetitions of parts of movements (varied reprises or "veränderte Reprisen"):

The *Probestück* in F major [Wq 63/5/iii] is a sketch of how one usually varies allegros with two reprises nowadays. As praiseworthy as this invention is, it is much abused. Here is what I think about this point: one must not vary everything, for it would become a new piece. Many passages, in particular those that are affective or recitative-like, should not be varied. This applies also to galant pieces in a style with certain novel expressions and twists that can hardly be grasped fully when heard the first time. All variations must be in accord with the affect of the piece, and they have to be better or at least just as good as the original. For when composing a piece, one often deliberately chooses to write down one idea instead of other ones because one deems it the best of its kind, although one did consider the variations that the performer chooses, believing that it does the piece a great honor. Simple ideas sometimes get well embellished in a fanciful manner and vice versa. This has to be done with careful deliberation, though, as one always has to keep in mind the preceding and the following ideas. One must have the whole piece in view to maintain a balanced mix of brilliance and simplicity, fire and languor, sadness and cheerfulness, vocal and instrumental idioms. The bass may be varied in keyboard pieces, provided the harmony remains the same. Notwithstanding all the variations, which are so fashionable today, one must conceive a performance that clearly preserves the composition's basic design, which displays its affect.¹³

13. "Das Probe-Stücke aus dem F dur ist ein Abriß, wie man heute zu Tage die Allegros mit 2 Reprisen das andremal zu verändern pflegt. So löblich diese Erfindung ist, so sehr wird sie gemißbraucht. Meine Gedanken hiervon sind diese: Man muß nicht alles verändern, weil es

Wq 50

An exemplar of the French issue in the British Library (GB-Lbl, K.10.a.28) is inscribed in Bach's hand, "First part of my Reprisen Sonaten with some variations" (Erster Theil meiner Reprisen Sonaten mit einigen Veränderungen). Bach's reference to the "First part" implies that by this time at least the second set (Wq 51), if not also the third (Wq 52), had been issued. Bach has entered a considerable number of embellishments in the margins affecting seven of the fifteen movements comprising Sonatas I–V. Composite readings incorporating these embellishments are given in the appendix to the present volume.¹⁴

This first set presents sonatas whose first and third movements are in binary form, in which repeat signs are replaced by a written-out text that recomposes what has come before, much as an act of storytelling. Bach does not limit himself to decoration, both involuntary and voluntary (*unwillkürliche/willkürliche Manieren*) of the upper voice: the totality of the texture is altered rhythmically and harmonically as well as melodically. The second movements are not in binary form; recurrences of the open-

sonst ein neu Stück seyn würde. Viele, besonders die affectuösen oder sprechenden Stellen eines Stückes lassen sich nicht wohl verändern. Hieher gehört auch diejenige Schreib-Art in galanten Stücken, welche so beschaffen ist, daß man sie wegen gewisser neuen Ausdrücke und Wendungen selten das erstmal vollkommen einseht. Alle Veränderungen müssen dem Affect des Stückes gemäß seyn. Sie müssen allezeit, wo nicht besser, doch wenigstens eben so gut, als das Original seyn. Denn man wählt bey der Verfertigung eines Stückes, unter andern Gedanken, oft mit Fleiß denjenigen, welchen man hingeschrieben hat und deswegen für den besten in dieser Art hält, ohngeacht einem die Veränderungen dieses Gedanken, welche mancher Ausfühler anbringt und dadurch dem Stücke viele Ehre anzuthun glaubt, zugleich bey der Erfindung desselben mit beygefallen sind. Simple Gedanken werden zuweilen sehr wohl bunt verändert und umgekehrt. Dieses muß mit keiner geringen Ueberlegung geschehen, man muß hierbey beständig auf die vorhergehenden und folgenden Gedanken sehen; man muß eine Absicht auf das ganze Stück haben, damit die gleiche Vermischung des brillanten und simplen, des feurigen und matten, des traurigen und frölichen, des sangbaren und des dem Instrument eignen beybehalten werde. Bey Clavier-Sachen kann zugleich der Baß in der Veränderung anders seyn, als er war, indessen muß die Harmonie dieselbe bleiben. Ueberhaupt muß man, ohngeacht der vielen Veränderungen, welche gar sehr Mode sind, es allezeit so einrichten, daß die Grundliniamenten des Stückes, welche den Affect desselben zu erkennen geben, dennoch hervor leuchten." *Versuch* I:3, §31; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 160–61.

14. See CPEB: CW, VIII/1 for a complete description of this source and the embellishments. This copy is listed in NV 1790 (p. 53): "In einem Exemplar des 1sten Theils der Reprisen-Sonaten sind hin und wieder Veränderungen eigenhändig eingeschrieben." An exemplar of Winter's German issue of the first set in F-Pn, Rés.F. 1664 (1) (*olim* Ac.p.682) likewise contains the same annotations (except for the third movement of Wq 50/5). But *pace* Darbellay, xvi–xvii, and Serwer, 234, the annotations are not in Bach's hand.

ing motive are usually decorated, as are other details. In Sonata VI there is only a single movement, which is in double variation form—a genre avidly employed by Haydn and occasionally by Beethoven—and this elaboration was apparently sufficient enough that Bach did not write in subsequent variations, as he had done for Sonatas I–V.

Wq 51

Although this second set is designated as a “Fortsetzung” (sequel) of Wq 50, Bach reverts to the use of repeat signs for the binary first and third movements of each sonata. Sonata V, in F major, is an exception: the first movement once again substitutes recomposition for repeat signs, and the third movement is a rondo, a rarity in these collections.

Given Bach’s declaration in the preface to Wq 50 that varied repeats are indispensable, and given the designation of Wq 51 as a sequel, it might be wise to entertain the hypothesis that, having demonstrated in Wq 50 the myriad ways of varying the repeats, here Bach is inviting the performer to follow his example and provide analogous execution to that of the first set. The first sonata in Wq 51, in C major, is a case that may well be without precedent or successors: whereas this sonata’s first and third movements have repeat signs, there are two additional versions of the entire sonata, Wq 65/35 and 65/36, which present the material of Wq 51/1 in the same varied manner as Bach carried out on only the repeats of Wq 50. (The entire first movements of these three sonatas are superimposed in score format at the end of the appendix to this volume.) Thus, there are three parallel versions of the sonata—retellings, as it were, of the same narrative with a different musical surface. It is impossible to be certain of whether these three versions should be considered autonomous, as pedagogical illustrations of the art of decoration, or conceivably for potential substitution of one of the three iterations by one of the other two. But this would engender some difficulty for the performer, who would have to place both versions side by side on the music rack and deal with the impracticality of page turns in the two separate scores.

The idea of presenting a written-out elaboration of a movement’s repeats as an example to be followed, primarily but not exclusively by students, does not originate with C.P.E. Bach. In the sarabandes of the second and third English Suites (BWV 807–808), Johann Sebastian Bach provides “Les agréments de la même sarabande.” In the case of the second suite, only the uppermost voice is elaborated; it alone is written out, with its decoration to be superimposed upon the unchanged texture of the other voices.

In the third suite, on the other hand, J.S. Bach varies the entire texture, essentially demonstrating the two principal ways of varying the repeats of sarabandes. That there are no such *agréments* for the other sarabandes in the collection is thus almost certainly intentional: having shown the performer two options for decoration, J.S. Bach evidently leaves the elaboration of the other sarabandes to the performer, as C.P.E. Bach seems to be doing with his *Fortsetzung*.

Wq 52

















As with Wq 51, most of the first and third movements of the third set have repeat signs. An interesting exception is Sonata III in G Minor, where the first movement is a harbinger of sonata form, without repeats and with some alteration of the second part of the recapitulation. The finale of the sonata is a rondeau in G major with a *couplet* in the parallel minor. The return of the refrain is provided with considerable elaboration, but not in the context of a repeat. Here too, Bach may well be making a point, demonstrating the ways that decoration can and should be employed.






While all but one of the sonatas in the first two sets date from between 1758 and 1760, the sonatas in the third set span a much larger range, including one from 1744 (Wq 52/4), one from 1747 (Wq 52/1), and one from 1762 (Wq 52/5). Whether this was mainly a consequence of the disruption caused by the Seven Years’ War (e.g., four of the sonatas were written in Zerbst in 1758, when Bach had to abandon Berlin) or an aesthetic consideration (Bach could have purposefully sought out earlier sonatas that would lend themselves to “varied reprises”) is an open question.





Performance Issues

Idiomatic execution of the ornaments found in the “Reprises” Sonatas is prescribed in the *Versuch*. Table 2 presents an overview of the ornaments used in the present volume. The table of ornaments that J.S. Bach compiled for his son Wilhelm Friedemann Bach in the *Klavierbüchlein* covers most of C.P.E. Bach’s symbols, save the trilled turn (♯) and the inverted turn (♯). The one significant difference between the two composers involves terminations of long trills (♯ , ♯ , and ♯). Whereas J.S. Bach assumes no terminations unless he calls for these explicitly with a vertical stroke through the end of the trill symbol, notated cautionary accidentals in the “Reprises” Sonatas suggest that C.P.E. Bach assumed terminations for long trills. For example, this is surely the only possible meaning of the


TABLE 2. ORNAMENTS USED IN 1/2

Symbol	Name	Versuch Reference	Execution
tr, +, 	Trill, regular trill (Triller, ordentlicher Triller)	I:2.3, § 1–21, and Tab. IV, Figs. XIX–XXIII	
	Trill from below (Triller von unten)	I:2.3, § 22, and Tab. IV, Fig. XXXIV	
	Trill from above (Triller von oben)	I:2.3, § 27, and Tab. IV, Fig. XLI	
	Short trill (halber Triller, Pralltriller)	I:2.3, § 30–36, Tab. IV, Figs. XLV–XLVIII, and Tab. V, Fig. XLIX	
	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	
	Inverted turn (Schleiffer von dreyen Nötgen)	I:2.7, § 5, and Tab. VI, Fig. LXXXIX	
	Mordent and long mordent (Mordent, langer Mordent)	I:2.5, § 1–15, and Tab. V, Figs. LXXII–LXXV	

sharp the sources give above the  in m. 23 of Wq 50/3/i. It cannot mean an $a\sharp'$ as the upper note of the *Pralltriller*; rather, it can mean only that there is no sharp over the  in m. 22: the termination involves e' (no accidental required). See also Wq 50/5/iii, m. 103, where the natural above the  can refer only to a termination. Likewise, it would appear that  and , which regularly appear at cadences, are intended to have terminations.

A few other notational details are worth keeping in mind. The figures  and  are normatively executed as  and , although executing the 32nd notes as triplets is conceivable. See Wq 50/4/iii, staff I, mm. 11, 29, 37, 53, 77, 97, 105, 121, and 129; of the nine occurrences in this movement, a triplet is designated only at mm. 11 and 105. It is left to the performer whether to standardize either way.

Normatively the stroke is an articulation, but in certain passages (e.g., Wq 50/2/iii, mm. 55 and 133; Wq 52/6/i, mm. 23 and 77), the stroke affects a note tied from the previous one. It is possible that the stroke in such cases calls for the previous note to be held (*tenuto*) with an articulation on the note affected by the stroke. As a rule, there is no

such stroke in the left-hand part when the right hand has an ornament (most commonly ) above a tied bass note.

Finally, it is probable that C.P.E. Bach expected fermatas on the dominant and on the tonic $\frac{6}{4}$ to be decorated with a lead-in (*Eingang*) and a cadenza, respectively.

Influence

It is commonly known that in the second half of the eighteenth century C.P.E. Bach's stature exceeded that of his father. Haydn's keyboard sonatas are greatly indebted to those of the younger Bach, and Mozart (who supposedly declared of Bach, "He is the father; we are the kids. Those of us who can do something right have learned it from him")¹⁵ owned a manuscript copy of the eighteen "Reprises" Sonatas. The audacity of Bach's language, and in particular the volatility of his rapid mood changes (especially in his Fantasies), bespeaks a subjectivity that clearly influenced Beethoven.

15. "Er ist der Vater, wir sind die Bub'n. Wer von uns was Rechtes kann, hat's von ihm gelernt." Friedrich Rochlitz, *Für Freunde der Tonkunst*, vol. 4 (Leipzig, 1832), 309.

The premise of the “Reprises” Sonatas, which assuredly reflects an inherited practice, has allowed posterity unequivocal insight into the expected way of performing works with repeat signs; but this aesthetic has yet to affect the performance of sonatas by the next generation of composers. The fact that Mozart owned the “Reprises” Sonatas in itself implies that he was aware of Bach’s aesthetic; given his skill as an improviser, it is scarcely credible that he would have confined the execution of repeats in his own sonatas to a few turns and trills here and there.¹⁶ It is to be hoped that C.P.E. Bach’s “Reprises” Sonatas will inspire growing involvement by musicians in the creative language of both Baroque and Classical repertoire, moving current-day and future performers away from polished, literal reproduction of notated texts, towards the creative spontaneity of narrative discourse.

16. Leopold Mozart wrote to Breitkopf on 6 October 1775 and asked whether he would publish keyboard sonatas [by Wolfgang] in the same style as those of C.P.E. Bach’s “mit veränderten Reprises” (ob sie nicht clavier Sonaten auf die Art drucken möchten, wie jene von H: Philipp Carl Emanuel Bach *mit veränderten Reprises*). Leopold also requested a list of all the works by C.P.E. Bach available. See *Mozart: Briefe und Aufzeichnungen*, ed. Wilhelm A. Bauer and Otto Erich Deutsch, vol. 1, 1755–1776 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1962), 527. Earlier that year Wolfgang had composed a cycle of six piano sonatas, K 279–284.

Acknowledgments

The editor would like to express his gratitude for the tireless and generous aid of Paul Corneilson, Jason B. Grant, Mark W. Knoll, and Kevin Leong at the editorial office, and to Darrell M. Berg and Peter Wollny of the Editorial Board, for many an engrossing discussion. Their expertise has been an enlightening stimulus in the preparation of this volume. Thanks go to the libraries that kindly permitted the use of facsimile plates: the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv; the Germanisches National-Museum, Bibliothek in Nuremberg; and Harvard University, Eda Kuhn Loeb Music Library in Cambridge.

This volume is dedicated to the memory of Christopher Hogwood.

Robert D. Levin