

INTRODUCTION

The three concertos for violoncello of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach represent his only surviving works for the instrument.¹ Composed over a four-year period, the concertos make a distinctive contribution to the violoncello literature. Each is listed in the “Nachlaß-Verzeichnis” (NV 1790, p. 31): the Concerto in A Minor (no. 27) was composed in Berlin in 1750, the Concerto in B-flat Major (no. 29) in Berlin in 1751, and the Concerto in A Major (no. 30) in Potsdam in 1753. NV 1790, however, lists the works as concertos for keyboard, describing each in the same words: “Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß; ist auch für das Violoncell und die Flöte gesezt” (Keyboard, 2 violins, viola and bass; it is also set for violoncello and flute).

Only one autograph manuscript survives, D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 355, a full score of the Violoncello Concerto in A Minor, Wq 170 (see plate 1). Since it is a holograph, it almost certainly represents the original form of the concerto. For the frequent revisions of his solo concertos, Bach established standard procedures. When he revised his Organ Concerto in G Major, Wq 34, for flute (Wq 169), he had a copyist prepare a score of the ripieno parts, to which he then added the new instrumental solo on the blank staves, altering the orchestration where necessary.² Alternatively, he could write the new solo separately, retaining the original ripieno parts.

After Bach’s death, copies of the versions for each instrument were obtained by the collector Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal, as shown in a letter from Bach’s widow, Johanna Maria Bach, to Westphal, dated 13 June 1792.³ These manuscripts, now in the Brussels Conservatory, as listed in the summary of sources in table 1, were all copied by Johann Heinrich Michel, a meticulous copyist who worked with Bach during his years in Hamburg (see

plates 2 and 4).⁴ As the letter states, the same ripieno parts were to be used for all three versions of the Concerto in A Minor, while the same ripieno parts were to be used for the violoncello and keyboard versions of the Concerto in B-flat Major; only the Concerto in A Major had to be copied out in full three times.⁵ In the present edition these concertos are presented as nine separate works.

Genesis

A manuscript of cadenzas for Bach’s concertos, B-Bc, 5871 MSM, presents further evidence concerning the genesis of the three concertos. Cadenza no. 18 is labeled “Cadenz zum ersten all.^o des Violonc. conc. aus dem A. moll. N.^o 27,” while the following cadenza, no. 19, is labeled “Zum Adagio des Vorigen Concerto.” Similarly, cadenza no. 23 is headed “Cadenz zum Adagio des Violonc. Conc. aus dem B. N.^o 29,” and cadenza no. 31 reads “Cadenz zum adag. des Violonc: Conc. aus dem A. dur N.^o 30.” The manuscript, dated after 1778, employs the numeration of NV 1790; the cadenzas are considered to be the authentic work of Bach.⁶ Even though the three concertos are labeled as works for violoncello, the cadenzas themselves are written for keyboard. In comparison with NV 1790, these headings represent a *lectio difficilior*, a reading that could not otherwise have been predicted. They afford an initial argument that all three concertos were originally composed for violoncello.

The argument is supported in the first instance by a consideration of the quality of writing for the solo instruments. In their earliest versions, the keyboard solos lack effective interaction between right and left hands.

1. A Sonata in G Minor, Wq 138, composed in 1740 for solo violoncello and basso continuo, has been lost; see CPEB: CW, II/1 for more information.

2. Wade, 103–7. For further discussion of Wq 169, see CPEB: CW, III/4.2. On Bach’s revision of his oboe concertos for keyboard, see CPEB: CW, III/9.13.

3. Schmid 1988, 499–500.

4. On Michel, see Georg von Dadelsen, *Bemerkungen zur Handschrift Johann Sebastian Bachs, seiner Familie und seines Kreises*, Tübinger Bach Studien, 1 (Trossingen: Hohner, 1957), 24. The full name was discovered by Stephen Clark in a document at the Hamburg Staatsarchiv. See Leisinger/Wollny 1997, 36, n. 45.

5. As stated in the notes written by J.J.H. Westphal on the original folders, the shared parts were supposed to reside with the keyboard solo. For the Concerto in B-flat Major they are now kept in the folder with the violoncello obbligato.

6. *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. 75 Cadenzas (H. 264/W. 120) for Keyboard*, facsimile ed. E. Eugene Helm (Utrecht: STIMU, 1997), iv.

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/4.1	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 = Private MS (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 b.c. 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 b.c. 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, Slg Thulemeier 21 (parts) D 5 = DK-Kmk, R. 403 (parts) D 6 = Private MS (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

Compared to other keyboard works of the 1750s, they demonstrate relatively little virtuosic display.⁷ Successive melodic leaps or leaps of a tenth are lacking. In each of the three works, the rhythms of the left hand all too often betray its origins as a basso continuo, resulting in a persistent stiffness and thinness of texture not found in more idiomatic keyboard concertos by Bach. The process of transcription from violoncello to keyboard may have been facilitated by presentation of the parts in double-staff format, with the violoncello on the top staff and basso on the lower staff. Sources exist in the same format for all three concertos, as illustrated in plate 3.⁸ The flute solos also show clear signs of transcription from another medium.⁹ The writing in the *Allegretto* and *Allegro* movements of the three flute concertos (Wq 166, 167, 168) is both unidiomatic and completely different from that in Bach's original compositions for flute (see CPEB: CW, III/4.1). In contrast, the violoncello solos in Wq 170 and 171 take full advantage of the instrument's sonorities and registers. The two concertos display a deep understanding of the instrument's possibilities, with passagework that recalls J. S. Bach's Six Suites for Violoncello Solo, BWV 1007–1012.¹⁰ Wq 172, on the other hand, is composed in a *galant* style that requires a different manner of playing, with rapid string crossings and a light touch, but nonetheless idiomatic to the instrument. Notable is the use of high register for expressive effect in the *Largo con sordini*.¹¹

The relationships between the versions for violoncello and those for keyboard and flute raise further questions concerning chronology and authenticity. The relationships are complicated by Bach's habit of revising works at later

stages; generally speaking, the revisions affect only the solo parts, yet Bach occasionally made adjustments to the ripieno parts, as well. Not unexpectedly, a number of keyboard sources survive for each concerto. In fact, the three versions for keyboard appear in the Breitkopf catalogue in 1763 and 1767; since these lists of concertos are retrospective, the keyboard versions of the concertos were probably in existence by the mid-1750s.¹² Multiple sources also survive for each version for violoncello (discussed in detail in the critical report). Only one source survives for each of the versions for flute. A consideration of manuscript sources and their interrelationships allows for further assessment of the thesis concerning the original medium for each concerto.

Concerto in A Minor

In creating alternative versions for different instruments, Bach naturally followed a compositional principle of melodic elaboration, or *Auszierung*.¹³ In the first movement of Wq 170, mm. 77–80, the keyboard version expands upon the austere violoncello line with a higher degree of intervallic motion (example 1). The flute version increases the rhythmic activity to triplets for much of this phrase. During the sequential passage that follows, mm. 81–86, the violoncello alternates 8th and 16th notes, whereas the keyboard and flute versions articulate scales or arpeggios in continuous 16th notes, doing away with the rhythmic alternation that underscores the writing for violoncello. In the third movement, mm. 158–59, the flute breaks away from the syncopated motive heard moments earlier, mm. 149–50, to present a rising scale in 16th notes (example 2). The violoncello continues the syncopation through two full measures. Because the syncopated motive occurs five times in the course of the movement, the flute elaboration disturbs its formal continuity. Further, the early keyboard and flute solos agree only when they follow the violoncello line; in passages where both differ from the violoncello, they also differ from each other. Consequently, the version for violoncello takes clear chronological precedence.

The keyboard version of the Concerto in A Minor, Wq 26, exists in two compositional layers, the first represented by four manuscripts (sources D 1–D 4 in table 1).¹⁴

7. The observations here speak to the differences with the Concerto in D Major, Wq 27 (1750) and the Concerto in C Minor, Wq 31 (1753).

8. Five sources have parts in double-staff format: B-Bc, 5633 MSM (Wq 170); S-Skma, Alströmer Wq 171; S-Skma, Alströmer Wq 172; D-B, SA 2593 (Wq 170); and D-B, SA 2592 (Wq 171). The two Sing-Akademie sources have double-staff format only in the second movement.

9. On Wq 166, see Leta Miller, "C. P. E. Bach's Instrumental 'Recompositions': Revisions or Alternatives," *Current Musicology* 59 (1995): 28–30. Miller demonstrates that many of the observed differences are necessitated by the range and customary tessitura of the flute.

10. Compare, for instance, the typical use of *bariolage* on an open string in Wq 171/i, mm. 128–29 (plate 3, third system), with BWV 1009, Gigue, mm. 21–24; the use of a stationary figure against a line moving stepwise below it in Wq 171/i, mm. 136–39 (plate 3, fifth system) with BWV 1008, Courante, mm. 13–15; and the sequential alternation of 8th-note arpeggios, played staccato, with scalar 16th notes in Wq 171/iii, mm. 128–38 and BWV 1010, Courante, mm. 8–13.

11. The first ritornello, which is repeated by the soloist, closely paraphrases the opening of J. S. Bach's Sinfonia no. 9 in F Minor, BWV 795.

12. Cat. Breitkopf, cols. 132 (Wq 29), 292 (Wq 26, 28).

13. Wade, 108.

14. The first layer is presented in the comparative edition, *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. Konzert A-moll für Violoncell oder Flöte oder Cembalo mit Streichorchester*, ed. Wilhelm Altmann (Leipzig and Vienna: Eulenburg, 1938). See also the recent edition of Wq 170, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, *Konzert für Violoncello, Streicher, und Basso Continuo, A-moll*, ed. Ulrich Leisinger (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 2004).

77

a. Violoncello

b. Flute

c. Cembalo

79

EXAMPLE 1. Concerto in A Minor, movement i, mm. 77–80.
 Comparison of (a) violoncello solo (B-Bc, 5633 MSM, Wq 170), (b) flute solo (B-Bc, 5516 I MSM),
 and (c) cembalo solo (B-Bc, 5887 MSM, Wq 26)

157

a.

b.

EXAMPLE 2. Concerto in A Minor, movement iii, mm. 157–61.
 Comparison of (a) violoncello solo (B-Bc 5633 MSM, Wq 170) and (b) flute solo (B-Bc, 5516 I MSM)

TABLE 2. RELATIVE CHRONOLOGY OF COMPOSITIONAL LAYERS AND SOURCES,
CONCERTO IN B-FLAT MAJOR

Compositional Layer	MS Shelf Mark	Scribe	Date
<u>First</u>			
Violoncello: obbligato and ripieno	D-B, SA 2592	Anon. SA Bach 4	1751–68
Cembalo: concertato	D-B, Thulemeier 21	Anon. 301	1751–63
	D-B, SA 2591 (3)	C.F.C. Fasch	1756–68
	B-Bc, 5887 MSM	Michel	1792
Cembalo: ripieno	D-B, Thulemeier 21	Anon. 403	1760–63
	D-B, SA 2591 (1) (score)	C.F.C. Fasch	1756–68
	B-Bc, 5633 MSM	Michel	1792
Flute: concertato	B-Bc, 5516 II MSM	Michel	1792
<u>Second</u>			
Violoncello: obbligato and ripieno	S-Skma, Alströmer Wq 171	Anon. 309	1780–86
	B-Bc, 5633 MSM	Michel	1792
Flute: ripieno	B-Bc, 5516 II MSM	Michel	1792

The second layer is represented by B-Bc, 5887 MSM (Wq 26). The version of the keyboard part in the Brussels source is an elaborate reworking of that in the earlier transcription. Since it was copied from parts in Bach's own library, it represents a *Fassung letzter Hand*. The flute version conforms to the melodic outline of the violoncello solo through most of the work, but with a higher degree of ornamentation, particularly in the second movement. Its listing in NV 1790 and the circumstance that a flute part apparently resided in Bach's library support the authenticity of that version, even though no source for it from Bach's lifetime survives.¹⁵

Concerto in B-flat Major

The complex of sources for the Concerto in B-flat Major contains at least two compositional layers (see table 2). Two closely related sources of the violoncello version, B-Bc, 5633 MSM and S-Skma, Alströmer Wq 171, represent the second layer of composition for violoncello. The history of the Alströmer manuscripts of Wq 171 and 172 has been unraveled by Elias N. Kulukundis.¹⁶ In his 1782

catalogue, the Hamburg music dealer Johann Christoph Westphal advertised the concertos together at a price of five marks apiece:¹⁷

Bach, C. P. E. I Violoncel-Concert a 5. p.
A dur. Neu et Original
——— I dito a 5. B dur, dito

A letter from J. C. Westphal to J. J. H. Westphal, dated 29 May 1789, relates how the former came in possession of the two works: "The two violoncello concertos are marked in his own hand, and were prepared for a friend at Cadiz, from whom—since they were too hard for him—they reached us, via a third party."¹⁸ Kulukundis identifies the original recipient of the music as the Hamburg merchant Daniel Stockfleet (1736–1789), who lived in Cadiz, Spain, for considerable periods until the late 1770s. While in Cadiz in 1772, Stockfleet subscribed to the publication of Bach's *Sei concerti per il cembalo concertato*, Wq 43.¹⁹ He may have been directly acquainted with the composer. The two concertos were probably prepared in the 1770s, while Stockfleet still resided in Spain.

15. According to Altmann, iii, writing in 1938, an "Original-Partitur" was once in the possession of the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin, but had been lost. The score originated with the Bach collector Georg Poelchau, who purchased a large portion of C. P. E. Bach's estate.

16. Much of the following information on these MSS is based on unpublished research that Kulukundis generously made available to the edition. For a recent edition of Wq 171, see Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, *Konzert für Violoncello, Streicher, und Basso Continuo, B-dur*, ed. Ulrich Leisinger (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel, 2006).

17. Cat. Westphal 1782, 217; the listing is repeated in Cat. Westphal c. 1790.

18. "Die 2 Violoncel Concerte sind mit seiner eigenen Hand bezeichnet, und für einen Cadixer Freund verfertigt, von dem wir sie, da sie ihm zu schwer gewesen, durch die 3ten Hand, wieder an uns gekommen sind." Transcribed in Leisinger/Wollny 1997, 35–36.

19. The subscription lists him simply as "Herr Daniel Stockfleet in Cadix." See CPEB: CW, III/8, plate 4.

A number of factors indicate that the Alströmer manuscripts came together from J. C. Westphal's shop in Hamburg. Wq 172 was copied entirely by Michel, Bach's chief copyist after 1780, who also worked on occasion for Westphal. Wq 171 was copied by a professional Hamburg scribe known as Anon. 309, except for the violin II part, which was copied by two significantly less accurate and accomplished hands. Anon. 309 worked for Bach on occasion in the early 1770s but was not one of his more regular copyists.²⁰ The title page of Wq 172 bears the erased notation "mk 5—" which corresponds to the price of five marks, no shillings, listed in the Westphal catalogue. The Alströmer copies of the two concertos also are labeled "N^o 13" and "N^o 14," in the same hand at the bottom center of their respective title pages.²¹ Because Westphal states that the concertos were "mit seiner eigenen Hand bezeichnet," the Alströmer manuscripts were undoubtedly made from master copies in Westphal's possession; they show no traces of Bach's handwriting.

The two concertos were obtained by the Swedish merchant Patrick Alströmer (1733–1804), probably for his youngest brother, Johan. J. C. Westphal was one of a number of dealers or printers from whom the Alströmers acquired music for the family library in Alingsås.²² Patrick Alströmer became acquainted with Westphal in 1760 and continued to correspond until 1786.²³ In 1771, Alströmer became one of the founders and main supporters of the Royal Swedish Academy of Music in Stockholm.²⁴ With the rediscovery of the family music library in the attic of their Alingsås home in 1948, the music was given to the library of the Royal Swedish Academy of Music, now part of the collections of the Statens musikbibliotek.²⁵

The collection of the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin has an early set of parts for Wq 171 (D-B, SA 2592). Although the source contains numerous inaccuracies, attesting to its distance from the composer, it nonetheless represents the

first layer of composition for the violoncello concerto. The earliest manuscript sources for Wq 28 are D-B, Sammlung Thulemeier 21 and D-B, SA 2591 (1). The keyboard part in the Thulemeier manuscript was copied by a scribe known as Anon. 301, who was associated with Bach in the 1740s and 1750s. The ripieno parts were copied by a second scribe, Anon. 403, who was active in the 1760s and 1770s.²⁶ The string parts undoubtedly are later in date, and should be considered separately from the cembalo concertato. The second early source, SA 2591, consists of three separate fascicles by two different scribes. Bach's colleague Carl Friedrich Christian Fasch copied the score and one cembalo concertato part, here labeled SA 2591 (1) and (3), respectively. The other cembalo concertato and string parts, here labeled SA 2591 (2), were copied by August Kohne, a violinist in the royal *Kammermusik*, who signed his initials at the end of the keyboard part. The cembalo concertato of Wq 28, as represented by Thulemeier 21 and SA 2591 (1) and (3), probably derives from the early redaction for violoncello, as transmitted by SA 2592. (The complete violoncello concertato and basso from D-B, SA 2592 are included in the appendix.) At the first solo entrance in the third movement, the cembalo concertato follows the violoncello line, one octave higher, then breaks away as additional short phrases are added to the melody (example 3). The flauto traverso concertato likewise depends on the early violoncello solo and belongs to the first layer of composition. In passages where it elaborates on or departs from the violoncello, it also deviates from the keyboard version, confirming its stemmatic independence.

Internal and source evidence demonstrates not only that the Concerto in B-flat Major was originally composed for violoncello in 1751, but that Bach was responsible for revising it for keyboard during his years in Berlin. The second layer of composition may have taken place in Hamburg, with the commission from Stockfleth. Though fairly extensive, the revisions in the Brussels and Alströmer manuscripts are such that they could have been made directly on the obbligato part. The ripieno parts in Bach's library were shared with the keyboard version, later copied by Michel in B-Bc, 5887 MSM (Wq 28). The basso ripieno belongs exclusively to the keyboard version. The flauto traverso concertato, though based on the first redaction for violoncello, retains its own, updated string parts. The basso and violin I preserve changes necessary to accommodate the melodic line of the flute. The basso of the flute version also

20. Anon. 309 copied a duplicate violin II part to the 1773 Passion According to St. Matthew, H 786 (D-B, SA 5136), and portions of Bach's score of the *Passions-Cantate*, Wq 233 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 337).

21. Kulukundis points out that the numbers are not only in the same hand, but that they represent the only portions of either manuscript not in the hands of the main scribes.

22. Cari Johansson, "Studier kring Patrik Alströmers musiksamling," *Svensk Tidskrift för Musikforskning* 43 (1961): 199–207.

23. Johansson, 199.

24. On Alströmer's musical activities, see Jan Ling, "Apollo Gothenburgensis: Patrick Alströmer och Göteborgs musikliv vid 1700-talets slut," *Svensk Tidskrift för Musikforskning* 81 (1999): 53–94.

25. Johansson, 195, 206–7.

26. The Thulemeier collection was removed to D-B in 2005; see Schwinger, 43.

42

a. Violoncello

b. Flute

c. Cembalo

48

53

EXAMPLE 3. Concerto in B-flat Major, movement iii, mm. 42–57.
 Comparison of (a) violoncello solo, early version (D-B, SA 2592), (b) flute solo (B-Bc, 5516 II MSM),
 and (c) cembalo solo, early version (D-B, Slg Thulemeier 21)

lacks figuration. By contrast, only the version for violoncello can be shown to have received extensive later revision by Bach's hand.

A passage that occurs in dominant and tonic keys in the third movement of the Concerto in B-flat Major, mm. 69–76 and 231–38, may help clarify the process of revision (example 4). In the first layer of the violoncello version, the phrase contains primarily 8th notes. The keyboard solo in Thulemeier 21 elaborates on the sequence, changing the rhythm to steady 16th notes. When Bach revised the violoncello obbligato, he borrowed this passage from the keyboard version, represented by Thulemeier 21. Bach retained the two phrases, with their correct parallelism, in the second violoncello redaction in B-Bc, 5633 MSM and S-Skma, Alströmer Wq 171. The knowledge that Thulemeier 21 belongs to the first layer of composition enables us to see how the composer drew on the keyboard and flute versions even as he revised the work for violoncello.²⁷

Concerto in A Major

Only two sources survive for the Violoncello Concerto in A Major: B-Bc, 5633 MSM and S-Skma, Alströmer Wq 172. Both manuscripts were copied by Michel, although at different times and under disparate circumstances. The closeness of their readings is underscored by the layout of the violin parts, which have coordinated page turns at exactly the same places in both manuscripts, even though the number of staves per page is different. Despite their stemmatic contiguity, however, the two manuscripts exhibit significant variants between them. A solo passage in the third movement, mm. 275–94, contains a different configuration for the broken chords in the two sources.²⁸ The accompanying orchestration differs at mm. 275–88 as well.²⁹ Compared to the early keyboard manuscript, D-B, SA 2618 (dated October 1764), only the violin I has a different reading in the Brussels manuscript. But in Alströmer Wq 172, the violin I, violin II, and basso continuo all exhibit distinct changes. Further, in the Brussels manuscript, all parts except the basso continuo read *Allegro assai* in the third movement. In

the Alströmer manuscript, only the violoncello concertato and basso ripieno, copied together in double-staff format, read *Allegro assai*; the upper strings have *Allegro*. Most importantly, the Brussels manuscript transmits a separate basso continuo with full figuration, while the Alströmer source lacks figured bass. Both manuscripts thus preserve different aspects of the lost house copy; the two sources present equally good, if competing, readings of the same work.

A great deal of internal and manuscript evidence survives for the keyboard and flute versions of the Concerto in A Major. The clearest interrelationships occur in the *Largo con sordini. Mesto*. The keyboard version, represented by the score manuscript D-B, SA 2618, presents an elaborate ornamentation of the melodic line (example 5). Unlike the violoncello and flute, a cembalo concertato lacks the sustained tone necessary for a cantabile melody. The flute version agrees with the simpler line of the violoncello, but presents straight 8th notes at m. 57, rather than the quarter-note syncopation characteristic of the movement. Here, as in the *Largo* as a whole, the tessitura of the flute lies unusually low.³⁰ Conversely, the violoncello reaches to f'' in measures 26–27 and 87–88, an unlikely choice for transposition.³¹

In the *Allegro assai*, a different pattern emerges. The violoncello and keyboard versions exactly agree for extended passages, with the keyboard melody typically lying an octave higher. The flute solo repeatedly diverges from the concordant passages of the violoncello and keyboard, in passages ranging from one to seven bars. The pattern suggests that the flute could not have been the original solo instrument. The differences in the flute version arise because, unlike the keyboard, the difficulty in transposing for flute across different tessituras leads to significant compromises (see CPEB:CW, III/4.1).

Yet the violoncello version is necessarily later, for it contains a long, virtuosic passage in the third movement, mm. 156–94, ten bars longer than the corresponding passages for keyboard and flute. Rather, the surviving sources for violoncello represent a reworking of the original composition of 1753. The reworking included adding the tempo designation *Allegro assai* in place of the *Allegro* that prevails in the keyboard and flute sources. The areas of disagreement between violoncello and keyboard, outlined above,

27. Passages in the revised violoncello part modeled on the flute version include movement ii, mm. 17 and 56.

28. Kulukundis suggests that the arpeggios could have resulted from a shorthand indication in the original score or part that was resolved differently by two copyists. On the notational convention, see Valerie Walden, *One Hundred Years of Violoncello: A History of Technique and Performance Practice, 1740–1840* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 156–57.

29. The reading for movement iii, mm. 275–94 in S-Skma Alströmer Wq 172 is edited in full score as example 2 in the critical report.

30. The flute version lacks many of the *forte/piano* contrasts notated for the solo violoncello in B-Bc, 5633 MSM, which are, however, present in D-B, SA 2618.

31. The highest note reached in both Wq 170 and Wq 171 is d''.

231

a. Violoncello

b. Cembalo

c. Violoncello

233

236

EXAMPLE 4. Concerto in B-flat Major, movement iii, mm. 231–38.
 Comparison of (a) violoncello solo, early version (D-B, SA 2592), (b) cembalo solo, early version (D-B, Slg Thulemeier 21), and (c) violoncello solo, late version (B-Bc, 5633 MSM, Wq 171)

53

a. Violoncello

b. Flute

c. Cembalo

56

59

EXAMPLE 5. Concerto in A Major, movement ii, mm. 53–61.
 Comparison of (a) violoncello solo (B-Bc, 5633 MSM Wq 172),
 (b) flute solo (B-Bc, 5515 II MSM), and (c) cembalo solo, early version (D-B, SA 2618)



EXAMPLE 6. Concerto in A Major, movement iii, mm. 195–202.
Pencilled addition on viola staff and cembalo solo, left hand (D-B, SA 2618)

may be explained as containing newly composed passages for one or the other instrument.

A passage in the keyboard source, D-B, SA 2618, may show just such signs of compositional activity. Written in the hand of Fasch, the manuscript carries an explicit annotation, “Copiato Potsdamo Ottobre 1764.” In the third movement, mm. 191–201 have been numbered 1–12 in pencil, underneath or above the upper staff of the keyboard solo (plate 5, second and third systems). Above the keyboard, in the viola staff, which otherwise contains rests, there is an area of pencil work, erased but still legible.³² The passage is transcribed against the basso in example 6.³³ It is clear from the harmonic context, in the approach to a strong C-sharp minor cadence, that the phrase was written in tenor clef. Since only a violoncello obbligato employed tenor clef, the melody most likely draws from a passage from a version for violoncello. The handwriting, however, does not appear to be that of Bach, which makes the sketch of uncertain authenticity. It may represent the original version or even a later revision of the Concerto in A Major. In fact, the melody works with the figured bass in B-Bc, 5633 MSM. In this view, the impromptu measure numbers could have been used to collate the keyboard score with the passage for violoncello obbligato, or vice versa. In either case, the unique occurrence of the melody points to a continuing juxtaposition of new and old materials in the transformation of the work.

32. A figured bass in pencil appears on the same page and the previous one, mm. 156–84, underneath the keyboard lower staff (plate 5, first and second systems). Written in an unidentified hand, the figuration matches the arpeggiation of the keyboard solo above it.

33. The d# with trill before the cadence would have been preceded by a quarter-note appoggiatura on e'. The passage corresponds to mm. 205–12 in the present edition. Ulrich Leisinger kindly confirmed the pitches in example 6 based on a first-hand examination of the manuscript.

Milieu

Musical academies and private concerts in Berlin in the 1740s and 1750s intersected with but remained independent of musical life at the court of Frederick the Great. An account published by Adolf Friedrich Wolff in 1755 offers a number of details concerning the *Musikübende Gesellschaft* that may apply to other musical academies, as well. The group, which numbered twenty honorary and regular members, was dedicated to performing “the newest and finest” music available.³⁴ As with other formal academies since the sixteenth century, a set of bylaws governed its operation. The Saturday afternoon concerts lasted three hours, beginning with an overture or symphony and continuing with seven or eight other works, in particular concertos, trios, and solos.³⁵ Besides the regular members, musicians of the royal *Kammermusik* normally took part. Performances might include visiting artists such as Johann Friedrich Fasch, *Kapellmeister* at Zerbst, who performed his own violin concerto, or guests such as the harpsichordist Baroness von Cocceii, wife of the Grand Chancellor.³⁶ Demand to attend the gatherings was so great that, in order to preserve space in the narrow music rooms, the *Musikübende Gesellschaft* began to issue tickets in November 1753, free of charge. The tickets were available from both members and participants, in effect creating semi-public concerts. Particularly notable is the behavior

34. Adolf Friedrich Wolff, “Entwurf, einer ausführlichen Nachricht von der Musikübenden Gesellschaft in Berlin,” in Friedrich Wilhelm Marburg, ed., *Historisch-kritische Beiträge zur Aufnahme der Musik*, 1 (1754–55): 396: “So soll zu diesem Ende ein gemeinschaftlicher Vorrath, und zwar nur von den neuesten und auserlesensten Ouvverturen, Sinfonien und Trios, gesamlet werden...”

35. Wolff, “Entwurf,” 396, 408–09.

36. Wolff, “Entwurf,” 409–10.

expected of those in attendance, “Whereby each listener is expressly required during the concert to keep himself still, and especially not to hinder the players in any piece.”³⁷

That Bach himself took part in the academies is testified by Johann Wilhelm Hertel, who heard the composer perform his Concerto in D Major, Wq 11, in October 1745 at a concert in the house of the violinist Franz Benda. Hertel recalled that “the Bach concerto especially had made such an impression on him that he now could scarcely think of anything else.”³⁸ In the 1750s, Bach was closely associated with Johann Friedrich Agricola, leader of an academy called simply the *Concert*, which met at his house on Sunday afternoons. Bach’s colleague Franz Benda also participated in the *Concert*, which may have provided a congenial outlet for new keyboard works. Hertel himself frequented several academies and private residences to play the keyboard, an opportunity also available to Bach.³⁹

Concertos for violoncello at this time were relatively rare. Johann Joachim Quantz writes that “Solo playing upon this instrument is not easy. Those who wish to distinguish themselves in this manner must be provided by nature with fingers that are long and have strong tendons, permitting an extended stretch.”⁴⁰ The violoncello’s prevailing role in the basso continuo and orchestral ripieno contributed to the anonymity of its exponents. Traveling virtuosi on the violoncello were still uncommon. As Quantz writes, “Good accompaniment is the chief quality demanded from the instrument.”⁴¹ Given the broad proportions of Wq 170, with its unusual $\frac{3}{8}$ meter in the first movement and intimate interplay of soloist with orchestra, we can assume that the violoncellist who played the

work was an accomplished professional. Although different in character, Wq 172 contrasts fleet passagework in the *Allegro* and *Allegro assai* with cantabile lines in middle and high registers in the *Largo*. As noted above, the amateur owner of the expressly made parts for Wq 171 and 172 rejected the works as being “too difficult” (zu schwer).

Since the three Bach violoncello concertos were written in 1750, 1751, and 1753, he likely composed them in Berlin and Potsdam for the same professional musician. Direct links to the composer are lacking, however, due to a dearth of information on violoncellists in Berlin and Potsdam. The violoncellists at the courts of Margraves Carl and Heinrich, respectively, were Johann Christian Schwedler, from Zielenzig (Sulęcín) in the county of East Brandenburg, and Georg Bandow, from the village of Arendsee in the Altmark, northwest of Brandenburg. In the royal *Kammermusik*, Anton Hock, a Bohemian, was paid 400 thalers in 1750–51. Johann Georg Speer, from Zerbst, was paid 300 thalers in 1750–51, the same salary as Bach.⁴² He also participated in concerts of the *Musikübende Gesellschaft*.⁴³

In 1742, the court hired two violoncellists, Ignaz Mara from Deutschbrod (Havlíčkův Brod) in Bohemia and Christian Friedrich Schale from Brandenburg in Prussia. Mara was engaged in the royal *Kammermusik* for 600 thalers, while Schale played in the new court Opera for 900 thalers.⁴⁴ Schale, besides serving as violoncellist in the *Hofkapelle*, was a harpsichordist, organist, and composer. He had studied organ and composition with Christian Ernst Rolle in Altstadt. Schale entered the service of Margrave Heinrich in 1735, before joining the Prussian court in 1742.⁴⁵ In the accounts of 1750–51, Mara’s salary remained at 600 thalers, while Schale received 200 thalers, which represents only his salary as musician to the king;⁴⁶ he would have received a separate salary as second organist in Berlin Cathedral. As the leader of the *Musikalische Assemblée*, which met on Mondays, Schale had ample opportunity for solo performance on violoncello, yet his

37. Wolff, “Entwurf,” 412–13: “Wobey denn auch von jedem Zuhörer ausdrücklich verlangt wird, daß sie sich währendem Concert beständig stille halten, und insonderheit den Spielern in keinem Stück hinderlich fallen sollen.”

38. Johann Wilhelm Hertel, *Autobiographie*, ed. Erich Schenk (Graz and Cologne: Böhlhaus, 1957), 24: “Das Bachische Concert hatte einen solchen Eindruck auf ihn gemacht, daß er jetzt beynahe ansonst nichts denken konnte.”

39. Hertel, *Autobiographie*, 33.

40. *On Playing the Flute*, ed. and trans. Edward R. Reilly (New York: The Free Press, 1966), 246; *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversière zu spielen* (Berlin, 1752), 217: “Das Solospielen ist auf diesem Instrumente eben nicht eine so gar leichte Sache. Wer sich hierinne hervorthun will, der muß von der Natur mit solchen Fingern versehen seyn, die lang sind, und starke Nerven haben, um weit aus einander greifen können.”

41. Quantz, *On Playing the Flute*, 246; *Versuch einer Anweisung*, 218: “Das gute Accompagnement ist das vornehmste, so von diesem Instrumente eigentlich erfordert wird.”

42. *CPEB-Spürensuche*, 30–31, 35–36; originally published in “Nachricht von dem gegenwärtigen Zustande der Oper und Musik des Königs,” *Historisch-kritische Beiträge zur Aufnahme der Musik*, 1 (1754–55): 75–84, esp. 77–78.

43. Wolff, “Entwurf,” 408.

44. Franz Lorenz, *Franz Benda und seine Nachkommen* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1967), 22.

45. “Vermischte Nachrichten,” *Historisch-kritische Beiträge zur Aufnahme der Musik*, 2 (1756): 93.

46. *CPEB-Spürensuche*, 30–35.

composition for the instrument is negligible; instead, he composed at least eight keyboard concertos and three for flute.⁴⁷

Ignaz Mara, first violoncellist in the royal *Kammermusik*, was approximately twenty-eight years old in 1750. According to Ernst Ludwig Gerber, “in his youth he was an excellent soloist on his instrument, and his tone and execution were extremely expressive.”⁴⁸ These qualities make a natural fit to the concertos of C.P.E. Bach. A writer in 1766 called Mara “strong on his instrument,” though reserving higher praise for another *Kammermusiker*, Joseph B. Zycka. He adds that Mara was a good composer for the instrument.⁴⁹ Gerber cites concertos and sonatas for violoncello among Mara’s contributions, which he would have composed for his own use. While evidence tying him to the Berlin academies is lacking, Mara would have been welcome in the circles of Bohemian musicians surrounding Franz Benda. An anecdote has Mara performing a string trio at a private party with the violinists Johann Peter Salomon and Johann Ludwig Müller. To the delight of the audience, the musicians played a musical joke on the composer of the trio, Johann Philipp Kirnberger, who had studied with J.S. Bach.⁵⁰ The anecdote confirms Mara’s participation in chamber music of the day in private concerts in Berlin. As the only one of the Berlin violoncellists to have gained a significant reputation, and a close collaborator of C.P.E. Bach’s, he may have been the first exponent of the concertos for violoncello.

In the early nineteenth century, Wq 171 was performed at the Sing-Akademie, successor to the academies of the 1750s. At the end of the violoncello concertato part in SA 2592, an annotation by Carl Friedrich Zelter refers to performances by two violoncellists of the royal *Kapelle*, one in 1813 by Johann Friedrich Kelz and another in 1819 by

August Ferdinand Cubelius.⁵¹ Kelz, a native Berliner, was appointed first violoncellist in the royal *Kammermusik* in 1811, the same position once held by Ignaz Mara. Both Kelz and Cubelius were active at the court until at least 1850.⁵² The parts in SA 2592 have occasional rehearsal marks and corrections in crayon or blunt pencil, testifying to performance of the work 68 years after its initial composition. The manuscript contains the original form of Wq 171 from 1751.

Performance Practice

The three concertos for violoncello were performed as chamber music rather than as orchestral works. Quantz, writing in 1752, states that concertos for a single instrument were called *Kammerconcerte*. He adds, “Some demand a large accompanying body, like concerti grossi, others demand a small one ... the class to which a concerto belongs may be perceived from the first ritornello.”⁵³ Wq 170 belongs to the first category, in which the $\frac{3}{8}$ time signature, half-note harmonic motion, unison passages, and serious character of the first movement correspond to Quantz’s description. The rapid harmonic rhythm and gay, fleeting melodies of Wq 172, on the other hand, correspond to the second category.

According to Quantz, a large ensemble consisted of three first violins, three second violins, and a viola for the upper strings, with a violoncello, violone, bassoon, and cembalo for the continuo.⁵⁴ A small chamber ensemble consisted of two first violins, two second violins, a viola, violoncello, violone, and cembalo. A still smaller group is possible, as reported by Johann Friedrich Reichardt in

47. NG^{II}, s.v. “Schale, Christian Friedrich,” by Raymond A. Barr.

48. *Historisches-biographisches Lexikon der Tonkünstler* (Leipzig: 1790–92), s.v. Mara (Ignaz), cols. 856–66: “war in seiner Jugend ein vorzüglicher Solospieler auf seinem Instrument, und sein Ton und Vortrag war äußerst rührend.”

49. “Verzeichniß der Personen, welche gegenwärtig die Königliche preußliche Capellmusik ausmachen, im Julius 1766,” *Wöchentliche Nachrichten und Anmerkungen die Musik betreffend*, 1 (25 Aug. 1766): 78. “Violoncellisten: Herr Joseph B. Zycka, aus Böhmen, ein großer Meister auf seinem Instrumente. Er hat viel schönes, an Concerten, Doppelconcerten, Solo, u.s.w. für dasselbe gesetzt. Herr Ignatius Mara, auch aus Böhmen; ebenfalls stark auf seinen Instrumente, und ein guter Componist für dasselbe.”

50. [Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg], *Legende einiger Musikheiligen* (Cologne, 1786), 54–57.

51. “Gespielt vom K. K... Hrn Kelz auf der Akademie den 20 Aug. 1813 | sowie [vom K. K...Hrn] Cubolius in einer ... d 5 Febr. [18]19.” The transcription follows Enßlin, 1:242; there is a similar note in pencil on the title page of the part.

52. On Kelz, see Eduard Bernsdorf, *Neues Universal-Lexicon der Tonkunst*, 3 vols. (Dresden: Schaefer, 1857), s.v. “Kelz, Johann Friedrich.” Kelz and Cubelius are listed as solo performers in the ranks of the royal *Kapelle* in the *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* 25 (1823), cols. 237–38. Both also appear in a list of members of the *Kapelle* who presented a silver laurel wreath to Meyerbeer in 1850; see Giacomo Meyerbeer, *Briefwechsel und Tagebücher*, 8 vols. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1959–2001), 5:841.

53. Quantz, *On Playing the Flute*, 311; *Versuch einer Anweisung*, 295: “Einige verlangen, so wie das Concerto grosso, ein starkes, die andern aber ein schwaches Accompagnement ... aus dem ersten Ritornell kann man abnehmen, von was für einer Gattung das Concert sey.”

54. *On Playing the Flute*, 214; *Versuch einer Anweisung*, 185. To expand the ensemble further would require additional woodwinds, absent from all three concertos.

1774: in flute concertos, Frederick the Great was accompanied by “6 virtuosi,” presumably with three violins, viola, violoncello, and cembalo.⁵⁵ The importance of balanced forces is underscored in the bylaws of the *Musikübende Gesellschaft*, which admonish the leader “to observe a perfect proportion in the setting of parts, to the furtherance of the euphony; and such [parts] should be arranged with the instruments neither too strong nor too weak.”⁵⁶

As noted, Wq 170 is appropriate for a large chamber ensemble. Since the soloist joins in the *tutti* passages, it is possible to omit one continuo instrument—either violone or bassoon—in order to maintain correct proportions (7 : 4) between upper strings and continuo. Such an omission would further prevent the continuo from overpowering the soloist in middle and low registers. The same consideration lies behind Quantz’s advice to realize the figured bass in the right hand in a low register, thereby supporting rather than overshadowing the violoncello soloist.⁵⁷

Wq 172 calls for a small chamber ensemble, corresponding to its lighter character. The rapid passagework of the violoncello obbligato would benefit from the reduced number of accompanying strings. Since the soloist joins in the *tutti* passages, the violone could be omitted, leaving a bare-bones continuo group of violoncello ripieno and cembalo to accompany the solo passages. In the Alströmer manuscript, however, the basso ripieno is transmitted without figured bass. In that case, one would omit the cembalo rather than the violone. Either configuration of instruments would be possible with the present edition, according to the preferences of the performers.

The late version of Wq 171 may have called for the smaller chamber ensemble detailed by Quantz, but with one principal difference: it leaves out the keyboard. In the Alströmer manuscript, the title page calls the part a “Basso

ripieno,” while in the Brussels manuscript, the part has the caption heading “Basso è Violoncello.” Neither part is figured. In the Alströmer manuscript, however, three separate figures have crept into the basso ripieno, none of which represents a particularly difficult harmony.⁵⁸ A fourth was copied, but then erased.⁵⁹ Consequently, the figured bass of the original composition must have been deliberately excluded; the four isolated figures stand as an atavistic remainder. While it is certainly possible for a good keyboard player to improvise harmonies over an unfigured bass, Bach specifically frowns upon this practice, writing of “the ridiculousness of the demand that accompaniments be realized from unfigured basses, and ... the impossibility of fashioning even a passable accompaniment.”⁶⁰ He later adds, “And so it remains irrefutable that a correctly figured bass is an indispensable adjunct to the correct performance of a piece. The composer who wants his works to be played as well as possible must take every step to reach this end.”⁶¹ Conversely, had Bach wanted a performance with keyboard, one would assume that detailed figures would have been included, as they are in the earlier version of the work. The present edition prints the score of the concerto without figures, but includes a figured basso part with the earlier version of the solo part from D-B, SA 2592 in the appendix.

All the existing sources for the three violoncello concertos show that the soloist should play in the orchestral *tutti* passages. Indeed, the notation of the solos is very precise, indicating where the violoncello joins with the basso continuo and where it rests (although details may differ between sources). Plate 3, from Wq 171, shows the careful dovetailing of the beginnings and endings of the solo phrases. In the first and second systems, the solo line

55. Reichardt, *Briefe eines aufmerksamen Reisenden die Musik betreffend*, vol. 1 (Frankfurt and Leipzig, 1774), 75: “Er [Burney] hört da nichts als 3 Flöten-Concerte von Quanz, von denen es sich gerade treffen kann, daß sie etliche zwanzig Jahre alt sind; und dann hört er 6 Virtuosen aus der Capelle, die diesen 3 Concerten nachgebend accompagniren, und denen er sehr unrecht thun würde, wenn er ihre Verdienste darnach beurtheilen wollte.”

56. Wolff, “Entwurf,” 398: “in Besetzung der Stimmen, zu Beförderung des Wohllauts, ein völlige Proportion observiret, und solche weder zu starck noch zu schwach mit Instrumenten besetzt werden mögen.”

57. Quantz, *On Playing the Flute*, 261–62: “For the reasons stated above, you must not accompany a violoncellist, if he plays a solo, as you would a violinist. With the former the right hand must play everything in the low register”; *Versuch einer Anweisung*, 234: “Aus oben gesagten Ursachen, darf man einen Violoncellisten, wenn er Solo spielt, nicht so, wie einen Violinisten, begleiten. Bey dem ersten muß man mit der rechten Hand alles in der Tiefe spielen.”

58. See movement i, m. 164, fig. 6, and movement ii, m. 59, fig. #, and m. 64, fig. 6. The extraneous figures correspond exactly to the figures transmitted in D-B, SA 2591 (2).

59. See movement i, m. 27, fig. 4. The figure, still legible, stands directly adjacent to a *p* mark. Had the copyist simply eliminated it on order of J. C. Westphal, one would have expected all four figures to have been erased.

60. C.P.E. Bach, *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments*, ed. and trans. William J. Mitchell (New York: Norton, 1949), 410; *Versuch* II:35, §1: “Es erhellet hieraus das Lächerliche der Anforderung, unbezifferte Bässe zu accompagniren, und man siehet zugleich die Unmöglichkeit ein, die letztern dergestalt abzufertigen, daß man nur einigermaßen zufrieden seyn könnte.”


61. Bach, *Essay*, 411; *Versuch* II:35, §3: “Es bleibet also unumstößlich wahr, daß zur guten Ausführung eines Stückes eine richtig bezifferte Grundstimme unentbehrlich sey. Jeder Componist, welcher wünschet, daß seine Arbeit so gut als möglich ausgeführet werde, muß auch alle Mittel ergreifen, diesen Endzweck zu erlangen.”

arises directly out of the basso continuo. When the first phrase concludes, a *custos* indicates where the soloist joins the ripieno; the same notation appears in the last system. Blank measures in the upper staff represent continuations of the ripieno line. That this careful morphology of the violoncello obbligato originates with the composer is demonstrated in plate 1, from the autograph manuscript for Wq 170, where the soloist joins the basso continuo for stretches as short as five notes (second system). Given that the interplay between solo and *tutti* is so important to the musical structure, it is necessary to preserve the exact relationship between them.

The violoncello soloist was expected to improvise a cadenza at the appropriate place in each concerto, each time prepared by a 6/4 chord. Only Wq 170 has two cadenzas, one in the first movement (m. 207) and one in the second (m. 97). Wq 171 has a cadenza before the final ritornello of the slow movement, as does Wq 172. Bach's cadenza manuscript, B-Bc, 5871 MSM, contains cadenzas for all three concertos, but written for keyboard (see appendix). They are of modest dimensions and not idiomatic to the violoncello. The cadenzas do provide, however, a model on which to base decisions concerning the appropriate length and melodic character of the cadenza as improvised or composed.⁶²

Compared with the keyboard versions, the violoncello concertos demonstrate a relatively narrow range of ornamental devices, restricted to simple appoggiaturas, compound appoggiaturas, and trills. In the *Andante* of Wq 170, the slide occurs twice (mm. 21 and 40) and the turn precisely once (m. 51). A comparison between the violoncello obbligato part in the earliest layer of Wq 171 and the latest version shows that Bach actually decreased the amount of melodic ornamentation in the process of revision. Since the composer ornaments the solo line throughout, the concertos afford limited opportunity for improvised embellishment. The one place at which extemporaneous ornamentation is expected occurs at cadences, where a quarter note or half note with appoggiatura normally calls for the addition of a trill.

A more specific problem occurs in the third movement of Wq 170. The violins begin with an appoggiatura and group of four 16th notes slurred together on the upbeat. When the viola and basso continuo state the motive together in

m. 8, at the end of a phrase, the 16th notes again are slurred. Nowhere else in the autograph does the motive receive a slur in the violins, viola, or basso continuo. Nevertheless, one may infer from the notation that Bach intended a *simile* reading throughout—otherwise, the prominent slurs at the start of the movement become anomalous. When the solo violoncello enters in m. 29, the 16th notes with appoggiatura are separated. The soloist has the option of playing the notes as written, slurring them, or changing the articulation through the course of the movement in order to introduce expressive variety. Both soloist and ripieno, on the other hand, should continue to play the  pattern at m. 3 with strokes, even when left unmarked. In the autograph, Bach specifies strokes at the soloist's entrance in the first half of m. 32, indicating a *simile* reading throughout the movement.

The use of strong *forte/piano* contrasts throughout the concertos may obscure aspects of the notation that are less common. On occasion, it appears that Bach asks for gradated dynamics. In the first movement of Wq 170, mm. 16–17, 137–38, and 215–16, the dynamic level moves from *forte* to *mezzo forte* to *piano*, which one could interpret as a continuous *decrescendo*. In the first movement of Wq 172, mm. 102–3, the ripieno parts have a brief, rising scale, marked *forte* at the beginning and *piano* at the end. From both musical and technical points of view, this figure implies a *decrescendo*. Similar gradated dynamics occur in Bach's symphonies from the 1750s.⁶³

While Bach specifies dynamics for the ripieno throughout, the normal level during solo passages is *piano*. When Bach gives dynamics to both concertato and ripieno, the ripieno typically plays one level lower than does the soloist. As a result, dynamic changes in the ripieno offer clues for the performance of the violoncello solo. At the first solo entrance in Wq 171, movement i, mm. 30–31, for example, the ripieno drops to *pianissimo*. The dynamic level ensures that the soloist's first, long-held note will stand out, even at *piano*. A duet for viola and violoncello obbligato immediately follows, mm. 32–35. Here, the viola is marked *mezzo forte*, both to contrast with the initial statement and to create a correct balance with the violoncello obbligato, at an implied *forte*. In Wq 170, when the strings play *pizzicato*, the dynamic level is assumed to be *piano*. In the first movement, mm. 109–14, the basso is marked *piano*, but when the violins come in with *pizzicato* at m. 112, the dynamic is

62. The cadenza in a privately owned manuscript of Wq 28, an addition squeezed in on the bottom of the page, transmits a line in the right hand that is both effective on violoncello and related to the preceding melodic material.

63. Compare the Symphony in F Major, Wq 174 (1755; see CPEB: CW, III/1), movement i, mm. 16–18, 65–67, and 115–17, with the passages cited in Wq 170/i.

unmarked. When the viola enters at the end of m. 112, it too is marked *piano*. The basso then switches to *pizzicato* in m. 113, again without requiring a new dynamic. The dynamics illustrate Bach's typical detail and care in laying out his score.

Acknowledgments

The editor gratefully acknowledges the Statens musikbibliotek in Stockholm for providing facsimiles of manuscripts from the Alströmersamlingen. Elias N. Kulukundis graciously shared his research on the history of the concertos. An editorial roundtable in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in February 2005, formed the essential background for

manuscript research for the related versions of the concertos for violoncello, keyboard, and flute. Participating were Paul Corneilson, Dexter Edge, Stephen C. Fisher, Barthold Kuijken, Robert Nosow, and Jane Stevens. Each of the participants shared and exchanged their additional findings and insights regarding the complex of manuscripts. Brent Wissick contributed expertise on performance practice from both a theoretical and practical perspective. Peter Wollny identified or confirmed nearly all the scribal hands responsible for the principal sources and those consulted for the edition. Stephen C. Fisher offered his advice on several aspects of the editing and critical report, while Paul Corneilson provided an invaluable springboard for ideas concerning the editing and introduction.

Robert Nosow