INTRODUCTION

The five fascicles of CPEB:CW, I/6 contain forty-six keyboard sonatas and six sonatinas composed by C.P.E. Bach that were not published during his lifetime (see CPEB:CW, I/6.1 for a discussion of sonatas falsely or questionably attributed to Bach). Table 1 lists these works in the order they appear in NV 1790, identifies the five fascicles of CPEB:CW, I/6 in which they are published, and provides information about place and date of composition as well as catalogue listings.

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

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

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

---

1. Wotquenne, 20–25.

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

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

TABLE I. (CONTINUED)

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

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

Bach's own catalogue numbers—usually the CV 1772 number in Bach's own hand, or the NV 1790 number in the hand of his daughter Anna Carolina Philippina, or both—and many of them contain further entries (corrections and revisions) in Bach's hand. For most of the sonatas in CPEB:CW, I/6 at least one house copy has survived (indicated by "hc" in table 1 in the critical report), and these have been used as the principal sources for the edition. The majority of Bach's house copies were sold at auction after A. C. P. Bach's death in 1804, and nearly all of them eventually made their way to the Königliche Bibliothek in Berlin (present-day SBB), where most of them are still to be found. A more detailed discussion of Bach's house copies is in the critical report.

About two-thirds of Bach's sonata output was published during the composer's life, either in sets of six sonatas each,[2] mixed with other genres, or separately in popular collections of music. However, some fifty sonatas remained unpublished. It is unclear why Bach allowed such a large quantity of sonatas to remain unpublished, considering the fact that he published his keyboard works on a regular basis and in great number. Perhaps he found some of the unpublished sonatas to be too strongly reflective of his own unique and acclaimed performances; thus their dissemination could have been unsuitable from both professional and economical perspectives. In some cases,

sonatas may have remained unpublished simply because Bach chose others (often emanating from the same period) for inclusion in the next planned collection that better reflected his current aesthetic orientation and understanding of the discriminating musical marketplace. Indeed, while only a few published sets of sonatas may have been composed as an integral set—such as the Sonatas with Varied Reprises (Wq 50), which represent a special technique of composition, and the "Probestücke" (Wq 63), which have a clearly defined pedagogical aim—Bach nevertheless had a distinct profile in mind for every set of works he published. At the same time, Bach tended to avoid including works of extreme virtuosity and invention in his published sets, as their technical difficulties might discourage potential buyers. Thus sonatas not fitting a collection's particular profile were temporarily set aside, with the expectation that they would eventually be released individually or as part of some future set.

The unpublished sonatas of Wq 65, which span the years 1731–86, are unified only by their eclecticism: some works espouse a clearly experimental character, while others represent the type of easy sonatas with rather accessible thematic materials that would have been suitable for inclusion in the numerous popular collections published in Bach's day. That these sonatas remained unpublished may be a result of the great number of such compositions in Bach's oeuvre, the restricted market for them, and Bach's quickly changing style—especially during the 1740s,[3] a

2. On the ubiquity of this configuration during Bach's lifetime, see Elaine Sisman, "Six of One: The Opus Concept in the Eighteenth Century," in *The Century of Bach and Mozart: Perspectives on Historiography, Composition, Theory and Performance*, ed. Sean Gallagher and Thomas Forrest Kelly (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2008), 79–107.

3. On Bach's compositional output prior to his employment with the Prussian court, see Leisinger/Wollny 1993, 127–204.

decade in which the style of his father, Johann Sebastian Bach, definitively gave way to the so-called *galant* style that was to dominate much of the remaining century.[4]

The present volume includes eleven sonatas (Wq 65/15–18, 65/20–25, and Wq 69), all composed in Berlin between 1745 and 1749. Although Wq 65/19 was given the date 1746 in NV 1790, and both Westphal and Wotquenne placed the sonata accordingly in their chronological catalogues, there are good reasons to believe that it was, in fact, one of Bach's last sonatas—if not the very last sonata—and thus it is published in CPEB:CW, I/6.5 among Bach's other late sonatas, rather than here.

Despite remaining unpublished, most of the eleven sonatas in this volume enjoyed significant popularity during Bach's lifetime. The sonatas in B-flat major (Wq 65/20), F major (Wq 65/21), G major (Wq 65/22), D minor (Wq 65/23), A minor (Wq 65/25), and D minor (Wq 69) each generated more than a dozen extant sources that document various phases of revision. The sonatas in G major (Wq 65/15), C major (Wq 65/16), G minor (Wq 65/17), and F major (Wq 65/18)—which comprise some of Bach's most experimental and virtuosic music—were also disseminated widely, although not to the same extent as their more accessible siblings. Only the Sonata in D Minor, Wq 65/24, seems to have had little circulation outside of Bach's immediate circle.

Nearly all of the sonatas in the present volume (as, indeed, is the case for almost all of Bach's sonatas) underwent various degrees of alteration over time. Unfortunately, only some of these changes are traceable to Bach and his circle, such as in the autograph copies of Wq 65/16 and 65/21. Others, like the unauthorized prints of Wq 65/18 and 65/20, are so corrupted stemmatically that their value for establishing a chronology of revision is nearly nonexistent. Regardless of the quality of the source, none of the changes are definitively datable. However, the identification of certain copyists—for instance, Johann Heinrich Michel, Bach's principal Hamburg copyist—can help narrow the possibilities of dating revisions.[5]

---

4. See Daniel Heartz, *Music in European Capitals: The Galant Style, 1720–1780* (New York: W. W. Norton, 2003), esp. 389–424; and David Schulenberg, "Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach," in *Eighteenth-Century Keyboard Music*, 2nd ed., ed. Robert L. Marshall (New York and London: Routledge, 2003), 191–229.

5. Aspects of Bach's processes of revision are discussed in, among others, E. Eugene Helm, "C. Ph. E. Bach and the Great Chain of Variation," in *Hamburg 1988*, 223–30; Darrell M. Berg, "Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs Umarbeitungen seiner Claviersonaten," *BJ* (1988): 123–61; and Leta Miller, "C. P. E. Bach's Instrumental 'Recompositions': Revisions or Alternatives?," *Current Musicology* 59 (1995): 5–47.

Style

Charles Burney observed in the fourth book (1789) of his monumental *A General History of Music* that

> the harpsichord Music of [Handel and J. S. Bach] gave way, about the middle of the century, to the more elegant and expressive compositions of C. P. Emanuel Bach, who was soon imitated so universally in Germany by writers for keyed-instruments, that there have been few works published for them since, which are not strongly tinctured with his style.[6]

The sonatas contained in this volume comprehensively illustrate Burney's assessment of C. P. E. Bach as an innovator of music for the keyboard around the middle of the eighteenth century. For instance, while the three-movement design that would become increasingly common as the century progressed is evident in most, some of Bach's sonatas approach this design with considerable freedom. Wq 65/16, for instance, while technically in two movements, includes an extended coda in the first movement that nominally introduces a new, independent *andante* theme in the subdominant—that is, a quasi second movement. Yet this theme is repeatedly assaulted by sudden recapitulations of the first movement's opening theme. To this confrontation Bach adds *adagio* sections of two or three measures that feature a regal, at times even pastoral, theme. This developmental coda ends not in the tonic of C major, but in the dominant of C minor. In this respect it prepares the second movement, which prominently grapples with modal identity.

The Sonata in G Minor, Wq 65/17, composed the following year, similarly couples the first and second movement, but here they remain thematically distinct. Moreover, the focus in this sonata—particularly in the first movement—is on the relationship between free and strict elements. The sonata begins with an extraordinarily bold flourish, in which rapid scales, plaintive instrumental recitatives, and arpeggiations contribute to an initial impression of the work as a free fantasy. Indeed, the opening seems to presage Heinrich Koch's definition of the fantasy from 1802:

> One binds oneself neither to form nor main key, neither to the adherence to the same meter nor to the retention of a particular character but portrays his sequence of ideas some-

---

6. Charles Burney, *A General History of Music*, ed. Frank Mercer (New York: Dover, 1957), 2:951.

times in truly coherent melodic sections, sometimes more loosely arranged, and sometimes also simply as diversely arpeggiated chords following one another.[7]

Yet after this initial outburst that begins and ends unambiguously in G minor, a theme emerges and develops according to sonata-form principles. As the movement progresses, however, material from the fantasy returns at key structural moments, such as the transitions to the second theme (m. 23) and especially to the recapitulation (m. 76). At the same time, each manifestation of the fantasy incorporates more elements from the sonata proper, so that ultimately the line between both blurs. Indeed, this generic hybridity would quickly become a hallmark of Bach's style, and can be traced through to some of his last works for keyboard, such as the "Kenner und Liebhaber" collections and the Fantasia in F-sharp Minor, Wq 67.[8]

The Sonata in B-flat Major, Wq 65/20, while formally straightforward, is a virtuosic and expressive tour de force. The sheer variety of figurations in the first movement—such as the rapid ascending scale and dotted figure in m. 6, the broken-chord accompaniment figuration of mm. 13–15, and most of the development section (mm. 45–88)—demands a creative performance choreography. Orchestral gestures punctuate the intricate two- and occasionally three-part writing, while the pseudo-continuo bass lines at mm. 22–25 and 100–103 support melodies notable for their surprisingly stark dissonances. Equally innovative and technically challenging is the expansive second movement, which sheds the orchestral ambitions of the preceding movement in favor of exploring the counterpoint between two finely-wrought voices. Indeed, this movement rarely assumes the profile of a keyboard work; instead, its lines imitate, challenge, and occasionally agree with each

other without regard for easy realizations by two hands (see, for instance, mm. 4–5 or 15–17).[9]

Conventions of genre are strained almost to the breaking point in Wq 65/24. While Bach clearly identifies this work as a "Sonata per il Cembalo" in his autograph (see source **A 15**), it barely resembles a typical keyboard sonata. Indeed, this piece has a decidedly experimental character: each of the outer movements features an introduction, several passages feature thick keyboard textures, and the musical language routinely blends baroque and *galant* stylistic elements. The work's closest relatives for the next thirty years would be Bach's own fantasies, with sporadic essays by Christian Gottlob Neefe or Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart not appearing until the last quarter of the century. That notwithstanding, today Wq 65/24 remains a thoroughly enigmatic piece, as it apparently did in Bach's day—only four sources are extant, by far the fewest number of any of the sonatas represented in this volume.

These sonatas—especially Wq 65/16, 65/17, and 65/20, and perhaps the unique Wq 65/24—all bear compositional and performance features designed with connoisseurs or experts ("Kenner") in mind. While Bach only specifically identified such a target audience when he issued six collections of sonatas, rondos, and fantasias "für Kenner und Liebhaber" between 1779 and 1787, his experiments from the 1740s demonstrate a keen awareness of aesthetic and stylistic distinctions that were already prominent in the larger cultural marketplace.[10] Indeed, amateurs or dilettantes ("Liebhaber") would have been well served by other sonatas included in this volume, such as Wq 65/15, 65/18, 65/21, 65/22, and 65/23. While the technical demands of these sonatas are by no means straightforward, their musical language is simpler and their keyboard writing more typical and therefore easier to play by well-trained amateur keyboard players of the time. Yet technical considerations are not the only way to differentiate groups of players and possible purchasers; Bach's strikingly different compositional approaches to the sonatas may also have been a decisive factor: pieces aimed at the connoisseurs tend to contain dramatic, contrasting materials, formal freedom, and extreme harmonies and melodic figures. Relatively simple

7. Heinrich Christoph Koch, "Fantasie," in *Musikalisches Lexicon* (Frankfurt am Main: August Hermann, 1802), cols. 554–55. "... ein solches Tonstück ... bey welchem sich der Spieler weder an Form noch Haupttonart, weder an Beybehaltung eines sich gleichen Zeitmaaßes, noch an Festhaltung eines bestimmten Charakters, bindet, sondern seine Ideenfolge bald in genau zusammenhängenden, bald in locker an einander gereiheten melodischen Sätzen, bald auch nur in nach einander folgenden und auf mancherley Art zergliederten Akkorden, darstellet." Translation from Annette Richards, *The Free Fantasia and the Musical Picturesque* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 40. An exploration of the fantasy primarily in Bach's keyboard works, but also in some of his larger ensemble works, is found in Matthew Head, "Fantasy in the Instrumental Music of C. P. E. Bach" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1995).

8. For a penetrating examination of the aesthetics behind Bach's late works, see Richard Kramer, *Unfinished Music* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2003), 71–128.

9. Pamela Fox explores further generic and stylistic interpenetration in the first movements of Wq 65/16 and Wq 65/20 in "Melodic Nonconstancy in the Keyboard Sonatas of C. P. E. Bach" (Ph.D. diss., University of Cincinnati, 1983), 192–211.

10. On the distinctions between "Kenner" and "Liebhaber," see CPEB:CW, I/4.1, xi–xiii; and Erich Herbert Beurmann, "Die Klaviersonaten Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs" (Ph.D. diss., Georg-August Universität Göttingen, 1952), 78–80.

harmonic progressions, approachable, tuneful melodies, and ordered, *galant* turns of phrase would have presumably appealed more to amateurs. Ultimately, Bach's simultaneous experimentation in creating material for both "Kenner" and "Liebhaber" attests to his deep and lifelong personal desire to express himself through different musical languages.

A letter from Bach to Johann Nikolaus Forkel provides possible insight into the original conception of three of the sonatas in the present volume:

> The 2 sonatas that particularly pleased you and are somewhat similar to a free fantasy, are the only ones of this type I have ever composed. They belong with the one in B minor I sent to you, to the one in B flat that you now also have and to the 2 from the Haffner-Württemberg collection, and all 6 were composed by me on a clavichord with the short octave in 1743 in Bad Töplitz [Teplice], where at that time I was suffering greatly from the gout.[11]

The "2 sonatas . . . somewhat similar to a free fantasy" must be Wq 65/16 and 65/17. The sonata in B minor must be Wq 65/13 (listed in NV 1790 as having been composed at "Töplitz 1743", and on the autograph manuscript as "Töpliz d. 26. Juni 1743"), while the sonata in B-flat major is probably Wq 65/20. The two from the Württemberg collection are most likely Wq 49/3 (NV 1790: "Töplitz 1743") and Wq 49/5 (NV 1790: "Töplitz 1743"). The letter reveals interesting information about the chronology and stylistic profile of Wq 65/16, 65/17, and 65/20. According to Bach's testimony they were conceived simultaneously with Wq 65/13 and two of the Württemberg sonatas. Since CV 1772 and NV 1790 place them in Berlin in 1746 and 1747, they probably were completed or revised only after his return from the spa town of Teplice. Perhaps they were originally composed with the intention of including them in the Wq 49 print, or perhaps Bach was planning a second volume of technically and musically demanding pieces to follow right after Wq 49.

The Sonata in D Minor, Wq 69, is in certain respects unique as well: designed explicitly for the harpsichord, it employs a style of keyboard writing that closely resembles Bach's earlier Berlin keyboard concertos (Wq 11, 14, and 25) as well as that of the six printed Hamburg concertos (Wq 43, also for harpsichord).[12] It is also the only unaccompanied keyboard sonata in Bach's output to feature a set of variations as the last movement.

Instruments

Sources for the sonatas included in this volume designate the instrument of execution as "cembalo," a generic term used in the eighteenth century for all stringed keyboard instruments. The French *clavecin* and German *Clavier*—a term frequently employed in NV 1790, for example—had the same connotations.[13] Only when instruments were otherwise specified did *Clavier* mean clavichord and *Flügel* harpsichord. Therefore, as generic terms, cembalo, clavecin, or Clavier could equally refer to plucked keyboard instruments (harpsichords), those with hammer or tangent actions (various sorts of early pianos and clavichords), or any combination of the two.[14]

In his *Versuch*, Bach gives a clear and concise description of the role of different types of keyboard instruments. According to him, the clavichord was meant to perform solo keyboard music and the harpsichord was considered more as an instrument for "strong" music, i.e., participating in chamber music or with orchestra as a solo or continuo instrument.[15] The fortepiano stood somewhere in the middle, being suitable for small-ensemble music and for solo repertoire. Although these distinctions are by no means set in stone, sources contemporary to Bach indicate that the clavichord was the most popular instrument during the second half of the century for performances of solo keyboard compositions. As regards Bach himself, he had a strong preference for the clavichord; his beloved clavichord built by Gottfried Silbermann—which inspired Bach's famous Rondo in E Minor, Wq 66, subtitled "Abschied von meinem Silbermannischen Claviere"—had

11. "Die 2 Sonaten, welche Ihren Beÿfall vorzüglich haben und etwas gleiches von einer freÿen Fantasie haben, sind die einzigen von dieser Art, die ich je gemacht habe. Sie gehören zu der, aus dem H moll, die ich Ihnen mitschickte, zu der, aus dem B, die Sie nun auch haben und zu 2en aus der Hafner-Würtembergischen Samlung, und sind alle 6, anno 1743, im Töpziger [Teplitzer] Bade von mir, der ich damahls sehr gichtbrüchig war, auf einem Clavicord mit der kurzen Oktav verfertiget." *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:485–88; *CPEB-Letters*, 75–76.

12. See CPEB:CW, III/7 and III/8, respectively.

13. See Darrell M. Berg, "Towards a Catalogue of the Keyboard Sonatas of C. P. E. Bach," *JAMS* 32 (1979): 276 –303, esp. 290–91.

14. Combination instruments may have been far more popular during the eighteenth century than has been generally assumed. On the development of the early piano, as well as the issue of combination instruments, see Konstantin Restle, *Bartolomeo Cristofori und die Anfänge des Hammerclaviers* (Munich: Editio Maris, 1991).

15. For instance, the *Sei concerti per il cembalo concertato*, Wq 43, from 1770 were clearly designed by Bach for optimal performance on the harpsichord. See advertisements in Wiermann, 174–77 and 181–88.

already become legendary during his lifetime. Indeed, his love of the clavichord remained unchanged throughout his life: NV 1790 mentions two large, unfretted clavichords in his estate, one made by Christian Ernst Friederici, the celebrated member of the post-Silbermann school in Saxony, the other by the otherwise less known Jungcurt. Many of Bach's contemporaries also cherished the clavichord, and in many circles it remained the keyboard instrument of choice until the end of the century.

Bach composed for the clavichord in as idiomatic a manner as the French *clavecinists* for the harpsichord, or later Chopin or Liszt for the piano. Bach's preference, however, did not and does not exclude performance of his works on other keyboard instruments. Indeed, nothing indicates that Bach would have ever restricted the performance of his sonatas to the clavichord, and many of the sonatas and other solo keyboard works can be performed on harpsichord with brilliant results. While the pianoforte eclipsed the clavichord in popularity during the nineteenth century, it was an instrument available to Bach throughout his life. Saxony was a center of pianoforte manufacturing during Bach's early years, and Frederick the Great, who employed Bach beginning in 1740, is known to have purchased a number of pianos by Silbermann for his palaces in Berlin and Potsdam. According to the contemporary press, during his Hamburg years Bach regularly performed both solo and concerted pieces on the fortepiano, and NV 1790 lists a "clavecin royal" among his instruments. This name was often used for square-type fortepianos with bare wooden hammers and mutational stops; these instruments were similar in their aesthetic to the so called *Tangentenflügel*, which may have also been familiar to Bach.

The only sonata in Bach's oeuvre designated explicitly for harpsichord, the Sonata in D Minor, Wq 69, was apparently composed with a large, double-manual harpsichord in mind. The precise registrations entered by Bach into the house copy (source **A 6**) indicate that the instrument had four registers: 8′ ("Flöte") and 4′ ("Oktav") on the lower manual; 8′ ("Spinet") and 8′ ("Cornet") along with a buff stop on the upper manual; and a coupler. The rapid changes of registrations in the third movement also indicate that the instrument may have been equipped with a special device to change stops quickly. In his *Versuch*, Bach mentions the name of Johann Hohlfeld and his ingenious invention that makes a quick change of stops possible by means of *Fußtritt*, that is, either pedals or some sort of knee levers. The same Hohlfeld was the inventor of the very *Bogenclavier* (or *Bogenflügel*) on which Bach is known to have performed a concerted work at the Prus-

sian court in 1753.[16] Bach clearly respected Hohlfeld and appreciated his ingenuity: Bach's song "Bey dem Grabe des verstorben Mechanicus Hohlfeld," Wq 202/11, serves as a reverent monument to the inventor.

While the specific instrument that Bach had in mind for Wq 69 does not seem to have survived, a description of a double-manual harpsichord made by Zacharias Hildebrandt shows that harpsichords with similar registrations were being built in Leipzig at the time. Hildebrandt, who worked closely with J. S. Bach when designing organs and stringed keyboard instruments, made an instrument that ended up in the hands of Enoch Richter, the successor to Gottfried Zimmermann of Zimmermann's Coffee House fame. Whether the instrument was originally sold to Zimmermann and then passed to Richter, or Richter bought the instrument directly from Hildebrandt, Richter offered the harpsichord for sale in the Leipzig press in 1770 (and again in 1775).[17] The 1770 notice describes the instrument as "a Hildebrandt contra F harpsichord with two manuals, . . . neatly veneered in walnut, with stand, has 5 stops: a 16′ principal, an 8′ octave, a 4′ octave, an 8′ spinet in the bass half of the keyboard, and an 8′ cornet."[18] The second notice from 1775 adds that the instrument has four sets of strings, with a range of F–f‴; that the 16′ and 8′ stops are on the lower manual; that the 4′, spinet, and cornet stops are on the upper manual; and that the instrument has a coupler.[19] This registration does not exactly match the requirements for Wq 69, but the fact that a harpsichord builder whom Bach knew was including registers named "spinet" and "cornet," while few others are known to have used this terminology, suggests that there might have

---

16. See Manuel Bärwald, "'. . . ein Clavier von besonderer Erfindung': Der Bogenflügel von Johann Hohlfeld und seine Bedeutung für das Schaffen Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs," *BJ* (2008): 271–300. The work in question may have been Bach's Keyboard Concerto in C Minor, Wq 31 (see CPEB:CW, III/9.10), composed in the same year as the performance.

17. Matteo Messori, "Ein 16′-Cembalo mit Pedalcembalo von Zacharias Hildebrandt," *BJ* (2010): 287–95.

18. "ein Hildebrandischer *Contra* F Flügel mit 2 Clavieren, . . . ist sauber mit Nussbaum fournirt, nebst Gestelle, hat 5 Registerzüge, als *Principal* 16 Fuß, *Octavo* 8 Fuß, *Octavo* 4 Fuß, *Spinet* 8 Fuß durch das halbe Clavier, Baß und *Cornet* 8 Fuß." *Leipziger Zeitungen*, 29 May 1770.

19. "Es stehet ein vierchörichter schön mit Nußbaum fournirter Flügel von Zacharias Hildebrand zum Verkauf. Selbiger hat 2 Claviere von contra F bis dreygestrichen F. Im Unterclaviere ist Principal 16 Fuß und Principal 8 Fuß. Auf dem obern ist Cornet 8 Fuß und Octava 4 Fuß. Zur Verstärkung der Bässe ist Spinet 8 Fuß in 2 Octaven von Cornet entlehnt. Hierzu sind 5 Register, mit welchen beym Gebrauche der Kuppel sehr viel Veränderungen gemacht werden." *Gnädigst privilegirtes Leipziger Intelligenz-Blatt*, 4 October 1775.

been another Hildebrandt instrument that did include all of the registers called for in the house copy of Wq 69. Further evidence tying Wq 69 to Leipzig is the fact that the house copy was copied by Schlichting on paper with a "ZITTAV" watermark. The same combination of scribe and watermark turns up in the original performing parts to C.P.E. Bach's Magnificat, Wq 215 (see CPEB:CW, V/1.1), which Bach had performed in Leipzig in late 1749 or early 1750, presumably to show that he was qualified to take over his father's position as cantor in Leipzig.[20] The younger Bach would have been eager to make the most favorable impression possible on the citizens of Leipzig, and a public appearance performing his latest keyboard music could have been part of this campaign. That Bach added the registration directives himself in the house copy of Wq 69 sometime after it had been copied by Schlichting could indicate that Bach waited until he was in Leipzig to do so, where he could familiarize himself with the instrument. Bach's handwriting in **A 6** certainly supports a dating of 1749–50. Of course, lacking unequivocal evidence that Bach had a Hildebrandt instrument in mind when writing Wq 69 (or at least when devising its registration), the above must remain speculation; but the circumstantial evidence suggests this could very well have been the case.

Performance Practice

In three of the sonatas in the present volume, Bach provides opportunities for cadential elaboration: Wq 69/ii, m. 44, Wq 65/15/iii, m. 62, and Wq 65/17/iii, m. 105. In the *Versuch* (I:2.9, §§1–6; CPEB:CW, VII/1, 136–38), Bach explains that broader-scale decoration is required for the elaboration of fermatas. He occasionally provided written-out examples of such elaborations in his sonatas (see CPEB:CW, VIII/1), but not for the sonatas here. Similar embellishment is expected in repeated sections of sonatas. Nevertheless, in the introduction to the first volume of Sonatas with Varied Reprises, Wq 50 (1760), he cautioned players to "consider whether such variation is permitted by their ability and the construction of the piece" ("ob solches die Einrichtung des Stücks, und die Fähigkeit des Ausführers erlaubt"; see CPEB:CW, I/2). For further discussion of embellishment and ornamentation in Bach's keyboard sonatas, see the appendix to this introduction.

---

20. This information was kindly supplied by Peter Wollny of the Bach-Archiv in Leipzig.

APPENDIX

Ornamentation

C.P.E. Bach's ornamentation practice is complex and not entirely consistent, and his views on the subject changed throughout his career. Starting mostly with the practice of his father—who taught him not only composition but also notation and keyboard playing—Bach moved from a rather general approach, where one or more signs might suggest little more than "play some kind of ornament here," to a more precise system of specific symbols implying specific resolutions that he attempted to codify in part I of his *Versuch* of 1753. Bach's own practice, however, was never completely one way or the other. In the sets of sonatas that were published after the appearance of the *Versuch* (the three sets of sonatas with varied reprises, Wq 50–52; the "Leichte" Sonatas, Wq 53; the "Damen" Sonatas, Wq 54; and the six sets of "Kenner und Liebhaber" pieces, Wq 55–59 and 61), Bach attempted to adhere closely to the principles of the *Versuch*. But in the sonatas that were published individually (mostly in Wq 62) and the sonatas that were not published in his lifetime (Wq 64, 65, and 69) his approach was less rigid, often mixing general and specific styles in the same work. Further confusing the matter, in his *Versuch* Bach allows for (and in certain musical situations actually requires) ornament substitution, where the ornament as played is different than the ornament as written. Behind all of this stands the overriding understanding from antiquity on that ornamentation is as much the prerogative of the performer as the composer (when the two are not, in fact, the same person), and that non-autograph manuscript copies of Bach's sonatas—especially ones far removed from his immediate circle—may include the

copyist's own attempts to sort out Bach's inconsistencies based on different training and experience. The present edition approaches keyboard ornamentation by recognizing this continuum of practice, generally keeping the more general signs of the very early works, but maintaining the more *Versuch*-style approach in works that Bach composed or revised after the early 1740s, during which time he was developing and refining his ideas for the *Versuch*. In each individual sonata, however, we have tried to be rather more than less consistent with the notation of ornaments: thus if both *tr* and + are used in the same manuscript in the same contexts, the edition will normalize one or the other.

Notation with Generic Signs

When ornaments are marked with general signs—such as *tr*, *t*, +, or rarely ᮣ or ᮤ—these signs can indicate any sort of the various forms of trills and turns, often even mordents. Their realization depends on the music's character and tempo, as well as the melodic and harmonic situation. In this notation appoggiaturas are mainly marked with generic small eighth notes (usually with no slash through the stem) and their sounding value also depends on the harmonic and melodic situation. Turns, when given their own symbol, are often written upright (⌇) rather than in the more familiar horizontal orientation (∽).

From this Bach gradually moved (but never in a straight line) toward a more structured system of ornamentation, especially after he had absorbed the new stylistic trends he encountered in Berlin in the late 1730s and early 1740s. Following the publication of the "Prussian" and "Württemberg" Sonatas in the first half of the 1740s, he began to introduce new symbols and new expectations into his keyboard ornamentation. This process culminated in the publication of part I of the *Versuch* in 1753. Even after the publication of the *Versuch*, however, Bach continued to use a more generic approach in non-keyboard music, and even in some keyboard concertos.

When the style and musical situations of compositions with generic signs are similar or identical to those in pieces with more detailed notation, the correct solution of the generic signs can be achieved by studying the sonatas with detailed notation and analyzing which ornaments are marked by the composer and where. In similar situations, similar ornaments should be used, even if only generic signs are given.

Notation with Specific Signs

In this case each different type of ornament gets its own specific symbol and execution, and appoggiaturas are more fully (but still not completely) explained. The performer should, however, get accustomed to the idea that even in the most precise notation some ornament signs can have various meanings depending on the musical context. The *Versuch* suggests this to a certain extent by explaining the practice of "abbreviation" of certain ornaments (e.g., substitution of longer ornaments with similar but shorter ones) and gives numerous examples of this. New types of ornament symbols are introduced, such as the turned trill (ᮥ, in German *prallender Doppelschag*). The descriptions of all of these ornaments as given in the *Versuch* are summarized in table 2. Bach on several occasions noted that the specific signs presented in the *Versuch* are almost exclusively intended for keyboard performers. Players of string and woodwind instruments would not be expected to deal with anything more than the generic signs, and this is largely born out in Bach's own manuscripts of orchestral parts.

Mixed Notation

As mentioned above, Bach never completely abandoned notation with generic signs. Thus the precision with which Bach notated ornaments varies from one composition to another (or, indeed, within one and the same composition). Interestingly, some of Bach's late works (including some places in the "Kenner und Liebhaber" sets) display a somewhat less detailed ornament notation than earlier compositions. A possible explanation for this could be Bach's realization that the broad public had not completely adopted the detailed notation of the *Versuch* and that Bach (at least partially) decided no longer to press the issue. An example of mixed notation is when *tr* and ∽ signs are given in a sonata to distinguish between the two types of ornaments, but no further distinction is made as to which specific kinds of trill (long, short, from above, from below) and turn (turn, inverted turn, trilled turn) are actually meant, leaving the option to the player.

Ornament Substitution

Ornament substitution is an option regardless of level of precision in the notation. With generic-sign notation, *tr* can (and in many cases should) be replaced by any of the various forms of turn, sometimes even by a *Schneller* or an

TABLE 2. ORNAMENTS USED IN I/6

Symbol	Name	*Versuch* Reference	Execution
tr, +, ⤳	Trill, regular trill (Triller, ordentlicher Triller)	I:2.3, § 1–21, and Tab. IV, Figs. XIX–XXIII	
ᏟᏗ	Trill from below (Triller von unten)	I:2.3, § 22, and Tab. IV, Fig. XXXIV	
ᏟᏗ	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	Adagio / Moderato / Presto
∾̰	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	
ᏆᏗ, ᏆᏗᏗ	Mordent and long mordent (Mordent, langer Mordent)	I:2.5, § 1–15, and Tab. V, Figs. LXXII–LXXV	

inverted turn, according to the situation. Situations for substitution of a turn for *tr* are listed in the *Versuch* (I:2.4 §§11–12; CPEB:CW, VII/1, 102–3). In mixed notation *tr* substitution is possible even in the presence of specific ⤳, ᏟᏗ, or ᏟᏗ signs in the same piece. In general, *tr* substitution can occur when the tempo (or a very short note duration) does not allow for the full execution of a trill. In such cases a simple appoggiatura can be played in place of a trill, or, given a little more time, an abbreviated trill with termination, which has the same melodic contour as a turn. Other examples of ornament substitution include: replacing a simple trill on a long note (or in a slow tempo) with a trill from below or above, or replacing some form of a trill with a trilled turn.

Embellishment and Variation

One could consider the embellishment or variation of repeated passages a sort of ornamentation on a larger structural scale. Such considerations, however, are explored in CPEB:CW, I/2 and are not discussed here.

Miklós Spányi