David Schulenberg The Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach Supplement 3.6. Problems of Origin in the Early Trios

The minuets that close Emanuel's Trio 1, for keyboard and violin (W. 71), recall those in the Flute Sonata BWV 1033 in C, whose authorship is disputed. Both pairs of minuets involve four-square phrases in which the obbligato keyboard plays mostly in decorated parallel thirds with the other instrument. Another point in common is the largely subsidiary character of one of the two upper voices, although the resulting texture (similar to that of the later accompanied-keyboard sonata) is found in many trio sonatas, even those of Corelli's opus 2. Emanuel certainly knew BWV 1033, which, as Jeanne Swack has shown, seems to borrow a theme by Christian Förster, violinist in Merseburg just a few miles from Leipzig.¹

Whoever composed BWV 1033—Emanuel apparently attributed it to his father²—it shares with W. 71 and 72 the character of a pastiche: in each, the various movements are distinct in style and follow no conventional sequence. Perhaps this was the result of combining movements that had been composed separately, possibly even by different members of the Bach household. Emanuel would later shuffle movements while renovating the six sonatinas of W. 64; Quantz somewhat similarly would remove movements to produce sonatas in the three-movement form prevalent at Berlin.³

Another likely instance of Bach's shuffling of movements occurs in Trio 2 in D minor (W. 72), which now ends with a gigue-like movement in 6/8. This is hardly surprising, but it is odd that the second movement is not only shorter but incorporates a syncopated *(alla zoppa)* rhythm; both features would be more expected in the final movement of a sonata of this period. This raises the possibility that the two quick movements were separately composed and later incorporated into a synthetic sonata. The first Allegro, whose theme recalls the last movement of the triple concerto BWV 1063, must be a Leipzig product. The gigue, however, is a masterwork in Bach's mature style of the 1740s.

The three-movement design of Trio 4 (W. 144), again with slow movement first, is that of many Berlin works which originally interposed a second slow movement between the two quick ones. One therefore must wonder whether the present sequence of movements is original. Equally suspicious is the presence of a slow movement in the tonic B minor at the center of Trio 3 (W. 143); was this movement originally in first place, or did it replace a movement in another key? In Bach's fair-copy autograph, probably made at the time of the renovation in 1744, the last two movements look as if they might been copied some time after the first, raising the possibility of a

¹ Swack, "On the Origins of the *Sonate auf Concertenart*," 399–401. Emanuel's copy of BWV 1033 from around 1731 is preserved in St 460; further discussion in CPEBCW 2/1:xx.

² The attribution to Sebastian in St 460 appears to be a later addition to the title page, probably by Emanuel himself.

³ Oleskiewicz, "Quantz and the Flute at Dresden," 170–71.

distinct origin.⁴

The relationships between Emanuel's Trio 5 (W. 145) and the obbligato-keyboard trio BWV 1036 are summarized below:

BWV 1036	W. 145	comment
Adagio, 4/4		No corresponding movement in W. 145
Allegro, 2/4	Allegretto, 2/4	The first three beats are parallel
Largo, 3/4, in F	same	W. 145 substitutes 27 measures for mm. 19–31 of BWV 1036
Vivace, 3/8	Allegro, 2/4	W. 145 substitutes a new sonata-form movement form, some
		passages roughly parallel to BWV 1036, movement 2

Thematic parallels with works of Sebastian confirm a likely origin during the 1720s or 1730s for BWV 1036—consistent, to be sure, with NV's date of 1731 for the early version of W. 145.⁵ Whatever the exact history of the two works, W. 145 clearly represents a purging of the virtuoso yet slightly gauche elements of BWV 1036. These are evident from the very beginning: the close imitation of the two crossing upper parts; the little echoes; and the stuttering motivic idea that enters in measure 3. One senses an original mind in these things, and the chromatic harmony, particularly in measures 6–7, is worthy of a pupil of J. S. Bach (online example 3.13).

Comparable things occur in the music of Friedemann Bach, and he must be considered beside Emanuel as a possible composer of the opening movement. This example also raises the possibility that the young Emanuel was closer, stylistically and in other ways, to Friedemann than would be suggested by their separate paths after leaving Leipzig. That Emanuel retained similar writing in the Largo of W. 145 is a point favoring his authorship of BWV 1036 (online example 3.14). So too is the instrumentation of the latter, which occurs in no certain work by Fridemann; a sonata for obbligato keyboard and violin in the unusual key of B major, although included in the new edition of Friedemann's music as a possible work, is far too late in style to have any relevance to BWV 1036.⁶ The idea that BWV 1036 was originally for two violins and bass has no

⁶ See Schulenberg, *Music of Wilhelm Friedemann Bach*, 127.

⁴ In the autograph score (P 357), the Adagio and Presto are written in a distinctly lighter and finer script than the opening Allegro, suggesting that Bach wrote the two following movements with a different pen. This is, however, a recurring phenomenon in Bach's autographs of the 1740s, including those of newly composed works such as Trio 9 (W. 149) of 1745.

⁵ Wolff, "Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs Trio in d-moll," 184–85, points out similarities in the theme of the first quick movement in both BWV 1036 and W. 145 to that of the opening ritornello in the aria "Nun mögt ihr stolzen Feinde schrecken" from Sebastian's Christmas Oratorio of 1734. Hermann Keller, in the foreword to his edition of BWV 1036 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1952), pointed as well to parallels in the Double Concerto BWV 1060 and the Organ Sonata BWV 527. To these one might add more fleeting parallels in the Triple Concerto BWV 1063 (subject of the last movement) and the *Trauerode* BWV 198 (opening theme of the final chorus, perhaps echoed in the little coda of the second movement for solo keyboard).

foundation in the sources.⁷ Yet it is hardly ruled out by the *unisono* solo for the keyboard instrument at the end of the second movement, which could originally have been for continuo alone.



Example 3.13. Sonata in D minor for keyboard and violin, BWV 1036, movement 1, mm. 1–7

⁷ The possibility was raised by Max Seiffert when the work was first discovered (see the foreword to Keller's edition, op.cit.),







