

INTRODUCTION

The three keyboard concertos contained in the present volume—the Concerto in A Major, Wq 7 (H 410); the Concerto in A Major, Wq 8 (H 411); and the Concerto in G Major, Wq 9 (H 412)—count among the early Berlin concertos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. According to NV 1790 (pp. 27–28), they were composed in the years 1740, 1741, and 1742, respectively, and thus they stand at the beginning of a period in which Bach was intensely involved with keyboard works. Written at the same time were the “Prussian” sonatas, Wq 48 (1740), among other compositions. Although at a later time Bach fundamentally reworked his concertos from the Leipzig and Frankfurt years, Wq 1–3, and the Berlin concerto Wq 5,¹ the concertos Wq 7–9, together with Wq 4 and 6, are among the first that he did not later subject to any global revision. But as with almost all his concertos, Bach revised these works in various details over a longer span of time.²

The exact circumstances of the creation of Wq 7–9 are unclear. Beginning in 1738, Bach was active as a harpsichordist for Crown Prince Friedrich. In 1741, a year after the latter’s coronation as King of Prussia, Bach was officially named court harpsichordist. This appointment notwithstanding, Wq 7–9 are likely not attributable to the court context, but rather originated as independent works of the composer. They were presumably performed in the Berlin amateur circles in which Bach was active.

Original Manuscripts and Other Central Sources

Autograph scores for all three works are extant today, and bear witness—at least as far as Wq 7 and 8 are concerned—to multi-layered stages of revision. Original sets of parts for the concertos are lacking, however. Only for the concerto Wq 7 do performing materials from the Bach household remain extant (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 515; source A 2). They were written by Anon. 311 and contain autograph corrections. The fact that these parts contain

only some of the changes to the work undertaken by Bach over time indicates that the manuscript was already transmitted at an early point to the later owner, Johann Christoph Friedrich Bach. These parts are therefore an important source for reconstructing the compositional history of Wq 7. One possible date for the change of ownership of the manuscript would be the year 1751, when Friedrich II spent time at the Bückeberg court to confer the Order of the Black Eagle upon Wilhelm, Count of Schaumburg-Lippe. Also in the retinue of the Prussian king was C. P. E. Bach,³ who may have given or promised musical materials to his brother on this occasion. From this it could be inferred that Bach had replacement materials prepared for Wq 7 which he used for performances, and in which he recorded the more extensive later corrections to the work.

Central sources for the concertos Wq 7–9 are connected with the music business that Bach’s widow and daughter ran jointly after the composer’s death. Insight into their business activities can be gained from the extant letters from Johanna Maria and Anna Carolina Philippina Bach to Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal, which not only document the collecting activities of the Schwerin organist, but which in passing also mention other commissions.⁴ A closer investigation of this enterprise and its circumstances, as well as a comprehensive identification of the works mentioned in the letters and the sources that have come down to us, has yet to be conducted. The Westphal collection contains a set of parts for Wq 7 in the hand of Johann Heinrich Michel (B-Bc, 5887 MSM; source B), for which acquisition from the Bach household cannot be proved but can be surmised. The Schwerin organist acquired parts for the concertos Wq 8 and 9 (also in B-Bc, 5887 MSM) at an unknown time through other channels and had them revised in the mid-1790s by copyists working

1. Bach mentions the fundamental reworkings of these concertos as *Erneuerungen* in NV 1790, 26–27. See also CPEB: CW, III/9.1 and III/9.2.

2. For Bach’s revisions of his concertos see Wade, esp. 85–102.

3. See the letter from Johann Wilhelm Gleim to Johann Peter Uz dated 29 August 1751, reproduced in *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:10–11 and in Gudrun Busch, *C. Ph. E. Bach und seine Lieder* (Regensburg: Bosse, 1957), 45–46. See also Ulrich Leisinger, “Ew. Durchl. Treu unterthänigster Knecht, J. C. F. Bachs Beziehungen zum Adel,” in *Johann Christoph Friedrich Bach (1732–1795). Ein Komponist zwischen Barock und Klassik* (Bückeberg: Createam, 1995), 17.

4. Schmid 1988 and *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1322–23.

for Bach's widow and daughter, as the letters from A. C. P. Bach document. The results for these two concertos were quite different. Source **B 1** for Wq 8 is a meticulously corrected set of parts, which with few exceptions agrees with the final version of the score. The corrections carried out in the parts by the copyist reflect the revisions carried out by Bach in the score over time. The examination of the materials for the concerto Wq 9 by the Bach household was considerably more complicated. In a letter to Westphal dated 3 September 1795, A. C. P. Bach explained how difficult it was to motivate the copyists to do the arduous correction work. In addition, Westphal's manuscript for Wq 9, which presumably originated in the Hamburg music shop of Johann Christoph Westphal,⁵ was seriously flawed. Thus the letter reads:

Both violin parts of concerto no. 10 are, I understand, written in a muddled fashion. Thus, precisely where the 1st violin switches to the 2nd, the 2nd switches to the 1st. Before he [the copyist] noticed this, he had erased so much in the first violin part that he had to rewrite it afterwards, and mark the places where the confusion occurs.⁶

This description corresponds exactly to the state of things in source **D 1** for Wq 9, a complete set of parts for keyboard and strings, in which the violin I contains an inserted bifolio, and both violin parts contain markings regarding the exchange of parts (see critical report for details). The manuscript was enlarged by the addition of a second group of parts (keyboard and basso; see source **B** in the critical report), whose time of origin is unclear. The copyist of these materials was also responsible around 1795 or 1796 for correction work performed in the household of Bach's widow and daughter on copies belonging to Westphal (see, for example, source **B 1** for Wq 8). Yet it is doubtful whether the corrections in **D 1** and the creation of **B** are directly related. The fact that A. C. P. Bach mentions the idiosyncrasies of the violin parts in her letter, and does not shed light on the necessity of writing out other parts anew, speaks against this assumption. Moreover, it does not follow from the letter that two different copyists were occupied with the work. Furthermore, we have no explana-

5. Leisinger/Wollny, 336.

6. "Die beyden Violinstimmen des Conc. N. 10 sollen sehr confus geschrieben seyn, indessen soll, wo die 1ste Viol. in die 2te übergeht, gerade die 2te in die 1ste übergehen. Ehe er dies bemerkt hat, hat er in der 1sten Viol, so sehr viel radirt gehabt, daß er es hernach hat müssen umschreiben, und die Stelle bemerken, die diese Verwechslung enthalten." Quoted in Schmid 1988, 508–9.

tion in the letter either as to why the original violoncello part was corrected, or why a new one was written out. Alternatively it is conceivable that Westphal, after receiving the shipment, later requested new parts for keyboard and violoncello, to have a figured cembalo part and to replace the heavily corrected violoncello part. In any case, a summary bill for the work that was done was not sent until 13 February 1796.⁷ The following notation by Westphal on the letter of 3 September 1795 should also be pointed out: "Concert 18½ Bog./Nro. 10.8" (Concerto 18½ sheets / No. 10.8). Similar comments are found on other letters as well, and point, in a hitherto unexplained way, to the scope of the work that was carried out.

The secondary sources for the concertos Wq 7–9 attest to the fact that these early works did not find the same wide transmission as the concertos that were created a few years later, when Bach enjoyed renown throughout Germany not only as a keyboard player, but also as a teacher and composer of keyboard music. To what degree Bach himself influenced the extent of their reception must remain an open question.

Bach prepared none of these three concertos for publication, and none were otherwise brought out in printed editions. But manuscript copies of the concertos were offered for sale in various catalogues of the music trade. The concerto Wq 8 appeared in part IV of Breitkopf's thematic catalogue in 1763, offered in a first collection (with the heading *Raccolta I*) together with Wq 20 and 32.⁸ Like almost the entirety of Bach's oeuvre, all three of these concertos were also offered for sale by Johann Carl Friedrich Rellstab beginning in 1790.⁹ At what time the Hamburg music dealership of J. C. Westphal began offering the concertos remains an open question, for the works listed in that firm's catalogues cannot be clearly identified.¹⁰ Only one manuscript now extant—source **D 1** for Wq 9—can be connected with Westphal's business.

7. *Ibid.*, 509–11.

8. *The Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue. The Six Parts and Sixteen Supplements 1762–1787*, ed. Barry S. Brook (New York: Dover, 1966), col. 132.

9. *Vollständiges Verzeichniß aller gedruckten, gestochenen u. geschriebenen Musikalien wie auch musikalischen Instrumenten welche zu Berlin bey dem Musik- und Instrumentenhändler J. C. F. Rellstab . . . zu haben sind* (Berlin, 1790), 68.

10. In *Verzeichniß von Musicalien, so bey Johann Christoph Westphal und Compagnie in Hamburg in Commission zu haben sind* (Hamburg, 1772), 49, and in several subsequent catalogues between 1774 and 1784, Westphal offered concertos in A major, which may refer to Wq 7 or 8, and a concerto in G major, which may refer to Wq 9.

Musical Design and the Revision Process

The corrections that Bach undertook over the years in Wq 7–9 relate to various aspects of the compositions. Only a few of the changes undertaken in the autograph score of Wq 7 (source A 1) seem to arise from the compositional process (for example, movement i, mm. 106–8). Rather, most of the changes are later ideas. They predominantly involve added ornament signs, not just in the solo part but also in the strings. For example, in the first movement Bach consistently added trills in the viola part (note 3 of mm. 74, 246, 374, and 559). In the second movement he specified the ornaments in the keyboard part, which surely stemmed from his own performing style.¹¹ In the third movement Bach made additions in both the keyboard and strings.¹² In all three movements in the autograph score A 1, following an old practice, Bach originally used only 8th-note appoggiaturas. He later differentiated the appoggiaturas according to the new practice, but it is not known precisely when he did this.¹³

Beyond ornamentation, Bach's revisions in Wq 7 concerned articulation and voice leading. In the original set of parts (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 515; source A 2) all strokes are missing in the strings in the third movement. One may therefore guess that Bach entered them only after the fact, thereby heightening the articulation. Especially in the third movement he adjusted the voice leading in various places, particularly that of the middle voices, generally emphasizing them more (e.g., mm. 7–9, va; m. 42, vn II; mm. 212–14, vn II and va; see commentary for details). At certain places Bach further heightened the virtuosity of the keyboard part. This can be seen in the third movement, mm. 98–101, where he varied the melodic line by means of an 8th-note gesture, as well as in mm. 226–32, where in the upper staff of the keyboard part there was originally an 8th-note pattern, which Bach increased to 8th-note

11. The additions can be identified in the autograph score (source A 1) only with difficulty, but can be reconstructed relatively reliably through the variants in the early parts (source A 2). Ornaments missing in A 1 and A 2, and present only in the late parts (source B), were clearly entered by Bach at a relatively late point only in the now-missing, second original set of parts, which was the model for B, and were not marked in A 1. See commentary for details.

12. The additions directly concern the string ritornello, for instance the trills in mm. 3, 7, 10, 28, and 32. Bach also added appoggiaturas and other ornaments in staff I of the keyboard part at highly characteristic places, for instance, in mm. 58, 60, 62, 65, 153, and 157.

13. The changing customs regarding the notation of appoggiaturas are described in *Versuch I* (first published in 1753), 2.2, §§5 and 11.

triplets.¹⁴ This same tendency is also reflected in the only larger instance of correction in the third movement, mm. 261–74: Bach first sketched an eight-measure final solo segment, which he later replaced with a fourteen-measure passage. This contains ascending sequences at the close, before the strings join in for the final ritornello.

The autograph score of Wq 8 (source A for that work) bears stronger traces of a compositional process. These are seen in detail in various smaller crossed-out passages (e.g., movement i, mm. 55–56; movement ii, m. 52; and movement iii, mm. 34–37 and 180–81). Further, at an unknown time Bach replaced bifolio 2 (pp. 5–8, movement i, mm. 127–240); it is reasonable to suppose that the discarded bifolio contained more substantial corrections, which arose in the context of writing down the work. Additionally, in the third movement Bach marked mm. 56–63 of the keyboard part with numbers (5, 6, 7, 8, 1, 2, 3, 4) to correct their sequence, and crossed out individual measures here and there (such as m. 155).

As with Wq 7, in the reworking of Wq 8 Bach dedicated his efforts in a striking way to the middle voices—above all the viola, which he worked out in detail—whereby he achieved altered harmonic shadings in all three movements, especially the third (movements i, mm. 11, 18, and 109; ii, mm. 1, 4, 34, 48, 52, 53, and 71; and iii, mm. 7, 9, 89, 91, 143, 147, 182, and 184). Regarding the revisions of Wq 8—in contrast with those in Wq 7—Bach added hardly any ornaments; rather, in the first movement, he erased several appoggiaturas in the violins (mm. 17–19, 60, 108–10; see plate 4 and commentary). Clearly in these places he strove for a more transparent voice leading. In addition, he refrained from later reworking the keyboard part with respect to its virtuosity.

Unlike Wq 7 and 8, the autograph score for Wq 9 contains corrections that relate to the overall concept of a movement. The first version of the opening ritornello was thirty-seven measures long, presumably to be followed immediately by the first entrance of the solo keyboard. Bach rejected this version and crossed out the last six measures; this was probably done during the compositional process, since this version of the ritornello does not appear anywhere else in the movement. Bach then notated a nine-measure conclusion to the ritornello in the still-empty systems at the bottom of the page, for a total of forty measures (see plate 6). Essentially he added mm. 34–36, which contain previously unused musical material. The addition is of

14. The corrected reading appears in the autograph score A 1 only in m. 226; it is found in its entirety only in source B.

particular interest, as Bach intertwines the solo keyboard part and strings in an unusual manner in this movement. The opening ritornello features two contrasting motivic groups, mm. 1–8 and 9–21, which are used in different ways in the course of the movement; the material of mm. 9–21 is no longer used in the following ritornellos and is picked up only once more in a *solo* passage (mm. 134–46). By adding mm. 34–36 Bach introduced a new motivic group, which he deployed contrapuntally during the *solo* passages in the strings (e.g., mm. 78–88, 214–21) and which is one of the integral features of the *tutti* sections. The reorganization of the opening ritornello is thus directly connected with the compositional idea of the stronger motivic work in the movement. A similar phenomenon is found in the third movement, where Bach later added mm. 33–37. Bach draws on this material several times in the course of the movement (e.g., mm. 130–34, 247–51, 392–96); in these passages the amalgamation between keyboard and strings is less pronounced than in the first movement.

Because of an inferior source situation, the sequence in which revisions occurred in the autograph score is substantially harder to clarify for Wq 9 than for Wq 7 and 8. Due to the lack of comparative sources for Wq 9, changes made during the compositional process can scarcely be differentiated from later alterations of the work. It should be emphasized, however, that even in Wq 9 Bach made improvements, especially to the second violin and the viola parts (e.g., movement i, mm. 5, 31, 33, and 37; and movement iii, mm. 7, 8, 39, 44, 45, 272, 316, 317, and 415). More so than in Wq 7 or 8, Bach differentiated the dynamics after the fact in Wq 9. Accordingly he changed *piano* passages to *pianissimo* (e.g., movement i, mm. 42, 50, 58, 120, and 152; and movement ii, m. 26) and *forte* passages to *mezzo forte* (movement iii, mm. 253, 259, 265, and 271). As far as can be detected, he did not make any later additions in terms of ornamentation of the keyboard part. Nor can it be assumed that the lost original set of parts contained noticeably more ornamentation, for source B, written in Bach's household, does not depart substantially from the autograph score, with the exception of some *Anschläge* in the keyboard part in the second movement (mm. 23, 28, and 29).

Performance Considerations

The principal source for Wq 7 (B) contains basso continuo figures, but these are absent in the principal sources for Wq 8 and 9 (source A for each work). Figuring for those two works is included in the appendix along with the alternate solo keyboard parts based on the comparative sources (B 2 for Wq 8 and B for Wq 9). For additional information on performance considerations, see the "Concertos" preface and the introductions to CPEB: CW, III/9.1, III/9.2, and III/9.4.

Bach provided explicit opportunities for inserting cadenzas for the solo instrument in the first and second movements of Wq 7, the second and third movements of Wq 8, and all three movements of Wq 9. Unfortunately, neither the surviving original sources nor the collection of seventy-five cadenzas (B-Bc, 5871 MSM = Wq 120; see CPEB: CW, VIII/1) contain authentic cadenzas specifically intended for these concertos. The performer will therefore have to model the length and style of cadenzas after those preserved in Bach's other early Berlin concertos.

Acknowledgments

My thanks are due to the colleagues of the numerous libraries that made their manuscripts available for the present edition and granted permission for the reproduction of facsimile plates. In this regard, special thanks are due to the colleagues in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn Archiv for their comprehensive support of my work. Peter Wollny supported the creation of the volume with great interest, encouragement, and critical observations, for which I am grateful to him. Likewise I thank Jason B. Grant for his careful review of the manuscript and his critical feedback.

Barbara Wiermann