David Schulenberg
The Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach
Supplement 5.2. Bach's Berlin Pupils

Although Bach wrote one of the great pedagogic works of eighteenth-century music, his known pupils at Berlin are few in number. Most were connected to the court in one way or another, and it may be that Bach did not need to accept ordinary pupils after his reputation had been established. Among those whom he did accept—if he was not essentially required to take them on as pupils—Duke Carl Eugen of Württemberg was only sixteen years years old when Bach's sonatas dedicated to him were brought out by Windter of Berlin.[1] Carl Eugen was, with his two younger brothers (also dukes of Württemberg), Frederick's guest in Berlin at the time. Reigning but not yet ruling, he belonged to a dynasty with a strong musical tradition and historical ties with Prussia: the composer Froberger had served Carl Eugen's great-great aunt, and her mother had been a princess of Brandenburg. The still youthful king might have seen something of himself in Carl Eugen, and doubtless he hoped that his hospitality would serve his political ends. It was not to be; Württemberg would wind up on the opposite side of Prussia in the Seven Years' War. Carl Eugen, moreover, proved a poor ruler and an intellectual lightweight. But it speaks well for Bach that the king entrusted him with the potentially delicate task of teaching the young duke. No such engagement would have been possible without the permission of the king, who probably received regular reports about the duke's musical progress, and anything else worth knowing.

The king's confidence in Bach is further evident in his payments to the latter for teaching the court harpist Brennessell; no doubt this instruction focused on figured bass realization and accompaniment.[2] Bach may also have coached at least one court singer, as suggested by his ownership of the king's autograph embellishments and cadenza for a favorite aria in Hasse's opera *Cleofide.* The aria, in which the Indian or Afghan princess expresses her faithfulness to her beloved Poro after his capture by Alexander the Great, must have made an impression on the Frederick, who valued loyalty above almost everything else. Bach's note on the manuscript indicates that the king wrote out the "variations" for the castrato singer known as Porporino (Anton Uber), who was engaged in 1742.[3] From this we can deduce that it was Bach's task to instruct the new singer in the style of embellishment and improvisation approved in Berlin. Porporino, already in his twenties and a pupil of Porpora, cannot have been entirely happy to

---

[1] There was also a subsequent issue, using the same plates, by Haffner of Nuremberg; see Berg, 2:xvii. Johann Wilhelm Windter is not to be confused with Georg Ludewig Winter, Bach's later publisher (and landlord) in Berlin.

[2]On Brennessell, see Henzel, "Neues zum Hofcembalisten Carl Phlipp Emanuel Bach," 176–77. Bach probably learned something about writing for the harp as a result of his teaching Brennessell, for his one sonata for the instrument dates from the period of this instruction (as pointed out by Oleskiewicz, CPEBCW 2/1:xvii).

[3] Oleskiewicz, "The Court of Brandenburg-Prussia," 93. The manuscript, D B Mus. ms. Friedrich II, has been edited in facsimile by Wolfgang Goldhan (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1991).

receive this sort of coaching, but it must have paid off, as his greatest talent is supposed to have been in adagios.[4] Praise for a performer's adagios presupposed that they were embellished expressively, as taught also by Quantz and accomplished ably by the king himself.[5]

Another extraordinary pupil, Ferdinand von Lobkowitz, was a friend of the king despite his high rank in the Bohemian nobility. Bach, perhaps around 1750, composed a sinfonia jointly with Lobkowitz, each writing a measure at a time in alternation. Unfortunately the work is not preserved in any collection of Bach's music, and a sinfonia that has been identified as the one in question shows no obvious signs that it was composed in the manner described.[6] Although the absence of wind parts (which are mentioned in NV) could mean that the extant source preserves an early or alternate version of the work, numerous ***mf*** dynamic markings as well as open fifths and other details of the harmony are atypical of Bach. Nor does the work reveal discontinuities between measures such as one might expect if they had been written by alternating composers. On the other hand, Bach might well have edited a work composed in such a manner to eliminate any problems. A few modulations in the first two movements could be the sorts of things that Bach might have introduced into what is otherwise a fairly generic example of a mid-century sinfonia (online example 5.6). (Click here for a complete score with critical commentary; audio file here).

---

[4] Schneider, *Geschichte der Oper,* 88–89.

[5] On Frederick's concern for the "expressive" *(touchant)* performance of adagios even as crown prince, see the letter of 1732 quoted by Oleskiewicz, "The Court of Brandenburg-Prussia," 85. Another singer, Salimbeni, engaged in 1743, "owed his renowned skill in free ornamentation in part to the study of harmony with Schaffrath," Bach's colleague (ibid., 104).

[6] The description is in NV, p. 65; Suchalla, *Die Orchestersinfonien Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs,* 127–34, identifies the work as the Sinfonia in G, Wq. n.v. 69, whose unique source (St 228) attributes it to "Bach de Berlin" (the last two words probably a later addition).

Example 5.6. Anonymous Sinfonia in G, Wq. n.v. 69, movement 1, mm. 34–37, 46–50