

# INTRODUCTION

---

## Inception

The six collections of sonatas, rondos, and fantasias “für Kenner und Liebhaber” issued between 1779 and 1787 together constitute Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach’s largest-scale publishing venture. (A complete list of contents is given in table 1.) Its preparation and sales (all published “im Verlag des Autors”) occupied much of Bach’s energy for the final ten years of his life; yet when he mooted the first collection—a retrospective selection of six sonatas—he does not appear to have thought of it as the beginning of a series: he only added “Erste Sammlung” to the title page shortly before publication. Only when the commercial success of the first keyboard collection was patent did he expand and vary the scheme, first by adding rondos (a recently popular form) for a second collection, and eventually, in the final three collections, samples of his free fantasies (so that, despite the ephemeral nature of this improvisatory art, posterity and the world at large might know what a *Phantast* he had been).

He had many reasons to propose such a venture: this was, for him, a time for securing his reputation. Like his father, C.P.E. Bach had never left Germany, and most of his important musical acquaintances came to visit him at home; he travelled less than many of his contemporaries, and regretted the fact: “I do not deny that it would have been both exceptionally pleasant and advantageous if I had had the opportunity of visiting foreign countries.”<sup>1</sup> One remedy for the lack of exposure that travel would have given him was publications that would circulate more widely than he had; Bach was also planning to publish select vocal works—the double-chorus Heilig, Wq 217, *Die Israeliten in der Wüste*, Wq 238, *Klopstocks Morgengesang*, Wq 239, and, with much effort, the score of the oratorio, *Die Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu*, Wq 240.

In addition, although he had been careful to control the manuscript circulation of his unpublished works, he was worried by the possibility and was constantly preoccupied

with financial security—for his family after his death as much as for himself at the present. He sensed rightly that there was an appetite for his music and that he had the accumulated resources to satisfy it. In many ways Bach’s works became his children, particularly after the death of his son during the preparation of the first “Kenner und Liebhaber” collection, and he struggled to send them decently and securely abroad into the world.

## “Kenner und Liebhaber”

The qualifier chosen by Bach for his collection, “für Kenner und Liebhaber,” did not propose a distinction new to the arts. French theorists such as Jean-Pierre Crousaz in his *Traité du beau* (Amsterdam, 1715) and Jean-Baptiste Dubos in *Réflexions critiques sur la poésie, la peinture et la musique* (Paris, 1719) had used the terms to distinguish differing approaches to aesthetic experience. Some twenty years before Bach’s use of the phrase, the archaeologist Johann Joachim Winckelmann had recommended a study of mythical Greece, wherein “The connoisseur will find plenty to reflect upon, and the amateur will learn to do likewise.”<sup>2</sup> Neither term was thought to be pejorative or even preferable.<sup>3</sup> Johann Nikolaus Forkel, a colleague and regular correspondent with Bach, had produced *Über die Theorie der Musik, insofern sie Liebhabern und Kennern notwendig und nützlich ist* in 1777, but the phrase was new to printed music when Bach adopted it. Quickly imitated elsewhere in Germany, it has since given rise to much analysis and speculation.<sup>4</sup> Bach’s nemesis in Berlin, Johann Carl Friedrich Rellstab, started a “Kenner und Liebhaber” concert series and a short-lived publication, the *Clavier-*

---

1. “Diesem allen ohngeachtet, läugne ich nicht, daß es mir ungemein lieb und auch vortheilhaft würde gewesen seyn, wenn ich hätte können Gelegenheit haben, fremde Länder zu besuchen.” *Autobiography*, 202.

2. Quoted in *German Aesthetic and Literary Criticism*, ed. H.B. Nesbit (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 54; see Winckelmann, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. Eiselein (1825–29), 1:56.

3. Although the lawyer (and timpanist) Christian Gottfried Krause did seem to lean towards the amateur, who, he explained, was “neither familiar with the rules of harmony, nor subject to other prejudices”. *Von der musikalischen Poesie* (Berlin, 1752), 31.

4. For other interpretations of *Kenner* and *Liebhaber* see Erich Herbert Beurmann, *Die Klaviersonaten Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs* (Ph.D. diss., Georg-August Universität Göttingen, 1952), 78–80.

TABLE I. CONTENTS OF BACH'S "KENNER &amp; LIEBHABER" COLLECTIONS

Collection / Caption Heading in Print	Key	Wq No.	H No.	NV 1790	Place, Date of Composition
<i>Erste Sammlung</i>					
Sonata I	C	55/1	244	p. 22, no. 170	Hamburg, 1773
Sonata II	F	55/2	130	p. 15, no. 106	Berlin, 1758
Sonata III	b	55/3	245	p. 22, no. 173	Hamburg, 1774
Sonata IV	A	55/4	186	p. 19, no. 143	Potsdam, 1765
Sonata V	F	55/5	243	p. 22, no. 169	Hamburg, 1772
Sonata VI	G	55/6	187	p. 19, no. 142	Potsdam, 1765
<i>Zweite Sammlung</i>					
Rondo I	C	56/1	260	p. 22, no. 177	Hamburg, 1778
Sonata I	G	56/2	246	p. 22, no. 172	Hamburg, 1774
Rondo II	D	56/3	261	p. 23, no. 178	Hamburg, 1778
Sonata II	F	56/4	269	p. 23, no. 184	Hamburg, 1780
Rondo III	a	56/5	262	p. 23, no. 179	Hamburg, 1778
Sonata III	A	56/6	270	p. 23, no. 185	Hamburg, 1780
<i>Dritte Sammlung</i>					
Rondo I	E	57/1	265	p. 23, no. 183	Hamburg, 1779
Sonata I	a	57/2	247	p. 22, no. 171	Hamburg, 1774
Rondo II	G	57/3	271	p. 23, no. 186	Hamburg, 1780
Sonata II	d	57/4	208	p. 21, no. 162	Potsdam, 1766
Rondo III	a	57/5	266	p. 23, no. 180	Hamburg, 1779
Sonata III	f	57/6	173	p. 17, no. 127	Berlin, 1763
<i>Vierte Sammlung</i>					
Rondo I	F	58/1	276	p. 24, no. 194	Hamburg, 1782
Sonata I	G	58/2	273	p. 24, no. 189	Hamburg, 1781
Rondo II	E	58/3	274	p. 23, no. 188	Hamburg, 1781
Sonata II	e	58/4	188	p. 19, no. 145	Berlin, 1765
Rondo III	B $\flat$	58/5	267	p. 23, no. 182	Hamburg, 1779
Fantasia I	E $\flat$	58/6	277	p. 24, no. 193	Hamburg, 1782
Fantasia II	A	58/7	278	p. 24, no. 192	Hamburg, 1782
<i>Fünfte Sammlung</i>					
Sonata I	e	59/1	281	p. 24, no. 198	Hamburg, 1784
Rondo I	G	59/2	268	p. 23, no. 181	Hamburg, 1779
Sonata II	B $\flat$	59/3	282	p. 24, no. 197	Hamburg, 1784
Rondo II	c	59/4	283	p. 25, no. 199	Hamburg, 1784
Fantasia I	F	59/5	279	p. 24, no. 191	Hamburg, 1782
Fantasia II	C	59/6	284	p. 24, no. 196	Hamburg, 1784
<i>Sechste Sammlung*</i>					
Rondo I	E $\flat$	61/1	288	p. 25, no. 202	Hamburg, 1786
Sonata I	D	61/2	286	p. 25, no. 201	Hamburg, 1785
Fantasia I	B $\flat$	61/3	289	p. 25, no. 208	Hamburg, 1786
Rondo II	d	61/4	290	p. 25, no. 209	Hamburg, 1785
Sonata II	e	61/5	287	p. 25, no. 200	Hamburg, 1785
Fantasia II	C	61/6	291	p. 25, no. 207	Hamburg, 1786

\* The pieces are not numbered in this collection.

*Magazin für Kenner und Liebhaber* (1787); Karl Hanke followed with *Gesänge beim Clavier für Kenner und Liebhaber* (Flensburg, Schleswig, and Hamburg, 1790), and the *Musikalische Anthologie für Kenner und Liebhaber* began in 1788 (later becoming the less fashionable *Anthologie zur Musikalischen Real-Zeitung*).

In literary cases the title usually implied an exclusive division: part of the publication would be concerned with theory, the other with practice, just as sonata collections might be described as “halb leicht, halb schwer” (Hässler, 1785) or the earlier collections of Georg Benda “für geübte und ungeübte Spieler” (1780–87). But Bach’s usage could equally be taken as inclusive: both *Kenner* and *Liebhaber* represent private rather than public qualities—the “connoisseur” possessing a palate deliberately sensitized by the intellect, while “amateurs” display a “natural” emotion and “untainted” feeling. Other sources interpreted the *Kenner* as “experts” (i.e., craftsmen of the highest rank), and the *Liebhaber* could be translated as “admirers.”<sup>5</sup> Certainly the lexicographers saw a demarcation which did not involve professionalism; Johann Christian Adelung’s *Wörterbuch* of 1796 (vol. 2, col. 261) provided a definition with a well-nuanced sting in its tail: “the *Liebhaber Ital. Dilettante*, is one who has an excellent taste for fine art and artworks without being an artist himself. Not all amateurs (*Liebhaber*) are also connoisseurs (*Kenner*).”<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, a glance at Bach’s subscription lists shows that many of his most loyal supporters combined both qualities.

By the time of the final collections, with declining sales and a smaller subscription base, the title eventually may have carried a privately cynical or satirical tone: Bach wrote “to please himself in spite of criticism over their difficulty and declining numbers of subscribers”;<sup>7</sup> even Charles Burney, one of the composer’s staunchest supporters, admitted early on that “Emanuel Bach . . . seems to have outstript his age,” a verdict repeated by François-Joseph Fétis some sixty years later.<sup>8</sup> Even today, especially among critics, there is a residual belief that such music is best reserved for the initiated.

5. J.S. Bach dedicated his *Clavierübung* to “denen Liebhabern zur Gemüths Ergetzung.”

6. Quoted in *The Musical Dilettante: A Treatise on Composition* by J.F. Daube, trans. Susan P. Snook-Luther (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 18n.

7. *New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, s.v. “Bach, Carl Philipp Emanuel,” by E. Eugene Helm.

8. See Burney, *The Present State of Music in Germany, the Netherlands and United Provinces*, 2nd ed., 2 vols. (London, 1775), 2:271, and Fétis, *Biographie universelle des musiciens et bibliographie générale de la musique*,

## Method of Publication

The stages of preparing and issuing a publication with Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf followed a standard pattern.<sup>9</sup> “Selbstverlag”—for which there is no elegant equivalent in English (“self-publication” melts too readily into “self-publicist”)—meant that Bach originated the proposal, requested Breitkopf’s services, organized the advertising for subscriptions once a printing price had been fixed, ran a team of agents or collectors (including Johann Philipp Kirnberger, Baron van Swieten, Charles Burney, etc.) in other towns and countries, and offered all material—title pages, dedication, listing of subscribers as well as musical content—in copy-ready form to Breitkopf. Subscription was by *Pränumeration* (payment in advance), rather than *Subscription* (payment on delivery), but there were many *lapsus memoriae* to which countless Bach letters bear impatient testimony. Those who failed to keep their promises were dismissed succinctly by Bach to Breitkopf as having died, either “morally or physically” (*moraliter oder physice*).<sup>10</sup>

The area covered by subscriptions was large (but, sadly, largest for the first collection). The many sales in Scandinavia are perhaps explained by the fact that the poets Klopstock, Claudius and Gerstenberg all lived in Copenhagen for some time, while Sweden remained a clavichord-dominated country longer than much of the rest of Europe, due to the ban on imports of fortepianos from Austria and Germany. St. Petersburg, Moscow, Bordeaux and London also appear as significant strongholds of Bach enthusiasts, displaying symptoms of what Burney’s friend, the wonderfully ebullient Thomas Twining, described as “Carlophilip-emanuelbachomania.” The subscribers included among the *Kenner* many professional musicians and theorists, some of whom (like Burney) also acted as agents or collectors for Bach’s subscriptions; unlike the amateurs, the professionals would have had additional outlets for their purchases, buying not only for their own use, but also on behalf of

2nd ed. (Paris, 1867–83), 1:204: “. . . il fut méconnu de ses contemporains, parce que son style était trop nouveau pour eux, et ses successeurs, instruits par son exemple, ont developpé ce qu’il avait inventé et en ont perfectionné les formes.”

9. Well summarized by Peggy Daub in “The Publication Process and Audience for C.P.E. Bach’s *Sonaten für Kenner und Liebhaber*,” in *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 2, J.S. Bach, the Breitkopfs, and Eighteenth-Century Music Trade, ed. George B. Stauffer (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996), 65–83.

10. See letter of 21 September 1787; *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1227; *CPEB-Letters*, 269.

their pupils and also for selling on to the general public in their locality. Among the *Liebhaber* subscribers we find nearly 30 percent consisted of women, a higher proportion than usual and one that “points to a new audience for chamber music and keyboard pieces in particular.”<sup>11</sup>

The evidence of his contemporaries and friends who were publishing solo clavier music at the same time may have led Bach to expect a greater response than materialized. The first volume of Georg Benda’s keyboard collection appeared in 1780 with an impressive 2,076 subscribers listed (and this without the late-comers), while a year later Nathanael Gruner had 1,368 subscribers for his collection of *Sechs Sonaten für das Klavier*, Op. 1 (among them C. P. E. Bach). Türk’s subscription lists seem to have rarely dropped below four figures: 1,254 in 1783 for his *Sechs leichte Klaviersonaten . . . Erster Theil* (his first publication); 1,334 for the *Zweyter Theil* in 1783; 2,354 for similar sonatas in 1785; and 2,415 in 1786. Any hopes that Bach might have entertained for such an impressive and regular increase were not sustained. His first collection listed 519 subscribers, and sold more than 600 copies; however, by the last collection only 288 subscribers were listed, although Bach claimed in a letter of 23 July 1785 that he often had up to 40 extra names that were not printed in the subscription list.<sup>12</sup> Nevertheless, it is estimated that he made 950 Reichsthaler profit from sales of the first collection alone, which was the equivalent of his annual Hamburg salary.<sup>13</sup> Additionally it must be noted that the large number of surviving manuscript copies of these collections, some in their entirety (see “Manuscript Sources Not Used for the Edition”) suggests a considerable body of supporters for whom the asking price for the print had been set beyond what they could afford or were willing to pay.

11. Daub, “The Publication Process,” 81.

12. For details of sales in Göttingen, see Klaus Hortschansky, “The Musician as Music Dealer in the Second Half of the 18th Century,” in *The Social Status of the Professional Musician from the Middle Ages to the 19th Century*, ed. Walter Salmen, trans. Henry Kaufman and Barbara Reisner (New York: Pendragon Press, 1983), 233; for the wider range of sales see Daub, “The Publication Process,” 77ff.

13. Hans-Günter Ottenburg, “Die Klaviersonaten Wq 55 ‘im Verlage des Autors. Zur Praxis des Selbstverlages bei Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach,” in *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: Beiträge zu Leben und Werk*, ed. Heinrich Poos (Mainz: Schott, 1993), 34.

## Printing and Proofreading

The largest part of Bach’s surviving correspondence in the last ten years of his life was with Breitkopf, not only in his capacity as printer and publisher, but also as a close friend of the composer. Bach confided his familial as well as financial concerns to Breitkopf, sympathized with him over the death of his wife and the divorce of his daughter, and gave his unguarded opinions on contemporaries and rivals. But in the first place there were the practicalities of interpreting the manuscript and the proofreading and distributing of the finished product.

Doubtless the high sales of other keyboard volumes was one encouragement for Bach to set the print run for his first “Kenner und Liebhaber” collection (after a moment’s hesitation) at 1,050 copies,<sup>14</sup> and to persist in this quantity through all six sets; 1,000 copies were for public sale, the extra 50 for complimentary distribution. Subscribers were asked to choose in which clef they wished the upper part notated, either treble (G clef or “violin clef” to Bach) or soprano (C clef or “keyboard clef”). The normal proportion Bach specified to Breitkopf was 600 in soprano clef and 450 in treble, although for the final collection in 1787 he requested equal numbers.<sup>15</sup> Amateur preference throughout Europe was moving away from the soprano clef, partly led by publishers in Vienna where, as Bach noted, the treble clef was most customary.<sup>16</sup>

One of the drawbacks of the Breitkopf printing method, using movable type, was that after a first print run the frames would be broken up and type used for other publications, unlike engraved plates, which could be stored and reused when necessary; this was probably a second incentive for Bach to risk over-optimistic print runs.<sup>17</sup> There still remains a need for research into the printer’s methods for issuing the same music in both soprano and treble clefs; although the right-hand staff would need resetting, the left-hand remained the same, and it would have been wasteful to have dismantled and then reassembled it. Some of the right-hand staves seem to have been reset on a “prefabricated” system, with a conglomerate of several pieces of type

14. See letter of 13 November 1778; *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:704; *CPEB-Letters*, 127.

15. See letter of 3 January 1787; *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1189–91; *CPEB-Letters*, 255–56.

16. See letter of 31 July 1784; *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1023–25; *CPEB-Letters*, 209.

17. A total of 3,038 copies of various *Kenner und Liebhaber* volumes still remained in Bach’s possession in 1788.

moved bodily together to stand one line or space higher or lower. Bach supplied manuscript copy in only one clef (sometimes mixing them in a single collection, as his letters testify), so presumably one work-stream in the Breitkopf house was devoted to transposition.

Bach wrote reminders to Breitkopf about idiosyncrasies of notation such as the use of large flats (letter of 1 May 1781), which are found from the third collection onward; he suggested improvements in spacing and layout, and even proposed explanatory footnotes for the fantasies with more esoteric notation (as suggested in a letter of 30 November 1782, but not implemented). The letters give us only occasional glimpses into the proofreading process, and no marked-up proofs survive in Bach's hand. It is not clear from the correspondence whether Bach proofread versions in both clefs or whether the changes mentioned in his letters were a result of seeing sample pages; certainly the corrections he sent in a letter of 10 March 1787 were based on checking his own manuscript copy. The letter of 28 December 1782 suggests that Bach made at least some corrections from memory, although the letter of 23 July 1783 shows that he had complete proofs to mark. A letter to Engelhardt Benjamin Schwickert on 17 November 1787 indicates that Bach saw all proofs of the "Kenner und Liebhaber" collections.

### Criticism and Reception

"How rarely does one find in a critic the necessary degrees of sensitivity, knowledge, honesty and courage!" (Wie gar sehr selten trifft man bey einem Kritiker Empfindung, Wissenschaft, Ehrlichkeit und Muth im gehörigen Grade an) Bach lamented in his autobiography (p. 208). Yet his late publications were well received by critics both in Germany and abroad, often with a perceptive, if flowery, appreciation of his most novel ventures. When the fifth collection appeared in 1786, a reviewer in the *Magazin der Musik* enthused that

The musical genius of our great Bach seems in fact to be inexhaustible. However often one studies his sonatas, rondos, or fantasias, of which he constantly issues new examples, and however often one compares them with one another, or with the work of other masters, one always finds that each piece is entirely new and original in its invention, while the spirit of Bach is unmistakably present in them all; thus this composer is literally incomparable.<sup>18</sup>

18. "Das musikalische Genie unsers vortrefflichen Bachs scheint in der That unerschöpflich zu seyn. Man mag seine Sonaten, Rondo's oder

Bach himself was not unconscious of this reputation and even his more prosaic explanation of his talent suggests that he warmed to such critical approval:

Since I have never liked excessive uniformity in composition and taste, since I have heard such a great variety of good things and since I have always been of the opinion that one may make use of good elements wherever they may be found . . . it is presumably precisely these considerations—with the aid of that natural skill granted by God—that explain the variety noticed in my work.<sup>19</sup>

### Erste Sammlung, Wq 55

The earliest mention of a new collection of keyboard music is found in letters to Breitkopf from 1778, beginning on 21 February when Bach hinted: "Perhaps I will appear soon with 6 new sonatas, without accompaniment, by subscription. People are asking for it."<sup>20</sup> On 1 May he was still hopeful: "Should the peace hold, I will lay claim to your press with 6 sonatas. May God grant it!"<sup>21</sup> Although contrary to his hopes, the War of Bavarian Succession broke out within two months, he nevertheless persisted, again reporting public demand and specifying that the format could be the same landscape format as the *Sechs leichte Clavier-Sonaten* of 1766 (letter of 28 July 1778). Not being too optimistic about potential sales, "since a few of the sonatas are somewhat more difficult" (Weil einige Sonaten darunter etwas schwehrrer sind), Bach suggested printing 650 rather than the usual 1,000 copies, in both soprano

---

Fantasien, so wie er sie nach und nach herausgegeben, ansehen, und unter sich vergleichen: auch mit den Musikstücken anderer Meister vergleichen, wie man will, man wird immer finden, daß jedes Stück gleichsam von ganz neuer Erfindung sey, und seine eigene Originalität habe, obgleich in allen der Bachsche Geist unverkennbar ist, so daß man diesen Componisten im eigentlichen Verstande den unvergleichlichen nennen kann." *Magazin der Musik*, vol. 2 (5 August 1786): 869–70.

19. "Da ich niemahls die allzugrosse Einförmigkeit in der Composition und im Geschmack geliebet habe, da ich so viel und so verschiedenen Gutes gehört habe, da ich jederzeit der Meinung gewesen bin, man möge das Gute, es stecke wo es wolle, . . . in einem Stücke anzutreffen ist, annehmen: so ist vermuthlich dadurch und mit Beyhülfe meiner mir von Gott verliehenen natürlichen Fähigkeit, die Verschiedenheit in meinen Arbeiten entstanden, welche man an mir bemerkt haben will." *Autobiography*, 208.

20. "Vielleicht erscheine ich bald mit 6 neuen Sonaten, ohne Begleitung, auf Pränumeration. Man verlangt es." *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:679; *CPEB-Letters*, 121 (modified).

21. "Sollte Friede bleiben, so werde ich mit 6 Sonaten an Ihre Preße Anspruch machen. Gott gebe es!" *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:680; *CPEB-Letters*, 122 (modified).

and treble clefs, but hoped that, once the subscription opened, he might have 100 subscribers.<sup>22</sup>

On 13 November he sent the sonatas to Breitkopf and had devised the title of “Sechs Clavier-Sonaten für Kenner und Liebhaber.” Of the six sonatas, he described three as being short (Sonatas I, III, and V): “accordingly they will amount to about 9 sheets.”<sup>23</sup> He must have felt surer of sales since he raised the total print run to 1,050 (the full thousand plus his complimentary copies). The division by clef (450 in treble and 600 in soprano clef) indicates that his public at least, if not that for his contemporaries’ music, was at ease with the “older” clef. He himself wrote in both, of course, and excused the fact that one of the manuscripts he sent was in the treble clef, the remainder in the “keyboard clef.” The sequence was firmly specified (“The order of the sonatas must stay according to the numbers”), and he was determined to match legibility with economy: “The notes not too spread out and not too close, whatever is appropriate. Too much empty space must not be left for page turns. In works for clavier a page turn without rests in advance does no harm.”<sup>24</sup>

From this point in the correspondence Bach’s instructions were mainly cosmetic or commercial in nature; he made one change of tempo marking in a postscript to a letter dated 25 November 1778 (“In the 4th sonata in A major, the last movement must read Allegro instead of Allegretto”), but was mainly occupied with the growth of the subscription list and the possibility of adding a suitable dedicatee, the need for which he mysteriously described as “due to an unexpected event” (letter of 2 December 1778). By the end of the year it was established that the dedicatee was “Madam Zernitz, born Deeling, in Warsaw,” but the occasion remained unexplained.

At the beginning of 1779 Breitkopf sent three sample sheets from the first collection for Bach’s approval, who on 20 February pronounced himself “very satisfied,” while nevertheless noting that Breitkopf’s more spacious layout was as much of a hindrance in fast movements as Georg Ludewig Winter’s compressed style had previously been in slow movements. He still harbored fears that sales would not be as rapid as with “very easy things,” but by 16 April

he was obviously sufficiently heartened by the number of subscribers to suggest adding “Erste Sammlung” to the title page, “If the title page . . . is not yet printed.” If it was too late, he would add “Zweyte Sammlung” to the sequel (this is the first mention of a second collection). Since many of his subscribers had also subscribed to the double-choir Heilig, a delay now ensued while that production was finished to allow Bach to save on postage by delivering both together (letter of 5 June 1779). However, he asked for quick delivery of his two presentation copies, on specially fine larger paper, so that these could be bound and delivered, and prayed that the copies destined for overseas subscribers would be able to be shipped “before the ocean becomes stormy” (letter of 12 July 1779).

Twelve copies of both works (Wq 55 and 217) were promised to Artaria in Vienna (with Baron van Swieten mentioned as the go-between), with the usual discount of one free copy for buying in bulk (letter to Artaria of 14 July 1779). The remainder of the summer correspondence contains minor details of hold-ups and the difficulties of pacifying his subscribers for late delivery. Despite the arrival of some copies damaged by rain (letter of 20 September 1779) and the return of a copy from Princess Amalia, “since she does not play clavier any more” (letter of 12 November 1779), Bach expressed himself agreeably surprised by sales: the sonatas were selling “like hot cakes” (wie warme Semlen) and by 2 November his supply was running out.

A single alternative printed source exists for one of the sonatas in this collection. Sonata IV was published by Corri in London in a two-movement form with an alternative finale under the title “A Favorite Sonata by Carlo Filippo Emanuel Bach. The Rondo of which was never Publish’d, being the Manuscript in Possession of Mr. Clementi, who has favored Mr. Corri with it.” It is found in volume 2, pages 42–53, of an undated two-volume publication titled: *A Select Collection of Choice Music for the Harpsichord or Piano Forte Consisting of Concertos Sonatas Duets National Airs with Variations &c. &c. &c.* (No trace of the original manuscript formerly in Clementi’s possession has been found.) However, the new rondo contains elements of tonal design as well as local details which are hardly typical of the mature Bach; mm. 2 and 4 of the rondo theme are suspect, as is the extended fantasy section which does duty as an episode. It could be a copyist’s misattribution, or even an imitative piece in the manner of Clementi’s *Musical Characteristics*, Op. 19 (1787), written in the styles of Haydn, Koželuch, Mozart, Sterkel, and Vanhal. The Rondo is included as a curiosity in the appendix to this volume.

22. Letter of 16 September 1778; see *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:693–96; *CPEB-Letters*, 125–26.

23. Letter of 9 October 1778; see *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:693–96; *CPEB-Letters*, 126.

24. “Die Ordnung der Sonaten muß nach der Numer bleiben. Die Noten nicht zu weitläufig u. nicht zu viel leerer Raum übrig bleiben. In Claviersachen schadet das Umkehren, ohne Pausen vorher, nichts.” *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:704–5; *CPEB-Letters*, 127.

## Zweite Sammlung, Wq 56

The unexpected enthusiasm of subscribers had led Bach, even before his first collection (Wq 55) was published, to propose a second collection to Breitkopf. Again it was to be self-published but “completely different from the first one,” as he wrote to Johann Philipp Kirnberger, asking him again to act as agent and rally subscribers as he had for the first collection. To Breitkopf he wrote on 10 December 1779:

In the New Year I will announce another subscription, to my 2nd collection of Sonaten für Kenner, etc. . . . The contents of these sonatas will be entirely different from all of my other things; I hope [they will be] for everyone.<sup>25</sup>

Reflecting his optimism about sales, Bach informed Breitkopf that the subscription price would rise from 1 Reichstaler to 1 Reichstaler, 15 Groschen, and expressed the hope that after the delays of the previous collection, they could this time set a realistic schedule.

In a letter to Artaria on 8 February 1780, Bach promised that the second set of *Claviersonaten für Kenner und Liebhaber* would appear in July, again in both soprano and treble clefs, but he was actually still in the process of assembling the collection piecemeal by sending items to Breitkopf in order to have a running page count. (His profit margin depended on pricing according to the number of folios required.) On 21 March he was planning to send one sonata and three Rondos (the promised novelties), and then at the last moment added one more sonata: “For now, I enclose 1 [changed to 2] sonatas and 3 Rondos from my 2nd part. . . . I cannot yet say whether my collection will be even larger than these 5 pieces.”<sup>26</sup> Breitkopf’s estimate of page length meant that a filler was needed, which Bach promised while also specifying the alternating sequence he desired:

The Rondo in C major comes first; after that follows the sonata in G major; then the Rondo in D major; after this the Sonata in F major and then the Rondo in A minor. However, since you write that these 5 pieces only amount to something over 7 sheets, I will send you another short sonata in A major in the next mail; this ought then to form the conclusion.<sup>27</sup>

25. “Mit dem neuen Jahre schreibe ich wieder auf meine 2te Sammlung Sonaten für Kenner p Contribution aus. . . . Der Inhalt dieser Sonaten wird ganz und gar von allen meinen Sachen verschieden seyn; Ich hoffe für Jedermann.” *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:804; *CPEB-Letters*, 151.

26. “Ich schicke Ihnen hierbey von meinem 2ten Theile fürs erste 2 Sonaten und 3 Rondos. . . . Ob meine Sammlung noch stärker werden wird, als diese 5 Stücke, kan ich noch nicht sagen.” *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:824–25; *CPEB-Letters*, 158.

Surprisingly, in the light of modern estimates of the profit that Bach had made on the first collection (and his enthusiasm to proceed to a second), he claimed that he had done himself “great harm with the first collection and charged too little money for too many goods.”

I must recover my losses with the 2nd collection. If the 5 pieces you already have had gone beyond 8 sheets, we would have left it that way. I do not know why exactly 6 pieces must be delivered. Five pieces would have been a collection of a new sort.<sup>28</sup>

More instructions on layout, pricing, and clefs (again requesting 600 copies in soprano clef and 450 in treble clef) followed, along with some details about notation, warnings, and corrections:

The first two bars of the first Rondo in C major must be marked “piano.” The 11th bar from the end in the A minor Rondo stays strictly as it is written [i.e., with only seven notes in the second beat]. In the sonata in F major in the 4th bar in the bass the first notes standing above one another must read C/E.<sup>29</sup>

The extra sonata to complete the collection was sent on 19 May 1780, with the warning that “the entire sonata must be played to the end in the same tempo and without a break; accordingly the repeat signs remain as directed with one and with two lines (:||: :|), and it is not necessary to indicate any tempo other than Allegretto at the beginning.”<sup>30</sup>

27. “(1) Das Rondo aus dem C dur kommt zuerst; hierauf folgt die Sonate aus dem G dur; alsdenn das Rondo aus dem D dur; hernach die Sonate aus dem F dur und alsdenn das Rondo aus dem A moll. Weil Sie aber schreiben, daß diese 5 Stück nur etwas über 7 Bogen ausmachen: so werde ich Ihnen mit nächster Post noch eine kurze Sonate aus dem A dur schicken; diese soll alsdenn den Beschluß machen.” *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:835; *CPEB-Letters*, 161.

28. “Weil ich bey der ersten Samlung mir ein Haufen Tort gethan habe u. für zu viele Wahre zu wenig Geld genommen hatte: so muß ich bey der 2ten Samlung meinen Schaden wieder gut machen. Wären mehr als 8 Bogen auf die 5 Stücke, die Sie bereits haben, drauf gegangen; so hätte es dabey sein Bleiben gehabt. Ich weiß nicht, warum man just 6 Stücke liefern muß. Fünf Stücke würden eine Samlung von neuer Art gewesen seyn.” *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:835–36; *CPEB-Letters*, 161.

29. “Die ersten beyden Takte des ersten Rondos aus dem C dur müssen ein piano bey sich haben. Der 11te Takt von hinten im A moll Rondo bleibt strenge so, wie er geschrieben ist. In der Sonate aus dem F dur im 4ten Takte im Baße müssen die ersten übereinander stehenden Noten c/e heißen.” *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:836; *CPEB-Letters*, 161.

30. “daß die ganze Sonate in einerley Tempo und ohne Absatz bis zu Ende muß gespielt werden, daher die Wiederholungszeichen mit einem und mit zwey Strichen (:||: :|) so bleiben, wie vorgeschrieben ist, u. weiter kein Tempo nöthig ist, darüber zu schreiben, als Allegretto im Anfange.” *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:838–39; *CPEB-Letters*, 162 (modified).

For this publication Bach did not repeat his previous mistake of waiting for full details from his slowest subscribers. He closed the subscription list on 5 September, but added a note to the printed list that it was complete only “so weit die Nachrichten gehen.” To Breitkopf on 15 September Bach complained: “I can no longer endure the loathsome demands of my subscribers” (Nun kan ich das abscheulige Mahnen meiner Pränumeranten nicht länger ausstehen), and was relieved when the copies arrived promptly in Hamburg on 6 October, in time to distribute them to subscribers before the official publication date. There was a moment’s alarm over possible piracy, when Johann Gräfe of Brunswick, a subscriber to the collection, wrote to Bach claiming that some of the rondos from the collection were already in circulation in manuscript before the publication date. Bach wrote (not altogether tactfully) to Breitkopf suggesting “you might have a Judas among your people” (aber sollten Sie etwa unter Ihren Leuten einen Judas haben), only to have to apologize a few weeks later when it emerged that Gräfe’s own bookbinder had had the copies made from the print while it was in his possession (see letter of 2 December 1780).

The dedicatee of the second collection *für Kenner und Liebhaber*, Friedrich Heinrich, Margrave of Schwedt-Brandenburg (1709–88), had been one of the godfathers to Bach’s second son Johann Sebastian, who had died in 1778 while Bach was working on the first collection. Fragments of the Rondo in C Major, Wq 56/1 and the Sonata in F Major, Wq 56/4 survive in autograph in D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 236 (see plates 9 and 10; for a complete description of this MS, which contains parts for Wq 179, see CPEB: CW, III/1).

### Dritte Sammlung, Wq 57

The success of the second collection, Wq 56, and especially the reception of the newly popular rondos, encouraged Bach to extend the series with a third, rather than continuing with his original plan to publish *Die Auferstehung*. The *Dritte Sammlung* was to carry the same title as its predecessor, although, as he warned Breitkopf on 8 March 1781, “The current Rondos are very different from the previous ones” (Die jetzigen Rondos sind von den vorigen sehr verschieden). Because the third collection was somewhat larger than the first two, Bach suggested a small increase in price to 1 Reichstaler, 20 Groschen (letter of 3 April 1781). As before, he specified an alternating sequence of pieces when he sent his manuscript to Breitkopf on 1 May:

Here is my manuscript. The order is the same as the last time, namely Rondo I, Sonata I. Rondo II, Sonata II, Rondo III, Sonata III. It is not significant that one of the sonatas is in keyboard clef. It happened by accident.<sup>31</sup>

In the same letter Bach specified that the number of copies to be printed (1,050) and the allocation by clefs was to be the same as for the second collection. He also warned the proofreader to “use double caution with the Adagio in G minor in the D minor sonata” (Beÿ dem Adagio aus dem G moll in der D moll Sonate laßen Sie ja den H. Corrector doppelte Aufmerksamkeit anwenden), where the ornamentation is particularly intricate. One peculiarity of notation called for comment: in a postscript Bach warned that “the large flats occurring in the F minor sonata in the first Allegro must remain large” (Die in der F moll Sonate im ersten Allegro vorkommenden großen ♭ müßen groß bleiben). His notation in fact represented double-flats, a device he had mentioned in the *Versuch*, although few other writers made use of his invention. Evidence of Bach’s proofreading corrections is sparse in the correspondence, but they were obviously carried out assiduously on the printed page; on 24 July he made one correction after praising the proofs: “The proof-sheets are fine. Would you please take note of a necessary *piano*, which must go under the first note on page 15, system 9, measure 4.”<sup>32</sup>

Copies of the new volume arrived safely to Bach on 9 November, after which his correspondence was, as usual, preoccupied with niceties of payment. The dedicatee of this third collection, Baron van Swieten, was an active champion of Handel, Mozart, and C. P. E. Bach in Vienna; he had commissioned six symphonies for strings, Wq 182 in 1773.

Four out of the six pieces in Wq 57, including all three sonatas, are in minor keys. The Sonata in F Minor, unusually, was republished in the late eighteenth century by F. S. Lischke (Berlin, n.d., plate no. 1838) as a “Sonate für Piano Forte” without Bach’s authorization; it was probably encouraged by Johann Friedrich Reichardt’s review in the *Musikalisches Kunstmagazin* claiming it to be Bach’s masterpiece: “I am still convinced that it is the greatest sonata

31. “Hier erscheint mein Manuscript. Die Ordnung ist, wie das vorigemahl, nemlich: Rondo I, Sonata I, Rondo II, Sonata II, Rondo III, Sonata III. Daß eine von den Sonaten in Clav. Schlüssel ist, bedeutet nichts. Es ist von ohngefahr.” *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:881; *CPEB-Letters*, 174.

32. “Die Aushangbogen sind schön. Ein nöthiges piano belieben Sie anzumerken, welches S. 15, syst. 9, takt 4 unter der ersten Note stehen muß.” *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:887; *CPEB-Letters*, 175.



that even Bach has produced; it speaks, it sings, it transports the listener through every facet of genius and art more than any other I could imagine.”<sup>33</sup>

Carl Friedrich Cramer’s review recommended the clavichord for Wq 57/1 and 57/4, but an extended review of the collection printed in the *Hamburgischer unpartheyische Correspondent* (1781, no. 187) recommended the “Forte Piano” for the Rondos and “Clavier” for the Sonatas.<sup>34</sup>

## Performance Considerations

### *Instruments and Tuning*

The title pages of the “Kenner und Liebhaber” collections mention two keyboard types: the clavier and the fortepiano. By this point in the eighteenth century, the term *Clavier* had become associated in Germany (though not in Vienna) almost exclusively with the clavichord (what Daniel Gottlob Türk described in 1789 as the “eigentlichen Klavier”), although not all writers were as dogmatic as Christian Gottlob Neefe, who bluntly stated in the preface to his *Zwölf Klavier-Sonaten* of 1773 (dedicated to C.P.E. Bach):

These sonatas are clavichord sonatas: I wish, therefore, that they be played only on the clavichord; for most of them would have little effect on the harpsichord or pianoforte because neither of these is as capable as the clavichord of cantabile and different modifications of sound upon which I have depended.<sup>35</sup>

C. F. Cramer reminds us that “all who have heard Bach play the clavichord must have been struck by the endless nuances of shadow and light that he casts over all his performances,”<sup>36</sup> and such variety is explicitly demanded in each of the six collections.

---

33. “Mir ist noch immer, als sey sie selbst Bachs vortrefflichste Sonate: redender, singender, durch jede Anwendung des Genies und der Kunst hinreißender kann ich mir nichts denken.” *Musikalisches Kunstmagazin* (1782): 87.

34. *CPEB-Westphal*, 157–58.

35. “Diese Sonaten sind Klaviersonaten: Ich wollte daher, daß sie auch nur auf dem Klavier gespielt würden; denn die meisten werde auf dem Flügel, oder Pianoforte wenig Wirkung thun, weil keines von beyden des Kantablen und der verschiedenen Modulation des Tons so fähig ist, als das Klavier wornach ich mich doch gerichtet.” Translated by Kenneth Cooper, “The Clavichord in the Eighteenth Century” (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1971), 154.

36. “Ein jeder, der Bachen auf dem Claviere hat spielen hören, muß es bemerkt haben, welche unendliche Nüancen von Schatten und Licht, welchen Ausdruck er durch sein Tenuto, das im Grunde nichts anders ist als die *Bebung*, über sein Spiel verbreitet.” *Magazin der Musik*, 1 (1 December 1783), 1217n.

In an undated letter to Breitkopf, Bach requested for a friend “a good unfretted clavichord with a range of low F to f’’, that does not rattle” (ein gutes Bundfreyes Clavicord vom großen F bis ins f’’, das nicht klappert). He had a special preference for Silbermann, Jungcurt, and Friederici as keyboard makers, and a dislike of builders such as Fritz or Hass, because of their “octave strings in the bass, a thing I cannot bear” (letter to Forkel dated 10 November 1773). Only in the first “Kenner und Liebhaber” collection do we find *Bebung* notated, an ornament exclusive to the clavichord; from the second collection onward, “Forte-Piano” (sometimes hyphenated, sometimes not) was added ambiguously to the title pages: *Clavier-Sonaten nebst einiger Rondos fürs Forte-Piano . . .* and later *Clavier-Sonaten und freye Fantasien nebst einiger Rondos fürs Fortepiano*.

However, the suggestion that “Fortepiano” was intended only or especially for the rondos and (possibly) the fantasies is partially refuted by Cramer’s review of the third collection, which particularly recommended that the Rondo in E Major, Wq 58/3 be performed on the clavichord:

By the way, this Rondo, like the preceding second Sonata, is superbly written for the clavichord, and only on [this instrument] is its peculiarly, variously nuanced expression possible. The flow, the interdependence of the melody lines, the multifaceted distribution of the light and shadow, the use of a certain musical chiaroscuro, and the almost complete avoidance of arpeggios, leaps, and passages consisting of nothing but broken harmony (these latter of which, I realize, some connoisseurs find too often in these collections) qualify these pieces as primarily for this instrument.<sup>37</sup>

One unique feature of fortepiano performance is mentioned (though cautiously) by Bach in the *Versuch*:

The undamped register of the fortepiano is the most pleasing and, once the performer learns to observe the necessary precautions in the face of its reverberations, the most delightful for improvisation.<sup>38</sup>

---

37. “Übrigens ist sowohl dieses Rondo, als die vorhergehende zweyte Sonate ganz vorzüglich fürs Clavier bestimmt, und auch nur darauf ihres gebührenden, mannigfaltig nüancirten Ausdrucks fähig. Der Fluß, das Aneinanderhängende des Gesangs, das vielfach darüber verbreitete Licht und Schatten, der Gebrauch eines gewissen musicalischen Helldunkels, und die fast gänzliche Enthaltung von den Horpeggios, springenden, und in bloß gebrochener Harmonie bestehenden Passagen, die, wie ich weis, einigen Kennern in diesen neuern Sammlungen des Herrn Capellmeisters zu oft vorkommen, qualificiren sie für dieses Erste der Instrumente.” *Magazin der Musik*, 1 (7 December 1783), 1245–46. See also Cooper, “The Clavichord in the Eighteenth Century,” 73.

38. “Das ungedämft Register des Fortepiano ist das angenehmste, und, wenn man die nöthige Behutsamkeit wegen des Nachklings

Instruments by Silbermann and Friederici had hand-stops to control the raising of the dampers (in imitation of the pantaleon, a type of large hammered dulcimer), effects that might have been used in the purely harmonic sections of Bach's fantasias.

The harmonic mobility of Bach's writing clearly requires a tempered tuning that makes remote tonalities viable, yet it is unclear whether his preference was for an artfully unequal temperament (as he describes in the *Versuch* I, "Einleitung," § 14), or for what appears to be a truly "equal" temperament described by Barthold Fritz in his *Anweisung, wie man Claviere, Clavecins und Orgeln, . . . stimmen könne* (1756) to which Bach also gave his full approval (there "everything necessary and possible has been said").<sup>39</sup>

### Fingering and Ornamentation

Performance questions such as fingering, ornamentation, elaboration of fermatas, and improvisation on a figured bass are all covered by Bach himself in the *Versuch* and require very little supplement or amplification here. On niceties of fingering it is well to remember that Bach did not claim of his father's technique that "I shall expound it here" (as the standard English translation gives it) but rather, "I take it here as a basis" (so lege ich solche hier zum Grunde; *Versuch* I:1, § 8.). From the first notated fingering (Wq 55/2, movement ii) the *Bachischen Applikatur* utilizes the agility of a modern, thumb-crossing technique, without being afraid to revert to the earlier system of crossing the third finger over the fourth when needed (e.g., Wq 58/4, movement iii).

All the abbreviated ornaments employed in the "Kensner und Liebhaber" collections are listed and explained in the *Versuch*:

- |        |   |
|--------|---|
| tr, +, | Trill, regular trill (Triller, ordentlicher Triller; see <i>Versuch</i> I:2.3, § 1–21, and Tab. IV, Fig. XIX–XXIII) |
| ♯      | Trill from below (Triller von unten; see <i>Versuch</i> I:2.3, § 22, and Tab. IV, Fig. XXXIV)                       |

- |      |  |
|------|--|
| ♯    | Trill from above (Triller von oben; see <i>Versuch</i> I:2.3, § 27, and Tab. IV, Fig. XLI)                                     |
| ♯    | Short trill (halber Triller, Pralltriller; see <i>Versuch</i> I:2.3, § 30–36, Tab. IV, Fig. XLV–XLVIII, and Tab. V, Fig. XLIX) |
| ∞, ℓ | Turn (Doppelschlag; see <i>Versuch</i> I:2.4, § 1–26, and Tab. V, Fig. L–LXII)   |
| ∞    | Trilled turn (prallender Doppelschlag; see <i>Versuch</i> I:2.4, § 27–36, and Tab. V, Fig. LXIII–LXX)                          |
| ∞    | Inverted turn (Schleiffer von dreym Nötgen; see <i>Versuch</i> I:2.7, § 5, and Tab. VI, Fig. LXXXIX)                           |
| ♯, ♯ | Mordent and long mordent (Mordent, langer Mordent; see <i>Versuch</i> I:2.5, § 1–15, and Tab. V, Fig. LXXXII–LXXXV)            |

Bach did not specifically address such compounds as the mordent plus *Bebung* (found in Wq 55/2, movement i). Nor did he explain whether the number of dots printed for a *Bebung* indicated the number of inflections required, as proposed by, for example, Peter Paulsen in his *Claviermusic zu Ernst- und scherzhaften Liedern* (1766) and supported by Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg in *Die Kunst das Clavier zu spielen* (1750/1762), §56, p. 21. Additional sources that can be used to supplement Bach's instructions range from Carl August Thielo's *Grund-Regeln* of 1753 to the later writings of Türk and Ernst Wilhelm Wolf (both, incidentally, agents for Bach). In particular, Wolf's introduction to *Eine Sonatine, Vier affektvolle Sonaten, 13mal variierte Thema* of 1785 provides a substantial supplement to Bach's instructions in the *Versuch*.<sup>40</sup>

Broader-scale decoration is required for the elaboration of fermatas (see *Versuch* I:2.9, §1–6) and the repeated sections of sonatas, always mindful of Bach's request that players "consider whether such variation is permitted by their ability and the construction of the piece" (introduction to the first volume of *Sonaten mit veränderten Reprisen*, 1760; see CPEB:CW, I/2).

anzuwenden weiß, das reizendeste zum Fantasiren." *Versuch* II, 41, § 4; translation after William J. Mitchell, *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1949), 431. See Dieter Krickeberg "Das 'ungedämpfte Register' bei Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach" in *Zur Geschichte des Hammerklaviers*, ed. Monika Lustig (Michaelstein: Institut für Aufführungspraxis, 1996), 122–26.

39. But see Mark Lindley, "J.S. Bach's Tuning," *The Musical Times* 126 (December 1985): 721, for a proposal that Fritz actually advocated unequal temperament.

40. Translated by Christopher Hogwood as "A Supplement to C.P.E. Bach's *Versuch*: E.W. Wolf's *Anleitung* of 1785," *CPEB-Studies* 1988, 133–57.

### Acknowledgments

The preparation of this volume was greatly facilitated by scholarly advice and practical help from Darrell M. Berg, Paul Corneilson, Mark W. Knoll, Ryan Mark, and Peter Wollny; I am also grateful for the cheerful assistance of librarians and staff in many European and American institutions, especially the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—

Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv, the Koninklijk Conservatorium Bibliotheek in Brussels, the British Library, Cambridge University Library, the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., and the University of Michigan. I am also very thankful for the dedication, perseverance, and patience of my colleagues in the CPEB: CW editorial office.

*Christopher Hogwood*