

INTRODUCTION

Throughout his life Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach was occupied in various ways with music for keyboard instruments. He dedicated himself to the keyboard with particular focus during his Berlin years, during which—beside his service as harpsichordist at the court of Friedrich II—he had enough latitude to be active as a keyboard teacher and to involve himself in the bourgeois musical life of the city through composing and giving concerts. In particular around the middle of the 1740s Bach brought out substantial collections of solo keyboard music, such as the “Prussian” and “Württemberg” sonatas, Wq 48 (1740) and Wq 49 (1744), respectively. He revised a number of his early keyboard sonatas Wq 65, his sonatinas Wq 64, and the keyboard concertos Wq 1–3 from the 1730s. In addition, he produced a series of new keyboard concertos in quick succession. In 1745 he published as a showpiece the concerto Wq 11 with Balthasar Schmid of Nuremberg, whose widow would later publish the concerto Wq 25 in 1752. Bach’s comprehensive compositional activity in the various genres of keyboard music, coupled with his own concertizing and pedagogical activities, was finally capped in 1753 with the publication of part I of his *Versuch*. Through these activities Bach attained his outstanding reputation as a keyboard composer, which would accompany him his entire life.

Work History and Original Sources

According to NV 1790 (p. 29), Bach wrote the three works contained in the present volume during the time of his intensive occupation with keyboard music in general and the keyboard concerto in particular: the Concerto in D Major, Wq 18 (H 421) in 1745; and the Concertos in A Major, Wq 19 (H 422) and C Major, Wq 20 (H 423) in 1746. Nothing more exact is known about the circumstances of their composition or of their first performances. They arose from the context of bourgeois music-making in Berlin. With eleven to sixteen extant sources each, Wq 18–20 are among the most richly documented concertos by Bach, in terms of their transmission history.

For the three concertos Wq 18–20, original materials in the hand of C.P.E. Bach and his immediate circle have survived. Autograph scores are extant for all three concertos,

which in differing depths reflect the development of the individual works. For the concerto Wq 20 an original set of parts also exists. None of the three concertos was published by Bach. But a comment in the composer’s own hand at the end of the autograph score for Wq 18 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 352, fasc. IX) seems to document plans for publication of that work. The comment reads: “unis. [diagonal line]; all the figures belong in the keyboard part; +. means *tr*; the # are mostly unclear and small, but easily distinguishable from the †; all *da capo* to be written out.”¹ As is explained more precisely in the source descriptions (see critical report), Bach systematically filled out *unisono* markings and added figures to the bass part or the left hand of the keyboard part in Wq 18, probably some time after finishing the composition. Presumably, this took place directly in connection with the planned publication of the work.

It cannot be conclusively explained when Bach prepared Wq 18 for publication, and why in the end the plan did not come to fruition. Based on the characteristics of the handwriting, Bach’s above-cited directive could have been made at any point up to the late 1760s or early 1770s.² Thus abundant options for the publication project present themselves. It is conceivable that after the publication of Wq 11 (and Wq 25) Bach was aiming for a further collaboration with Schmid or his widow. Just as imaginable is a collaboration with the Berlin publisher Georg Ludwig Winter, with whom Bach brought out various projects in the 1750s and 1760s. It is possible that the printing of Wq 18 was envisioned to happen before the outbreak of the Seven Years’ War (1756–63) and fell through on account of the political and concomitant economic circumstances. From 1758 on, Bach and Winter devoted themselves to other works; their last publication together appeared in 1768. It cannot be ruled out that Bach still planned to publish Wq 18 with Winter, but was prevented from doing so by Winter’s

1. “unis. | [diagonal line] | alle Ziffern gehören in die Clav. stime | +. bedeutet *tr* | die # sind mehrentheils undeutlich | und klein, aber von den † sehr | gut zu unterscheiden | alle Da Capo werden | ausgeschrieben”.

2. See for comparison the title page of the partly autograph score of the *Passions-Cantate*, Wq 233 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 337).

death in 1772. At any rate, Bach seems to have given concert performances of some of his older keyboard concertos in Hamburg in the years 1768 and 1769. It would appear that, despite his other obligations, he expressly strove to introduce and establish himself in the city of Hamburg as a keyboard player and composer.³ A further publication in a related genre would have supported these aspirations. A cooperative project with the publishing house of Breitkopf, with which Bach had published various works since 1760, does not appear plausible in the case of Wq 18. It is unlikely that such a project would have left no trace whatsoever in Bach's copious correspondence with Breitkopf. Also, in this connection, no reasons are apparent for the ultimate failure to carry out the printing. But regardless of which printer Bach planned to work with, the hoped-for publication of Wq 18 shows that the composition belonged to those of Bach's concertos that he himself prized most highly.

Bach's Performance Specifications

The autograph scores for Wq 18–20 and the original parts—or the sets of parts that can be traced back directly or indirectly to the original parts—reflect to varying degrees the manner in which Bach revised the works and refined his material over the years. Within these sources, there is only one exceptional case in which the musical text was changed significantly, namely in Wq 19: in measures 75 and 153 of the first movement, Bach replaced 16th-note figuration with 32nd-note figuration, thereby strikingly escalating the virtuosity of the keyboard part. Bach added dynamic markings, ornaments, and other performance-related details in all three concertos over the course of time.

In the autograph of Wq 18 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 352, fasc. IX) one can distinguish between the additions that were entered in connection with the planned printing, and the refinements—reconstructable from secondary sources—that Bach presumably entered in the original parts. In connection with the printing Bach systematically added slurs in the second movement in the string parts, along with the already-discussed *unisono* markings and basso continuo figures. Over time Bach made several addi-

tions in the performance details, especially in the keyboard part, including arpeggios in the first movement and numerous appoggiaturas in the second movement.

In the autograph of Wq 19 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 352, fasc. X) one can readily make out how Bach refined his ideas of dynamics over the course of time. After 1764, some twenty years after completion of the composition, he added comprehensive dynamic markings in the third movement in the string parts. While he thus emphasized an echo effect, he also strove for a heightening of dynamic contrasts by the deliberate use of *pianissimo*. The transmitted sets of parts, which must directly or indirectly stem from the original set of parts, suggest that over the years Bach added ornaments on a large scale in the keyboard part. For this he made use of the multiplicity of ornament types current at the time, as discussed in his *Versuch*.

Even more clearly than in Wq 19, a gradual development of dynamics can be observed in Wq 20. In the autograph (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 354, fasc. VI), Bach first sketched the dynamic markings with pencil and later confirmed them in ink. He then entered a second dynamic layer directly in ink. In the partly autograph set of original parts (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 493), Bach himself mostly entered the dynamics into the parts that had been written in another hand. These parts also document a further instance of how Bach increased ornamentation, including adding numerous trills at an unspecifiable time. Wq 20, however, does not show the multiplicity of ornaments found in Wq 19.

In all three concertos the difference between the scores and sets of parts, in terms of corrections and additions, suggests that much of what Bach added after the conclusion of the compositional process grew directly out of performance. Further, Bach seems to have had a growing need to pin down and specify the interpretation of his works for others. To what extent he specified details of performance more precisely *a priori* in later compositions is a topic ripe for research.

Reception and Transmission History

The numerous sources for Wq 18–20 give instructive insight into the many-layered reception history of Bach's works. Looking at the overall picture of the surviving manuscripts, it is striking that for the most part transmission began first in the 1760s, and that many sources originated in the 1770s and 1780s. Even disregarding losses that may have occurred during the Seven Years' War, among other events, the reception of Bach's works seems to have be-

3. Relevant concert appearances are attested to for 28 April 1768, 6 March 1769, and 14 and 21 December 1769. The announcements mention the performance of keyboard concertos, but state that they were not new works; see Barbara Wiermann, *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. Dokumente zu Leben und Wirken aus der zeitgenössischen hamburgischen Presse (1767–1790)*, *Leipziger Beiträge zur Bach-Forschung* 4 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2000), 435 and 438–39.

gun with astonishing delay. This is particularly surprising, given that by 1753 at the latest, with the publication of part I of his *Versuch*, Bach had established his reputation as a keyboard composer throughout almost all of Germany. Even if this newly-won authority did not lead immediately to an increased reception of his concertos, it can indeed be seen as the foundation for the extended reception of his keyboard compositions over time. Manuscripts containing Bach's keyboard concertos ended up being in active use for almost fifty years.

In the almost thirty years of his activity in Berlin, Bach had contact with numerous musicians and was active in various circles, which so far have only begun to be researched. One individual about whom we have relatively good information, and who worked in close contact with Bach, is the harpsichordist Carl Friedrich Christian Fasch (1736–1800). Fasch amassed a large music collection that on the one hand contained keyboard music, and on the other hand would serve in later years for his work with the Berlin Sing-Akademie. In the 1760s he copied numerous scores of Bach's keyboard works, including the concertos Wq 19 (D-B, SA 2580) and Wq 20 (D-B, SA 2594). His collection chiefly comprised pieces from the later 1740s and 1750s, for which Fasch presumably had received the sources from the composer himself. Fasch's copies transmit reliable musical texts, which quite understandably convey, in part, early versions of the works. These manuscripts give insight into one aspect of the multifaceted musical exchange between the two colleagues.

A further stock of sources that documents Berlin musical life in Bach's time is the collection of the Prussian Minister of State, Friedrich Wilhelm von Thulemeier (1735–1811). Thulemeier's Bach sources, including a set of parts for the concerto Wq 18 (D-B, Sammlung Thulemeier 20), came into his possession for the most part via Bach's colleague Christoph Nichelmann (1717–62).⁴ Here we find comparatively early copies of Bach's works, which apparently came from his immediate circle, even if contact between the composer and Thulemeier cannot be proved.

We have no evidence of Bach's relationships with certain other Berlin musicians and collectors identified by name. Joachim Ludwig Franz (d. 1789 in Kyritz), who owned, among other works, a set of parts for Wq 18 (D-B, SA 2610 (2)), was praised by Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg as an extraordinary interpreter of J.S. Bach's music.⁵ He was an immediate contemporary of C.P.E. Bach, so an ac-

quaintance between them is not out of the question. Carl Jacob Christian Klipfel (1727–1802), a porcelain painter, arrived in the Prussian capital city from Meissen only after 1763; as Christoph Henzel has been able to prove, this move led to a realignment of Klipfel's music collection.⁶ While Klipfel had amassed parts for practical use in Saxony, in Berlin he predominantly copied scores, for instance the score of Wq 18 (D-B, SA 2611). For the time being it is not possible to conclude from this that he was active in musical circles on a larger scale. Whence he obtained his sources is unknown; connections with Bach, who left Berlin in 1768, or with his closer circle are unlikely. Another collector of Bach's works, Johann Samuel Carl Possin, born in 1753, was likely then too young to have had contact with Bach in Berlin.⁷

The sources for Wq 18 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 271) and Wq 20 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 193) in the hand of Johann Christoph Friedrich Bach give rise to more fundamental considerations. Little is known about the relationship between the two brothers, who were eighteen years apart in age. Personal meetings between them after C.P.E. Bach left the parental home in 1734 are barely demonstrable. In 1751, when Friedrich II spent time at the Bückeburg court on the occasion of the granting of the Order of the Black Eagle to Wilhelm, Count of Schaumburg-Lippe, C.P.E. Bach was in the retinue of the Prussian king, so the two brothers met in this context.⁸ In addition, it is assumed that J.C.F. Bach visited Hamburg in April 1778 while he was on the way to London with his son Wilhelm Friedrich Ernst. There are no references to further meetings in person. Much, however, supports the likelihood that C.P.E. and J.C.F. Bach continued to have contact with one another in the 1770s and 1780s, which led to a cer-

der Musiker und Musikgelehrten der christlichen Zeitrechnung bis zur Mitte des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts (Leipzig, 1900–1904), 4:64.

6. Christoph Henzel, "Die Musikalien der Sing-Akademie zu Berlin und die Berliner Graun-Überlieferung," *JbSIM* (2002): 60–106, esp. 72–77.

7. On Possin, see Christoph Henzel, "Agricola und andere. Berliner Komponisten im Notenarchiv der Sing-Akademie zu Berlin," *JbSIM* (2003): 31–98, esp. 57–60. Among other works in the hand of Possin is a score for Wq 18 (D-B, SA 2610 (1)). A cadenza written by him for the second movement of Wq 19 suggests that he owned that concerto as well (D-B, SA 2659, no. 9; according to Enßlin, SA 2659 (7)).

8. 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.P.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* (Bückeburg: Createam, 1995), 17.

4. See Schwinger, 407–10.

5. See Robert Eitner, *Biographisch-bibliographisches Quellen-Lexikon*

tain amount of collaboration and a clear exchange of music. In 1770 the collection *Musikalisches Vielerley* appeared, in which C.P.E. Bach included numerous compositions by J.C.F. Bach.⁹ Then in the following years J.C.F. Bach was active as an agent for works by C.P.E. Bach.¹⁰ At any rate, the two musicians apparently had enough contact during these years to be mutually informed about each other's upcoming projects.¹¹ The existing sources suggest that the two composers exchanged mostly keyboard concertos and cantatas or oratorios.¹²

C.P.E. Bach's estate included two keyboard concertos by J.C.F. Bach: "Ein Clavier-Concert in Partitur" and "Ein Clavier-Concert aus E # in Stimmen."¹³ For the latter work C.P.E. Bach owned the autograph parts, which he must have acquired from J.C.F. Bach. Along with the concertos Wq 18 and 20, J.C.F. Bach owned four other concertos by C.P.E. Bach that we know of,¹⁴ and he subscribed to the six concertos Wq 43 (1772). The sources for C.P.E. Bach's works appear to have come into J.C.F. Bach's possession predominantly in the 1770s. It can be concluded, based on

9. Included in the collection were fifteen works by J.C.F. Bach: Wf VII/1, VIII/2, X/3, XI/1–2, XII/3–7, and XIX/1a–e.

10. J.C.F. Bach evidently acted as agent for four works by C.P.E. Bach: Wq 43 (1772), Wq 196 (1774), Wq 90 (1776), and Wq 58 (1783). For several publications the agents cannot be precisely determined, as the calls for subscriptions speak only of "all his friends." C.P.E. Bach subscribed to J.C.F. Bach's *Sechs leichte Sonaten* (Leipzig, 1785), but it is not known whether he acted as an agent.

11. In a now-lost letter dated 30 August 1784, J.C.F. Bach mentioned to Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf that he discussed a printing project with his elder brother; see *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1035. C.P.E. Bach mentioned to Breitkopf in a letter dated 23 December 1784 that J.C.F. Bach was planning to have his oratorio *Die Hirten bei der Krippe zu Bethlehem* printed; see *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1055.

12. Apart from the two Michaelmas cantatas by J.C.F. Bach, which C.P.E. Bach owned out of professional interest, the modern cantatas *Pygmalion* (on a text by Carl Wilhelm Ramler), *Die Amerikanerin* (on a text by Heinrich Wilhelm von Gerstenberg), and *Ino* (after Ramler) are attested to in NV 1790, 82 and BA 1789, 67. Mutual interest in the cantatas of Ramler is supported in the parallel composition of *Die Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu*, and through the fact that C.P.E. Bach sent the autograph score of his composition as a present to J.C.F. Bach after its publication. On the score (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 336) there is a comment by J.C.F. Bach: "Received as a present from my beloved brother." See Barbara Wiermann, "Werkgeschichte als Gattungsgeschichte: Die 'Auferstehung und Himmelfahrt Jesu' von Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach," *BJ* (1997): 117–43.

13. See NV 1790, 82. While the first concerto can no longer be identified, the second concerto is found in the manuscript D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 274.

14. Wq 5 (D-DS, Mus. ms. 970), Wq 7 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 515), Wq 16 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 360), and Wq 42 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 212).

the quality of the manuscripts, that most of the materials go back to models by C.P.E. Bach. Since they are without exception sets of parts, it can be assumed that the works were performed in Bückeberg by J.C.F. Bach. The keyboard part for Wq 18 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 271) requires particular attention. On the title page and in a further title at the end of the bass part the composer's name "C.P.E. Bach" has been changed to "G.F.C. Bach" or "G.C.F. Bach." It is highly probable that J.C.F. Bach himself made this change and added the note "manu propria" (in his own hand). It is not possible to date the entry; nor can the motivation or the reason for the alteration be reconstructed with any certainty. It is imaginable that such a falsification was made only after C.P.E. Bach's death (1788) and in a situation in which the Bückeberg Bach was asked for a new concerto on short notice.

Johann Heinrich Grave and Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal collected the works of C.P.E. Bach on a larger scale in the 1770s and 1780s, as well as after Bach's death. J.H. Grave, born in 1750 in Wotnik, studied in Greifswald and Göttingen between 1766 and 1773 and finally became a lawyer in Greifswald.¹⁵ Grave played the keyboard and collected above all for his own practical use. Over his lifetime he assembled a wide-ranging collection of manuscripts, with a clear concentration in keyboard music. In 1862 around 200 manuscripts from Grave's possession were sold by the theology student Hermann Johann Gottfried Budy to the former Royal Library of Berlin (SBB). Isolated Grave sources are found in other libraries. Grave's earliest musical acquisitions can be dated to his student years; then more intensive collecting activity is observable in the 1770s, during which period his copies of Wq 18 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 508) and Wq 20 (CH-Gpu, Ms. mus. 322) originated. Most of the copies from this time were prepared in Greifswald in the hand of Grave himself. He obtained a few other manuscripts through the music market. In the 1780s Grave acted as agent for the "Kenner und Liebhaber" collections III–V (Wq 57–59, 1781–85), whereby he came into personal contact with Bach. There is evidence of letters between them from the middle of the 1780s on topics that relate not only to matters of the subscription business, but also to musical questions.¹⁶ From this point, Grave's collection improved qualitatively. He now received sources directly from Bach's house, including a set of parts

15. See Wiermann 2010.

16. *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1008–10 (Bach to Grave, 28 April 1784) and *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1258 (Bach to Grave, 25 February 1788); the letters are now lost.

for Wq 19 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 513) in the hand of Johann Heinrich Michel. In addition Bach made available to Grave cadenzas to various keyboard concertos, for instance Wq 20.¹⁷ The fact that Grave was able to acquire the cadenzas from Bach can be seen as a sign of a particular closeness between the two men.

In connection with their practical use, Grave entered notes and other markings in his manuscripts to an extent that is no longer exactly reconstructible. Thus the sources themselves, although stemming from the house of Bach, were adulterated. An example of this is an added flute part for Wq 19. It is further to be pondered whether the basso continuo figures and ornamentation in the parts for Wq 19 might not also be traced back to Grave. To date, only little is known of the circles in which Grave was musically active. It can be shown that he performed in the musical circle (associated with the university) of the medical professor Karl Friedrich Rehfeld, who in the 1770s and 1780s presented concerts regularly. It is noteworthy that after Rehfeld's death in 1794, Grave hardly acquired any orchestral works but rather almost solely chamber music. Rehfeld's circle thus seems to have been an important forum for Grave.

In contrast with Grave's collection, the C. P. E. Bach collection of the organist J. J. H. Westphal came about less for reasons of practical use than from a documentary interest. Westphal collected works for all forces and in all genres with the goal of the greatest possible accuracy. It is not known, however, that he brought Bach's works to performance to any significant degree. Rather the documentary impulse of Westphal is further underlined by his *Gesammelten Nachrichten von dem Leben und den Werken des Herrn Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach Kapellmeister in Hamburg nebst einer Sammlung verschiedener Recensionen und Beurtheilungen seiner herausgegebenen Werke*.¹⁸ Westphal was occupied for the most part with the completeness of his collection and in service of this goal he was in contact with Bach, at the latest, from 1786 onward. Thus Wq 18–20 are all transmitted in Westphal's collection as sets of parts in B-Bc, 5887 MSM. The particular strength of the Westphal sources has to do with the fact that he assigned great value to the reliability of his manuscripts, and even after Bach's death he submitted for proofreading in Bach's house

manuscripts that did not originate there.¹⁹ This is true, for instance, of the set of parts for Wq 18. As the parts go back indirectly to the original set of parts but corrections were ascertained on the basis of the original score, this source now presents an idiosyncratic mixture of readings that can scarcely be separated from one another. As can be deduced on the basis of a letter to him from J. M. Bach, Westphal also sent a manuscript of Wq 19 for proofreading in Bach's house. This manuscript does not correspond with the parts now in B-Bc, which contain no proofreader's entries and in which numerous early variants of the work remain. The location of the corrected manuscript is unknown.

The role that the music trade played for the dissemination of C. P. E. Bach's concertos is difficult to reconstruct in detail. Similarly it is in large part still unclear what source material the dealers used as models and to what extent their actions were agreed to by Bach. By and large, Bach seems to have had difficulties conducting satisfying business relationships with various music dealers; he seems to have preferred, where appropriate contacts existed, to sell his works himself. Even the relationship with Breitkopf, his long-standing business friend, was not unproblematic. In a letter dated 26 August 1774 Bach sent Johann Nikolaus Forkel the following suggestion: "In case you are thinking you may not want to trouble me about my printed things since you could get them from Breitkopf, let me have the honor of explaining to you that you can have the following things, apart from the psalms, which are by the way also all of my published books, directly from me more quickly and for the same price, since Breitkopf gets them from me and I must give him a large discount. . . . The handwritten things Breitkopf sells as mine are partly not by me, and in any case they are old and incorrectly copied."²⁰

17. Grave owned further authentic cadenzas for the concertos Wq 5, 14, 15, 24, and 34. The same cadenzas are transmitted in B-Bc, 5871 MSM in the hand of Michel.

18. B-Bc, Ms. II 4133 Mus.; cf. also *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach im Spiegel seiner Zeit. Die Dokumentensammlung Johann Jacob Heinrich Westphals*, ed. Ernst Suchalla (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1993).

19. See letters from Johanna Maria Bach and Anna Carolina Philippina Bach to Westphal dated 13 February 1795 and 13 February 1796; cf. *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1322–24 and Schmid 1988, 473–528, esp. 509–11.

20. "Bey Gelegenheit, da Sie zu sagen belieben: wegen meiner gedruckten Sachen dürften Sie mich nicht beschwehren, weil Sie sie von Breitkopfen kriegen könnten, habe ich die Ehre Ihnen zu expliciren, daß Sie außer den Psalmen folgende Sachen, welche ebenfalls NB sämtlich meine Verlags-Bücher sind, näher u. für eben den Preiß bey mir unmittelbar haben können, weil sie Breitkopf von mir nimt, u. ich ihm viel Rabbat geben muß. . . . Die geschriebenen Sachen, die Breitkopf von mir verkauft, sind theils nicht von mir, wenigstens sind sie alt u. falsch geschrieben." See *CPEB-Briefe*, 1:432–33; translation adapted from *The Letters of C. P. E. Bach*, trans. and ed. Stephen L. Clark (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997), 62.

In 1763, Wq 18–20 appeared in part IV of the Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue.²¹ They were gathered together as part of three collections. Wq 20 appeared in *Raccolta I* together with Wq 32 and Wq 8. Wq 18 was offered in *Raccolta II* with Wq 34 and Wq 29. *Raccolta III* consisted of Wq 19, Wq 16, and a concerto by Johann Christian Bach (H 484.2/Warburton C 73), which was falsely attributed to C. P. E. Bach. It appears, from both this misattribution and the incorrect sequence of the works, that the sources cannot be traced back to the composer himself. What served as house copies for Breitkopf, or on what basis he offered the works, is completely open to speculation. No traces of the collections assembled by Breitkopf can be shown for the transmitted manuscripts of the concertos Wq 18–20. It is just as difficult to determine how well the concertos sold. None of the surviving sources can be demonstrated with certainty to have been in Breitkopf's possession.

The music dealership of Johann Christoph Westphal, founded in 1770 in Hamburg, offered a wide spectrum of C. P. E. Bach's works, which certainly in no way always appeared in consultation with the composer. Wq 20 and possibly Wq 19 first appeared in the Westphal catalogue of 1772.²² By 1784 Westphal regularly announced all three concertos Wq 18–20. Although copies from the house of Westphal show certain definite characteristics, the dissemination of Bach's works through the Hamburg music dealer is traceable only with difficulty. It can be assumed that two sources for Wq 18 were acquired from Westphal (B-Bc, 5887 MSM, Wq 18 and D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 508). In this case the models may go back indirectly to the original set of parts. For other works Westphal used undoubtedly less reliable manuscripts.²³

Bach's connections to the music printer and dealer Johann Carl Friedrich Rellstab began with a disagreement, when Rellstab planned to reprint Bach's Sonatas with Varied Reprises, Wq 50, in 1785, purportedly under the terms of an agreement with the widow of G. L. Winter, who had first printed the collection in 1760.²⁴ Rellstab first offered works by C. P. E. Bach on a large scale in the 1790s, among them the concertos Wq 18–20.²⁵ The close correspondence of the Rellstab catalogue with NV 1790, which had already appeared at this time, allows one to guess that Rellstab sold works on commission and that he had no sources of his own at his disposal. To what extent Rellstab succeeded in selling works by C. P. E. Bach is open to speculation.

Acknowledgments

My thanks go to the numerous libraries and private owners who made copies of their sources available for this volume. Particular thanks are due to the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv, where I was able to examine numerous original sources, and the staff there who have supported my research for years. For numerous conversations and suggestions I would particularly like to thank Peter Wollny. I would also like to thank Matthias Röder and especially Jason B. Grant for their editorial assistance.

Barbara Wiermann

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

22. *Verzeichnis von Musicalien, so bey Johann Christoph Westphal und Compagnie in Hamburg in Commission zu haben sind* (Hamburg, 1772), 49.

23. See for example Bach's letter to J. G. I. Breitkopf dated 23 July 1785, in which the composer complains about faulty copies from the house of Westphal; see *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1085. Bach's irritation that Westphal owned a manuscript of the symphonies Wq 182, which were expressly intended only for Baron Gottfried van Swieten, also shows that there was no open exchange of sources; see *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1033.

24. *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1081–85.

25. *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.