

INTRODUCTION

The three works in the present volume, the Concerto in G Major, Wq 4 (H 406), the Concerto in C Minor, Wq 5 (H 407), and the Concerto in G Minor, Wq 6 (H 409), 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.¹ One additional concerto from this period, composed earlier in 1740 for two keyboard instruments and strings, is edited separately.² Although Bach is known to have composed three concertos while a student at Leipzig and Frankfurt an der Oder (Wq 1–3, published in CPEB:CW, III/9.1), Wq 4–6 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 seven completed keyboard concertos that Johann Sebastian Bach copied into a fair-copy manuscript around 1738, the same year Wq 4 was written.³ A second inspiration would have been the artistic, social, and economic ferment of Berlin during the period when Crown Prince Friedrich, now securely in the good graces of his father Friedrich Wilhelm I, was preparing to take the throne. He did so on 31 May

1740, and among his first acts as king was the reestablishment of a royal band (*Capelle*), chiefly to perform opera in the capital city of 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.⁴ 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.⁵ Among these were Johann Gottlieb Graun and Franz Benda (violinists) and Carl Heinrich Graun (tenor and cellist), who would become the core of Friedrich’s *Capelle*. Many more musicians were added to the group after Friedrich’s accession as king, including Johann Joachim Quantz (flutist and composer). 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 such as Philipp Emanuel.⁶

1. See NV 1790, in which the present works are nos. 4, 5, and 7 (pp. 26–27). Bach mentions the year of his move to Berlin (1738) in his *Autobiography*, 199.

2. The concerto Wq 46 (published in CPEB:CW, III/10), is no. 6 in NV 1790, p. 27. Two horns are a later addition to the work.

3. See NBA, VII/4, ix. An eighth concerto survives as 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.

4. Best known is Burney, 2:152–55; also published in German as *Carl Burney’s der Musik Doctors Tagebuch seiner musikalischen Reisen*, vol. 3, *Durch Böhmen, Sachsen, Brandenburg, Hamburg und Holland*, trans. Christoph Daniel Ebeling and Johann Joachim Christoph Bode (Hamburg, 1773), 109–11. Accounts of court music-making earlier in Friedrich’s career depict more lively and varied activity; see Mary Oleskiewicz, “Like Father, Like Son? Emanuel Bach and the Writing of Biography,” in *Music and Its Questions: Essays in Honor of Peter Williams*, ed. Thomas Donahue (Richmond, Va.: OHS Press, 2007), 267–68.

5. Bach explains in his *Autobiography*, pp. 199–200, 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.

6. At least three members of Friedrich’s *Capelle* in the early years—C. H. Graun, Christoph Nichelmann, and Christoph Schaffrath—were significant composers of keyboard concertos. GraunWV, xiii and *passim*, indicates that only two (of twenty-three) extant keyboard concertos bearing a reliable attribution to “Graun” can be certainly assigned to C. H. Graun, as opposed to his brother J. G. Graun, although the former is known to have composed at least fifteen such works. 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.

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. The extant sources provide no evidence of having belonged to members of the royal family or of having been used for performances at court. However, 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.⁷ It is possible that at least Wq 6 (together with Wq 46) was composed after Friedrich had become king; one further concerto, Wq 7 in A major, would follow during 1740.

In any case, concerts 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 semipublic 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.⁸ 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 individual).⁹ 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.¹⁰

7. See Oleskiewicz, "Like Father, Like Son," 253–79.

8. Johann Gottlieb Janitsch reportedly began a concert series at Ruppin 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), 386ff.

9. 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.

10. See, for example, the references to a concert performance of the Concerto in D Major, Wq 11, and to an unidentified "trio" (probably an obligato-keyboard sonata) performed with the violinist F. Benda "numerous times at court" (*mehrmals bey dem Hofe*), in the critical report for Wq 4 (description of source B 1). 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*, 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.

That the present works 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 of 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 Bach had composed previously. The German term *erneuert*, commonly translated as "revised," in fact means "renovated" or "renewed," evidently referring 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. As part of the process, older manuscript scores and sets of parts were literally replaced by new ones.

Of the present concertos, only Wq 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.¹¹ But in fact all three of the works edited here exist in multiple versions, those for Wq 4 and 6 differing from those for Wq 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 Bach's keyboard sonatas and other works of the 1730s and 1740s.¹²

11. Wq 5, composed in 1739, was *erneuert* in 1762; and the Concerto in A Minor, Wq 21, of 1747 was "renovated" even later, in 1775, seven years after the composer's move from Berlin to Hamburg.

12. Details are given in the critical report. The most extensive study of Bach's revisions in the concertos remains Wade. For an overview of Bach's approaches to melodic embellishment, variation, and form, see Schulenberg 1984, esp. chaps. 4–6. Darrell M. Berg analyzes the revisions affecting one work, the sonata Wq 65/9, in "Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs Umarbeitungen seiner Clavier-sonaten," *BJ* 74 (1988): 123–61.

Only the *Erneuerung* of Wq 5 is 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 “renovated” Wq 5 in 1762, at a time when he was mainly occupied with the composition of sonatinas for keyboard and orchestra. The sonatinas, 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 reflected changes in concert life as Berlin and Prussia emerged from the Seven Years’ War. Thus it is somewhat surprising to find Bach revising Wq 5, a very different sort of work, at the same time; perhaps, however, the contrast would have enhanced the effect of both types of work in the revitalized concert life of the city.¹³

The main musical text of the present edition contains the latest known versions of Wq 4–6 as well as the earliest extant version of Wq 5. Early versions of Wq 4 and 6, as well as intermediate states of all three concertos, are described in the critical report and commentary for each work, and an intermediate version of Wq 4/ii is given in appendix A. 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 their early history. The edition of the early version of Wq 5, based on a score and parts that may have been copied from early states of the lost composing score, is meant to correspond to the form in which the work would first have been disseminated. The edition of the intermediate version of Wq 4/ii is based on a set of parts that belonged to a colleague of Bach in Berlin and incorporates revisions made by the composer before he left Berlin for Hamburg.

Sources

Bach’s revisions, although musically compelling, had the effect of assimilating both the notation and the style of the

13. Jane Stevens reaches similar conclusions in liner notes for *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: The Complete Keyboard Concertos*, vol. 9, Miklós Spányi, soloist, with Concerto Armonico, BIS CD-868 (Djursholm: Grammofon BIS, 2000). Spányi (“Performer’s Remarks,” *ibid.*, p. 6) suggests that the availability of a new instrument with keyboard compass up to *f*’ was another factor; indeed, this pitch appears in the late version of the work, albeit as a single appoggiatura (first movement, m. 197).

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 nine such works published by the composer himself (Wq 11, 14, and 25, published in CPEB:CW, III/7, and Wq 43/1–6, published in CPEB:CW, III/8), and by the similar format of the manuscript copies collected during the late eighteenth century by the Schwerin organist Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal. Westphal 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 manuscript copy of the late version of Wq 6, and he was involved in the preparation of copies of Wq 4 and 5 as well. In addition, a manuscript copy in the same format, incorporating autograph revisions and corrections, exists for Wq 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 there to a role as accompanist. 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 preserve the original versions of these works. Even late copies contain indications that the soloist, rather than accompanying during ritornellos—that is, realizing a figured bass—may have originally doubled the first violin (and bass) and sometimes even the inner string parts.

In the fair-copy autograph scores of Sebastian Bach’s keyboard concertos (whose extant versions date from the same period as Wq 4–6), the solo part, although occasionally adding counterpoint or brief interjections within ritornellos, generally doubles the first violin and bass in tutti passages; the same type of doubling is indicated by shorthand notation in one of the surviving manuscript scores of the present works.¹⁴ Similar doublings by the soloist

14. In the manuscript score (D-B, Am.B. 99) of the early version of Wq 5/i, m. 134, the upper staff of the keyboard part contains the first two notes of the first violin, entering in that measure; the third note of the violin is indicated by a custos and the following measures of the keyboard part are blank.

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 the 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 also 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 Bach's lifetime is clear from the incorporation of basso continuo figures into the part for the keyboard 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 (for example, in D-B, Mus. mss. Bach St 197 and St 217 for Wq 5 and 6, respectively; see plates 5, 9) continue to call for such doublings, sometimes together with and sometimes in place of continuo figures. Although these parts may have been used for unaccompanied performance (without strings), there is little evidence that such a practice was anything more than a provisional stopgap.¹⁵ On the other hand, especially in Wq 4 and 5 it is clear from the sources 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.

Nevertheless, the early version of Wq 5 and the intermediate version of Wq 4/ii 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 doublings of the upper string parts in the keyboard part, and copyists left different interpretations of what was intended. Whether Bach doubled the upper string parts in the first performances of these works is unknown. In his autograph scores from 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 cor-

15. An autograph arrangement for solo keyboard exists for Wq 42, and the six concertos of Wq 43 were published with a keyboard part designed for playing with or without the strings.

respond 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 Wq 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.¹⁶

Performance Considerations

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. To be sure, Bach's *Versuch*, as well as the treatises of Quantz, Johann Friedrich Agricola, and other Berlin musicians,¹⁷ presumably provides reliable information about general aspects of 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, which today, as probably in 1738 or 1740, 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;¹⁸ Bach would use it for concertos and

16. See Carl Phil. Em. Bach. *Konzert g-moll für Cembalo (Klavier) und Streicher*, ed. Fritz Oberdörffer (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1952). 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. See the critical report for further discussion of these sources.

17. Johann Joachim Quantz, *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen* (Berlin, 1752); simultaneous French edition as *Essai d'une methode pour apprendre à jouer de la flute traversiere* (Berlin, 1752); trans. Edward R. Reilly as *Essay on Playing the Flute*, 2nd ed. (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2001). Johann Friedrich Agricola, *Anleitung zur Singkunst* (Berlin, 1757), trans. Julianne C. Baird as *Introduction to the Art of Singing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

18. See Mary Oleskiewicz, "The Trio in Bach's Musical Offering: A Salute to Frederick's Tastes and Quantz's Flutes?" in *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 4, *The Music of J.S. Bach: Analysis and Interpretation*, ed. David Schulenberg (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 98–101.

other pieces in his concerts at Hamburg.¹⁹ Other so-called expressive clavier, such as the *Tangentenclavier*, would also eventually become available. Many of these instruments, including the early fortepianos by Gottfried Silbermann that Friedrich II 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.²⁰ 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.²¹ 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 have been relatively rare.²² 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 Wq 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 Wq 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 Wq 4/iii, m. 155, where Bach altered the basso part to read a fifth above the lowest note in the solo part.²³ 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 figures may have been habitually slurred even when a written 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 short trills (*Pralltriller*) whose initial (upper) note is actually tied to the previous tone (as in Wq 5/ii, m. 68, keyboard, right hand; see *Versuch* I:2.3, §33ff.). But not all slurs were dictated by convention, and the gradual accumulation of additional slurs in extant sources may document real changes in how the music was conceived and performed, as in the slow movement of Wq 6. The contrasting notation of the early and late versions suggests that performances of this movement tended over time toward an increasingly legato, unarticulated style.

Unfortunately, in Wq 6/ii and 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;²⁴ that is, recurrences of a given motive are generally slurred (or

19. 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 oratorio *Die Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu*, Wq 240, and the double-choir *Heilig*, Wq 217; on 15 March 1779 he played “pieces on the piano” (Stücke auf dem Fortepiano) alongside his oratorio *Die Israeliten in der Wüste*, Wq 238. 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.

20. The music room in Friedrich’s palace of Sanssouci at Potsdam, completed in 1747, is quite small. Visitors such as Burney, who described the king’s private concerts, normally had to listen from outside the room—contrary to the impression created by the famous painting by Adolph Menzel (*Das Flötenkonzert in Sanssouci*, 1850–52). See Oleskiewicz, “Like Father, Like Son,” 255.

21. The sole source for the late version of Wq 6 designates the lowest part “Violono à Bassono” [sic].

22. 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,” *BJ* 73 (1987): 85–112.

23. 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).

24. “Weg mit dem Phrasierungsbogen,” in *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*, 3 vols. (Munich: Drei Masken, 1925–26, 1930), 1:43–60.

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 Wq 4/iii, in addition to Wq 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 are documented in the commentaries.

The precise meaning of certain articulation signs is also unclear. The stroke sign is now usually understood as a sign for “staccato,” but Bach described notes bearing strokes as *gestossen* (pushed or struck; see *Versuch* I:3.17). 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 Wq 5/ii, may indicate so-called bow vibrato, as is apparently the case in J.S. Bach’s works.²⁵ At Berlin, however, the same effect may have been indicated by a combination of dots and a slur over repeated notes (the sign for *Bebung* in Bach’s solo keyboard music; see *Versuch* I:3.20). 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).²⁶ Reichardt’s interpretation may apply to a few passages in Wq 4 (e.g., movement i, m. 11) that appear to demand a more distinct type of articulation than that produced by bow vibrato.²⁷ Perhaps this is true as well for a few repeated notes in the violin parts of Wq 5/ii that bear slurs but no dots (e.g., at m. 20). Elsewhere, copyists occa-

sionally 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 Wq 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.

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 Wq 5/ii, m. 34 suggests a diminuendo from *ff* two measures earlier. The *f* on the second of two tied notes in the basso part of Wq 5/iii, m. 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.²⁸ 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 Wq 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 that the so-called long or “variable” (*veränderliche*) appoggiatura takes half the value of the note to which it is attached (two thirds the value of a dotted note; see *Versuch* I:2.2, §11). But this rule does not apply to short or “invariable” appoggiaturas, which can be distinguished only by the context unless the com-

25. 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.

26. “[E]s bleibt zwischen jeder Note eine kleine Ruhe in Bogen.” See *Ueber die Pflichten des Ripien-Violinisten* (Berlin and Leipzig: G.J. Decker, 1776), 24.


27. 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 Major for two violins and continuo, Graun WV A:XV:11 (see Graun WV, 62–63), published in *Musikalisches Vielerley*, ed. C.P.E. Bach (Hamburg: Michael Christian Bock, 1770), pp. 130ff.


28. 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 Wq 18 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 352, p. 239; Wade, 67, argues that these directions were in preparation for a planned publication of the work).

poser has notated them 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 8th notes (*Versuch* I:2.2, §5). Indeed, the great majority of the small notes (*petites notes*) in both the early and later versions of the present works are 8ths. Quarter-note and half-note appoggiaturas do occur occasionally, but the distinction is not necessarily meaningful for performance. The recurring appoggiatura in the ritornello of Wq 6/iii (mm. 2, 4, etc.) was probably intended to be performed as the short, “invariable” type; in the partially autograph source A (see critical report) it appears consistently as an 8th, 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 in 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 *petites notes* such as the double appoggiatura or *Anschlag* are always “invariable,” that is, played short and on the beat.²⁹ Questions arise when the first note of an *Anschlag* is dotted, which occurs several times in the late version of Wq 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 counterintuitive. Evidently the dotted note of the *Anschlag* could in fact take most of the value of the main note that eventually follows.³⁰ The dotted slide receives a similar interpretation.³¹ The configurations in which these ornaments occur in Wq 4 correspond precisely to examples in *Versuch* I, which was published in 1753 and therefore perhaps roughly contemporary with the revision that added these ornaments to the score of Wq 4.

29. 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.

30. Thus in Wq 4/ii, m. 2, the *Anschlag* and main note (a’–c’’–b’’) on beat 3 of the first and second violin parts might be realized as , following the model of *Versuch* I:2.6, §9. The appoggiatura a’ that follows would then be realized as an actual 16th note.

31. Thus in Wq 4/ii, m. 4, the dotted slide and main note (e’–f’–g’) on beat 2 of the violin parts would be realized as , as shown in the first example for *Versuch* I:2.7, §12.

Whether the relatively plain appearance of these concertos in their 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 a 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 Wq 5 and 6.³² A manuscript collection of written-out cadenzas by Bach (B-Bc, 5871 MSM) includes one example each for Wq 5/ii and Wq 6/ii. The principal source for the late version of Wq 5 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 523) contains three further examples, all of which are surely Bach’s, but the same cannot be true of two cadenzas for Wq 6 preserved in more peripheral sources. On the other hand, a secondary source for Wq 4 (D-B, Sammlung Thulemeier 18) contains a cadenza (see appendix B) 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 Wq 6 does the principal source (B-Bc, 5887 MSM, Wq 6) incorporate the cadenza into the main text of the concerto; the present edition follows the source in that respect. For Wq 5, the principal source gives the four cadenzas on a separate page (see plate 6); these are given in appendix B.

Acknowledgments

The editor is grateful for support furnished by the Packard Humanities Institute in the course of preparing this volume. Jason B. Grant, Mark W. Knoll, and Paul Corneilson (all of the editorial office), and Peter Wollny of the editorial board were generous with their time and expertise. Stephen C. Fisher and Teri Noel Towe furnished 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.

Thanks are due to the following institutions and individuals for providing access to materials: the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv, its former director Dr. Helmut

32. On the inclusion of cadenzas in the absence of fermatas, see the introduction to CPEB: CW, II/1, xix. The slow movement of Wq 4 was revised to give the soloist an opportunity for a cadenza, reflecting Berlin fashion.

Hell, and staff; Dr. Karl W. Geck and the staff of the Sächsische Landesbibliothek—Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Musikabteilung, Dresden; and Johan Eeckeloo and the staff of the Koninklijk Conservatorium, Bibliotheek, Brussels. The editor also acknowledges assistance received

during an earlier editorial project on Wq 6 from Ulrich Leisinger, Julian Elloway of Oxford University Press, Jane Stevens, E. Eugene Helm, and Rachel Wade.

David Schulenberg