

# INTRODUCTION

---

This volume contains two works that Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach composed at the opposite ends of his career: the Concerto in F Major, Wq 46, written in 1740, and the Concerto in E-flat Major, Wq 47, written shortly before his death in 1788. Among Bach's fifty-two concertos, this pair of works stands apart as his only examples of the double concerto, with Wq 46 intended for two undesignated keyboard instruments and orchestra, and Wq 47 scored specifically for harpsichord, fortepiano, and orchestra. Entries for each piece are integrated in the chronological list of "Concerte" in Bach's estate catalogue, NV 1790 (on pp. 27 and 35, respectively):

No. 6. *F. dur.* B[erlin]. 1740. 2 Claviere, 2 Hörner, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.

No. 52. *Es. dur.* H[amburg]. 1788. Clavier, Fortepiano, 2 Hörner, 2 Flöten, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.

While NV 1790 does not indicate that Wq 46 has been substantially revised (*erneuert*), early and late versions of the work do exist. Of the two concertos, Wq 46 circulated more widely, as evidenced by ten extant sources for it—including seven that preserve the early version (see appendix). Wq 47 was composed so late in Bach's life that it exists in a single version, transmitted in only three sources.

## Wq 46

Bach wrote his first concerto (Wq 1) in 1733, and by the end of 1740 had completed seven more, including Wq 46—cited in NV 1790 as no. 6, the first of three concertos listed for that year.<sup>1</sup> That the date 1740 coincides with Bach's official appointment as court harpsichordist, upon the accession of Frederick II to the Prussian throne, suggests little about the concerto's performance venue. Bach's works were not written for court performance, but far more likely found their audience in Berlin's thriving, private concert

---

1. In addition to the two other keyboard concertos (Wq 6 and 7) from the same year, other works that Bach composed in 1740 include four solo keyboard sonatas (Wq 48/1, 48/2, 62/3, and 65/12); two sonatas for flute and basso continuo (Wq 128 and 129); and his lost sonata for violoncello and basso continuo (Wq 138).

culture, which expanded from the 1740s into the 1750s and 1760s. The growth of musical societies and academies provided ample opportunities for new works to be heard, often organized by the same Berlin musicians who served at court.<sup>2</sup> Bach's own participation in such concerts during the 1740s is corroborated, for instance, by the account of composer Johann Wilhelm Hertel (1727–89), who heard Bach perform the Concerto in D Major, Wq 11, at a Berlin concert in the house of Franz Benda in 1745.<sup>3</sup>

The earliest source for Wq 46 is Bach's autograph composing score (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 352; source A 1), notated for two cembalos and four-part strings and dated 1740 in Bach's hand. Bach soon afterward added two horn parts, drafting them in *particella* format. His copyists then extracted a full set of eight performing parts (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 362; source A 2) from the autograph score and *particella*, likely shortly after the work's inception. Since P 352 lacks continuo figures, Bach added these himself at least to the cembalo II part (the figures in cembalo I are in the copyist's hand, raising the possibility that this is a later replacement part). In the cembalo I part, the scribe notated a cadenza at the end of movement ii for both keyboards, to which Bach added a caveat: "NB wird nicht mit geschrieben" (NB: not to be copied with [this part])—perhaps a caution against automatically including the composer's cadenza with every subsequent sales copy.

Bach kept score, parts, and *particella* together in his library. As he began to revise the concerto, he at first entered his changes into both the score and the parts, but eventually only into the parts—thus leaving his autograph score with a mixture of early and late readings. His performing parts therefore provide the most complete text of the concerto's late version, and serve as principal source for the edition.

---

2. Among the most well-documented of such groups is the "Musikübende Gesellschaft," founded in 1749; see, e.g., Adolf Friedrich Wolff, "Entwurf einer ausführlichen Nachricht von der Musikübenden Gesellschaft zu Berlin," in Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg, *Historisch-kritische Beyträge zur Aufnahme der Musik*, vol. 1, part 5 (Berlin, 1755), 385–413.

3. See Johann Wilhelm Hertel, *Autobiographie*, ed. Erich Schenk (Graz: Hermann Böhlaus Nachf., 1957), 24.

Bach's revisions to Wq 46 include numerous passages in which he elaborates, for instance, his original 8th notes into quicker, decorative figuration. Such passagework is particularly concentrated in movement ii, where Bach fully embellishes both keyboard parts for the later version. A significant revision—struck through and rewritten in both P 352 and St 362—occurs in movement i, mm. 113ff. (see plate 2 and commentary). Here, Bach streamlines a modulatory passage, shortening the relevant portion of it from eleven measures to two.

All seven of the sources that transmit the early version of Wq 46 are from Berlin. While traces of it are still legible in Bach's composing score (P 352) and in his performing parts (St 362), the clearest record of this early layer is preserved in a set of manuscript parts (D-B, Sammlung Thulemeier 16; source A 3) that passed through the hands of Bach's colleague Christoph Nichelmann (1717–62).<sup>4</sup> These parts were made from St 362, and were likely sold by Bach in the 1750s. As such, they fall at a point in the compositional chronology after Bach had added the horns, continuo figures, and cadenza to his performing parts, but before he had completed any larger revisions. They preserve, for instance, the original modulatory passage in the first movement (mm. 113ff.), and the simpler, unelaborated second movement. More minutely, the beginning of the work lacks the "Allegro" tempo heading that Bach later added to his house copy. That Bach corrected this sales copy is clear from a scattering of entries in his hand throughout the parts.

Nichelmann's hand is found in both keyboard parts of Thulemeier 16, where he himself has copied out Bach's cadenza for movement ii. This suggests that he was the owner of this manuscript, acquiring the cadenza from Bach. It is tempting, then, to imagine a Berlin performance of the early version of Wq 46 with Nichelmann playing the second cembalo part. Any such concert would have occurred between 1745 and 1756, the years during which Nichelmann served as harpsichordist at the Berlin court, alongside Bach, and was active himself as a composer of keyboard concertos.<sup>5</sup> Other potential Berlin candidates

4. The collection of the Prussian state minister Friedrich Wilhelm von Thulemeier (1735–1811) includes various other works by Bach that he likely acquired from Nichelmann's estate, and which demonstrate close ties to Bach. Thulemeier's copies of Wq 4 and 34 also have cadenzas in Nichelmann's hand; see CPEB: CW, III/9.2 and III/9.11.

5. Nichelmann was a student at the Leipzig Thomasschule under J.S. Bach, and studied keyboard with Wilhelm Friedemann Bach; after the publication of his treatise on composition in 1755—and C.P.E. Bach's reputed criticism of it—Nichelmann left the Prussian court

who could have participated in an early performance of Wq 46 include the two court harpsichordists who preceded Nichelmann in the role: Christoph Schaffrath, who served at court from 1740 to 1744; and Christian Friedrich Schale, from 1742 to 1745.

Hints of another performance venue for Wq 46—while entirely speculative—may also reside in the details of scribes and watermarks in the Thulemeier 16 parts. Three of these parts (violin I–II and violone) are by the Berlin scribe Schlichting, copied on paper with the watermark "ZITTAV." Additionally, three other parts (viola and horn I–II) are in the hand of Anon. Vr, who worked for Johann Sebastian Bach in Leipzig from 1743 to 1750, and for C.P.E. Bach in Berlin from 1750 to 1754. The same pairing of the scribe Schlichting and the watermark "ZITTAV" appears more than once in C.P.E. Bach's library—notably in the performing parts to the Berlin version of his Magnificat, Wq 215 (see CPEB: CW, V/1.1).<sup>6</sup> Bach performed his Magnificat in Leipzig in 1749 or early 1750, most likely as part of his application to succeed his father as Cantor at the Thomaskirche; the majority of the original parts had been copied for it in advance by Berlin scribes.

It is plausible to envision that the 35-year-old Bach would also seek to show his skill in other genres and styles during his Leipzig visit, as a kind of extended informal audition. A work with circumstantial evidence to suggest its performance during this visit to Leipzig is Bach's Sonata in D Minor, Wq 69—for which Bach's house copy similarly combines Schlichting's hand and "ZITTAV" paper (see CPEB: CW, I/6.3, xvii–xviii). With scribe and watermark to encourage the hypothesis, is it possible that Bach also performed the more lavishly scored Wq 46 at the same time? Potential venues for such a performance included Zimmermann's Coffee House and the "Drei Schwannen" concert hall.<sup>7</sup> It is tantalizing to imagine Bach's second keyboardist for a Leipzig concert to be his own ailing father—though the elder Bach's health would likely have precluded

the following year. A biographical sketch of Nichelmann appears in Marburg, *Historisch-kritische Beyträge*, vol. 1, part 5, 431–39; see also Thomas Christensen, "Nichelmann contra C.P.E. Bach: Harmonic Theory and Musical Politics at the Court of Frederick the Great," in *Hamburg 1988*, 189–220.

6. Schlichting worked for Bach in Berlin from the 1740s to the mid-1750s; his hand in Thulemeier 16 is consistent with details of his writing in the Magnificat parts. I thank Peter Wollny for the assessment of stages in Schlichting's hand, and especially for the insight regarding the potential connection of scribe and watermark with Leipzig.

7. The formal audition of another candidate for the position indeed took place in the "Drei Schwannen"; see Christine Blanken's discussion in CPEB: CW, V/1.1, xv.

that possibility. Without additional evidence, it remains an open question whether a Leipzig performance of Wq 46 took place.

Bach preserved Wq 46 in his library in Hamburg after 1768, and may have continued to tweak the parts; while it is unclear when all of his later entries to them were made, the house copy includes a duplicate part for cembalo II in the hand of a Hamburg copyist. Bach's dissemination of the work in the 1770s is documented in his letter to Johann Nikolaus Forkel, apparently written in December 1774. Bach writes:

A little inflammatory fever and a funeral music have prevented me from sending you before now the enclosed 6 solos and 4 concertos of mine . . . . In addition to the enclosed concerto in F [Wq 46], I have composed 2 sonatinas for 2 harpsichords.<sup>8</sup>

The identity of the “enclosed concerto in F” as Wq 46 is clarified by the similar double-keyboard scoring in the two sonatinas that Bach mentions, Wq 109 and 110. Which version of Wq 46 Bach sent to Forkel and the current whereabouts of Forkel's copy remain unknown.

### Wq 47

Written in Hamburg in 1788, the Concerto in E-flat Major, Wq 47, is Bach's last concerto and one of his final compositions. Four decades after composing Wq 46 in Berlin, he returned to the genre of double concerto with Wq 47. According to correspondence from the Bach household, it appears that this unusual work, featuring both harpsichord and fortepiano, was commissioned by Sara Levy (1761–1854), a renowned Berlin keyboard virtuoso, music patron, and collector. In a letter dated 5 September 1789, Bach's widow, Johanna Maria Bach, replied to Levy regarding an outstanding concerto that Levy was expecting to receive:

You may already have been notified by Herr Wessely that my dear husband's illness did not allow him to think about the concerto you had commissioned from him. Whatever he had

promised was certainly only with the expectation of being able to carry it out soon. But alas!<sup>9</sup>

Given the compositional timeline of C.P.E. Bach's concertos, the missing work in question is almost certainly Wq 47, as Peter Wollny has shown.<sup>10</sup> Bach had contributed no other work to the genre since 1778; and in the summary of Bach's compositions attached to her letter, J.M. Bach cites a total of 52 concertos—a number that indeed would include Wq 47. Clearly, the mistake regarding the concerto's completion was then rectified by the Bach household. Levy ultimately received Bach's autograph score of Wq 47 (D-B, N. Mus. SA 4; source A), adding a title page to it in her own hand (see plate 7).<sup>11</sup>

While no house copy for Wq 47 is known, Bach's heirs surely kept a copy of the concerto before sending the autograph to Levy. The work is listed in NV 1790, and Johann Heinrich Michel made two subsequent copies of it: a set of parts, copied for Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal (B-Bc, 5890 MSM; source B), and a score acquired by Joseph Haydn (H-Bn, Ms. Mus. IV 694; source D).<sup>12</sup> Bach's autograph copy from Levy's library serves as the principal source for the present edition, with Westphal's set of parts consulted for comparison.

In her commission of the double concerto, Levy may well have specifically requested the unusual combination of harpsichord and fortepiano, if not also the work's inclusion of flutes. In the same year, Levy also appears to have commissioned from Bach another set of pieces with unconventional instrumentation: his three quartets, Wq 93–95,

9. “Sie werden durch Herr Wessely schon benachrichtiget worden seyn, daß die Krankheit meines lieben Mannes ihm nicht erlaubt hat, an das von Ihnen ihm comittirte Concert zu denken. Was er diesfalls versprochen hat, ist gewiß nur in der Erwartung, es bald erfüllen zu können, geschehen. Aber leider!” Letter transcribed in Wollny 2010, 49–51 (excerpt also translated in Wollny 1993, 657–58); also in *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1309–16, and Bitter, 2:307–11. To her letter, J.M. Bach attached an inventory—essentially in NV 1790 order—tallying C.P.E. Bach's repertoire by genre, apparently to clarify the works that Johanna Maria believed Levy still lacked in her collection.

10. See Wollny 1993, 657–58; additionally, as noted on p. 683, n. 30 regarding the logistics of Levy's commission of Wq 47, “Wessely” may refer to Berlin composer Karl Bernhard Wessely, who traveled to Hamburg in 1787 and could have conveyed Levy's commission for the concerto to Bach at that time.

11. A complete facsimile of Bach's autograph is published in *Double Concerto in E-flat Major, Wq 47* (CPEB:CW, series III supplement), with an introduction by Robert D. Levin (Los Altos, Calif.: The Packard Humanities Institute, 2019).

12. Kulukundis, 172, suggests that Wq 47 is also accounted for in AK 1805, lot 105.

8. *CPEB-Letters*, 68–71; *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:457–62: “Ein klein Flußfieber und eine Trauermusik hat mich verhindert eher, als jezt, beÿkommende 6 Soli u. 4 Concerten von mir einzusenden. . . . Außer dem beÿkommenden Concerte aus dem f, habe ich noch 2 Sonatinen für 2 Flügel gemacht.” The letter is undated, but may be assigned to December 1774 from Bach's mention of funeral music—likely *Trauermusik Schele* (BR-CPEB F 68; lost), performed for the funeral of Hamburg Bürgermeister Martin Hieronymus Schele on 28 November 1774.

written for keyboard, flute, and viola, with the keyboard part also likely intended for fortepiano (see CPEB: CW, II/5).<sup>13</sup> In both commissions, the prominence of flutes may reflect the performance role of Samuel Salomon Levy, Sara's husband, who appears to have been a skilled flutist.<sup>14</sup> Wq 47 is one of only three keyboard concertos by Bach to specify a keyboard instrument other than harpsichord, and the only one to indicate fortepiano.<sup>15</sup>

As a keyboardist and collector of both music and instruments, Sara Levy regularly performed in Berlin, notably in her own influential salon, and often with her sister Zippora Wulff (later Cäcilie von Eskeles; 1760–1836).<sup>16</sup> It is plausible, then, to envision this venue and duo for Wq 47. That the music collections of Levy and Wulff included additional concertos for two keyboards is evidenced by a title wrapper stamped with Wulff's possessor's mark. Though now separated from its original contents, its title reads: "3. Concerti Doppii per 2. Cembali. Ob[bliga]to. Von No[m]. 1. F. 2. C. 3. Es." (see critical report, Wq 46, footnote to source D 4b). The first item, in F major, is attributed as "Dell Sig.ri C. P. E. Bach," and appears to have been Wulff's now-untraceable copy of Wq 46. The other two works lack composer attributions, but could have been the copies of concertos by J.S. and W.F. Bach that eventually passed into the Sing-Akademie collection.<sup>17</sup> Levy's commission of a double concerto for harpsichord and fortepiano from C. P. E. Bach, then, perhaps reflects a desire to expand both the aesthetic and practical aspects of her collection—enhancing her assemblage of works for the genre with an unusually scored artifact from the Bach circle; and adding a lavish performance piece to her concert repertoire, for the

gathering of connoisseurs in her salon.<sup>18</sup> Perhaps, however, even though few extant eighteenth-century works specifically prescribe harpsichord and fortepiano, this combination may not have been an uncommon practice in the Levy salon. It may instead represent a performance choice often employed for keyboard duos, and potentially favored by Levy herself.<sup>19</sup>

The dissemination of Wq 47 was narrow. Other than the set of parts that Bach's heirs sold to the collector J. J. H. Westphal, the only additional known copy is the score that belonged to Haydn (source D), a known admirer of C. P. E. Bach. While it is unclear how Haydn received this manuscript, he may have acquired it from the Bach household when he visited Hamburg in 1795. Alternatively, he may instead have obtained it through Baron van Swieten, an ardent supporter and promoter of Bach's works in Vienna.<sup>20</sup> As the composition is so closely associated with Levy, however, it is also possible that Haydn was alerted to the double concerto by one of Levy's two sisters: both Zippora Wulff and Fanny von Arnstein (1757–1818) resided in Vienna, where they themselves held musical salons.<sup>21</sup>

13. As with Wq 47, Levy received fair copies in Bach's own hand for at least Wq 94 and 95 (now preserved in D-B, SA 3328); the presumed autograph for Wq 93 is lost. For facsimiles of these two scores, see *Quartets for Keyboard, Flute, and Viola, Wq 94–95* (CPEB: CW, series II supplement), with an introduction by Laura Buch (Los Altos, Calif.: The Packard Humanities Institute, 2015).

14. See Wollny 2010, 25–28.

15. The other two concertos are Wq 34 and 35, both of which list organ and harpsichord as possibilities in NV 1790; see CPEB: CW, III/9.11. The only additional mention of the fortepiano among Bach's original sources appears on the title pages of five of his "Kenner und Liebhaber" collections, beginning with the second collection (Wq 56) in 1780; see CPEB: CW, I/4.1–4.2.

16. See Wollny 2010, 41. Levy's interdisciplinary sphere of influence is collectively explored in Rebecca Cypess and Nancy Sinkoff, eds., *Sara Levy's World* (Rochester, N.Y.: University of Rochester Press, 2018).

17. See Wollny 2010, 41: nos. 2 and 3 may correspond with copies of the Double Concerto in C Major (BWV 1061) by J.S. Bach and the Double Concerto in E-flat Major (Fk 46) by W.F. Bach.

18. The connection between the conversational milieu of the salon and the style of Bach's double concerto is addressed in Michael Marissen, review of Rebecca Cypess and The Raritan Players, *In Sara Levy's Salon* (Acis Productions), in *Nashim: A Journal of Jewish Women's Studies & Gender Issues* 34 (2019): 196–201. For a discussion of similar aspects of salon dialogue in Bach's flute quartets, see Steven Zohn, "The Sociability of Salon Culture and Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach's Quartets," in *Sara Levy's World*, 205–42.

19. See Rebecca Cypess, "Duets in the Collection of Sara Levy and the Ideal of 'Unity in Multiplicity,'" in *Sara Levy's World*, 181–204, esp. 185–89. As Cypess notes, such explorations of timbre are also reflected in contemporary hybrid keyboard instruments that combine both harpsichord and fortepiano mechanisms in a single, two-manual instrument. Regarding a link between Bach and such a combination instrument, see Peter Wollny, "Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs Rezeption neuer Entwicklungen im Klavierbau: Eine unbekannte Quelle zur Fantasie in C-Dur Wq 61/6," *BJ* (2014): 175–87. For additional orchestral works that combine harpsichord and piano, published in Paris between 1778 and 1783, see Jean-François Tapray, *Four "Symphonies Concertantes" for Harpsichord and Piano with Orchestra ad libitum*, ed. Bruce Gustafson (Madison: A-R Editions, 1995).

20. See Wade, 54; also see Ernst Fritz Schmid, "Joseph Haydn und Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach," *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 14 (1932): 309–10. On Haydn's trip to Hamburg, see Robert von Zahn, "Haydn's Aufenthalt in Hamburg 1795," *Haydn-Studien* 6 (1994): 309–12. Haydn's library also contained several other works by Bach that were copied by Michel and perhaps similarly acquired at the same time; these are also preserved in H-Bn: Wq 67 (H-Bn, Ms. Mus. IV 743; see CPEB: CW, I/8.1); Wq 80 (H-Bn, Ms. Mus. IV 742; see CPEB: CW, II/3.1); Wq 93 (H-Bn, Ms. Mus. IV 741; see CPEB: CW, II/5); and Wq 94 (H-Bn, Ms. Mus. IV 740; see CPEB: CW, II/5). See Blanken, 2:700–703.

21. Regarding Levy's own personal acquaintance with Haydn, see

Haydn likely acquired his copies of Bach's flute quartets Wq 93 and 94 through the same avenue as Wq 47, and probably at the same time.

In 1813, Levy gave much of her collection—including Bach's autograph of Wq 47—to the Berlin Sing-Akademie, then under the direction of Carl Friedrich Zelter. Upon Zelter's death in 1832, the score passed into the Sing-Akademie library. Unlike the majority of the materials from the Sing-Akademie, this manuscript was among only a handful of items whose whereabouts were known in the aftermath of World War II.<sup>22</sup> In the summer of 1943, as sources from the collection were packed for shipping to Silesia for safe-keeping, the Wq 47 score apparently remained on the desk of Georg Schumann, who was then director of the Sing-Akademie.<sup>23</sup> In 1974, through the collaboration of Rudolph Elvers, the manuscript was given to the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. Even with the displacement of the Sing-Akademie collection, then, Bach's autograph remained accessible for study during the twentieth century.<sup>24</sup>

In this late work of Bach's final year—as in his three flute quartets, composed earlier that same year—Bach deploys a complex compositional style together with an unusual scoring, sparing no virtuosic expense throughout. In the dense exploration and development of his motivic material, he creates a dialogue that involves each instrumental part, further enhanced by the contrasting colors of harpsichord against fortepiano. The concerto concludes with a tour-de-force movement that strikingly mingles *galant* wit—in its short exchanges, dynamic surprise, and harmonic intrigue—with learned counterpoint. A closing stretto passage, heralded with a simultaneous chorale-like phrase in the horns, marks the end of this last instrumen-

tal masterwork of J.S. Bach's son, who has travelled a long way but acknowledges the trip.

### Performance Considerations

In NV 1790, the designation for the solo instruments of Wq 46 is “2 Claviere,” a term typically intended to include any type of stringed keyboard instrument. While the description leaves the choice open, Bach most likely performed his first double concerto with a pair of harpsichords. For Wq 47, the determination of instruments is intentionally fixed, with harpsichord plus fortepiano required by NV 1790 and by the extant sources.

With two keyboards available during the *tutti* sections, the question of basso continuo accompaniment for these passages arises. As the principal sources for both concertos provide continuo figures for each keyboard part, it seems likely that both are intended to participate in the accompaniment.

Bach provides a clear opportunity for a cadenza in movement ii of Wq 46; he supplies an authentic cadenza in his house copy, and another in the collection of seventy-five cadenzas preserved in B-Bc, 5871 MSM (Wq 120). These are included in the appendix. No authentic cadenzas survive for Wq 47.

### Acknowledgments

I am grateful to the many who have improved and clarified this volume. I thank all of my colleagues at the editorial office of CPEB: CW for our numerous valuable discussions of Bach's double concertos. I offer my particular thanks to Peter Wollny for his insights and generous advice about these works, and to Paul Corneilson, who oversaw the entire editorial process with its innumerable details. I thank the following libraries for kindly providing access to materials in their collections and for granting permission to publish facsimile plates: the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv; and the library of the Royal Conservatory in Brussels.

Laura Buch

---

Felix Eberly, *Jugenderinnerungen eines alten Berliners* (Berlin: Verlag für Kulturpolitik, 1925), 254.

22. Regarding the trove of lost Sing-Akademie material recovered in 1999, see Christoph Wolff, “Recovered in Kiev: Bach et al. A Preliminary Report on the Music Collection of the Berlin Sing-Akademie,” *Notes* 58 (2001): 259–71.

23. This and the following sentence are based upon personal communication from Christoph Wolff.

24. A year after his 1958 edition of Wq 47, based upon Michel's copy in B-Bc, 5890 MSM (see critical report, footnote 1), Erwin R. Jacobi described Bach's autograph of the work in “Das Autograph von C. Ph. E. Bachs Doppelkonzert in Es-dur Für Cembalo, Fortepiano Und Orchester (Wq 47, Hamburg 1788),” *Mf* 12 (1959): 488–89. See also Hans-Günter Klein, “Werke Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs in der Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz Berlin: Neuerwerbungen von Handschriften nach 1945,” in *Hamburg 1988*, 461–71, esp. 469–71.