

## JOHANN SEBASTIAN BACH

## OUVERTURE (SUITE) No. 1

C major/C-Dur/Ut majeur BWV 1066

Edited by/Herausgegeben von Harry Newstone



Ernst Eulenburg Ltd

London · Mainz · Madrid · New York · Paris · Prague · Tokyo · Toronto · Zürich

## **CONTENTS**

Preface	Ш
Vorwort	V
Préface V	ΊI
I. Ouverture	1
II. Courante	14
III. Gavotte 1 alternativement	16
Gavotte 2	17
IV. Forlane	18
V. Menuet 1 alternativement	19
Menuet 2	20
VI. Bourée 1 alternativement	21
Bourée 2	22
VII. Passepied 1 alternativement	23
Passepied 2	24

© 2017 Ernst Eulenburg & Co GmbH, Mainz for Europe excluding the British Isles Ernst Eulenburg Ltd, London for all other countries

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the publisher:

Ernst Eulenburg Ltd 48 Great Marlborough Street London W1F 7BB

## **PREFACE**

From early in the 17th century until the form engaged the interest of Johann Sebastian Bach, various composers had contributed to the development of the orchestral suite, notably and one of the first, Johann Rosenmüller (c.1619–1684), a predecessor of Bach's at the Thomasschule in Leipzig where he was appointed assistant master in 1642 and where, three years later, he published his first work – a collection of instrumental dances entitled *Paduanen*, *Alemanden*, *Couranten*, *Balletten*, *Sarabanden mit 3 Stimmen und ihren Basso pro Organo*.

Other German composers, among them Johann Caspar Ferdinand Fischer (c.1665–1746) whose Op.1 of 8 Overture-Suites Journal de printemps was published in 1695, and later Georg Philipp Telemann (1681–1767) and Johann Friedrich Fasch (1688–1758) also produced instrumental suites of dances. Fasch, who was to become a scholar at the Thomasschule under Bach's immediate predecessor, Johann Kuhnau (1660–1722), wrote a number of orchestral suites in emulation of his admired Telemann and behind so many of his German contemporaries can be discerned the masterful presence of Jean-Baptiste Lully (1632–1687), not least in the innovation of preceding his dances with an imposing 'Ouverture' from which the form eventually took its name. Fasch, later to go into the service of Count Morzin of Lukavec, Bohemia, (who was in 1759 to give Joseph Haydn his first Music-Directorship) was much admired by Bach who hand-copied a number of Fasch's orchestral suites.

From Bach himself, only four such suites have come down to us although Heinrich Besseler who, with Hans Grüss, edited these works for the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*, suggest that there may well have been others, now lost, a proposition rejected by Werner Breig in a more recent article on the Bach Suites. Of the four survivors, only

sets of parts (some in Bach's hand) and some copyists' scores are extant, the original autograph scores having disappeared. It would seem that we owe a good deal of our limited knowledge of the Suites Nos. 2, 3 and 4 to the diligence of Christian Friedrich Penzel (1737–1801) who was a student at the Thomasschule from 1751 (the year after Bach's death) and who made copies of Bach manuscripts he found there.

Thus, neither the dates nor the order of composition of the suites can be established with any certainty. The NBA editors suggest that they were composed in the order by which we know them today with the following approximate dates: No. 1 (BWV 1066) 1718, No. 2 (BWV 1067) 1721, No. 3 (BWV 1068) 1722, and No. 4 (BWV 1069) 1723.2 This would place the suites (or 'Ouverturen' as Bach called them), like the Brandenburg Concertos, in the composer's Cöthen period at which time No. 4 lacked the trumpets and timpani which were added in Leipzig at Christmas 1725 when the first movement was adapted for the opening chorus of the Cantata BWV 110, Unser Mund sei voll Lachens. It is possible that the trumpet parts and timpani of the Suite No. 3 were also added later in Leipzig but there is no direct evidence to support this. Breig even suggests that the Suite No. 3 may originally have been written for strings only.3

An alternative and quite different chronology for these works is proposed by Stephen Daw, placing the Suite No. 3 in its original version first in order of composition 'by 1724' and the fourth suite in its first version, and the Suite No. 1, 'by the end of 1724', the final version of No. 4 being completed 'c.1729', and the Suite No. 3 'adapted to form its final version' between 'c.1729–31'. '[...] we have no evidence to indicate – as has often been stated – ', writes

Werner Breig, 'The Instrumental Music' (translated by Stewart Spencer), in *The Cambridge Companion to Bach*, ed. John Butt (Cambridge, 1997), 133

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Heinrich Besseler and Hans Grüss in *Neue Bach Ausgabe*, Kritischer Bericht (Critical Report) (Kassel, 1967), 13–16

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> The Cambridge Companion, op.cit., 135