

INTRODUCTION

Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach's substantial repertoire of concertos includes six for solo flute; these works also exist in versions for solo keyboard, with three of them having originated as violoncello concertos. All six concertos stem from Bach's years in Berlin, at least in their earliest versions, with composition dates in Bach's estate catalogue (NV 1790, pp. 28, 30–32) ranging from 1744 to 1755.

The edition organizes the six flute concertos in two groups, beginning with the two works that Bach appears to have conceived first for flute: CPEB: CW, III/4.1 includes the Concerto in D Major (1744) and the Concerto in D Minor (1747), both of which Bach subsequently set for keyboard (as Wq 13 and Wq 22, respectively); the third concerto in this fascicle, the Concerto in G Major (Wq 169), was first written for organ or harpsichord (Wq 34; 1755), and later arranged for flute.

The second group of concertos, in CPEB: CW, III/4.2, consists of the three flute concertos Wq 166 (in A minor), Wq 167 (in B-flat major) and Wq 168 (in A major), the works that also exist as concertos both for violoncello (Wq 170–172) and for keyboard (Wq 26, 28, and 29).¹ Table 1 summarizes all three related settings for each concerto, providing a transcription of the entry for each work in NV 1790, and a list of extant sources for each version.

There is no indication that these latter three works were conceived as a group,² though they seem to share the same history. They likely originated in the early 1750s as violoncello concertos; before Bach's departure from Berlin in 1768 (as NV 1790 suggests), each was independently transcribed, in the same keys, for keyboard and for flute. The solo sections obviously needed some adaptation to accommodate the keyboard or flute, which sometimes also led to changes in the orchestral parts. In the A minor concerto, these changes are fewest: the same orchestral parts can be used for all three versions. In the B-flat major concerto, violoncello and keyboard share the same orchestral parts;

for the flute version new string parts were necessary. In the A major concerto, the three versions differ so much that each needed its own set of parts. Nevertheless, the essence of each concerto remained basically unchanged through the three different versions.

Tracing the complex history of these three concertos raises issues regarding the original solo instrument, the construction of the flute arrangement, source interrelationships, and versions authorized by Bach.

The Original Solo Instrument

C.P.E. Bach's estate catalogue (NV 1790, p. 31) lists all three works as keyboard concertos that had also been transcribed for violoncello or flute (“auch für das Violoncell und die Flöte gesetzt”). Most sources transmit only a single version without mentioning alternatives.³ This is not the case, however, for the manuscripts in the hand of Johann Heinrich Michel, obtained by the collector Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal in 1792 from Bach's widow and now preserved in Brussels (see table 1).⁴ The title pages for both the A minor and the B-flat major concertos seem to suggest, like NV 1790, that the keyboard settings were the original versions (see critical report for source descriptions, with title page transcriptions); however there are strong arguments against the keyboard as original solo instrument. In B-Bc, 5871 MSM, a collection of original keyboard cadenzas by C.P.E. Bach for his own concertos and sonatas (Wq 120), copied by Michel after 1788, each of these three concertos is described as a violoncello concerto, despite the cadenzas themselves being clearly written for keyboard. The B-flat major and A major concertos are similarly listed as concertos for violoncello in the 1782 catalogue of the Hamburg music dealer Johann Christoph Westphal, who somewhat inaccurately describes them as “Neu et Original.”⁵ Further, Bach mentions “49 Concerten

1. The violoncello concertos are published in CPEB: CW, III/6; the keyboard concerto Wq 26 is published in CPEB: CW, III/9.8, and Wq 28–29 in CPEB: CW, III/9.9.

2. Two years separate the composition of the B-flat major and A major concertos (see table 1).

3. Only the A minor concerto survives in an autograph score (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 355); it transmits the cello version.

4. This date is confirmed by a letter from Bach's widow to J.J.H. Westphal, 13 June 1792; see Schmid 1988, 499–500.

5. Cat. Westphal 1782, 217. A listing for these two concertos is repeated in Cat. Westphal c. 1790. (J.C. and J.J.H. Westphal are not related.)

TABLE I. SOURCES OF THE RELATED KEYBOARD, FLUTE, AND VIOLONCELLO CONCERTOS

Work NV 1790 Listing	Keyboard CPEB:CW, III/9.8 and III/9.9	Flute CPEB:CW, III/4.2	Violoncello CPEB:CW, III/6
Concerto in A Minor "No. 27. <i>A. moll.</i> B. 1750. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß; ist auch für das Violoncell und die Flöte gesetzt."	Wq 26 (H 430) B 1 = B-Bc, 5887 MSM (parts)* B 2 = D-B, SA 2602 (score) D 1 = D-B, SA 2601 (score) D 2 = US-Wc, M1010.A2B13 W26 (score) D 3 = MS, private possession, on deposit in D-LEb, Kulukundis II.3 Wq 26 (parts) [D 4] = D-B, Mb 802 (parts), lost Q = D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 355	Wq 166 (H 431) B 1 = B-Bc, 5516 I MSM (fl and bc in <i>particella</i>) B 2 = B-Bc, 5887 MSM* Q = D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 355	Wq 170 (H 432) A = D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 355 (autograph score) B 1 = B-Bc, 5633 MSM (vc and bc in <i>particella</i>) B 2 = B-Bc, 5887 MSM* D = D-B, SA 2603 (parts)
Concerto in B-flat Major "No. 29. <i>B. dur.</i> B. 1751. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß; ist auch für das Violoncell und die Flöte gesetzt."	Wq 28 (H 434) B 1 = B-Bc, 5633 MSM† B 2 = B-Bc, 5887 MSM (cemb part) B 3 = D-B, SA 2591 (1 & 3) (score and cemb part) D 1 = CH-Gpu, Ms. mus. 333 (score) D 2 = D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 221 (parts) D 3 = D-B, SA 2591 (2) (parts) D 4 = D-B, Sammlung Thulemeier 21 (parts) D 5 = DK-Kmk, R 403 (parts) D 6 = MS, private possession, on deposit in D-LEb, Kulukundis II.3 Wq 28 (parts) [D 7] = Prieger lot 196 (parts), lost	Wq 167 (H 435) B = B-Bc, 5516 II MSM (parts) Q 1 = B-Bc, 5633 MSM Q 2 = B-Bc, 5887 MSM	Wq 171 (H 436) B 1 = B-Bc, 5633 MSM (parts with additional basso part)† B 2 = D-B, SA 2592 (parts with additional basso part) B 3 = S-Skma, Alströmer saml. Wq 171 (parts)
Concerto in A Major "No. 30. <i>A. dur.</i> P. 1753. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß; ist auch für das Violoncell und die Flöte gesetzt."	Wq 29 (H 437) B 1 = B-Bc, 5887 MSM (parts) B 2 = D-B, SA 2618 (score) D 1 = D-B, SA 2617 (score) D 2 = US-Wc, M1010.A2B13 W29 (parts) [D 3] = Königsberg, Rf β 49 fol. (parts), lost	Wq 168 (H 438) B = B-Bc, 5515 II MSM (parts) Q 1 = B-Bc, 5633 MSM Q 2 = B-Bc, 5887 MSM	Wq 172 (H 439) B 1 = B-Bc, 5633 MSM (parts) B 2 = S-Skma, Alströmer saml. Wq 172 (parts)

* Orchestral parts shared for Wq 26, 166, and 170

† Orchestral parts shared for Wq 28 and 171

fürs Clavier und andre Instrumente, (welche letzten ich aber auch aufs Clavier gesetzt habe)" in his 1773 *Autobiography* (p. 207), though without specifying the violoncello concertos. Finally, in all three concertos, the keyboard is treated far less idiomatically than in the many concertos that Bach wrote expressly for solo keyboard. A comparison with Wq 27, for instance, shows that here the left hand participates much more in the virtuosity of the solos (particularly in the fast movements), rather than being limited to a basso continuo style more typical of the violoncello or flute concertos, as often occurs in Wq 26, 28, and 29.

It is just as unlikely that the flute was the original solo instrument for these three concertos. Whereas in the oboe concertos, Wq 164–165, the solo part very adequately uses the instrument's technical capacities, tessitura, and character, in these three flute concertos the solo part is rather unidiomatic and surprisingly often does not take advantage of the instrument's entire standard compass. The more cantabile sections work beautifully well on the flute, but the fast movements present difficulties not found in Bach's other flute compositions. From his earliest sonatas to his very last quartets, he did not hesitate to compose challenging parts for the flute, but these are always eminently playable and efficient, respecting the instrument's possibilities and making excellent use of them; this cannot be said of these three concertos in their entirety. Within each concerto the layout of the solos is generally the same in the three versions, resulting in some extremely long stretches without any good breathing opportunity, longer than in "standard" flute concertos,⁶ and longer than Bach is accustomed to ask from flutists. The virtuoso passages themselves are frequently awkward and ungraceful, which could raise doubts about whether Bach himself was responsible for the arrangements: they look more as if made by someone not so intimately familiar with the flute. However, similarly unidiomatic difficulties appear in the G major flute concerto Wq 169, for which we have Bach's autograph.⁷

For whom did Bach create these flute adaptations? Bach's court colleague (and, *de facto*, his superior) Johann

Joachim Quantz would hardly have needed someone to compose flute concertos for him: he himself wrote some 300 of them. Quantz might not even have known the flute versions, as no fragments of these three concertos (or Wq 169) are included in his *Solfeggi*, a collection of difficult passages from numerous works by Quantz himself—as well as by Georg Philipp Telemann, Wilhelm Friedemann Bach and C.P.E. Bach, Johann Gottlieb Graun, Franz Benda, and others—often with comments on performance practice or technique.⁸ It is unlikely that Bach's transcriptions were made for King Frederick II: he was reputed to play only his own and Quantz's concertos. In Bach's circle, there were flutists (some of them Quantz's students) for whom these concertos might have been prepared or who might have requested them.⁹ Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg cites the following flutists active in Berlin: George Christoph von Arnim, Philipp Bogeslav von Heyden, Georg Wilhelm Kodowski, Johann Joseph Friedrich Lindner, Friedrich Wilhelm Riedt, and Georg Zarth; for 1754, Marpurg names Kodowski, Lindner, Augustin Neuff, Quantz, and Riedt as flutists in the opera.¹⁰ It should be mentioned that Bach possessed a portrait of the famous French flute virtuoso Pierre-Gabriel Buffardin (1690–1768), drawn by Bach's son, Johann Sebastian the younger (1748–78).¹¹ The flute was obviously very popular in Berlin and must have been considered particularly well-suited to the *empfindsamer Stil*, judging by the large number of flute

8. Passages from Bach's concertos in D major (Wq 13, flute version) and D minor (Wq 22, flute version) are quoted in *Solfeggi*, 9 and 40. The motif quoted from Wq 13/i, mm. 96–99 is almost identical to the beginning of Quantz's Trio Sonata in E Minor, QV2:20, included in *Solfeggi*, 64.

9. See introduction to CPEB: CW, II/1 for Mary Oleskiewicz's discussion of flutists in Bach's circle. In his *Autobiography*, 208, Bach states: "Weil ich meine meisten Arbeiten für gewisse Personen und fürs Publikum habe machen müssen, so bin ich dadurch allezeit mehr gebunden gewesen, als bey den wenigen Stücken, welche ich bloß für mich verfertigt habe. Ich habe sogar bisweilen lächerlichen Vorschriften folgen müssen. . . ." (Because I have had to compose most of my works for specific individuals and for the public, I have always been more restrained in them than in the few pieces that I have written merely for myself. At times I even have had to follow ridiculous instructions. . . .); trans. William S. Newman, "Emanuel Bach's Autobiography," *The Musical Quarterly* 51 (1965): 371. One wonders whether this may also apply to these three flute concertos and also to Wq 169.

10. See Marpurg, *Historisch-kritische Beyträge zur Aufnahme der Musik*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1754), 408; and 77–78.

11. See NV 1790, p. 98; and CPEB: CW, VIII/4, no. 60 and plate 46. Buffardin, solo flutist in the Dresden Hofkapelle, was Quantz's flute teacher. He returned to Paris in 1750, and it is not known when J.S. Bach the younger executed the portrait, though apparently he based it upon an earlier painting or pastel.

6. See, e.g., Wq 166/iii, mm. 101–12, an uninterrupted twelve-bar chain of 16th notes, longer than the already very long passages that Johann Joachim Quantz requires to be played in one breath in his *Solfeggi*, 15, 16, 42, 48. Even in a high-speed *allegro di molto*, this becomes problematic. (For *Solfeggi*, see also its MS source: DK-Kk, mu 6210.2528 [Gieddes Samling I, 16]; available in a digital scan on the library's website.)

7. See CPEB: CW, III/4.1 for a description of D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 769, the very exemplar that Bach used to make his flute arrangement; a copyist prepared a complete score of the original keyboard concerto leaving one blank staff, on which Bach then entered the flute solo.

sonatas, trios, quartets, and concertos that were composed during Bach's Berlin years by him or his colleagues. In Berlin, private concerts ("Akademien"), where these pieces could have been performed, were frequently organized by such musicians as Johann Friedrich Agricola, Johann Gottlieb Janitsch, Johann Philipp Sack, Christian Friedrich Schale, and possibly Bach himself.

These arrangements could very well represent only the first stage of a transcription for flute, yet to be tested in practice and improved if necessary. Perhaps this might explain why there is only one extant copy of these three flute concertos, made after the composer's death.

Everything thus points towards the violoncello as the original solo instrument.

Arranging the Concertos for Flute

Most places in which the flute solos differ from corresponding passages in the violoncello version were obviously changed out of pure necessity: a literal transcription of the violoncello solos (one to even three octaves higher) would have exceeded the flute's range or would have put important material in the flute's lowest, relatively weak register. The baroque flute had, at most, a tessitura from d' to a''' . An exceptional and very soft $c\sharp'$ could be produced by fingering d' and turning in the embouchure, a technique already mentioned by Michel de la Barre,¹² and used by Bach on the very last note of his trio sonata in A major, Wq 146/i (1731, rev. 1747; see CPEB: CW, II/2.1), but not in these concertos. Notes above e''' were judged by Quantz to be unreliable.¹³ It is interesting to check the use of notes above e''' in the German flute repertory from c. 1725–90. Predictably, we find extremely few of them in Quantz's works, and the same is true for Telemann. In his sonatas for flute and basso continuo from Frankfurt/Oder

12. Michel de la Barre, "Avertissement," *Pièces pour la flûte traversière, avec la basse-continue, oeuvre quatrième* (Paris, 1702).

13. Quantz, IV, §20. Indeed on many flutes, mainly of the older, wide-bored type (as were Quantz's own instruments), f''' is difficult to produce; $f\sharp'''$ and g''' are easier but often too sharp; $g\sharp'''$ and a''' mostly rough and sharp. This is especially the case when these instruments had to be adapted to a relatively high pitch. Quantz's flutes work best at $a' = c. 392$ Hz., the pitch at court, but generally the Berlin pitch was closer to $a' = c. 415$ Hz. (Narrower-bored flutes, such as those made by Scherer in Butzbach, Gottlieb Crone and his son Johann August in Leipzig, or August Grenser in Dresden, produced most of these high notes more easily and better in tune, the latter two even at the higher pitch.) On pitch standards in Berlin and Potsdam, see Bruce Haynes, *A History of Performing Pitch* (Lanham, Maryland: Scarecrow Press, 2002), 288–89 and 316–18.

and Berlin (Wq 123–131 and Wq 134), Bach rarely ventures above e''' ;¹⁴ however, in his Hamburg works, we find high notes much more often.¹⁵ Other composers of the second half of the eighteenth century, such as Haydn, Mozart, and François Devienne, also use these higher notes with increasing frequency in their chamber music works, concertos, and symphonies.

In these three concertos and also in Wq 169, the absence of any note above e''' (even where it could have been conveniently played) points to Berlin—where Quantz was very influential—rather than Hamburg as the place where Bach, during his years at the court of Frederick II, carried out these arrangements. This is confirmed by the partly autograph score of Wq 169 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 769), whose main scribe is the Berlin copyist Anon. 303.

Very often the adaptations to the flute's tessitura weaken the internal logic of the passages. Occasionally, keeping solos somewhat longer in their original form or octave might have been better, or would have shifted the problem to another bar. Several examples of unsuccessful or unidiomatic passages, as adapted for flute, may be found in each concerto. These include: Wq 166/iii, m. 118 (octave leap on notes 2–3, rather than the expressive long appoggiatura found in Wq 26 and 170); Wq 167/iii, m. 72 (lacks expected f'''); Wq 168/i, mm. 165–66 (altered from the first appearance in mm. 58–59, because otherwise either b or $f\sharp'''$ would have been required). Additionally, in Wq 168/ii, the range of the flute part is extremely small and totally atypical: $d'-a''$, instead of extending to d''' or e''' as usual.

Sources for Wq 166–168

According to his 1773 *Autobiography* (p. 207), Bach decided to adapt for keyboard all of the concertos he had written for other instruments, probably doing so between the late 1750s and his departure for Hamburg in 1768. When Bach revisited his works, he often further elaborated and ornamented them. This applies even to his violoncello concer-

14. Bach only asks for a single trilled $e'''-f'''$ in Wq 123/i (1735), and twice includes $f\sharp'''$ in Wq 126/ii (1738); his trio sonatas have only one $f\sharp'''$, which appears in Wq 150/ii (1747), and there are no notes above e''' in the flute parts of his sonatas for flute and obbligato keyboard. However, he uses f''' several times, and in highly exposed spots, in his solo sonata Wq 132 (1747, predating the first version of the concertos by only a few years).

15. The pitches f''' , $f\sharp'''$ and g''' are freely used in the symphonies Wq 183/1 and 3 (1775–76); $f\sharp'''$ and g''' in the sonata for flute and basso continuo Wq 133 (1786); g''' in the quartet Wq 95 (1788); even $g\sharp'''$ and a''' (with alternatives one octave lower) in the quartet Wq 93 (1788).

tos: in the process of transcribing them for keyboard or flute, it appears that the original violoncello concerto then also underwent its own revisions based upon the newly-adapted versions (see CPEB:CW, III/6). At later stages, the keyboard or violoncello concertos could then be further developed independently from one another. We do indeed find different violoncello and keyboard versions, though each flute version has been preserved in only one manuscript.

NV 1790 unfortunately does not help to clarify the dates of adaptation for these three concertos. Unlike some other cases, where both the original composition date and the date of a revision are listed, here the estate catalogue gives only one date, without specifying which of the three versions is concerned (at face value, these seem to relate to the keyboard versions): 1750 (Berlin) for Wq 26 in A minor; 1751 (Berlin) for Wq 28 in B-flat major; and 1753 (Potsdam) for Wq 29 in A major (for full entries, see table 1).¹⁶

Wq 166

While the oldest extant source for the Concerto in A Minor is the violoncello autograph, D-B, Mus. mus Bach P 355, this source may not always present the earliest readings: in movement iii, mm. 146 and 148 (see example 1a), the flute is the only solo instrument with a simple, long, written-out appoggiatura; this has instead been divided into 16th-note figuration in all other sources. This figuration is logical enough for the harpsichord, where long notes cannot easily be held, but unnecessary for the violoncello, which thus clearly borrows here from the keyboard arrangement. That the flute represents the earliest reading for this passage is corroborated by mm. 155 and 157 (see example 1b), where all three solo instruments (including the keyboard) play the same motif with the same unornamented long appoggiatura.

Unfortunately, autographs of the keyboard and flute versions are no longer extant.¹⁷ In the preface to his 1905 edition of Wq 26, Georg Amft states: “Die Bearbeitung

16. For the situation regarding Bach’s adaptation of his oboe concertos, Wq 164–165, as keyboard concertos Wq 39–40, see CPEB:CW, III/5 and III/9.13; regarding his adaptation of the concerto for organ or harpsichord, Wq 34 (CPEB:CW, III/9.11) as flute concerto Wq 169, and the adaptation from flute to keyboard of concertos Wq 13 and 22 (CPEB:CW, III/9.4 and III/9.7), see CPEB:CW, III/4.1.

17. Also lost is any clear trace of the keyboard arrangement that the Breitkopf firm offered for sale in 1767 (which provides the *terminus ante quem* for the keyboard concerto); we cannot know which version it transmitted. See Cat. Breitkopf, col. 292.

erfolgte nach dem Original (Autograph) aus der Kgl. Bibliothek in Berlin (Sammlung Sara Levy, geb. Itzig).¹⁸ This source was subsequently lost, as Wilhelm Altmann notes in the preface to his comparative 1938 edition of Wq 170, Wq 166, and Wq 26: he used the keyboard part of Amft’s edition as his source, “as the original score [Amft] used at the time cannot be traced.”¹⁹ For the flute version, Altmann had to use B-Bc, 5516 I MSM; he states: “The original score of the hitherto unpublished version for flute has vanished; it is said to have passed from the ownership of Poelchau to that of the Berlin Singakademie, but has been missing for years.” Indeed, this score has not been found in the archives of the *Sing-Akademie*. Altmann uses the word “Originalpartitur” to describe the violoncello autograph, and again uses the same word for both the keyboard and flute sources; on the strength of the information available to him, he obviously did not question that these were autographs as well. Both Sara Levy (Felix Mendelssohn’s great-aunt) and Georg Poelchau were well-known collectors of Bachiana. Much of Levy’s collection passed to Carl Friedrich Zelter or the Berlin Sing-Akademie, and then into the Königliche Bibliothek (SBB, now D-B); Poelchau, a singer active in the Berlin Sing-Akademie who acquired portions of Bach’s estate, notably also possessed the violoncello autograph. The alleged provenance of both lost autographs (or at least of manuscripts originating within Bach’s circle) is thus not unlikely to be correct. (For further discussion, see the critical report for Wq 26 in CPEB:CW, III/9.8.)

The keyboard version in B-Bc, 5887 MSM provides the orchestral parts for the flute edition; this source could have been copied either directly from the violoncello autograph score (as suggested by copying errors in movement iii, mm. 186 and 188), or from a now-lost set of parts in Bach’s library that descended from the autograph. For the flute version, the basso part in movement i, mm. 81–87, would have needed further adaptation, which was never carried out, evidence that this part was intended only for the keyboard version (see critical report).

The flute version of the concerto is transmitted only in the flute and basso *particella* (B-Bc, 5516 I MSM). In movement iii, m. 159, at the end of the same phrase offering the earliest reading of movement iii (see mm. 146 and 148 of example 1a), surprisingly the flute part alone has an orna-

18. *Konzert (a-moll) für Klavier und Streichorchester von Philipp Emanuel Bach*, ed. Georg Amft (Leipzig: Kahnt, 1905), 2.

19. *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. Konzert A-moll für Violoncell oder Flöte oder Cembalo mit Streichorchester*, ed. Wilhelm Altmann (Leipzig: Eulenburg, 1938; reprint with English translation, London, [1954]), i.

145

Flute,
Wq 166

Violoncello,
Wq 170

Cembalo,
Wq 26

EXAMPLE 1a. Concerto in A Minor, movement iii, mm. 144–48

154

Flute,
Wq 166

Violoncello,
Wq 170

Cembalo,
Wq 26

157

EXAMPLE 1b. Concerto in A Minor, movement iii, mm. 153–61

mental flourish that seems more likely the latest development of this passage (see example 1b). In some measures, this version shows ornamentation more idiomatic for the harpsichord than the flute (see, for example, the *Anschlag* figure in movement i, mm. 30 and 33—an ornament absent in the violoncello and the earlier keyboard versions, but present in the last keyboard version in B-Bc, 5887 MSM). That the flute and keyboard arrangements were carried out independently from one another is suggested, for instance, by movement ii, mm. 92–93 (see example 2). The alterna-

tives for keyboard and flute are not identical; both would have been equally playable for both instruments. The right hand of the keyboard perhaps more closely resembles the violoncello than the flute part, and might be the earlier of the two.²⁰

20. Regarding a mistake that occurred in adapting the violoncello version for flute, see the commentary for movement iii, m. 122; in the flute and basso *particella*, the figured bass is correct here for the violoncello version, but should have been cancelled or changed for the flute concerto.

EXAMPLE 2. Concerto in A Minor, movement ii, mm. 92–93

In summary, the Concerto in A Minor originated as a concerto for violoncello in 1750. The keyboard version, Wq 26, was made before 1767, the date given in Cat. Breitkopf; the initial solo part was revised at least twice. The flute version, Wq 166, appears to be the last of the three scorings, though in one passage it reflects perhaps the earliest reading. It could have been prepared in the last years of Bach's residence in Berlin, shortly before 1768.

Wq 167

Unfortunately, no autograph materials survive for the Concerto in B-flat Major. Both the violoncello and the keyboard versions are transmitted in several copies, which present different readings; only one source is extant for the flute version (B-Bc, 5516 II MSM), a set of parts copied in 1792 by Michel for J.J.H. Westphal.

The sources represent several different compositional layers (summarized in the introduction to CPEB: CW, III/6). The oldest version with violoncello solo, presumably dating from 1751 (the date given in NV 1790), is found in D-B, SA 2592 (published in CPEB: CW, III/6, appendix). The flute solo part (in B-Bc, 5516 II MSM) corresponds most often to this early violoncello version in movements i and iii; differences in the flute, however, are not always due to tessitura issues, but may sometimes reflect later development. For instance, some ornaments in movement i (mm. 38, 167, 168) and the very last flourish in movement iii (m. 245) are clearly borrowed from the keyboard version. In movement ii, the flute contains a simpler, less ornamented version than that of SA 2592, presumably closer to Bach's first idea. Most keyboard versions belong to this first layer.

An intermediate layer is transmitted only in D-B, SA 2591 (2), a set of five parts in the hand of Berlin violin-

ist August Kohne, presumably still written during Bach's Berlin years. The keyboard solo part is extremely different from the earlier version, and lies between the violoncello solo parts of the first and last layers; it has not been further developed or transmitted in any other source (and no evidence confirms that these readings were authorized by Bach).²¹ The orchestral parts contain more dynamic and articulation indications than the other manuscripts;²² the parts clearly do not all belong to a keyboard concerto: the presence of a basso continuo part that is completely figured (in both *solo* and *tutti* passages) suggests that at least this part originally served a lost violoncello or flute version, since a keyboard concerto would only require figures during *tutti* sections.²³ That a number of accompaniment passages in the upper strings appear in a higher octave than in the other keyboard or violoncello versions also strongly suggests that the readings in SA 2591 (2) originated with flute rather than with keyboard or violoncello as the solo instrument. Since the flute of Wq 167 plays one or two octaves higher than the violoncello of Wq 171 and occasionally an octave higher than the keyboard of Wq 28, some accompanimental passages, mostly from the original viola

21. Wq 28 was offered for sale, next to Wq 26, in Breitkopf's 1767 catalogue; it is unknown whether it contained this version or the apparently more popular earlier one; see Cat. Breitkopf, col. 292. For an additional description of D-B, SA 2591 (2), see CPEB: CW, III/9.9, 147.

22. In addition to *piano*, vn and va also have *pizz.* in movement i, mm. 175–80 (vn II starts *arco* on the last note of m. 180); movement ii prescribes "con sordini" for vn and va; movement iii is entitled "Allegro assai alla Polacca" in vn and cemb.

23. Unexpectedly, this figured bass does not always fit the flute part transmitted in B-Bc, 5516 II MSM: see mvt. i, mm. 144–46, and m. 225, note 4; and mvt. iii, m. 125, note 5. That this continuo part is labeled "Violon Cello" makes it unlikely that the orchestral parts originally belonged to a vc concerto.

part, have been moved an octave or two higher as well, and generally have been reassigned to violin I or II of the flute version.²⁴

The last compositional layer is from Hamburg.²⁵ In the case of Wq 171, S-Skma, Alströmer Wq 171 and B-Bc, 5633 MSM—which present essentially the same reading—both show further development from the earliest layer transmitted in SA 2592: some solo passages were rendered more virtuosic or more expressive, occasionally borrowing from the earlier keyboard version (mvt. iii, m. 61) or from the flute version (mvt. iii, mm. 207–25); movement ii is ornamented much less than in SA 2592, and generally follows the flute version, even including its rhythmic error in m. 62. The final layer of the orchestral parts is found in the Brussels manuscripts. Except for the figured left hand of the keyboard part during *tutti* passages, there is no figured bass: clearly Bach did not include any figures in the parts kept in his own library. In Wq 167, one new accompaniment formula, which does not appear in any other version, was added in violin I–II, movement iii, mm. 64–67.

Wq 168

The present edition of this flute concerto is based upon the single extant source (B-Bc, 5515 II MSM), a set of parts copied by Michel for J.J.H. Westphal in 1792. Any autograph material for the Concerto in A Major is lost, as is a 1763 keyboard version advertised by Breitkopf.²⁶ The earliest extant source for the concerto is the early version of the keyboard scoring preserved in D-B, SA 2618; it was copied by Carl Friedrich Fasch, who has dated it “copiato Potsdamo ottobre 1764.” The keyboard version in B-Bc, 5887 MSM, also copied by Michel for Westphal in 1792, clearly differs from the readings in SA 2618, reflecting a later version. (This later Brussels manuscript has been consulted as a comparative source for the edition of the flute concerto.)

While the concerto originated as a work for violoncello, the two extant Wq sources, copied by Michel in the 1780s (S-Skma, Alströmer saml. Wq 172) and in 1792 (B-Bc, 5633 MSM), do not represent the earliest state of

the concerto: many solo passages have been elaborated much more than in either the flute or the keyboard versions. These variants appear notably in movement iii, which differs in length for each scoring: it is shortest for the flute concerto (341 mm.); the keyboard concerto (345 mm.) includes a four-measure extension in mm. 239–42; the violoncello concerto (351 mm.) instead adds a ten-measure extension at mm. 156–66. (For further discussion, see the introduction to CPEB: CW, III/6.)

That the flute concerto lacks both the four-bar keyboard and ten-bar violoncello extensions suggests that these measures were not part of the original composition. The incomplete basso continuo figuring in the flute version (see critical report) indicates that the flute and basso parts were most likely arranged from a keyboard part, where naturally only the *tutti* passages are figured (as they are in all keyboard sources). Whereas the violoncello solos in B-Bc, 5633 MSM are completely figured, figures accompany the flute solos only in places where the bass was newly written to accommodate the flute’s tessitura or other idiomatic issues. Further, in some of these phrases the flute line is nearly identical with the violoncello solo (see, e.g., movement i, m. 95), perhaps indicating that the flute version was arranged while consulting or remembering both keyboard and violoncello parts.

The flute solos are always simpler than solos of the late keyboard version in the Brussels source, and often (but not always) resemble readings in the early keyboard version of SA 2618; indeed, at times the flute readings appear to be earlier than those of SA 2618.²⁷ Thus, since SA 2618 cannot have been the direct source for the flute version, but since the flute part was arranged from a keyboard part, Bach’s lost house copy must have at one point contained an earlier keyboard version than that transmitted in SA 2618.²⁸ (One might speculate on whether this was the version offered for sale by Breitkopf in 1763.)

A comparison of Wq 168 and Wq 172 shows that Wq 168 also appears to contain the older version of readings in the following instances: movement i, mm. 28–31, 36, 40–46, 51–52, 55, 131, 133, 151–59; movement ii, m. 57; movement iii, mm. 81–85, 156–94 (violoncello numbering,

24. Between B-Bc, 5516 MSM and D-B, SA 2591(2), these adaptations are similar but not identical; they mostly occur at the same spots: movement i, mm. 31–35, 42–43, 61–63 (SA only), 98–99 (SA only), 100–2, 160–64; movement ii, mm. 25–27; movement iii, mm. 228–30.

25. Much of the background regarding the chronology of the concerto versions is based on unpublished research that Elias N. Kulukundis generously made available to the edition; see further discussion in CPEB: CW, III/6.

26. See Cat. Breitkopf, col. 132; also CPEB: CW, III/9.9.

27. When flute and SA 2618 versions differ, the flute usually has the later reading, with the following exceptions in which the flute readings represent earlier material than in SA 2618: movement i, mm. 28–31; movement ii, excluding mm. 91–96, beat 1; and movement iii, mm. 230–39 and m. 242.

28. This hypothesis is also supported by the fact that the Brussels keyboard version transmits parts of the oldest material, not present in SA 2618, in movement i, mm. 33–34.

with extended solo), 242–49. Further, in at least two of these phrases, the Wq 168 readings also predate SA 2618 (compare, for instance, movement i, mm. 28–31; movement ii, mm. 57–58; and possibly movement iii, mm. 156–84). Consequently, Wq 168 here represents the oldest extant version.

One may thus summarize the genesis of Wq 168 as follows. From Bach's lost violoncello autograph of presumably 1753 (the date given in NV 1790), a first keyboard arrangement was made, possibly containing both Wq 172 and Wq 29; perhaps this keyboard version was offered for sale by Breitkopf in 1763. In 1764, Bach's colleague C.F. Fasch copied a new keyboard version (further transmitted in the remaining two sources for this concerto; see table 1). Bach's first keyboard arrangement was used as the basis for the keyboard version in B-Bc, 5887 MSM and for the flute version, Wq 168.

Bach's Authorized Versions

The inclusion of the keyboard, violoncello, and flute versions in NV 1790 offers strong evidence that Bach authorized all three versions; indeed, there can be little doubt that the keyboard versions were authorized, since the *Autobiography* mentions these very transcriptions.

For the flute versions, we must look for evidence of Bach's role in the transcription process itself. The technical characteristics of Wq 166–168 being so similar, everything indicates that these were prepared roughly at the same time, during Bach's Berlin years, and by the same person. Though there is no absolute proof that Bach himself was responsible for the transcription of Wq 166–168, the similarity to Wq 169 definitely points to him as arranger for the whole group, even if the results are not entirely convincing. Who else would have done it? If Quantz or Frederick II would have arranged Bach's violoncello concertos for the flute, the result would probably have been more idiomatic. For Wq 166, while the existence of an autograph score for flute in Poelchau's collection cannot be proved, it perhaps cannot be fully dismissed; further, the reading of movement iii, mm. 146 and 148, confirms that here the flute version predates the other known versions. For Wq 167, the revision of the violoncello part is in some places a development of the flute and keyboard versions (see CPEB:CW, III/6, introduction, p. xviii, n. 27). In Wq 168, the later violoncello version occasionally borrows from the flute version.

Together, the evidence indicates that Bach originally composed all three concertos for violoncello, and that he

arranged them himself for keyboard and for flute; at least for Wq 168, the flute version apparently postdates a now-lost first keyboard version. The flute versions probably remained relatively unknown and were not copied before 1792, whereas different manuscripts of the keyboard and violoncello versions show that these were further disseminated and developed during the decades after their composition.

Performance Practice

Composition of the Orchestra

The constitution of the accompanying orchestra for these concertos cannot be established with certainty. Though it need not be identical in all cases, there is no strong reason why it should differ in three rather similarly built concertos. The very word "orchestra" might well be misleading: the ensemble could be as small as a simple string quartet. While the parts in J.J.H. Westphal's collection were not intended for performance, in all other copies of the various concerto scorings, each of the three upper string parts are also always transmitted in only one exemplar. Quantz mentions one-to-a-part performance, where the bass is presumably performed by keyboard and violoncello, without contrabass.²⁹ In an ensemble without contrabass, the keyboard could possibly offer the only accompaniment in the solos, and the violoncello, as a ripieno bass, would play only in the *tutti* passages. Bach also mentions the situation where no other bass instrument plays with the keyboard,³⁰ but the presence of *pizzicato* and *arco* indications in the basso continuo part of the Concerto in A Minor shows that this part must be played by keyboard and violoncello, not keyboard alone.³¹ Bach describes his ideal continuo group for a sonata: "For a solo, the most complete accompaniment—to which no one can object—is a keyboard instrument along with violoncello." (Das vollkommenste

29. Quantz, XVII, i, §5: "besonders wenn jede Stimme nur einmal besetzt ist". See also Richard Maunder, *The Scoring of Baroque Concertos* (Woodbridge, England: The Boydell Press, 2004), which demonstrates that the majority of baroque concertos were performed one-to-a-part.

30. See *Versuch I: Einleitung*, §9, note; CPEB:CW, VII/1, 10. See also *Versuch II: Einleitung*, §27 and II:36, §8; CPEB:CW, VII/2, 10 and 301–2.

31. Quantz, XVII, vi, §6 mentions continuo accompaniment for harpsichord without violoncello for trio sonatas; and in Bach's own sonatas for flute and basso Wq 124–127 (1737–39), the bass descends below C quite frequently, as if the sonatas were conceived without violoncello. In his *Autobiography*, 200, Bach notes that in 1740 he accompanied the new king's first flute solo "all alone at the harpsichord" (mit dem Flügel ganz allein).

Accompagnement bey dem Solo, dawider niemand etwas einwenden kann, ist ein Clavierinstrument nebst dem Violoncell.)³² One might extrapolate this to also apply to concertos, since many solo sections in violoncello or flute concertos are scored for the soloist accompanied only by bass, as in a sonata.

Quantz offers further guidelines, however, for employing a larger accompanying ensemble. With four violins (i.e., two per part), Quantz recommends one viola, one violoncello, harpsichord, and one double bass of medium size.³³ An engraving by Peter Haas (c. 1786) shows the king accompanied by one more flute (playing left-handed and standing at the left of, presumably, the concertmaster), altogether six violins/violas (each reading from his own part), one violoncello, one double bass, and keyboard (most likely a double-manual harpsichord); violoncello and contrabass are positioned right and left behind the cembalo player, and read from his part or score; the music on the king's stand appears to show the caption "Concerto di Quantz" (see figure 1).³⁴ Quantz explains that in concertos, the contrabass pauses during the solo sections.³⁵ With six violins, Quantz would add a bassoon to the bass section; a bassoon is never explicitly mentioned, however, in any of the sources for Bach's flute concertos.³⁶

32. See *Versuch II:Einleitung*, §9; CPEB: CW, VII/2, 8.

33. See Quantz, XVII, i, §16; Quantz uses "Contraviolon" to indicate a 16-foot double bass; in XVII, v, §3, he specifies that the best double basses are four-stringed, of medium size, with frets.

34. Haas's engraving is also included in Friedrich Förster, *Leben und Thaten Friedrichs des Grossen* (Meissen, 1840). Also see the continuo pair in the famous nineteenth-century portrait of Frederick the Great performing a flute concerto, by Adolf Menzel, "Flötenkonzert Friedrichs des Grossen in Sanssouci" (1850–52), Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Alte Nationalgalerie.

35. Quantz, XVII, v, 8: "Allezeit, absonderlich aber in Concerten, muß er richtig pausiren, damit er, wenn die Ritornelle eintreten, zu gehöriger Zeit mit dem Forte mit Nachdruck einfallen könne."

36. From 1756 on, a bassoon was regularly included in Frederick's orchestra; see Christoph Henzel, "Neues zum Hofcembalisten Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach," *BJ* (1999): 174. This practice is already found in J.C. Naudot's flute concertos opus II (c. 1735), where in the *tutti* sections a ripieno violin doubles the first violin and a bassoon doubles the "organo e violoncello." Also, in Frederick's orchestra the bassoon replaced the double bass; see Friedrich Nicolai, *Anekdoten von König Friedrich II von Preussen* (Berlin and Stettin, 1788–92), 320: "... daß in den letztern Jahren ehe Quantz starb [1773], die mit einem Pianoforte und Violoncell besetzte Baßstimme mit einem Fagotte verstärkt ward." In his *Briefe eines aufmerksamen Reisenden die Musik betreffend*, vol. I (Frankfurt & Leipzig, 1774), 75, Johann Friedrich Reichardt speaks of Charles Burney hearing the king accompanied by six musicians in 1773; these were thus likely playing single strings, fortepiano, and bassoon.

In these concertos, the accompanying parts have only rare, incomplete, or unsystematic *tutti* or *solo* indications from which any additional ripieno players could have known when to enter; the frequent use of *forte* and *piano* within *tutti* and *solo* sections does not offer any further guidance. Among the more than two-dozen extant related sources for these concertos (see table 1), only SA 2592 (source B 2 for Wq 171) explicitly calls for a contrabass—but there seems to be no cello in this case.

Use of Basso Continuo

The principal sources for two of the concertos in the present volume lack basso continuo figures: they are entirely absent for Wq 167, and Wq 168 is only partially figured (see commentary). Quantz tells us, however, that a harpsichord should always be included in the accompaniment of both large and small ensembles.³⁷ Bach, not surprisingly, shares this opinion, further noting that in addition to continuo realization, the function of the harpsichord is to keep the ensemble together; he disapproves of omitting a keyboard instrument from the continuo group.³⁸ In the related keyboard versions of the present concertos, solo keyboard passages sometimes include a simple tenor part in the left hand, thereby avoiding the emptiness of only melody and bass line. All of this offers a strong argument against the omission of basso continuo in the flute and violoncello versions, even when figures are absent in the sources. Though he insists on having the bass part properly figured in order to avoid mistakes (*Versuch II*:35, §1 and 3; CPEB: CW, VII/2, 297–98), Bach also writes that a good cembalist all too frequently must be able to play continuo from unfigured basses, or from other parts, as well.³⁹ One could sup-

37. Quantz, XVII, i, 16: "Den Clavicymbal verstehe ich bey allen Musiken, sie seyn kleine oder große, mit dabey."

38. *Versuch II:Einleitung*, §7; CPEB: CW, VII/2, 7: "Man kann also ohne Begleitung eines Clavierinstruments kein Stück gut aufführen."; also see *Versuch I:Einleitung*, §9, note; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 11: "Das Clavier . . . ist . . . am besten im Stande, nicht allein die übrigen Bässe sondern auch die gantze Musik in der nöthigen Gleichheit vom Tacte zu erhalten"; and further: "Der Ton des Flügels, welcher ganz recht von den Mitmusicirenden umgeben stehet, fällt allen deutlich ins Gehör." On performances that omit the harpsichord, see *Versuch II:Einleitung*, §4 and 8; CPEB: CW, VII/2, 7–8: "Man hört leyder mehr als zu oft, wie kahl . . . die Ausführung ohne Begleitung des Flügels ausfällt"; "wie nüchtern klingt er [= der Baß] ohne Harmonie"; and "Alle Schönheiten, die durch die Harmonie herausgebracht werden, gehen verlohren; ein großer Verlust bey affectuösen Stücken." (All quotations from Bach's *Versuch* reflect the critical edition of the text published in CPEB: CW, VII/1–2, which is based upon the 1787 and 1797 printings of the work.)

39. *Versuch I: Vorrede*; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 3: "Man verlangt . . . , daß ein Clavierspieler . . . [den General-Baß] . . . nach einem . . . gar nicht . . .



FIGURE 1. Engraving by Peter Haas, “Friderich der Grosse in seinen Erholungs Stunden” (c. 1786), with King Frederick II performing a flute concerto. Courtesy of the Stiftung Stadtmuseum Berlin

pose, however, that Bach himself would not willingly put a keyboard player in such an uncomfortable position.

The presence of “violoncelli soli” in the bass part of all sources for the B-flat major concerto (Wq 167, 171, and 28), movement ii, m. 7 (and the corresponding “tutti” in m. 9), is very likely to be understood as “senza cembalo.” In Wq 28, the keyboard would normally have realized the basso continuo during the *tutti* passages. In Wq 171, the solo cello

doubles the orchestral cello during the *tutti* passages; this could explain the plural “violoncelli,” which was then simply copied into the flute and keyboard arrangements. Some manuscripts for Wq 28 and 171 carry the singular form “violoncello,” indicating that only one cello should play during this passage.⁴⁰

Harpsichord or Fortepiano?

As a continuo instrument, harpsichord and fortepiano both seem possible (the sources give no indication; and

beziefernten Basse spielen soll; daß er diesen General-Baß manchmal aus Partituren von vielen Linien, bey . . . pausirenden Bässen, wenn nemlich eine von den andern Stimmen zum Grunde der Harmonie dienet, ziehen und dadurch die Zusammenstimmung verstärcken soll.”

40. The “Basso Violono” part in SA 2592 (Wq 171) here reads “senza contrab.,” but is figured in the “cembalo” part.

in the related keyboard concertos, the solo parts are labeled only with the perhaps more generic term “cembalo”). Quantz generally mentions the harpsichord for orchestral accompaniment, but adds that the fortepiano has all the good qualities for accompanying.⁴¹ (The Haas engraving in figure 1 probably shows a double-manual harpsichord.) In the *Versuch*, Bach remarks that the harpsichord is most apt to keep an ensemble together; he recommends the fortepiano for playing alone or in smaller ensembles, or—like the clavichord—for performances that require the most refined taste.⁴² We know that Frederick the Great very much liked the new fortepiano (he owned several such instruments made by Silbermann), and used them in his concerts for continuo, as is testified by C. F. Fasch, keyboard player at the court from 1756.⁴³ There is no evidence, however, to link any performance of these concertos with the court orchestra, and it is unclear how widespread the use of the fortepiano was in Berlin c. 1750–68.

Tutti Passages

Custos signs in the violoncello part of the autograph score of Wq 170 make it clear that the solo cellist should act as a ripieno bass during the *tutti* passages; in the keyboard version, the soloist realizes the basso continuo during these passages. Similarly, the flutist could also function as a ripienist, doubling the first violin; and indeed, in all substantial *tutti* passages of Wq 167, the first violin part is duplicated in the flute part, with the exception of the closing *tutti* of movement ii. On the other hand, the notation of “*tutti*” over rests in the flute part in movement i, m. 206 (rather than more practically in m. 207) might suggest that “*tutti*” serves as a functional indication for the flute, rather than as a request to play along with the first violin. The notated *tutti* passages may have been simply intended to permit the flutist to lead the ensemble, or to provide cues for solo entrances.

41. See Quantz, XVII, i, §16; and XVII, vi, §17.

42. See *Versuch I:Einleitung*, §11; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 12: “Die neuern Forte piano . . . thun gut beym allein spielen und bey einer nicht gar zu stark besetzten Musik.”; and *Versuch II:Einleitung*, §6; CPEB: CW, VII/2, 7: “Das Fortepiano und das Clavicord unterstützen am besten eine Ausführung, wo die größten Feinigkeiten des Geschmacks vorkommen.” (Also see note 38 above.)

43. See Carl Friedrich Zelter, *Karl Friedrich Christian Fasch* (Berlin, 1801), 13: “Fasch reisete also nach Potsdam ab und trat im Frühling des Jahres 1756 seinen Dienst an, der darin bestand: wechselsweis mit Bach von vier zu vier Wochen dem Könige täglich seine Konzerte und Flötensolo auf dem Fortepiano zu accompagniren.” Also see Nicolai, *Anekdoten von König*, 320.

That the *tutti* passages were not intended to be played by the flutist is supported by the flute parts for Wq 166 and 168: usually only the beginning or end of the *tutti* is given, sometimes even exceeding the flute’s range (see plates 7 and 8). Often (but not systematically) Michel writes *tutti* passages in small, cue-size notation. Frequently the last note of the solo is shortened from the expected quarter note (as confirmed by the violoncello or keyboard sources) to an 8th note, in order to accommodate the beginning of the violin I part.

That the soloist may sometimes choose to play the *tutti* passages, however, is demonstrated by Quantz: in the *Solfeggi*, he quotes both a *solo* and a *tutti* fragment from Bach’s D major flute concerto (Wq 13, flute version), movement i.⁴⁴ However, in his *Versuch* (1752), Quantz does observe that a flutist will create a better effect by resting during ritornellos, at least in slow movements:

Were the flautist to join in the performance of a well-written ritornello in an Arioso that is played muted or Piano, and whose melody reappears at the beginning of the solo part on the flute, he would produce the same effect as that of a singer singing along in the ritornello of an aria, or of one player doubling the other’s part instead of resting in a trio. If you leave the ritornello to the violins alone, the following solo of the flute will make a much better impression than would otherwise be the case.⁴⁵

Table 2 charts the specific inclusion of notated *tutti* sections in the sources for all of Bach’s flute concertos. As shown, closing *tutti* passages are often explicitly omitted in the sources. The only autograph material to survive for any of the flute concertos is the partially autograph score that Bach used in arranging Wq 169 from the keyboard concerto, Wq 34 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 769); here, Bach clearly indicates the *tutti* sections for the flute (most often

44. See *Solfeggi*, 9, systems 5–11 (MS in DK-Kk: systems 1–5). The excerpts correspond to Wq 13/iii, mm. 270–77, mm. 184–91, and mm. 107–15; followed by mvt. i, mm. 68–71 and mm. 96–99. The last excerpt is a *tutti* passage.

45. Quantz, *On Playing the Flute*, 2nd ed., trans. Edward R. Reilly (Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2001), 202; Quantz, XVI, §28: “Wenn der Flötenist ein wohlgesetztes Ritornell, in einem Arioso, welches mit Dämpfern, oder sonst piano gespielt werden soll, und dessen Melodie im Solo zu Anfange wieder vorkömmt, mit der Flöte mitspielen wollte: so würde solches eben die Wirkung thun, als wenn ein Sänger das Ritornell einer Arie mitsänge; oder als wenn einer in einem Trio, anstatt der Pausen, des andern seine Stimme mitspielte. Wenn man aber das Ritornell den Violinen allein überläßt; so wird das darauf folgende Solo der Flöte viel bessern Eindruck machen, als sonst geschehen würde.”


TABLE 2. TUTTI INDICATIONS IN THE FLUTE PARTS OF THE CONCERTOS

Concerto	Source	Remarks*
Concerto in D Major (Wq 13, flute version)	D–B, SA 2584 (parts)	<i>Tutti</i> passages fully notated
	D–B, SA 4845 (parts)	<i>Tutti</i> passages fully notated
Concerto in D Minor (Wq 22, flute version)	D–B, Am. B. 101 (score)	<i>Tutti</i> passages indicated by custodes
	D–B, SA 2583 (parts)	<i>Tutti</i> passages fully notated; closing <i>tutti</i> passages have rests
	GB–Lcm, MS 2000 (score)	<i>Tutti</i> passages have rests
Concerto in G Major (Wq 169)	B–Bc, 5515 I MSM (parts)	<i>Tutti</i> passages fully notated; closing <i>tutti</i> passages have rests
	D–B, Mus. ms. Bach P 769 (score)	<i>Tutti</i> passages usually indicated by notes/custodes/rests; mvt. i lacks opening <i>tutti</i> ; all lack closing <i>tutti</i>
Concerto in A Minor (Wq 166)	B–Bc, 5516 I MSM (fl + bc <i>particella</i>)	<i>Tutti</i> passages usually indicated by incipit/custodes; mvt. ii lacks opening and closing <i>tutti</i> ; mvt. iii lacks closing <i>tutti</i>
Concerto in B-flat Major (Wq 167)	B–Bc, 5516 II MSM (parts)	<i>Tutti</i> passages fully notated; mvt. ii lacks closing <i>tutti</i>
Concerto in A Major (Wq 168)	B–Bc, 5515 II MSM (parts)	<i>Tutti</i> passages usually indicated by incipit/custodes; mvt. i lacks closing <i>tutti</i> ; mvt. ii–iii lack opening and closing <i>tutti</i>

* See commentary for further details.





in shorthand notation), specifically omitting some passages with rests.⁴⁶ Further details regarding the notation of *tutti* passages in the principal source for each flute concerto are listed in the commentary by movement.

Rhythm

Bach's rhythmic notation is usually very precise,⁴⁷ but some conventions of his time should be kept in mind. Generally, Bach, Quantz, and their contemporaries recommend overdotting the  figure; frequently, the string players should lift the bow on the dot. Thus, in Wq 166/ii, m. 2 (etc.) the dotted 8th note on beat 2 should be double-dotted in performance, as confirmed by mm. 80 and 85; in this last measure, a dotted 8th is followed by a 32nd instead of a 16th in the flute's *tutti* notes. (Compare also Wq 166/ii, m. 4, with mm. 16, 33, 57, and 100).

Wq 167/i and Wq 168/i and iii include many instances of simultaneous or consecutive 8th-note triplets and dot-

ted 8th + 16th notes. This problem was not always solved in the same way. In pieces notated in \mathbf{C} , $\frac{3}{4}$, or $\frac{2}{4}$ where triplets dominate (works which, in fact, could have been written more easily in $\frac{12}{8}$, $\frac{9}{8}$, or $\frac{6}{8}$), Bach recommends playing the 16th note together with the last note of the triplet (underdotting).⁴⁸ Quantz, on the contrary, advocates overdotting everywhere.⁴⁹ In Wq 167/i (Allegretto), the triplets are by

48. See *Versuch* I:3, §27; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 155: "Seit dem häufigen Gebrauche der Triolen bey dem sogenannten schlechten oder Viertheil-Tacte, ingleichen bey dem Zwey- oder Drey-viertheil-Tacte findet man viele Stücke, die statt dieser Tact-Arten oft bequemer mit dem Zwölf, Neun oder Sechs Achttheil-Tacte vorgezeichnet würden. Man theilt *alsdann* [my italics] die bey Fig. XII. befindlichen Noten [ against ] wegen der andern Stimme so ein, wie wir allda sehen [ against , with the last 8th directly under the last note of the triplet]. Hierdurch wird der Nachschlag, welcher oft unangenehm, allezeit aber schwer fällt, vermieden."

49. See Quantz, V, §22: he wants to avoid the $\frac{12}{8}$ impression and finds the literal execution (dotted but not overdotted) "sehr lahm und einfältig," instead of "brillant und prächtig." A third opinion comes from Bach's colleague Johann Friedrich Agricola, harpsichordist at Frederick's court and a student of both J.S. Bach and Quantz: underdotting is only done at the most extreme speed, otherwise the contrast between $\frac{12}{8}$ and \mathbf{C} gets lost. Agricola adds that J.S. Bach taught this to all his students, so presumably also to C.P.E. See *Allgemeine deutsche Bibliothek*, vol. 10, no. 1 (Berlin and Stettin, 1769), 242–43; reprinted in *Bach-Dokumente* III, 206.

46. The score of the present edition omits the *tutti* passages in the flute line, as such passages are readily visible in vn I. In the performance parts offered by The Packard Humanities Institute, however, the *tutti* part is included for the flute part throughout in cue-size notation, matching the vn I line.

47. See the 16th-note upbeat to Wq 167/ii, m. 67, note 3 in va and basso, in contrast to the 32nd-note upbeat elsewhere.

no means present throughout the movement; the dotted rhythms are very much characteristic for the piece, and are likely to have been overdotted to enhance their springy liveliness.


Upbeats of one note, written as 8th or as 16th, are a special problem: whereas in Wq 168/iii, mm. 166, 169, 267, and 271, the 8th-note upbeat sounds more logical as a triplet, the 16th note in Wq 167/i, m. 61 (etc.) and Wq 168/iii, mm. 185 and 189 might be shortened in order to produce crisper repeated notes.

Articulation and Dynamics

Wq 166–68 carry quite detailed (but, naturally, never completely systematic) dynamic and articulation markings, better in one source than in another. For the interpretation of written articulation, Quantz—in both his *Versuch* and *Solfeggi*—offers the flutist a wealth of information regarding the relative strength given each note, and about tonguing technique.⁵⁰

According to C. P. E. Bach, unslurred quarter notes and 8th notes in a moderate or slow tempo should generally be held for half of their value; when marked with a dash or dot (which he considers equivalent), they become shorter still; when marked *tenuto*, they retain precisely their complete value; leaping notes and passages in quick tempo should be played “gestossen” (i.e., held for less than half of their value, as if given dots or dashes; see *Versuch* I:3, §6, 17, and 22; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 142, 147, and 151).



Ornamentation

Generally the violoncello version of all three concertos shows the least ornamentation, and the keyboard version the most; the flute version lies in-between, and occasionally borrows ornamentation from the keyboard. Typical of Bach’s harpsichord language, these ornaments help the player to overcome that instrument’s lack of dynamic resources or sustaining possibilities. Such ornaments, however, are not necessarily limited to the harpsichord, and can also be further added by flute or violoncello: if Quantz calls them “wesentliche Verzierungen” (Quantz, VIII), it must be essential to add them in performance when they are not specified in the score. It is striking that in the autograph of the oboe concertos, Wq 164–165, Bach often notates the “prallender Doppelschlag” (trilled turn: ) which is oth-

50. See, for instance, Quantz, XI, §14 for dynamics; and VI for articulation. For fast passages, it is important to recall that the “T-K” double tonguing was not used; instead, Quantz prescribes “Did’ll.” (Quantz also gives very detailed bowing instructions for string players: Quantz, XVII, ii, §8–28.)

erwise mostly absent in non-keyboard music; a flutist can similarly add it at appropriate spots.

Quite naturally, Bach’s own rules for the realization of the ornaments should be followed, although it should be noted that he does not always follow his own system.⁵¹ Some important points from Bach’s *Versuch*:

- All appoggiaturas and other small ornaments must strictly be played on, not before, the beat (*Versuch* I:2.1, §23 and I:2.2, §14; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 66 and 75).
- A 16th-note appoggiatura should be very short when followed by  or  (*Versuch* I:2.2, §13; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 74: “so kurz . . . daß man kaum merckt, daß die folgende Note an ihrer Geltung etwas verlieret”).
- When three notes ascend by a major or minor second and return to the first pitch (a–b–a or b–c–b), an appoggiatura added to the highest note is normally short (*Versuch* I:2.2, §15; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 76–77). When such spots require a long appoggiatura, the composer writes a sequence of four 16ths (cf. Wq 167/i, m. 56; and iii, m. 246).
- Appoggiaturas between falling thirds are generally short, but not excessively so (*Versuch* I:2.2, §14; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 75). When the last of the series falls on a strong beat, it can be longer (see, e.g., Wq 167, iii/124–25).
- Trills always have a resolution (*Versuch* I:2.3, §13–14; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 86–88), unless followed by a note a second lower, or where time does not permit the resolution (*Versuch* I:2.3, §16; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 88–89).

In the sources for the present volume, appoggiaturas have frequently been written in full rhythm, when their length is not what one would have expected when following Bach’s own rules: see Wq 167/i, last quarter beat of m. 171; and Wq 168/ii, mm. 65, 69, 73, 74, and 76. In other cases the figures, parallel passages within the same movement, or appearances in other versions can clarify the intended appoggiatura length. In Wq 167/ii, mm. 22 and 23, the flute has a simple, lower 8th-note appoggiatura on note 4; this might well be a shorthand notation for a (dotted) *Anschlag*, as found in some cello and keyboard sources at this very spot. Since the normal *Anschlag* often occurs in this movement, a contrasting dotted *Anschlag* might be the right solution here. Bach explains (*Versuch* I:2.6, §7; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 127) that the *Anschlag* can indeed also be indicated by the lower appoggiatura alone—flutists or cellists must have understood from the context that this is true here. Bach regrets that other instrumentalists or sing-

51. Quantz’s prescriptions are similar but not always identical; see Quantz, VIII–IX.

ers did not adopt the many different signs for ornaments that were in use for keyboard music (*Versuch* I:2.1, §14–15; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 64), but in this particular case, he behaved just the same way himself.

In the early layer of Wq 171 preserved in D-B, SA 2592, exposed long notes in the violoncello solo are marked with the long trill (♯) (see CPEB: CW, III/6, appendix, movement i, mm. 31, 54, 56, 98, and 160). Since trills are usually written as *tr*, the long trill might indicate vibrato here; it is significant that in each case the ornament is notated on the second half of the long note: this is where Bach himself recommends beginning a *Bebung* on the clavichord.⁵² The corresponding flute part in Wq 167 has none of these long trills, but a finger vibrato (also called “*Bebung*” by Quantz),⁵³ together with the *messa di voce*, would be an evident choice for any flutist.⁵⁴

Free ornamentation (Quantz’s “willkürliche Veränderungen”) can or should be added mainly (but not exclusively) in the slow movements.⁵⁵ For the violoncello and flute, the embellished readings found in the keyboard versions can be a guide.

Cadenzas for the flute concertos may be readily adapted from Bach’s cadenzas for his related keyboard concertos, Wq 26, 28, and 29. Four such cadenzas are included in the appendix to the present volume (and also are published in CPEB: CW, VIII/1).

Acknowledgments

My heartfelt thanks go to the library and staff of the Brussels Royal Conservatory, and to the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv, for making their manuscripts available for this edition and for kindly providing the facsimile plates; to Paul Corneilson and his wonderful colleagues at the CPEB: CW office, to Peter Wollny for sound advice, and above all to Laura Buch for invaluable help in the editing of this volume.

Barthold Kuijken

52. See *Versuch* I:3, §20; CPEB: CW, VII/1, 150.

53. See Quantz, XIV, §10. Wq 171/iii, m. 95 in SA 2592 also has a long trill in the solo violoncello, but on a low C, where vibrato is less obvious; however, the parallel places (movement iii, mm. 21 and 188) have the normal *tr*.

54. The harpsichord would need a trill or mordent in order to sustain the long notes, and indeed we find these long trills in most keyboard versions, starting on the beginning of the long note.

55. See Quantz, XIII; XIV, §2–4; and XII, §27. Indeed, in some MSS the solo part has double staff notation in the slow movement only, presumably so that the soloist can improvise on the correct harmony.