



ON LINKING BACH'S F-MAJOR SINFONIA AND HIS HUNT CANTATA

Author(s): MICHAEL MARISSSEN

Source: *Bach*, Vol. 23, No. 2 (FALL/WINTER 1992), pp. 31-46

Published by: Riemenschneider Bach Institute

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41634120>

Accessed: 28-08-2017 19:39 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/41634120?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



Riemenschneider Bach Institute is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Bach*

JSTOR

ON LINKING BACH'S F-MAJOR SINFONIA AND HIS HUNT CANTATA

MICHAEL MARISSSEN

In contrasting the apparently old-fashioned style of the opening *Allegro* from the First Brandenburg Concerto with the more "modern" style of its third movement some Bach scholars have been led to believe that the Concerto was composed over a considerable period of time, with the first movement predating Bach's Weimar encounter with Vivaldi's *L'estro armonico* concertos, and with the third movement having been written considerably later.¹ Also the unusual scoring of the work (including horns) has caused some Bach specialists to reason that the concerto would have been performable only with an expansion of Bach's typical orchestra (since none of his groups included members specifically listed as horn players). The opinion that the two (or more?) versions of the concerto must have been written with other venues in mind logically followed – the advantage in this kind of reasoning being that several of Bach's appearances at outside courts can be dated fairly precisely.² It then seemed especially reasonable to conclude that the first movement of the Concerto originated in an early part of Bach's compositional career, once it was determined that the F-major Sinfonia *BWV* 1046a (formerly *BWV* 1071), copied by Christian Friedrich Penzel in 1760,³ represented an early version of the concerto, not a later one as had been previously supposed.⁴ It is important to note that Penzel's score includes neither the

¹See especially Martin Geck, „Gattungstraditionen und Altersschichten in den Brandenburgischen Konzerten,“ *Die Musikforschung* 23 (1970): 139-152.

²See Heinrich Bessler, ed., *Johann Sebastian Bach, Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke*, VII/2: *Sechs Brandenburgische Konzerte, Kritischer Bericht* (Kassel and Leipzig: Bärenreiter, 1956), p. 22; and Johannes Krey, „Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des ersten Brandenburgischen Konzerts,“ in *Festschrift Heinrich Bessler zum sechzigsten Geburtstag*, ed. Institut für Musikwissenschaft der Karl-Marx-Universität (Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1961), pp. 337-342.

³„Sinfonia di Giov. Seb. Bach,“ Mus. ms. Bach P 1061, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin.

⁴Bessler pointed out that there are readings of the Penzel score visible beneath some of the revisions in the Margrave's score; see *Kritischer Bericht*, p. 41. Hermann Kretzschmar and Rudolph Gerber had argued only on stylistic grounds that the Penzel version was probably a later eighteenth-century arrangement of the First Brandenburg Concerto. See Kretzschmar, *Festschrift und Programmbuch zum I. deutschen Bachfest 1901 in Berlin*, p. 41; and Gerber, *Bachs Brandenburgische Konzerte. Eine Einführung in ihre formale und geistige Wessensart* (Kassel and Basel: Bärenreiter, 1951), p. 57.

third movement nor the Polonaise of the final Brandenburg version and also that it features some differences in scoring: there is no *violino piccolo*, and the Trio with horns has a different accompaniment, being scored for violins, not oboes.

My concern here, though, is not to seek specific new dates for the composition of the First Brandenburg Concerto or for the Penzel Sinfonia. In another essay I have argued that the opening movement of the First Brandenburg Concerto represents an especially sophisticated example well suited for a sociological study of "Vivaldi reception" in Bach's music.⁵ However, space in that study did not allow for critical scrutiny of all of the evidence that would, or could, be damaging to a Vivaldian interpretation of the concerto. Most of this evidence centers on the almost universally accepted idea in Bach research that Penzel's sinfonia served as the overture for Bach's apparently pre-Vivaldian "Hunt Cantata" (*Was mir behagt ist nur die muntre Jagd!*, BWV 208).⁶ My aim is to show that the research of Krey and Geck is, to draw on the words of Dorothy Parker, "not to be tossed aside lightly. It should be thrown with great force." The present contribution is meant, then, as a kind of text-critical supplement to my earlier style-oriented study of the F-major concerto.

* * *

Believing connections had to be sought outside of Köthen at the courts known to have had horn players in their ranks, Johannes Krey suggested that the Penzel version of the First Brandenburg Concerto might have served as the overture for a 1716 Weißenfels performance of the Hunt Cantata presented in the presence of Duke Christian of Sachsen-Weißenfels (it is clear from Bach's notation of the proper names in the

⁵Michael Marissen, "Concerto Styles and Signification in Bach's First Brandenburg Concerto," *Bach-Perspectives* 1 (currently in press).

⁶The most detailed consideration of this hypothesis is provided by Krey, „Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des ersten Brandenburgischen Konzerts.“ For varying degrees of endorsement for this idea, see, e.g., Laurence Dreyfus, *Bach's Continuo Group: Players and Practices in his Vocal Works* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1987), p. 253; Werner Neumann, *Handbuch der Kantaten Johann Sebastian Bachs* (Leipzig: VEB Breitkopf & Härtel, rev./1971), p. 223; Joshua Rifkin, essay in booklet accompanying the compact disc *Violin Concertos at the Court of Weimar*, Stanley Ritchie, violin, and The Bach Ensemble, directed by Joshua Rifkin (London: L'OISEAU-LYRE [421 442-2], 1989), 4-11; Hans-Joachim Schulze, „Johann Sebastian Bachs Konzerte – Fragen der Überlieferung und Chronologie,“ *Bach-Studien* 6, *Beiträge zum Konzertschaffen Johann Sebastian Bachs*, ed. Peter Ansehl (Leipzig: VEB Breitkopf & Härtel, 1981), pp. 9-26; and Christoph Wolff, *The New Grove Bach Family* (New York: Norton, 1983), p. 156.

libretto that the cantata was conceived for Duke Christian).⁷ Krey goes on to suggest that the Brandenburg version with the *violino piccolo* (which he considers to be a French instrument) may originally have been prepared for a performance by Jean Baptiste Volumier (the "Frenchified" concert master at Dresden) and accompanied by the Dresden court orchestra during Bach's documented 1717 visit to that city.⁸

After the publication of Krey's essay, the Hunt Cantata was redated to February 1713 on the basis of biographical and philological research. Newly uncovered archival documents have revealed that Bach was lodged in Weißenfels during Duke Christian's 1713 birthday celebrations. (Thus, for a 1713 performance of the Hunt Cantata, Bach would no doubt have used an earlier manuscript copy of the libretto published in 1716.) Moreover, the notational appearance of Bach's score betrays its early origins. For example, there are a number of instances in which Bach cancels his sharps with flats instead of using natural signs (he seems to have abandoned this old-fashioned practice sometime between 1713 and 1716).⁹ Endorsing Krey's suggestion of linking the sinfonia and the cantata and referring to the new dating for the cantata, Martin Geck has been able to objectify his view that the style of the sinfonia was pre-Vivaldian.¹⁰ Bach's organ version of the D-Minor Concerto arranged from Vivaldi's *L'estro armonico* – the one surviving autograph score among Bach's Vivaldi arrangements – has been dated by Georg von Dadelsen by means of handwriting criteria to have originated at sometime between 1714 and 1717.¹¹ Soon after this Hans-Joachim Schulze was able (through archival research) to narrow the dating for Bach's series of arrangements and Bach's first familiarity with Vivaldi's concerto style to between July 1713 and July 1714 (that is, to a time earlier than that of von Dadelsen's contention, although later than the Hunt Cantata).¹² It now turns out that scholars following Geck can find further support for an early dating of the sinfonia in new (but as yet

⁷Krey, „Zur Entstehungsgeschichte des ersten Brandenburgischen Konzerts,“ accepted the 1716 dating from Philipp Spitta, *Johann Sebastian Bach* Vol. 1 (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1873), pp. 811-812.

⁸Regarding some logistical problems with this idea, see fn. 22 below.

⁹For the details, see Alfred Dürr, ed., *Johann Sebastian Bach, Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke, I/35: Festmusiken für die Fürstenhäuser von Weimar, Weißenfels und Köthen, Kritischer Bericht* (Kassel and Leipzig: Bärenreiter, 1964), pp. 39-43.

¹⁰Geck, „Gattungstraditionen und Altersschichten in den Brandenburgischen Konzerten,“ p. 146.

¹¹Geck, 142, citing Georg von Dadelsen, *Beiträge zur Chronologie der Werke Johann Sebastian Bachs* (Trossingen: Hohner, 1958), p. 79.

¹²Schulze, "J. S. Bach's Concerto-arrangements for Organ – Studies or Commissioned works?" *The Organ Yearbook* 3 (1972): 4-13.

unpublished) research on the development of Bach's handwriting, with Yoshitake Kobayashi suggesting that the Hunt Cantata may even date from as early as 1712.¹³

Schulze was among the first to raise substantial objections to Geck's and Krey's research. First, he has pointed out that Krey did not have to look for records of guest appearances by horn players at Bach's courts or to look only to Weißenfels and Dresden for resident players. In support of this statement he notes that Friedrich Wilhelm Zachow's church cantatas, written for performances in Halle, contain fairly elaborate horn parts, and moreover, that in the 1715 and 1716 Weimar court records there are several recently uncovered references to payments received by resident horn players. Thus, the presence of two guest players from Weißenfels in Weimar in April 1716, often mentioned in the secondary literature on Bach, should not be taken to suggest that there were no available horn players in Weimar.¹⁴ Schulze's discovery that resident Weimar horn players were in fact available no longer compels us to look elsewhere for players. This, in turn, somewhat weakens the case for linking the early version of the First Brandenburg Concerto with the first performance of the Hunt Cantata. Schulze also notes that in Köthen there were various non-court musicians who may well have performed with Prince Leopold's ensemble, although their presence would not necessarily have been documented.¹⁵ I would add to this important observation the fact that players listed as trumpeters were often called upon to play horn parts in the eighteenth century, and that their ability to do so was facilitated by the fact that, unlike the situation in later times, trumpet and horn embouchures were virtually identical at this point.¹⁶ It

¹³Kobayashi, „Diplomatische Überlegungen zur Chronologie der Weimarer Vokalwerke“ (paper delivered at the Bach-Kolloquium Rostock 1990); my thanks to Professor Kobayashi for allowing me to see this essay.

¹⁴See Schulze, „Johann Sebastian Bachs Konzerte,“ p. 16. See also the register of professional horn players in Europe from 1680-1725 in Horace Fitzpatrick, *The Horn and Horn-Playing and the Austro-Bohemian Tradition from 1680-1830* (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), pp. 91-100. It is not clear, however, why Bach on this one occasion hired Weißenfels horn players for Weimar if it had been possible to secure local players.

¹⁵Schulze, „Über die angemessene Besetzung einiger Konzerte Johann Sebastian Bachs,“ *Studien zur Aufführungspraxis und Interpretation von Instrumentalmusik des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Heft 2/1, *Zu Fragen des Instrumentariums, der Besetzung und der Improvisation in der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Eitelfriedrich Thom (Michaelstein/Blankenburg: Die Kultur und Forschungsstätte, [1975]), pp. 21-25.

¹⁶See Fitzpatrick, *The Horn and Horn-Playing*, pp. 67 and 159.

is also important to note that at this time both the Weimar and Köthen court records list trumpeters on the regular payroll.¹⁷

Also, Schulze considers the Minuet movement to make a weak impression after the first two movements of the sinfonia and therefore asserts that this version of the concerto is "obviously, at least according to today's taste, musically unsatisfying."¹⁸ The sinfonia, Schulze claims, needs something between its slow movement and the minuet (and, of course, in the Brandenburg version we have at that point the *Allegro* with *concertato violino piccolo*). Schulze argues further that the sinfonia should not be associated with the first performance of the Hunt Cantata because the style of the Penzel sinfonia appears to be much more developed than the style of the orchestral movements introducing the cantatas *Gleichwie der Regen und Schnee vom Himmel fällt*, BWV 18, and *Der Himmel lacht! die Erde jubilieret*, BWV 31, both of which post-date the Hunt Cantata. He concludes, therefore, that the first two movements of the BWV 1046a sinfonia may have served as the instrumental prelude, and the minuet as the postlude, to the newly performed Hunt Cantata, which was probably presented in 1716 as a part of the birthday celebration for Duke Ernst August of Sachsen-Weimar, nephew of the co-reigning Duke Wilhelm Ernst.¹⁹ Questioning other aspects of Krey's work less directly associated with the Hunt Cantata problem, Schulze also notes that while the stimulus for the third movement of the First Brandenburg Concerto may have come from Dresden, it is unlikely, according to text-critical evidence of the dedication score, that the version with *violino piccolo* would have been composed too long before Bach sent the piece to the Margrave of Brandenburg in 1721 (for example, the Polonaise and the

¹⁷The Weimar 1714 and c1715 personnel lists are printed in Werner Neumann and Hans-Joachim Schulze, eds., *Bach Dokumente*, Band II: *Fremdschriftliche und gedruckte Dokumente zur Lebensgeschichte Johann Sebastian Bachs 1685-1750* (Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1969), pp. 55 and 62-63. Later in the 1714 document, not reproduced by Neumann and Schulze, there appears a list of the ceremonial field-musicians (i.e., including the brass players); this is printed in Charles Sanford Terry, *Bach: A Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, rev./1933), pp. 92-93. The most detailed discussion of the Köthen records appears in Günther Hoppe, „Köthener politische, ökonomische und höfische Verhältnisse als Schaffensbedingungen Bachs (Teil 1),“ *Cöthener Bach-Hefte* 4 (1986): 13-62.

¹⁸Schulze, „Johann Sebastian Bachs Konzerte – Fragen der Überlieferung und Chronologie,“ p. 18.

¹⁹We know the cantata was re-performed at some point in Weimar from the fact that in Bach's score (Mus. ms. Bach P 42, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin) the references to "Christian" (Duke at Weißenfels) were crossed out and replaced with "Ernst August" (Duke at Weimar). 1716 is taken by Bach scholars for the most likely date, because the appearance of two guest horn players from Weißenfels is documented for that year at the time of Ernst's birthday. See Dürr, *Kritischer Bericht*, p. 43.

Trio with horns are not fully autograph,²⁰ and also Bach has squeezed the words "Tutti" and "violino piccolo tacit" into the heading for the Polonaise.²¹ To this I would add that another reason why a scheduled performance of the concerto at court is unlikely to have taken place during Bach's Dresden visit in 1717 is the fact that there was in force at that time a mourning period following the death of the king's mother.²²

I would suggest, then, that Schulze did not go far enough in his objections to Krey's and Geck's essays. One might, as a matter of fact, reasonably attempt the exercise of questioning altogether Krey's and Geck's linking of the Penzel version of the First Brandenburg Concerto with the Hunt Cantata.²³

²⁰This suggests that Bach had just composed the movements in question and therefore did not "need" to copy the music himself (in the other movements, presumably composed somewhat earlier, he would have wanted to do the copying himself so that he could immediately enter revisions as he went along). On the identification of the non-autograph handwriting, see fn. 11 above. For this reason Klaus Häfner's suggestion that the Polonaise is an arrangement of „Denn grünen unsre Felder“ from Bach's lost cantata *Heut ist gewiß ein guter Tag*, BWV Anh. 7, seems doubtful; see Häfner, *Aspekte des Parodieverfahrens bei Johann Sebastian Bach* (Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 1987), pp. 423-432.

²¹„Bachs-Konzerte – Fragen der Überlieferung und Chronologie,“ pp. 17-18.

²²See fn. 38 of Friedrich Wilhelm Riedel, „Musikgeschichtliche Beziehungen zwischen Johann Joseph Fux und Johann Sebastian Bach,“ in *Festschrift Friedrich Blume zum 70 Geburtstag*, ed. Anna Amalie Abert (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1963), pp. 290-304; Bach was apparently in Dresden to compete with Louis Marchand who, according to the archival research of Spitta (*J.S. Bach*, p. 818), was most likely in Dresden in September (the mourning period at court extended to the feast of St. Michael).

²³Another, more difficult, way to avoid the apparent problems associated with interpreting Bach's *sinfonia* as Vivaldian would be to try to show that Bach must have become familiar with Vivaldi's new concerto style before 1713 (Schulze reasonably dates Bach's keyboard arrangements of Vivaldi's string concertos to after July 1713 – see fn. 12 above). Consider, e.g., the *ritornello* form of the aria „Ein Fürst ist seines Landes Pan“ in the Hunt Cantata, which is "Vivaldian" on account of its use of subsequent quotations of the easily separable *Vordersatz*, *Fortspinnung*, and *Epilog* segments from a tonally closed *ritornello*; none of the other non-recitative movements in the Hunt Cantata follows the procedure of this particular model (for Vivaldi's specific formal contributions to concerto procedure, see Michael Talbot, "The Concerto Allegro in the Early Eighteenth Century," *Music and Letters* 52 [1971]: 8-18, 159-72; and for more detailed discussion of syntax in Vivaldian *Fortspinnung*-type *ritornellos*, see Laurence Dreyfus, "J.S. Bach's Concerto *Ritornellos* and the Question of Invention," *Musical Quarterly* 71 (1985): 327-58). The arrival in Weimar of at least some of Vivaldi's concertos could perhaps be pushed back to the beginning of 1713, for Bach's pupil Philipp David Kräuter petitioned his Augsburg authorities on 10 April 1713 for an extension of his study period in Weimar, partly on the grounds that "the Weimar Prince here, who is not only a great lover of music but himself an incomparable violinist, will return to Weimar from Holland after Easter and spend the summer here; much fine Italian and French music can be heard, particularly profitable to me in composing Concertos and Overtures ... thus I shall be able to see, hear and get copies of a great deal..."; this translation of Kräuter's letter is quoted in Schulze, "J.S. Bach's Concerto-arrangements," p. 7 (the German original is printed in *Bach Dokumente III: Dokumente zum*

Krey gave the following reasons for believing that the two works belonged together: (1) The courts at which Bach was employed did not have horn players, while the Weißenfels court, where Bach performed the Hunt Cantata, did have resident horn players. (2) The sinfonia and the cantata are in the same key and share the same scoring of two horns, three oboes, bassoon, strings, and continuo. (3) The style and mood of the horn writing (that is, of the hunting fanfares) are similar in the sinfonia and cantata. (4) The very use of the term "Sinfonia" suggests that the work introduced the cantata, for without an orchestral prelude, the cantata would open weakly with a secco-recitative (this sort of opening, Krey claims, would be stylistically atypical for Bach's secular cantatas; and because of the general din that may have accompanied the feast following the Weißenfels hunt, a recitative would probably have been inaudible, while an orchestral sinfonia with horns would easily have taken hold of the audience's attention). (5) And, above all, the autograph score of the Hunt Cantata has no title page to refer unambiguously to the opening movement of the cantata, while an instrumental designation at the beginning of the score (as it survives) refers only to the scoring of the first aria.

As mentioned above, Schulze, partly by means of documentary evidence, has countered the idea that local horn players were not available in Weimar and Köthen.

Krey's observation that the cantata and sinfonia are in the same key is obviously indisputable, but I would point out that his observation concerning the correspondence of the scorings is not quite correct. The third oboe part in the Penzel sinfonia is scored throughout for the standard oboe (notated in the treble clef, with a normal range of c'-d'''),²⁴ while the

Nachwirken Johann Sebastian Bachs 1750-1800, ed. Hans-Joachim Schulze [Kassel and Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1972], pp. 649-650). Presumably Kräuter had some fairly specific idea of what to expect in the upcoming shipments of Italian violin concertos, which would mean that he probably had already (recently) encountered Vivaldi's new concerto style. Another way to deal with the "problem" of the chronological relationship between the Penzel version of the First Brandenburg Concerto and the Hunt Cantata, a method almost certain not to succeed (especially in light of Kobayashi's recent research – see fn. 13), would be to look for evidence that the cantata was composed later than 1713.

²⁴Penzel overlooked Bach's alternate reading for the oboe in measures 6-7 of the minuet because he was copying from a set of parts (Penzel probably considered more than a cursory glance at the oboe parts to be unnecessary in this movement, for here the oboes double the strings). We know Penzel copied from a set of parts from the fact that he initially made a score with four staves for the first trio and entitled it "Trio a 3 Hautb. et Bassono." He entered measures 1-2 of the third oboe part to the main *Menuet* into the third staff of the trio before he discovered his mistake, and he then changed the "3" in his heading to a "2." In the main minuet Penzel notated the three oboe

third oboe part in the cantata is scored throughout for "taille" (notated in the alto clef, with a range which is a fifth lower than that of the standard oboe). Also, the cantata calls for the participation of cello and "Violono groÙo" (a string bass evidently playing an octave below the cello) in the continuo, while the sinfonia, with one less bass line in the score, makes no mention of 16'-instruments (the continuo line is designated merely "Fondam[ento].") In this connection it is important to notice that in the Margrave's score of the First Brandenburg Concerto it appears from the darker shade of ink, from the traces of a slightly thicker quill, and from the minor discrepancy with his title heading, that Bach later added "è Violono groÙo" to his original designation of "Continuo" at the bottom line of the score. In other words, a 16' violone may not have been employed in the early version of the concerto.²⁵ But the instrument was present in the first version of the Hunt Cantata, where the designation "Cont. è Violono grosso" appears to have been entered into the composing score at one sitting.²⁶

It is true that there is some similarity of mood and style between the horn writing in the cantata and in at least the ritornello section of the first movement of the sinfonia. However, the style and mood of the writing in the episodes of the sinfonia at times differ rather strikingly from those of the cantata. (See, for example, the uncharacteristic horn-writing of the fourth-species counterpoint from measures 36 and 65 in the sinfonia). What separates the horn parts of the two works even more significantly is the difference in their technical demands. Both works certainly feature virtuosic writing for the first horn players. But the cantata stays within the middle range of the instrument (sounding f-d"), while the sinfonia goes beyond this range in both directions (sounding c-f"). That is, in addition to the pitches called for in the cantata, the sinfonia calls for the third partial and repeatedly calls for partials 14, 15,

parts and the violin and viola parts into only three staves, thereby missing Bach's accommodated readings in mm. 6-7. The alto clef was corrected from a treble clef (but the key signature was entered at the outset in the alto-clef position), and the "Corno 2" staff at first read "Hautb. 1" (this is further evidence that Penzel was copying from parts).

²⁵The slightly different version of the first movement of the First Brandenburg Concerto (and, as in the Penzel sinfonia, without the *violino piccolo*) that was used in 1726 as the opening movement of the cantata *Falsche Welt, dir traue ich nicht*, BWV 52, does not call specifically for the participation of violone in either the autograph score (Mus. ms. Bach P 85, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin) or the separate performance parts (Mus. ms. Bach St 30, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin).

²⁶Dreyfus, *Bach's Continuo Group*, pp. 153-156, has shown that 16' violones did not appear in Bach's works conceived for performance in Weimar (remember that the Hunt Cantata was conceived for performance in Weißenfels). The philological observations on the violone parts in the Hunt Cantata and the First Brandenburg Concerto are taken from Dreyfus's same discussion.

and 16 (this is the *clarino* range).²⁷ And, unlike the cantata, it calls for both pitches of the eleventh partial, sounding b'-flat and b'-natural. The ranges of the second horn parts are more similar, namely sounding f-d" in the sinfonia and f-c" in the cantata. That is, in addition to the pitches called for in the cantata, the sinfonia calls for the sharper pitch of the thirteenth partial (d"), and, unlike the cantata, calls for both pitches of the eleventh partial (b'-flat and b'-natural). In short, since the technical demands of the sinfonia are significantly greater than those of the cantata, it appears unlikely that the two works were conceived together for the same occasion.²⁸ Consider the following assessment by the natural-horn player and historian Horace Fitzpatrick:²⁹

... the horn parts in Brandenburg No. 1 demonstrate the remarkable advancement in technique which horn-playing had reached by this time [Fitzpatrick assumes that the First Brandenburg Concerto was conceived in 1719 in Köthen with guest players from the nearby court at Barby in mind, whose appearance at the Köthen court in 1721 is documented], ... In sheer point of facility these parts show a considerable gain over those of the *Jagdkantate* [the Hunt Cantata, *BWV* 208] which Bach had written only three years earlier [Fitzpatrick assumes that the cantata was conceived in 1716 for Weimar with the technical abilities of the guest players of the Weißenfels court in mind] ... Both the first and second parts abound with long chains of florid semiquavers; both make liberal use of the third octave; both parts bristle with leaps of fifths

²⁷In the Brandenburg Concerto version the third partial is required instead by the second horn. This is because in mm. 8-13/n1 and mm. 79-84 of the Penzel sinfonia and the corresponding measures in the version of the sinfonia for the cantata *Falsche Welt, dir traue ich nicht, BWV* 52, the first and second horn parts are switched around from the way they appear in the Brandenburg version.

²⁸It could be suggested that the cantata was conceived with the somewhat more limited capabilities of the Weißenfels players in mind and that the sinfonia with its more difficult horn parts was added to the cantata for its performance in Weimar, by which time either the technique of the Weißenfels players had greatly developed (see fn. 19 above for documentation of the guest appearance of Weimar in 1716 of two players from Weißenfels), or at which time (not 1716?) talented resident players from Weimar were available (see fn. 14 above). The possibility that this version of the sinfonia was later inserted into the cantata remains unlikely, however, when the several differences in the scoring for the cantata and sinfonia (particularly the third oboe parts), and accurate text-critical information are taken into consideration (on the latter, see the discussion below).

²⁹*The Horn and Horn-Playing and the Austro-Bohemian Tradition from 1680-1830*, p. 66.

and octaves; and both require a degree of endurance which gives pause to even the best players of our own day.

It would not necessarily follow from the very use of the term "Sinfonia" in Penzel's score that this version of the First Brandenburg Concerto once introduced a larger, vocal work. For instance, among the independent Vivaldi works copied in Venice by Johann Georg Pisendel,³⁰ and brought back by him in the fall of 1717 to Dresden (where Bach was a September 1717 visitor), there is a three-movement "Sinfonia di Sig. Vivaldi [RV 146]," a concordance of which is found in Schwerin carrying the designation "Concerto à 4."³¹ According to a recent study of the Neapolitan opera sinfonia, the terms "sinfonia" and "concerto" appear to have been more or less synonymous in early eighteenth-century Naples (consider, for example, Alessandro Scarlatti's 1715 collection *Sinfonie di concerto grosso*).³² A similar point has also been made for the instrumental repertory at the Dresden court.³³ In sum, we should not feel compelled to believe that Vivaldi's independently transmitted instrumental sinfonias all belonged with vocal works that are now lost. The question remains, of course, whether Bach would use the term to refer to non-introductory instrumental works. The only examples we have of this (apart from the possibility of the Penzel version to the First Brandenburg

³⁰Pisendel took Telemann concerto parts in Bach's handwriting to Dresden; see Schulze, *Studien zur Bach-Überlieferung im 18. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig: Edition Peters, 1984), p. 165.

³¹See Karl Heller, *Die deutsche Überlieferung der Instrumentalwerke Vivaldis* (Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1971), p. 149, for information on the Dresden and Schwerin manuscripts of Vivaldi's G-major sinfonia, RV 146 (on pp. 26-27 Heller dates Pisendel's score to his 1716-1717 stay in Venice on the basis of its watermark). There are other examples of the apparently equivalent use of "sinfonia" and "concerto" in Vivaldi. For example, the F-major sinfonia, RV 140, is called "Sinf^a Concerto" in the Turin autograph (see Peter Ryom, *Répertoire des Oeuvres d'Antonio Vivaldi: Les compositions instrumentales* [Copenhagen: Engstrøm & Sødring, 1986], pp. 201-202). The E-minor sinfonia, RV 134, was first marked "Con^{to}" ("concerto") by Vivaldi and later changed, by Vivaldi, to "Sinf^a" (see Ryom, *Répertoire*, p. 197). And a copy in Turin of the C-major violin concerto, RV 192, carries the title "Sinfonia à 4" (see Ryom, *Répertoire*, pp. 251-252).

³²See Helmut Hell, *Die Neapolitanische Opernsinfonie in der ersten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Tutzing: H. Schneider, 1971), p. 99.

³³See Ortrun Landmann, "Marginalien zur Dresdener Höfischen Kammermusik zwischen 1720 und 1763," *Studien zur Aufführungspraxis und Interpretation von Instrumentalmusik des 18. Jahrhunderts*, Heft 23, *Musikzentren und Musikpersönlichkeiten in der 1. Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Eitelfriedrich Thom (Michaelstein/Blankenburg: Die Kultur- und Forschungsstätte, 1984), pp. 11-18, at p. 13. On the other hand, Karl Heller, "Über die Beziehungen zwischen einigen Concerto- und Sinfonia-Sätzen Vivaldis," *Informazioni e studi vivaldiani* 4 (1983): 41-60, in studying autograph materials kept in Italy, shows that while Vivaldi certainly transmits sinfonias as works independent from vocal works, he did distinguish sinfonias and concertos stylistically.

Concerto) are the fifteen Three-part Inventions, *BWV 787-801*, each of which is labeled "Sinfonia" in Bach's fair-copy Köthen manuscript (Mus. ms. Bach P 610, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin).

While Krey's observation that Bach's secular cantatas do not as a rule begin with a *secco* recitative is true, it is worth mentioning that there are at least six secular and five Bach church cantatas that do begin with recitatives. The secular cantatas include the following:³⁴

Durchlauchtster Leopold, BWV 173a
Ich bin in mir vergnügt, BWV 204
O angenehme Melodei!, BWV 210a
O holder Tag, erwünschte Zeit, BWV 210
Schweigt stille, plaudert nicht, BWV 211
Die Zeit, die Tag und Jahre macht, BWV 134a

Since Bach's extant *oeuvre* includes only about twenty-five secular cantatas, it would certainly be an exaggeration to suggest that Bach's beginning a secular cantata with a recitative would be stylistically anomalous (Krey more cautiously states that Bach does not do this "as a rule"). The church cantatas which begin with recitatives include:³⁵

Erhöhtes Fleisch und Blut, BWV 173
Ein Herz, das seinen Jesum lebend weiß, BWV 134
Mein Gott, wie lang, ach lange, BWV 155
Mein Herze schwimmt im Blut, BWV 199
Sie werden euch in den Bann tun, BWV 183

In all eleven of these cases Bach's personal scores and original orchestral parts show no signs indicating that instrumental sinfonias have been

³⁴The opening recitatives of Cantatas 173a, 210, and 210a are labelled "Ausinstrumentiertes secco" in the German literature on Bach (that is, in these cases the realization of the *recitativo basso continuo* is written out to be played by the orchestral instruments). The secular cantata *BWV 184a*, whose text does not survive, opened with a motivically accompanied recitative; see Neumann, *Handbuch der Kantaten Johann Sebastian Bachs*, p. 193.

³⁵In cantatas 173, 183, and 199 the opening recitatives are "Ausinstrumentiertes secco." The church cantatas *Er rufet seinen Schafen mit Namen, BWV 175*, and *Erwünschtes Freudenlicht, BWV 184*, open with motivically accompanied recitatives. It is unclear whether the (documented) organ improvisations directly preceding the performances of Bach's church cantatas, which were primarily designed to allow instrumentalists to tune inconspicuously, would have been considered musically substantial enough by Krey to function as a substitute for an orchestral sinfonia in reducing the supposedly weak impression of beginning a cantata with a recitative (on these improvisations, see George Stauffer, *The Organ Preludes of Johann Sebastian Bach* [Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1980], pp. 138-144).

severed from, or should be added to, the materials. Not only do the fascicle structures of the scores show no physical indications of missing material at the beginning of the manuscripts, but even more significantly, the surviving scores and parts in each case show a title for the entire work inscribed at the head of the first page of music.³⁶

It turns out that Krey's claim that the text-critical indications in the Hunt Cantata support the notion of a *sinfonia* probably preceding the *secco recitative* was based on faulty, or at least incomplete, reporting of information. Although it is true that the wrapper for Bach's personal score of the cantata is lost, still Krey had no basis for assuming that a title page would have made some clear reference to a *sinfonia* comprising the first movement of the cantata. As a matter of fact none of Bach's title pages to cantatas with introductory *sinfonias* refers to the instrumental movement.³⁷

Furthermore, Krey has incorrectly reported that Bach's instrumental designation at the beginning of the score to the Hunt Cantata as it survives today refers only to the orchestration of the first aria. The instrumental designation at the very beginning of the manuscript reads "2 Corni da Caccia. 2 Violini una Viola è Cont.," while there is a separate designation, "2 Corni è Soprano," inscribed at the head of the first aria (which is also on page 1 of the manuscript). More damaging to Krey's case is his neglecting to report the fact that the complete (autograph) designation from the top of the page clearly reads as a title to the work: "Cantata à 4 Voci, 2 Corni da Caccia. 2 Violini una Viola e Cont." Since there is a title in Bach's handwriting at the head of the first page of the cantata and since the fascicle structure of the score begins with an untorn binio, the text-critical evidence does not clearly support the idea that some material is missing from the beginning of the cantata. The only anomaly, which is irrelevant to the question of whether the *sinfonia* and the cantata ought to be linked, is Bach's failing to mention the oboes in his title. (Perhaps he was not planning to include them at the outset of his work on the composing score? They first enter at the seventh movement.)

³⁶All of these cantatas have already been printed in the appropriate volumes in the first series of *Johann Sebastian Bach, Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke* (Kassel and Leipzig: Bärenreiter), together with the text-critical reports providing the information on the headings in and fascicle structures of Bach's personal materials.

³⁷Surviving printed texts distributed for Bach's listeners to follow along also do not refer to the instrumental *sinfonias*. See the facsimiles in Werner Neumann, ed. *Sämtliche von Johann Sebastian Bach vertonte Texte* (Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1974).

For the sake of thoroughness it should also be noted that no Bach autograph cantata score that includes an instrumental overture carries a title for the work at the head of the movement directly following the sinfonia and that with one exception (see footnote 38 below), each of them carries a title for the entire work at the head of the sinfonia. The cantatas in question are the following:

- Am Abend aber desselbigen Sabbaths*, BWV 42 (Mus. ms. Bach P 55, Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Berlin)
Falsche Welt, dir trau ich nicht, BWV 52 (P 85, Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Berlin)
Geist und Seele wird verwirret, BWV 35 (P 86, SPK)
Gott soll allein mein Herze haben, BWV 169 (P 93, SPK)
Himmelskönig, sei willkommen, BWV 182 (P 103, SPK)
Ich geh und suche mit Verlangen, BWV 49 (P 111, DSB)
Ich liebe den Höchsten von ganzem Gemüte, BWV 174 (P 115, SPK)
Mer hahn en neue Oberkeet, BWV 212 (P 167, SPK)
Tritt auf die Glaubensbahn, BWV 152 (P 45, DSB)
Weinen, Klagen, Sorgen, Zagen, BWV 12 (P 44, SPK)
Wir danken dir Gott, wir danken dir, BWV 29 (P 166, DSB)³⁸

In other words, if it were not known that no extant Bach cantatas carry titles at the movements following sinfonias, the Hunt Cantata might still be considered to be missing a sinfonia, in spite of the inaccuracy of Krey's claim that the cantata as it survives lacks a title.

Schulze's suggestion that the Penzel version of the sinfonia seems musically unsatisfying and was therefore probably not intended to stand as an orchestral piece can be critically examined by addressing the text-critical problems surrounding it more fully. It is worth investigating the source from which Penzel was probably copying when he made his score in 1760. As demonstrated above (see footnote 24), his (lost) exemplar would have been a set of parts. Since that exemplar took the form of performing materials and since it seems likely that Penzel, a remarkably active copier of Bach manuscripts in the 1750s and 1760s, would simply have copied all of what he had in front of him rather than excerpting only

³⁸*Wir danken dir* carries a title neither at the head of the sinfonia nor at the head of the opening chorus. This may have been intentional, for in this case the fascicle structure is arranged in a way allowing for the possibility of separating the sinfonia from the rest of the cantata (see Robert L. Marshall, *The Compositional Process of J.S. Bach* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972], Vol. 1, p. 63).

the instrumental movements from a larger work,³⁹ someone in the first half of the eighteenth century – why not Bach? – must have believed that the version of the *sinfonia* transmitted by Penzel was "complete" (that is, musically satisfying). At this point it is important to note that Bessler's text-critical assessment of the relationship between the Penzel version of the *sinfonia* and the First Brandenburg Concerto incompletely reports the relevant information.⁴⁰ Bessler correctly reports that there are readings of the Penzel score visible beneath some of the revisions in the Margrave's score,⁴¹ but neglects to mention either that there are also readings of the Margrave score visible beneath some revisions in the autograph score to the version of the *sinfonia* introducing the 1726 cantata *Falsche Welt, dir trau ich nicht* (BWV 52) or, furthermore, that these revised readings have been transmitted in the Penzel version. In other words, the Penzel *sinfonia* is, strictly speaking, not the early version of the First Brandenburg Concerto. Rather, as Ulrich Siegele had pointed out already in 1957, the Brandenburg Concerto, the 1726 *sinfonia*, and the Penzel *sinfonia* are all revised versions separately based on a lost original. This was presumably the composing score, which apparently had the same scoring and sequence of movements as the Penzel copy.⁴² If Penzel based his score on a set of parts transmitting some revisions made by Bach in 1726, this would mean that either the set of parts came from Bach's own performing materials used in Leipzig (for example, parts for the Collegium Musicum he directed from 1729 to 1737 and from 1739 to 1741) or, a much less likely explanation, that someone else arranged the *sinfonia* from Bach materials. Either way, the *sinfonia* would have been considered "complete" by someone working before Penzel did his copying.⁴³

³⁹Penzel's copies of Bach materials are examined by Yositake Kobayashi in *Franz Hauser und seine Bach-Handschriftensammlung* (Diss.; University of Göttingen, 1973).

⁴⁰*Kritischer Bericht*, p. 37-41.

⁴¹See fn. 4 above.

⁴²Siegele's dissertation for Tübingen University has in the meantime been published as *Kompositionsweise und Bearbeitungstechnik in der Instrumentalmusik Johann Sebastian Bachs* (Neuhausen-Stuttgart: Hänssler, 1975). The detailed discussion regarding the question of the text-critical relationships between the various versions of the First Brandenburg Concerto and regarding why we should assume that the earliest version had the same scoring and sequence of movements as the Penzel copy appears on pp. 146-150. (To provide one example: the *violino piccolo* part was clearly added *ad hoc* in Bach's score sent to the Margrave of Brandenburg; there are corrections of transposition errors from a third above, especially in the slow movement, where the *violino piccolo*, taking on the first ["normal"] violin part of the Penzel version, is not doubled by the first violin in the accompanying string choir.)

⁴³Curiously, Schulze does mention that Penzel's score was based on a set of parts which were "evidently of Leipzig provenance," but does not explore the implications of this for the notion of whether the *sinfonia* is "complete" or part of a larger work like the Hunt Cantata (see „Johann Sebastian Bachs Konzert – Fragen der Überlieferung und Chronologie," p. 17). Penzel

In summary, Schulze is surely right to assume that the earliest version of the First Brandenburg Concerto is unlikely to have predated the arrival of Vivaldi's *L'estro armonico* concertos in Germany. But I think that both Geck's backdating of the sinfonia version to a time before Bach's encounter with Vivaldi and Schulze's redating it to 1716 may not hold up in the end. Both Geck and Schulze have perhaps too uncritically assumed that Bach's two works were transmitted incompletely (in Geck's case, primarily the cantata; in Schulze's, primarily the sinfonia). Although I see no obvious reason, why the sinfonia version could not have been written in Köthen,⁴⁴ I do not feel compelled to offer a specific alternative date, since my concerns in the essay to which this study serves as a follow-up were to center on exploring Bach's reception of Vivaldi's concerto form as something interesting for its own sake,⁴⁵ rather than on the use of style-

apparently copied many of his manuscripts from materials in W.F. Bach's possession; see Kobayashi, *Franz Hauser und seine Bach-Handschriftensammlung*, p. 129.

⁴⁴It is true that none of Bach's surviving Köthen works has horn parts, and of Bach's surviving works known to have been performed in Weimar, only the Hunt Cantata (see fn. 19 above) contains parts for horn. The authorship and dating of the (probably early) cantata *Lobe den Herrn, meine Seele*, BWV 143, which has three B^b-horn parts, is disputed among Bach scholars. Bach's performance parts derived from Johann Ludwig Bach's 1716 autograph manuscript of his *Missa*, BWV Anh. 166, which features hunting horns, were prepared in Leipzig, not Weimar. See Alfred Dürr, *Zur Chronologie der Leipziger Vokalwerke J.S. Bachs* [Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1976], p. 167, where the composer is identified as Johann Nikolaus Bach. The corrected ascription to Johann Ludwig comes from Hans-Joachim Schulze, „Johann Sebastian Bachs Vokalwerke in den nichtthematischen Katalogen des Hauses Breitkopf aus den Jahren 1761 bis 1836,“ paper read at the Congress of the International Musicological Society, Bologna, 1987 (publication in preparation, as reported in Kirsten Beißwenger, *Johann Sebastian Bachs Notenbibliothek* [Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1992], pp. 244 and 448). As was already mentioned above in the main text, Bach's trumpeters could very well have also played the horn. There are two trumpeters listed on the Köthen court payroll. To get a possible indication of whether they would have been talented enough to take on such difficult horn parts as those in the Sinfonia, we have for comparison only two surviving Bach works with trumpet that might have been performed by the Köthen brass players. The Second Brandenburg Concerto has a formidably difficult trumpet part. The clarino trumpet writing in the aria „Heiligste Dreieinigkeit“ from Bach's cantata *Erschallet, ihr Lieder*, BWV 172, is also fairly virtuosic. For evidence that this Weimar cantata might have been partly recopied in Köthen, see Stephen Daw (assisted by Yoshitake Kobayashi), "List of Music Attributable to Bach's Köthen Period (December 1717 to May 1723) on Positive Documentary and/or Historical Grounds," in Friedrich Smend, *Bach in Köthen*. trans. John Page, ed. and rev. Stephen Daw (St. Louis: Concordia, 1985) pp. 217-225, at p. 219. Joshua Rifkin, however, has pointed out that these parts may actually have been prepared later for a Leipzig performance of the cantata, just as scholars had previously thought; see his review of Hans-Joachim Schulze and Christoph Wolff, *Bach Compendium* (Frankfurt and New York: Peters, 1985-) in *Early Music* 17 (1989), pp. 79-88, at p. 80. There is even less to go on in comparing the oboe parts in the Sinfonia with Weimar and Köthen pieces. Three normal oboes are called for in the pre-Köthen cantatas *Der Himmel lacht! die Erde jubiliert*, BWV 31, and *Christen, ätzet diesen Tag*, BWV 63, as well as the Köthen cantata, BWV 194a (whose text is lost, but many of whose separate performing parts were reused for the Leipzig parody *Höchsterwünschtes Freudenfest*, BWV 194).

⁴⁵See fn. 5 above.

criticism for dating works whose composing scores have been lost. For the purposes of that discussion, it is necessary only to demonstrate that no text- or style-critical evidence is able clearly to contradict an interpretation of the piece as a development of concerto procedures apparently first encountered by Bach in Vivaldi's string concertos at sometime around 1713 – that is to say that new observations on chronology may emerge as corollaries rather than as the primary purposes of study.⁴⁶ In this interpretation, the Penzel sinfonia, which appears from the text-critical evidence to have been a self-contained work, may be seen as the first layer in one of Bach's novel applications of Vivaldian concerto style, and the First Brandenburg Concerto may be seen as a revision and expansion of that initial idea.⁴⁷

⁴⁶In my essays "Relationships between Scoring and Structure in the First Movement of Bach's Sixth Brandenburg Concerto," *Music and Letters* 71 (1990): 494-504 and „Beziehungen zwischen der Besetzung und dem Satzaufbau im ersten Satz des sechsten Brandenburgischen Konzerts von Johann Sebastian Bach,“ *Beiträge zur Bach Forschung* 9-10 (1991): 104-28, for example, a much later than usually cited dating for the Sixth Brandenburg Concerto emerges as a corollary to the interpretation of the relationships between structure and scoring rather than as the central point of the discussion.

⁴⁷All of this is not to say, however, that the Penzel sinfonia (in spite of differences in scoring for the sinfonia) cannot have been performed in connection with any of Bach's various presentations of the Hunt Cantata (in spite of lack of any evidence for musical expansion at the beginning of the cantata). Apart from the performances already mentioned above, the cantata was also performed in the 1740s (most likely 1742) for August III of Saxony; see Yoshitake Kobayashi, „Zur Chronologie der Spätwerke Johann Sebastian Bachs. Kompositions- und Aufführungstätigkeiten von 1736 bis 1750,“ *Bach-Jahrbuch* 74 (1988): 7-72, at p. 48. The usefulness of this exercise lies rather in showing that there are many more significant problems associated with making the connection to the first performance of the cantata than is generally believed. A partly similar process of revision and expansion of an earlier, shorter version of a Brandenburg Concerto can be seen in the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto; a situation which is discussed in my essay "Bach's Brandenburg Concertos as a Meaningful Set," *Musical Quarterly* 77 (1993): 215-257.