

Edition Eulenburg
No. 818

J. S. BACH

OUVERTURE (SUITE) No. 3

D major/D-Dur/Ré majeur
BWV 1068



Eulenburg

JOHANN SEBASTIAN BACH

OUVERTURE (SUITE)
No. 3

D major/D-Dur/Ré majeur
BWV 1068

Edited by
Harry Newstone



Ernst Eulenburg Ltd

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

CONTENTS

Preface	III
Vorwort	V
Préface	VII
I. Ouverture	1
II. Air	23
III. Gavotte 1	25
Gavotte 2	28
IV. Bourrée	31
V. Gigue	34
Appendices	40

© 2009 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 'Overture' 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 Bessler who, with Hans Grüss, edited these works for the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*, suggests that there may well have been others, now lost, a proposition rejected by Werner Breig in a more recent article on the Bach Suites.¹ 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 'Ouvverturen' 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

¹ Werner Breig, 'The Instrumental Music' (translated by Stewart Spencer), in *The Cambridge Companion to Bach*, ed. John Butt (Cambridge, 1997), 133

² Heinrich Bessler and Hans Grüss in *Neue Bach Ausgabe*, Kritischer Bericht (Critical Report) (Kassel, 1967), 13–16

³ *The Cambridge Companion to Bach*, op. cit., 135

IV

to indicate – as has often been stated –’, writes Daw, ‘that any of these works were composed before Bach’s arrival in Leipzig in May 1723’.⁴ Breig supports this possibility and points out that all the surviving sources for the suites originated in Leipzig and proposes the following chronology:

The principal source of Suite No. 1 [...] almost certainly dates from his first year in office; in its original form, Suite No. 4 [...] must have been completed before Christmas 1725; Suite No. 3 [...] survives in a set of parts dating from 1731; and Suite No. 2 [...] survives in an MS from around 1738/9.⁵

Penzel’s copies have survived and among them is a set of parts (source C) and a score (source D) in which the difficult first violin part in the first movement (bars 42–58 and 71–89) and the whole first violin part of the *Air* are marked to be played by a solo violin (Violino Concertato). We do not know the source from which Penzel made his copies; it may well have been the original Cöthen material but with so little else changed in these movements it is possible to speculate an authentic basis for this version. It is worth noting that the solo violin part is more comprehensively phrased than the first violin part of the ‘tutti’ version – a circumstance which may afford additional insight into some of the performing conventions of the period – particularly where slurring was clearly

expected of the performer though not always specifically indicated. These variants are shown in our edition as Appendices A, B and C.

The Suite No. 3, which Breig suggests may originally have been written for strings only, dates, in its final form, from around 1731. Among the sources listed in the *NBA*’s Critical Report (Sources A–D), source a is a set of parts in which the first violin part and the continuo parts of the Bourrée and the Gigue are in Bach’s hand, the whole of the second violin is in C. P. E. Bach’s hand, the rest of Violin I and continuo were written by Johann Ludwig Krebs (who became Bach’s pupil in 1726) and the remaining parts by an unidentified copyist. Our edition is based on sources A, C, and D; source B is a handwritten score with a pencilled figured bass and is textually virtually identical with source A. All of these sources are located in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv.

Editorial slurs – shown here as broken ligatures – are added on the basis of parallel parts or by analogy with prevailing phrasing elsewhere in the movement, e.g. Gavotte 2 bar 6ff, violins and oboes. Editorial dynamics and trills etc., are shown in square brackets. Trumpets and Timpani are shown in D throughout.

Harry Newstone

⁴ Stephen Daw, notes to J.S.Bach, ‘The Four Orchestral Suites’, The Brandenburg Consort/Roy Goodman (Hyperion CDD 22002, 1991)

⁵ *The Cambridge Companion to Bach*, op. cit., 134

VORWORT

Vom Beginn des 17. Jahrhunderts bis zu dem Moment, als sich Johann Sebastian Bach der Orchestersuite zuwandte, hatten schon verschiedene Komponisten zur Entwicklung dieser Gattung beigetragen. Hier ist vor allem Johann Rosenmüller (um 1619–1684) zu nennen, ein Vorgänger Bachs an der Thomasschule in Leipzig. Er wurde dort 1642 stellvertretender Kantor und veröffentlichte drei Jahre später sein erstes Werk, eine Sammlung von instrumentalen Tänzen mit dem Titel *Paduanen, Alemanen, Couranten, Balletten, Sarabanden mit 3 Stimmen und ihren Basso pro Organo*.

Aber auch andere deutsche Komponisten schufen instrumentale Tanzsuiten; so z. B. Johann Caspar Fischer (um 1665–1746), dessen Opus 1 *Le Journal de printemps* (eine von acht Ouvertüren-Suiten dieses Komponisten) 1695 gedruckt wurde, und später Georg Philipp Telemann (1681–1767) sowie Johann Friedrich Fasch (1688–1758). Fasch, ein Schüler von Bachs unmittelbarem Vorgänger Johann Kuhnau (1660–1722), schrieb eine Anzahl von Orchestersuiten, in denen er seinem Vorbild Telemann nacheiferte. Bei ihm ist aber auch, wie bei vielen seiner zeitgenössischen, deutschen Komponistenkollegen, die meisterhafte Präsenz Jean-Baptiste Lullys (1632–1687) erkennbar. Diese zeigt sich nicht zuletzt in der Neuerung, den Tanzsätzen eine imposante „Ouvertüre“ voranzustellen, von der diese Form möglicherweise auch ihren Namen hat. Fasch, der später in die Dienste des Grafen Morzin zu Lukawitz in Böhmen trat (desjenigen Grafen also, der 1759 Joseph Haydn seine erste Musikdirektorenstelle gab), wurde von Bach, der mehrere seiner Orchestersuiten abschrieb, sehr bewundert.

Von Bach selbst sind nur vier Orchestersuiten überliefert. Heinrich Bessler, der diese Werke zusammen mit Hans Grüss in der *Neuen Bach Ausgabe* (NBA) edierte, vermutete allerdings, dass es möglicherweise mehr Werke gegeben habe, die nun aber verschollen seien.

Diese These wurde jedoch von Werner Breig in einem Artikel über Bachs Suiten zurückgewiesen.¹ Von den vier überlieferten Werken existieren lediglich Stimmen (einige davon in Bachs Handschrift) sowie einige Partituren, die von Kopisten stammen. Die autographen Partituren sind verschollen. Ein Großteil unseres ohnehin begrenzten Wissens über die Suiten Nr. 2, 3 und 4 scheinen wir dem Eifer Christian Friedrich Penzels (1737–1801) zu verdanken. Er war seit 1751 (dem Jahr nach Bachs Tod) Schüler an der Thomasschule und kopierte die dort von ihm vorgefundenen Manuskripte Bachs.

Deshalb können wir weder über die Entstehungsdaten noch die Kompositionsreihenfolge gesicherte Aussagen machen. Die Herausgeber der NBA vertreten die These, dass sie in der uns heute bekannten Folge komponiert wurden, wobei sie hinsichtlich der Datierung von den folgenden Annäherungswerten ausgingen: Nr. 1 (BWV 1066) 1718, Nr. 2 (BWV 1067) 1721, Nr. 3 (BWV 1068) 1722, Nr. 4 (BWV 1069) 1723.² Damit würden die Entstehungszeiten der Suiten (oder „Ouvertüren“, wie sie Bach nannte), den Brandenburgischen Konzerten vergleichbar, noch in Bachs Köthener Zeit fallen. Zu diesem Zeitpunkt fehlten in der 4. Suite noch die Trompeten und Pauken. Sie wurden erst Weihnachten 1725 in Leipzig ergänzt, als Bach den ersten Satz für den Eröffnungschor der Kantate BWV 110 *Unser Mund sei voller Lachens* umarbeitete. Es ist ferner möglich, dass auch die Trompeten und Pauken der 3. Suite erst in der Leipziger Zeit ergänzt wurden, doch lassen sich dafür keine direkten Hinweise finden. Breig vermutet sogar, die 3. Suite sei ursprünglich nur für Streicher geschrieben worden.³

¹ Werner Breig, „The Instrumental Music“, in: *The Cambridge Companion to Bach*, hrsg. v. John Butt, Cambridge 1997, S. 133 (ins Englische übersetzt von Stewart Spencer).

² Heinrich Bessler und Hans Grüss, *Neue Bach Ausgabe*, Kritischer Bericht, Kassel 1967, S. 13–16.

³ Werner Breig, a. a. O., S. 135.