

## C. P. E. BACH, CONCERTOS W. 4–6: INTRODUCTION

Edited here are the first three concertos for solo keyboard and strings that Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach composed at Berlin. These works date from 1738, 1739, and 1740, respectively, years that saw Bach move to Berlin and enter the service of King Friedrich II “the Great” of Prussia.<sup>1</sup> Although Bach is known to have previously composed three concertos as a student at Leipzig and Frankfurt-on-the-Oder, the present works are the first products of an extraordinary creative development that would continue in the twenty-two further concertos that Bach would compose or revise at Berlin and Potsdam through the 1740s. Only within the domain of the keyboard sonata would he produce a greater number of works during this period.

Although written at the beginning of Bach's professional career, these are not tentative or student works. They reveal a youthful but fully mature composer brilliantly expanding the vocabulary of a new genre in each new work. One inspiration for this outburst of creativity doubtless was furnished by his father, in particular the eight completed keyboard concertos that Johann Sebastian Bach copied into a fair-copy manuscript around 1738, the same year as W. 4.<sup>2</sup> A second would have been the artistic, social, and economic ferment of Berlin during the period when Prince Friedrich, now securely in the good graces of his father Friedrich Wilhelm II, was preparing to take the throne. He did so on 31 May 1740, and among his first acts as king was the re-establishment of a royal band (*Capelle*), chiefly to perform opera in the capital city Berlin but also to provide music for the king's private concerts there and at Potsdam and elsewhere. Friedrich's activities as a flutist and composer are well known, having been described in numerous accounts.<sup>3</sup> These make it clear that his musical activity as king was a continuation of that as crown prince at Rheinsberg and Ruppin, where Bach may at least occasionally have joined the small group of exceptional musicians who had already been officially engaged.<sup>4</sup> Among these were

---

<sup>1</sup> Dates and places of composition for Bach's works are established by the *Verzeichniß des musikalischen Nachlasses des verstorbenen Capellmeisters Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* (Hamburg, 1790), hereafter NV 1700; facsimile edition by Rachel Wade as *The Catalog of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach's Estate: A Facsimile of the Edition by Schniebes, Hamburg, 1790* (New York: Garland, 1981) (hereafter NV 1790). The present works are nos. 4, 5, and 7 in NV 1790. Bach mentions the year of his move to Berlin (1738) in the autobiography that was inserted into Charles Burney, *Tagebuch einer musikalischen Reise*, 3 vols., translated by Christoph Daniel Ebeling and Johann Joachim Christoph Bode (Hamburg, 1772–3); see 3: 199.

<sup>2</sup> See *Johann Sebastian Bach: Konzerte für Cembalo*, edited by Werner Breig, in *Johann Sebastian Bach: Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke*, vol. VII/4 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1999), ix. A ninth concerto remains a fragment. The original dates of composition for the works are unknown; most are thought to be arrangements of concertos originally for violin or another melody instrument.

<sup>3</sup> Best known is that of Burney, describing the king's cultivation of music near the end of his reign (*Tagebuch*, 55ff., especially 109–11; pp. 180–2 in the modern edition by Percy Scholes of the original English: *An Eighteenth-Century Musical Tour in Central Europe and the Netherlands*, London: Oxford University Press, 1959). Accounts of court music-making earlier in Friedrich's career depict more lively and varied activity.

<sup>4</sup> Bach explains in his autobiography that he did not “formally” (*förmlich*) enter royal service until 1740, but he had been called to Ruppin in 1738 and he implies that he accompanied Friedrich during the interim on an unofficial basis.

the violinists Johann Gottlieb Graun and Franz Benda and the tenor (and cellist) Carl Heinrich Graun, who would become the core of Friedrich's *Capelle*. Many more musicians were added to the group after the Friedrich's accession as king, including the flutist and composer Johann Joachim Quantz. Close and continuous work with so many talented composers and performers, several others of whom also wrote keyboard concertos, would have provided heady stimulation to a young virtuoso.<sup>5</sup>

Apart from their date and place of composition, nothing is known about the origins of the works edited here: for whom they were composed, when and where they were first performed. None are now preserved in the surviving portion of the royal music collection, and this would appear to confirm reports from the end of Friedrich's reign that the repertory of his private concerts was limited to his own compositions and those of Quantz. However, as Mary Oleskiewicz has shown, allegations that the king disliked Bach's music (and even Bach personally) are based on late accounts and anecdotes and may not reflect the reality especially of the king's early years.<sup>6</sup> It is possible that at least W. 6 (together with the double concerto W. 46) was composed after Friedrich had become king, perhaps even for a performance associated in some way with his accession; one further concerto, W. 7 in A, would follow during 1740.

In any case, performances involving the king were by no means the only venue for performances of instrumental music at Berlin during this period. The queen and the queen mother sponsored their own palace concerts, as eventually did other members of the royal family. Even before 1740 at least one semi-public concert series had apparently been organized by a future member of the royal *Capelle*. Others would follow, although details of their repertory, personnel, and performance venue and audience remain obscure.<sup>7</sup> Presumably Bach's music would have been heard in these concerts and elsewhere as well, for unlike Quantz he is not known to have been under any obligation to withhold new compositions for the private use of the king (or any other

---

<sup>5</sup> Of the members of Friedrich's *Capelle* in the early years, at least three—Carl Heinrich Graun, Christoph Nichelmann, and Christoph Schaffrath—were significant composers of keyboard concertos. Dates of their works in this genre have not been established. Jane R. Stevens, *The Bach Family and the Keyboard Concerto: The Evolution of a Genre* (Warren, Mich.: Harmonie Park Press, 2001), 111n. 18, questions the traditional assumption that C. H. Graun was composer of all of the twenty-odd keyboard concertos attributed to “Graun,” allowing that some could be by his brother Johann Gottlieb. Mary Oleskiewicz has argued that Quantz exerted significant influence on C. P. E. Bach; see “Quantz and the Flute at Dresden: His Instruments, His Repertory, and Their Significance for the *Versuch* and the Bach Circle” (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1998), 437–47. An apparent echo of a recently discovered work by Quantz occurs in W. 5, where a recurring phrase in the opening ritornello of the third movement (mm. 2–7) resembles a passage in Quantz's flute quartet no. 2, third movement, mm. 68–73 (flute).

<sup>6</sup> See “Like Father, Like Son? Emanuel Bach and the Writing of Biography,” in *Music and Its Questions: Essays in Honor of Peter Williams*, edited by Thomas Donahue (Richmond, Va.: Organ Historical Society Press, forthcoming).

<sup>7</sup> Johann Gottlieb Janitsch reportedly began a concert series at Ruppín which was continued as the “Friday Academy” at Berlin. Information about this and other early Berlin concert series derives chiefly from the brief account in Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg, *Historisch-Kritische Beyträge zur Aufnahme der Musik*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1754; facsimile, Hildesheim: Olms, 1970), 386ff.

individual).<sup>8</sup> References to concerts appear occasionally in eighteenth-century documents, including Bach's letters; although not nearly as informative as we would like them to be, these sources suggest that Bach participated in numerous concerts both at court and elsewhere during his Berlin years.<sup>9</sup>

That the present works, in addition, had a relatively wide circulation, is shown by their survival in a somewhat larger number of eighteenth-century manuscript copies than is typical for Bach's concertos. These copies reveal, by their varying dates and provenances, that even Bach's first Berlin concertos circulated widely in Germany for some fifty years or more after their composition. Moreover, during the 1740s Bach must have established a working method in which copies of his works were made available for sale in manuscript copies; although he could not control subsequent copying and dissemination of his music, he could encourage purchasers to deal directly with him by revising earlier compositions and selling only the latest version. Direct evidence for this practice comes only from much later in his career, but NV 1790 records the *Erneuerung* during the 1740s of most of the extant works that he had composed previously. The German term, commonly translated as “revised,” evidently referred to a thorough recasting of the music that affected both its formal structure and the musical surface, bringing both up-to-date stylistically. In effect, Bach reworked earlier compositions into the styles and forms that he had adopted by the early 1740s, refining harmony and texture (especially by simplifying the four-part polyphony of some works), adding melodic embellishment and performance indications such as ornament signs and slurs, and, in some cases, eliminating or replacing entire passages, or otherwise altering the form of a movement.

Of the present concertos, only W. 5 is listed in NV 1790 as having undergone *Erneuerung*. It is one of just two of Bach's Berlin concertos for which such a procedure is recorded, in both cases long after the initial composition.<sup>10</sup> But in fact all three of the works edited here exist in multiple versions, differing from W. 5 only in that the reworking involved no substantial insertions or deletions of material. In all three works, the revisions are similar to those that took place in keyboard sonatas and other works of the 1730s and 1740s.<sup>11</sup> Only the *Erneuerung* of W. 5 is

---

<sup>8</sup> So Quantz wrote in an autobiographical letter sent to Padre Giovanni Battista Martini in 1762, now in Bologna; edited in Horst Augsbach, *Thematisch-systematisches Werkverzeichnis der Werke Johann Joachim Quantz* (Stuttgart: Carus, 1997), 267.

<sup>9</sup> See, for example, the references to a concert performance of the Concerto W. 11 and to an unidentified “trio” (probably an obbligato-keyboard sonata) performed with the violinist Franz Benda “numerous times at court” (*merhmals bey dem Hofe*), in the description of sources for W. 4. Christoph Henzel, “Das Konzertleben der Preussischen Hauptstadt 1740–1786 im Spiegel der Berliner Presse (Teil 1),” in *Jahrbuch des Staatlichen Instituts für Musikforschung Preußischer Kulturbesitz 2004* (Mainz: Schott, 2005), 216–91, lists numerous performances involving the royal *Capelle*, of which Bach was a member, at the palaces of members of the royal family from 1741 through 1757.

<sup>10</sup> W. 5, composed in 1740, was *erneuert* in 1762, and the A-minor concerto W. 21 of 1747 was “renewed” even later, in 1775, eight years after the composer's move from Berlin to Hamburg.

<sup>11</sup> Details are given in the Critical Report. The most extensive study of Bach's revisions in the concertos remains Rachel Wade, *The Keyboard Concertos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach*, Studies in Musicology, no. 48 (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1981). For an overview of Bach's approaches to melodic embellishment,

dated, but its earliest revision is likely to have taken place in the mid-1740s, when many other works were revised.

It is not known why Bach “renewed” W. 5 in 1762, at a time when he was mainly occupied with the composition of sonatinas for keyboard and orchestra. The latter, although superficially resembling his concertos, constituted a new genre that is best described as a sort of divertimento in which the keyboard soloist alternates with a larger ensemble. Lighter in manner and simpler formally than the concertos, the sonatinas must have reflected changes in concert life as Berlin and Prussia emerged from the Seven Years' War. Thus it is somewhat surprising to find Bach revising W. 5, a very different sort of work, at the same time; perhaps an explanation for this will emerge in further research.

The present edition presents the latest known version of each work, followed by the earliest version documented in surviving sources. Intermediate states are described in the list of variant readings for each work. Although reliable sources survive for the latest versions, the nearly complete loss of Bach's own material for these works, whether in the form of composing scores, revision copies, or performing parts, presents difficulties for understanding the early history of these works. The early versions as edited here are meant to correspond not to Bach's first draft, that is, his lost composing score, but to the form in which the works would first have been disseminated, either in scores or in parts copied from early states of the composing score. Such a source appears to exist only for W. 5. But by comparing several different manuscript copies of each work, and through knowledge of Bach's practices of revision in other compositions of the period, it is possible to reconstruct texts for W. 4 and 6 that are probably close to those which the composer first offered to the public. In reconstructing these early versions, doublings that might have been left implicit in the composing score are fully notated, and continuo figures and other essential performance signs are included.

### **Sources and the format of the scores**

Bach's revisions, although musically compelling, had the effect of assimilating both the notation and the style of the music to those of later works. Because the present works come at the beginning of a new phase in Bach's musical and professional career, it cannot be assumed that they originally resembled later works either musically or in the physical characteristics of their lost composing manuscripts.

Modern views of Bach's keyboard concertos have been shaped by the nearly uniform format of the eight such works published by the composer himself, and by the similar format of the manuscript copies collected during the late eighteenth century by the Schwerin organist Johann Jacob Heinrich Westphal. The latter assembled a nearly complete collection of Bach's works, the greatest number of them obtained from the composer and his heirs in accurate manuscript copies of performing parts. Most of these were made expressly for Westphal by Bach's chief Hamburg music copyist, Johann Heinrich Michel. Of the present works, Michel was responsible for the sole

---

variation, and form, see David Schulenberg, *The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1984), especially chaps. 4–6. Darrell Berg analyzes the revisions affecting one work, the keyboard sonata W. 65/9, in “Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs Umarbeitungen seiner Clavier-sonaten,” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 74 (1988): 123–161.

manuscript copy of the late version of W. 6, and he was involved in the preparation of copies of W. 4 and 5 as well. In addition, a manuscript copy in the same format incorporating autograph revisions and corrections exists for W. 4 (see Plate 1). Each of these copies consists of a single keyboard part accompanied by parts for two violins, viola, and “basso” (the exact designation of the last part varies). The keyboard part includes basso continuo figures in the ritornellos and other “tutti” passages, indicating that the soloist switched to a role as accompanist in the latter. All parts are carefully marked with performance indications, that is, signs for dynamics, articulation, and ornaments.

But such copies, all relatively late in date, do not reflect the original versions of these works. Moreover, even the late copies contain indications that the soloist, rather than accompanying during ritornellos, originally doubled the first violin (and bass) and sometimes even the inner string parts. There are also indications that these works might have been initially conceived, at least in principle, for an ensemble that contained two keyboard instruments, one of which served as soloist, the other as a ripieno part providing the continuo accompaniment.<sup>12</sup> There is evidence that Sebastian's keyboard concertos, created or at least revised during the same period as these, were similarly conceived.<sup>13</sup> In the fair-copy autograph scores of the latter, the solo part generally doubles the first violin and bass in tutti passages, and the same sort of doubling is indicated by shorthand notation in some of the surviving manuscript scores of the present works (see Plates 3, 4, 10).<sup>14</sup> Similar doublings by the soloist were a normal convention in the concertos for violin and other instruments that had furnished the model for the keyboard concerto; the modern concept of the solo concerto as a work in which soloist alternates with a larger ensemble, rather than emerging from the latter, evolved subsequently. A keyboard concerto differed in that its soloist could double not just the first violin but the bass and sometimes the entire texture of the accompanying ensemble. Hence in concertos by both J. S. and C. P. E. Bach, the keyboard player alone can play nearly all of the essential music of the work. The strings furnish a ripieno in the original sense of the word, doubling and accompanying the soloist with lines that are not strictly necessary, at least not at a basic level of musical coherence.

That this concept was changing during Emanuel's lifetime is clear from the incorporation of basso continuo figures into the part for the soloist, who evidently ceased doubling the upper string parts at an early point in the compositional history of the present works. Yet many manuscript keyboard parts continue to call for such doublings, sometimes together with, sometimes in place of continuo figures (see Plates 5, 10). Although these parts may have been sometimes used for

---

<sup>12</sup> In the work that followed W. 5, the double concerto W. 46, both keyboard instruments serve as soloists. The latter work thus might have differed from the ordinary concertos just as J. S. Bach's *Saint Matthew Passion* differed from his *Saint John Passion*: the ripieno, whether a second keyboard player or an entire second group of singers and instrumentalists, became an equal partner in a more ambitiously scored work. On this aspect of Sebastian Bach's work, see Daniel Melamed, “The Double Chorus in J. S. Bach's *Saint Matthew Passion* BWV 244,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57 (2004): 3–50.

<sup>13</sup> A separate figured continuo part survives for one of J. S. Bach's keyboard concertos, BWV 1055 in A; facsimile in Breig, xii.

<sup>14</sup> The shorthand generally consists of a *custos*, indicating the first note of the doubled passage, and often a verbal indication as well, e.g., *con violino*.

unaccompanied performance (without strings), there is little evidence that such a practice was anything more than a provisional stopgap.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, especially in W. 4 and 5 it is clear that the soloist was meant to double the first violin line in many brief tutti passages, and in longer ritornellos it is often uncertain precisely where the soloist should cease doubling and begin to play continuo (in the absence of a second keyboard player).

Nevertheless, the early versions as edited here assign an accompanimental role to the soloist during most tutti passages, just as in the late versions. This is because Bach almost certainly did not write out the doublings of the upper string parts by the keyboard, and copyists left different interpretations of what was intended. Whether Bach doubled the upper string parts in the first performances of these works, and whether a second keyboard player would have been present, is unknown; the latter was certainly not the case in most later performances. No figured continuo parts exist for any of Bach's concertos, and in his autograph scores of the mid-1740s Bach was already entering rests into the upper staff of the solo part at the beginnings and ends of tutti passages, to make clear where the soloist switches to the role of continuo player. Although this notation may not correspond to Bach's initial conception of these works, it no doubt reflects actual practice in most if not all of his Berlin concertos.

The only previous edition of any of these works is that of W. 6 by Fritz Oberdörffer, which mixes early readings for the strings with an intermediate version of the keyboard part. In this version the lower staff of the keyboard doubles the viola in tutti passages where the bass is silent; these doublings, as well as the continuo figures provided in these passages, were almost certainly not intended by Bach.<sup>16</sup>

## Performance

These works raise many questions of performance practice that cannot be readily answered by reference to standard sources, not even Bach's *Versuch*, whose first volume appeared more than a decade after the latest of these concertos was composed.<sup>17</sup> To be sure, Bach's *Versuch*, as well as the treatises of Quantz, Agricola, and other Berlin musicians,<sup>18</sup> presumably provides reliable

---

<sup>15</sup> An autograph arrangement for solo keyboard exists for W. 42 of 1770, and the six concertos of W. 43 were published with a keyboard part designed for playing with or without the strings.

<sup>16</sup> Based on unidentified manuscripts at D B (“handschriftliche Stimmen der Staatsbibliothek Berlin”), Oberdörffer's edition gives readings from D B Mus. mss. Bach St 217, St 532, and St 533; the keyboard doublings of the viola part, with figures, are from St 533.

<sup>17</sup> *Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1753–62; facsimile edited by Wolfgang Horn, Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1994); English translation in one volume by William J. Mitchell as *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments* (New York: Norton, 1949). References to this work will be through volume, chapter, and paragraph numbers of the original German edition (the chapters are renumbered in part 2 of the English translation).

<sup>18</sup> Johann Joachim Quantz, *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen* (Berlin, 1752; facsimile, Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2000); simultaneous French edition as *Essai d'une methode pour apprendre à jouer de la flute traversiere* (Berlin, 1752; facsimile, Paris: Zurfluh, 1975); English translation by Edward R. Reilly as *Essay on Playing the Flute*, reissue of the 2d edition (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2001). Johann Friedrich Agricola, *Anleitung zur Singkunst* (Berlin, 1757), translated by Julianne C. Baird as *Introduction to the*

information about general aspects of original performance practice in these works. But on specific issues the treatises may reflect conditions and practices that were not yet conventional in 1738 or 1740.

Fundamental is the question of instrumentation for the solo part. Today, as probably in 1738 or 1740, the latter is usually assumed to be best played on the harpsichord. But the word *cembalo* used in most of the sources, or *Clavier* in NV 1790, could designate any stringed keyboard instrument. By 1747 the fortepiano was a familiar alternative, at least at the royal court,<sup>19</sup> and Bach would use the latter instrument for concertos and other pieces in his concerts at Hamburg.<sup>20</sup> Other so-called expressive claviers, such as the *Tangentenclavier*, would also eventually become possibilities. Many of these instruments, including the early fortepianos by Gottfried Silbermann that King Friedrich collected, are quiet by modern standards, seemingly best suited for accompanying the solo voice or another instrument in chamber music. Yet the rooms in which Berlin concertos were originally performed were not necessarily large, nor were audiences of any kind necessarily present.<sup>21</sup> Intimate performances on either fortepiano or harpsichord, with a four-part string ensemble, may well have been the norm for these concertos.

Indeed, the sources contain no indication that any part might have been doubled, with the exception of a few manuscripts that include an extra copy of the lowest string part. Whether doubled or not, the lowest string part usually bears the heading “basso,” leaving open the question of both instrumentation and register. Only occasionally is violoncello specified; *violone* and even *bassono* are also mentioned.<sup>22</sup> The precise meaning of these terms is likely to have changed over the half century or more that separated the composition of these works from the copying of the latest manuscripts. The cello probably had not yet gained a monopoly on the bass line in small string ensembles of the late 1730s, especially in Germany, where genuine violoncellos might still

---

*Art of Singing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

<sup>19</sup> See Mary Oleskiewicz, “The Trio in Bach’s Musical Offering: A Salute to Frederick’s Tastes and Quantz’s Flutes,” in *Bach Perspectives, Volume Four: The Music of J. S. Bach: Analysis and Interpretation*, edited by David Schulenberg (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 98–101.

<sup>20</sup> For instance, on 4 June 1778 Bach performed a “new concerto on the piano” (“neues Concert auf dem Fortepiano”) in a concert that also included his *Auferstehung* cantata and *Heilig*; on 15 March 1779 he played “pieces on the piano” (“Stücke auf dem Fortepiano”) alongside his *Israeliten* oratorio. See Christoph Gugger, “C. Ph. E. Bachs Konzerttätigkeit in Hamburg: ‘Zur Ehre Gottes—zum Besten der Jugend—zum Nutzen des Publici,’” in *Der hamburger Bach und die neue Musik des 18. Jahrhunderts: Eine Veranstaltungsreihe anlässlich des 200. Todesjahres von Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach 1714–1788* (Hamburg: Kulturbehörde der Freien und Hansestadt Hamburg, 1988), 181.

<sup>21</sup> The music room in Friedrich’s palace of Sans Souci at Potsdam, completed in 1747, is quite small, and the king’s private concerts normally had no visiting auditioners—contrary to the impression created by the famous painting by Adolph Menzel (*Das Flötenkonzert in Sanssouci*, 1850–2). See Oleskiewicz, “Like Father, Like Son.”

<sup>22</sup> The sole source for the late version of W. 6 designates the lowest part “Violono à Bassono” (*sic*).

have been relatively rare.<sup>23</sup> One can imagine performances with some other variety of string bass, such as the French *basse de violon* or a small violone, or even with a bassoon furnishing the sole bass part. But chords in the “basso” part of W. 6 require the cello, particularly in the early version, if the sources can be believed (see Critical Report).

The occasional second bass part may be designated “violone,” as in sources for W. 4 and 5, but such parts were not necessarily for a double bass (sixteen-foot) instrument. Evidence that the composer did not expect an octave doubling of the bass line occurs in W. 4 at iii.155, where Bach altered the basso part to read a fifth above the lowest note in the solo part.<sup>24</sup> But Bach's revision probably dates from well after the early version of the work, in which a double bass instrument might have been anticipated.

Another area of uncertainty concerns the interpretation of signs for dynamics, articulation, figured bass, and ornaments. These markings occur more frequently in late than early versions. But many of the added markings, particularly slurs, may merely have made explicit what expert performers would have played in any case.

Certain recurring types of motivic figure may have been habitually slurred even when the slur is absent. This seems especially likely for many triplet groups and for certain figures incorporating trills on short notes; the latter might have been performed as half-trills (*Pralltriller*) whose initial (upper) note is actually tied to the previous tone.<sup>25</sup> But not all slurs were dictated by convention, and the gradual accumulation of additional slurs may document real changes in how the music was conceived and performed, as in the slow movement of W. 6. The contrasting notation of the early and late versions suggests that Bach's and contemporary players' view of the character of this movement developed over time toward an increasingly legato, unarticulated manner of performance.

Unfortunately, here as in other movements, imprecisely drawn slurs in the manuscript copies deprive us of precise knowledge of how Bach expected the music to sound. In his autographs, Bach's slurs are usually motivic in the sense first described by Heinrich Schenker;<sup>26</sup> that is, recurrences of a given motive are generally slurred (or not slurred) in the same manner, the slur being an essential element of the musical idea. Yet Bach did add slurs in later versions of certain movements (notably W. 4/iii, in addition to W. 6/ii). Even in autographs, and in copies revised by Bach, slurs are not always drawn precisely or consistently. In the absence of autograph sources for most of this music, decisions regarding the reading of slurs have been based on careful comparison of the sources and of parallel passages; all decisions that might be open to question

---

<sup>23</sup> The instrument had been developed in northern Italy during the later seventeenth century. On cello-type instruments in the circle of J. S. Bach, see Ulrich Drüner, “Violoncello piccolo und Viola pomposa bei Johann Sebastian Bach: Zu Fragen von Identität und Spielweise dieser Instrumente,” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 73 (1987): 85–112.

<sup>24</sup> Doubling the bottom string part at the octave below would create an unprepared dissonant fourth with the left hand of the keyboard part. The revision allows the violins and viola to make exact imitations of the lowest string part by turns in the following passage (mm. 157, 159, and 161, respectively).

<sup>25</sup> As in W. 5/ii.68 (keyboard, right hand); see *Versuch*, i.2.3.33ff.

<sup>26</sup> “Weg mit dem Prasierungsbogen,” in *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*, 3 vols. (Munich: Drei Masken Verlag, 1925–6, 1930; facsimile, Hildesheim: Olms, 1974), 1: 43–60.

are documented in the lists of variant readings.

Some uncertainty attaches to the precise meaning of certain articulation signs. The stroke is now usually understood as a sign for “staccato,” but Bach described notes bearing strokes as *gestossen* (pushed or struck).<sup>27</sup> The term, which for Bach might have seemed particularly relevant to the clavichord, is also meaningful for bowed stringed instruments, where it might refer to the sharp attack, a “digging in” to the string, at the beginning of a short note, as opposed to a detached release, although the latter is implicit as well.

Repeated notes beneath a slur, as in the lower string parts in the late version of W. 5/ii, may indicate so-called bow vibrato, as is apparently the case in J. S. Bach's works.<sup>28</sup> At Berlin, however, the same effect may have been indicated by a combination of dots and a slur over repeated notes, as appears to have been the case at least for one copyist of W. 5.<sup>29</sup> But Johann Friedrich Reichardt, violinist and director of the Berlin opera from 1775 to 1794, seems not to have known the technique of bow vibrato, indicating that dots on repeated notes beneath a slur call for a brief pause of the bow after each note (i.e., the modern convention).<sup>30</sup> Reichardt's interpretation may apply in a few passages in W. 4 (e.g., i.11) that appear to demand a more distinct type of articulation than that produced by bow vibrato.<sup>31</sup> Perhaps this is true as well for a few repeated notes in the violin parts of W. 5/ii that bear slurs but no dots (e.g., at m. 20). Elsewhere, copyists occasionally seem to employ dots or strokes merely to cancel a slur, or to clarify that a carelessly drawn slur does not apply to a particular note. The edition has removed markings of the latter sort insofar as they can be identified.

As in other concertos of the period, the initial, unmarked dynamic level of a movement is *forte*, as is clear in the last movement of W. 4, whose early version contains an explicit *f* for the repetition of the opening ritornello. *Piano* is used most often in the string parts to signal the beginning of a solo episode, *f* representing the beginning of a ritornello. But more nuanced uses of dynamic markings appear even in the early versions, which include *p* within several opening ritornellos. Later versions of these concertos include *pp*, *mf*, and *ff* markings. Dynamic markings are absent from the solo part except in the left hand, when doubling the basso during ritornellos.

---

<sup>27</sup> *Versuch*, i.3.17.

<sup>28</sup> On this technique, also called “slurred tremolo,” the most complete discussion, focusing on earlier music, remains Stewart Carter, “The String Tremolo in the Seventeenth Century,” *Early Music* 19 (1991): 43–60.

<sup>29</sup> In Bach's solo keyboard music, this is the sign for *Bebung* (*Versuch*, i.3.20). See list of variant readings and Exx. 18a–b for W. 5 (intermediate version) at i.174–82 and 190–8 (= mm. 175–83 and 191–9 of the early version). The source, now in the Library of Congress, probably originated in Berlin.

<sup>30</sup> “[E]s bleibt zwischen jeder Note eine kleine Ruhe in Bogen”: *Ueber die Pflichten des Ripien-Violinisten* (Berlin und Leipzig: G. J. Decker, 1776), 24.

<sup>31</sup> Similar figures employing the same notation occur in works of C. H. and J. G. Graun, e.g., the latter's trio sonata in G for two violins and continuo, no. 59 in the thematic catalog by Matthias Wendt, *Die Trios der Brüder Johann Gottlieb und Carl Heinrich Graun* (inaugural dissertation, Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1983), published in *Musikalisches Vielerley*, edited by C. P. E. Bach (Hamburg: Michael Christian Bock, 1770; facsimile, Peer, Belgium: Alamire, 1993), pp. 130ff.

Alternating *forte* and *piano* markings do not necessarily indicate so-called terrace dynamics; in some contexts a gradual crescendo or decrescendo may be implied. Thus *pp* at W. 5/ii.<sup>34</sup> suggests a diminuendo from *ff* two measures earlier. The *f* on the second of two tied notes in the basso part of W. 5/iii.10 implies a crescendo (swell) on the note tied over the barline.

Probably the sole indications for ornaments in the earliest versions of these works are the abbreviation “tr” and the occasional appoggiatura.<sup>32</sup> Even in later versions, more explicit ornament signs are rare outside the keyboard part, but string players were probably expected to interpret “tr” using the full range of ornaments described in detail in Bach's *Versuch*. This is particularly clear in parallel passages notated with “tr” for the strings and a more explicit ornament sign for the soloist. Thus in W. 5/ii, “tr” in the violins at m. 4 might be realized either as a trilled turn (*prallender Doppelschlag*) or as a turn played after the note, following the varying notation of the same figure in the keyboard part in mm. 36 and 52, respectively.

Bach's *Versuch* states the so-called long or “variable” (*verändlicher*) appoggiatura takes half the value of the note to which it is attached (two thirds the value of a dotted note).<sup>33</sup> But this rule does not apply to short or “invariable” appoggiaturas, which can be distinguished only by the context unless the composer has notated appoggiaturas in their intended values. Writing in 1753, Bach mentions that until recently appoggiaturas took fewer distinct rhythmic values in performance and were all written as eighths.<sup>34</sup> Indeed, the great majority of the small notes in both the early and later versions of the present works are eighths. Quarters and larger written values for appoggiaturas do occur occasionally, but the distinction is not necessarily meaningful for performance. The recurring appoggiatura in the ritornello of W. 6/iii (mm. 2, 4, etc.) was probably intended to be performed as the short, “invariable” type; in the partially autograph source C1 (see “Issues of Text and Performance” in the evaluation of sources) it appears consistently as an eighth, although drawn so hastily that the flag is often reduced to a slight waver in the stem of the note. If this reflects the notation of the lost autograph score, it is easy to understand why some copyists wrote the same appoggiatura as a quarter. Only at m. 73 of this movement is there a clear instance of a long appoggiatura, notated as such in the late but not the early version. Some other appoggiaturas in this movement raise further questions that are considered in the Critical Report.

Pairs of small notes (*petites notes*) such as the double appoggiatura or *Anschlag* are always “invariable,” that is, played short and on the beat.<sup>35</sup> Questions arise when one of the little notes is dotted, as in several *Anschläge* added in the late version of W. 4/ii. Such ornaments are rarely encountered outside keyboard parts, so it may be worth pointing out for the benefit of string players that the rhythmic interpretation of these ornaments as explained by Bach is somewhat

---

<sup>32</sup> Bach's autographs of the period actually use “t” (not “tr”); the letter, which is sometimes followed by a period, can resemble a cross or “plus” sign. Most copyists regularized this sign to “tr,” as Bach directed them to do in instructions in the autograph score for W. 18 (D B Mus. ms. Bach P 352, p. 239; Wade, *The Keyboard Concertos*, 67, argues that these directions were in preparation for a planned publication of the work).

<sup>33</sup> *Versuch* i.2.2.11.

<sup>34</sup> *Versuch*, i.2.2.5.

<sup>35</sup> See the illustrations for *Versuch* i.2.6.3, which bear out Bach's somewhat surprising advice that these small notes are played more softly than the main one, the reverse of the practice for single appoggiaturas.

counterintuitive. Evidently the small dotted note could in fact take most of the value of the large main note that eventually follows.<sup>36</sup> The dotted slide receives a similar interpretation.<sup>37</sup> The configurations in which these ornaments occur in W. 4 correspond precisely to examples in part 1 of the *Versuch*, published in 1753 and therefore perhaps roughly contemporary with the revision that added these ornaments to the score of that work.

Whether the relatively plain appearance of these concertos in the early versions ever corresponded to actual performance is doubtful in light of the extensive ornamentation and embellishment that was eventually written out, especially in the slow movements. All three slow movements nevertheless demand further elaboration in the form of a cadenza, which is explicitly called for by the fermata just before the end of the last solo passage in the late version of each work. Even in the earlier versions, where fermatas are usually absent, cadenzas were no doubt expected in W. 5 and 6.<sup>38</sup> A manuscript collection of written-out cadenzas by Bach includes one example each for W. 5 and 6; the principal source for the late version of W. 5 contains three further examples. All of the latter cadenzas are surely Bach's, but the same cannot be true of two cadenzas for W. 6 preserved in more peripheral sources. On the other hand, a secondary source for W. 4 contains a cadenza which, although it cannot be assigned indisputably to Bach, conforms in style and notation to those known to be his.

Only in the late version of W. 6 does the principal source incorporate the cadenza into the main text of the concerto; the edition follows the source in that respect. For W. 5, the principal source gives the four cadenzas on a separate page (see Plate 6), and these are edited together as an appendix to the main text for that work. The cadenzas not by Bach appear as musical examples in the Commentaries for their respective works.

### Acknowledgements

Research support for this edition was furnished by the Packard Humanities Institute, which will publish a modified version of the scores and accompanying textual commentary. I am grateful to Teri Noel Towe for furnishing helpful answers to a number of queries. My wife Mary Oleskiewicz provided photographs and detailed notes for several sources, but, more importantly, steadfast support, guidance, and advice.

---

<sup>36</sup> Thus at W. 4/ii.2, the small dotted note  $a''$  on beat 3 of the first and second violin parts might be realized as a dotted sixteenth, the following small note  $c'''$  as well as the large  $b\flat''$  after it gliding by rapidly as sixty-fourths, following the model of *Versuch*, i.2.6.9. The small sixteenth  $a''$  that follows would then be realized as an actual sixteenth.

<sup>37</sup> Thus at W. 4/ii.4 the small  $e\flat''$  on beat 2 of the violin parts would be realized as an eighth tied to a thirty-second; the following small  $f''$  as well as the large dotted eighth  $g''$  are actually played as sixty-fourths, as shown in the first example for *Versuch* i.2.7.12.

<sup>38</sup> The slow movement of W. 4 was revised to give the soloist an opportunity for a cadenza, reflecting Berlin fashion.