INTRODUCTION

Three works by Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach are published in the present volume: the Concerto in A Minor, Wq 1 (H 403), written in 1733 in Leipzig and revised in 1744 in Berlin; the Concerto in E-flat Major, Wq 2 (H 404), written in 1734 in Leipzig and revised in 1743 in Berlin; and the Concerto in G Major, Wq 3 (H 405), written in 1737 in Frankfurt an der Oder and revised in 1745 in Berlin. They are the only orchestral compositions by Bach whose origins extend back to his pre-Berlin period. The works are listed in NV 1790 (under "Concerte"), p. 26:

> No. 1. *A. moll.* L[eipzig]. 1733 E[rneuert]. B[erlin]. 1744. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.
> No. 2. *Es. dur.* L. 1734. E. B. 1743. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.
> No. 3. *G. dur.* F[rankfurt]. 1737. E. B. 1745. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.

Taking into account his entire output (which Bach cleaned up and thinned out heavily), these works are among the few surviving bits of evidence of his compositional activity during his student years in Leipzig and Frankfurt an der Oder.[1] Besides these three concertos, few instrumental compositions survive from his early years that Bach accepted later on as valid works—and indeed only in a heavily revised form: from the Leipzig period (1731–34) only twelve "Clavier Soli," seven or eight trios, and possibly one solo sonata;[2] from the Frankfurt period (1735–37) only seven "Clavier Soli," one trio, and two solo sonatas.[3]

The impetus behind the composition of these three concertos was probably Bach's involvement with his father's collegium musicum in Leipzig and, later on, the "musikalische Akademie" in Frankfurt an der Oder which he himself directed. These works are thus evidence of the abundant, varied, and demanding musical repertoire performed by students and members of the middle class in two university cities, both with rich traditions.

In the period from c. 1730 to 1734, the Leipzig collegium musicum performed several large-scale works, including four grand overture-suites by the Eisenach organist and court musician Johann Bernhard Bach (1676–1749); the dramatic cantata *Armida abbandonata*, HWV 105, by Georg Friedrich Handel (and probably other secular cantatas by Italian composers); and the Concerto Grosso in F Minor, op. 1, no. 8, by Pietro Antonio Locatelli (1695–1764). Johann Sebastian Bach himself composed stately orchestral works for this ensemble, in addition to an impressive series of secular congratulatory cantatas for the Electoral House of Saxony. There is documentation for performances with the collegium musicum in the early 1730s for the Violin Concerto in A Minor, BWV 1041; the Double Concerto for Two Violins in D Minor, BWV 1043; and the Overture-Suite in D Major, BWV 1068; performance materials for these works were prepared with the help of C. P. E. Bach. Furthermore, the two Concertos for Three Harpsichords, BWV 1063–64, have been shown, with good reason, to date from this time period;[4] as does the Concerto for Four Harpsichords and Strings, BWV 1065, a transcription of Antonio Vivaldi's concerto op. 3, no. 10. Finally, his father's Harpsichord Concerto in D Minor was of special importance to C. P. E. Bach: around 1734 he made his own copy of the earlier version (BWV 1052a).[5] That this second-oldest Bach son played an active role in his father's collegium musicum in the early 1730s is substantiated not only by his activity as a copyist, but also

1. See Leisinger/Wollny 1993. Further youthful works by Bach are published in CPEB:CW, I/8.2 and V/5.2.

2. In detail, these are the sonatas Wq 62/1 and Wq 65/1–3, the suite Wq 65/4, the six sonatinas Wq 64/1–6, the "Menuett mit überschlagenden Händen" Wq 111, the trios Wq 71–72 and Wq 143–47, and perhaps also the "Trio für die Violine, Bratsche und Baß mit Johann Sebastian Bach gemeinschaftlich verfertigt" (NV 1790, p. 65), and the undated oboe sonata Wq 135. (The likewise undated flute sonata in NV 1790 has been assigned on good authority by Mary Oleskiewicz to the Berlin period; see CPEB:CW, II/1, xii.)

3. These are the Minuet by Locatelli with 21 Variations, Wq 118/7; the sonatas Wq 65/5–10; the trio Wq 148; and the flute sonatas Wq 123–24.

4. See NBA, VII/6, Kritischer Bericht, 26.

5. For the works mentioned here, see Andreas Glöckner, "Neuerkenntnisse zu Johann Sebastian Bachs Aufführungskalender zwischen 1729 und 1735," *BJ* 67 (1981): 43–75; Kirsten Beißwenger, *Johann Sebastian Bachs Notenbibliothek*, Catalogus Musicus 13 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1992), passim; and George B. Stauffer, "Music for 'Cavaliers et Dames': Bach and the Repertoire of His Collegium Musicum," in *About Bach*, ed. Gregory G. Butler et al. (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 135–56.

in the following report by his fellow student in Leipzig, Jacob von Stählin: "I am enchanted by the remembrance of the celebrated Emanuel Bach, our mutual friendship, and almost daily conversations in Leipzig, where I sometimes played a solo or a concerto in the collegium musicum of his late father."[6]

Concerning his Frankfurt ensemble, C.P.E. Bach reported that he had taken part in "all the public musical celebrations that took place at that time" (alle damals vorfallenden öffentlichen Musiken bey Feyerlichkeiten).[7] The instrumental repertoire that he presented, insofar as it has now been identified, shows some remarkable overlapping with the works performed by the Leipzig collegium musicum. In existence are performing parts written in Frankfurt from c. 1735 for J.S. Bach's Double Concerto, BWV 1043; the Overture-Suite, BWV 1068; the "Brandenburg" Concerto no. 5, BWV 1050; and the Sinfonia for the Easter Oratorio, BWV 249/1–2. In addition, C.P.E. Bach wrote out a new solo part for the concerto BWV 1052a in Frankfurt.[8]

Nothing specific is known about the size of the membership and the performance arrangements for the two student ensembles in Leipzig and Frankfurt. Nevertheless, we learn from contemporary reports that J.S. Bach's collegium musicum "was held in the summer time at Herr Gottfried Zimmermann's garden on Wednesdays from 4 to 6 o'clock, and in the winter time at the coffee house on Catharinen-Strasse on Friday evenings from 8 to 10 o'clock."[9] Bach may have directed a similarly regular cycle of performances in Frankfurt.

In addition to their general importance for our understanding of the activities of the student collegia musica in Leipzig and Frankfurt, the early concertos Wq 1–3 also serve as reliable witnesses for Bach's first independent steps as a composer and for the development of his own unmistakable personal style. The indications in NV 1790 about their revisions make it clear that all three compositions were reworked in the first half of the 1740s and thus brought up-to-date stylistically. An examination of the surviving sources reveals that only the concerto Wq 1 has been preserved in a version that precedes the revision of 1744, while the concertos Wq 2 and 3 exist solely in the later Berlin versions. The concerto Wq 2—one of the first pre-Berlin works revised in 1743—was adjusted to fit the standard of the "Prussian" Sonatas, Wq 48, which appeared in print in 1743. It is not by chance that Wq 2 resembles in many details the Concerto in D Major, Wq 11, which was composed in 1743. The concertos Wq 1 and 3 were reworked in 1744 and 1745, respectively. Thus, they take their place in the series of concertos Wq 12–18 that were newly composed during those years.

The Early Version of Wq 1

Considering the almost complete loss of the original versions of the pre-Berlin works, the survival of the early version of Wq 1 can be regarded as a stroke of luck. At the same time, however, it creates many problems. As is explained fully in the critical report, the earlier version of this work diverges greatly from the late version—the version that is represented both by the original parts (PL-Kj, Mus. ms. Bach St 495; source **A**), which come from C.P.E. Bach's estate (and which for the most part were written out by J.S. Bach), and by the copy by Johann Heinrich Michel from the collection of Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal (B-Bc, 5887 MSM, Wq 1; source **B 1**). The earlier version, of which there are six copies (sources **B 2**–**B 7**), is unusually well-documented. (For some other concertos of the Berlin period there exist decidedly fewer sources.) Consequently, it appears that Wq 1 had a special position during Bach's youth and early maturity, and that it probably was played quite often, attracting a great deal of interest among his contemporaries. The earliest available copy of this version (B-Bc, 26537 MSM; source **B 2a**) stems from the hand of J.S. Bach's pupil Johann Friedrich Agricola (1720–74); according to the evidence of the watermarks and handwriting, it originated in Leipzig c. 1739/40. It also appears that this work still belonged—many years after C.P.E. Bach's departure from Leipzig—to the valued repertoire of pieces documenting the musical life of the students there. If a remark found on Agricola's copy is accurate, according to which J.S. Bach entered revisions in his own hand on the string parts (now lost), then this source must have an immediate relationship with the music library and

6. *Bach-Dokumente* V, 235: "Je suis charmé du souvenir du celebre Eman[ue]l Bach de notre mutuelle amitié et conversation presque journaliere à Leipsig, oû je jouois quelq[ue]fois un solo ou un Concert dans le College Musicale de feu son pere." The translation is adapted from *The New Bach Reader: A Life of Johann Sebastian Bach in Letters and Documents*, ed. Hans T. David and Arthur Mendel, rev. and enlarged by Christoph Wolff (New York: W.W. Norton, 1998), 369.

7. *Autobiography*, 199.

8. See Peter Wollny, "Zur Überlieferung der Instrumentalwerke Johann Sebastian Bachs. Der Quellenbesitz Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs," *BJ* 82 (1996): 7–21.

9. *Bach-Dokumente* II, 234: "bey Hrn. Gottfried Zimmermann, Sommers-Zeit im Garten Mittwochs, von 4. biß 6. Uhr, und Winters-Zeit Freytags im *Caffee*-Hause, auf der Catharinen-Strasse, Abends von 8. biß 10. Uhr gehalten."

performance repertoire of the Thomaskirche Cantor. The other remaining sources appear to have originated without exception in Berlin over the course of a long period. Thus, C. P. E. Bach had already made Wq 1 known before his "revision" of it—that is, between 1740 and 1744—and in this form it found its way into many hands.

A remarkable feature of the early version is the quite large number of variant readings. In many cases these involve details of voiceleading, but also the new composition (in the manner of "varied reprises") of two longer solo passages in the slow middle movement. Thus, already before the "revision" of 1744, Bach must have repeatedly made improvements in matters of detail; but he apparently did not make larger structural changes. Whether Agricola's copy reflects the original form of 1733 or an already-revised version cannot be determined definitely, but one can presume that it at least approaches rather closely the original idea of the work.

In all sources of the early version of Wq 1 the keyboard part generally doubles the first violin and basso in *tutti* passages, sometimes even including material from the inner string parts. This seems to suggest that—similar to the keyboard concertos by J. S. Bach—the soloist did not play continuo in the ritornellos but doubled the respective strings (see also the introduction to CPEB:CW, III/9.2, xiii–xiv). The subsequent addition of basso continuo figures in a manuscript copy from Johann Philipp Kirnberger's library (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 239) suggests a turning away from this older concept.

The Revision Process in Wq 1

A comparison of the two surviving versions of Wq 1 allows us to recognize some of the important features of Bach's method of making revisions.[10] At once it is clear that entirely different principles are at play in the three movements. Thus, Bach's revisions were not at all systematic; instead, he attempted to work out the basic musical idea underlying each movement in a more effective way, using the greater compositional skill he had acquired by the mid-1740s. In doing so, he gave up the ideal of the traditional four-part writing for strings in favor of a more modern, flexible, and transparent three-part texture with extended unison passages in the violins. To be sure, three-part passages with unison violins also appear in the earlier version, just as four-part settings are to be found in the later version, but in each case the context reveals that this occurrence is a deviation from the respective normal pattern.

The extensions in the first movement mostly involve a quieter and musically more logical development of the solo part, as well as the working out of a dramatic climax shortly before the concluding ritornello, thus allowing the soloist the opportunity for an effective cadenza. The expansions in the ritornello of the third movement are structurally more profound. They essentially make the strings more important than the soloist, create a broader palette of diverse ideas, and altogether help the movement attain more balanced proportions. Here, too, the original musical substance is largely maintained; nevertheless, it is extended and displayed more effectively, and a stronger use is made of its inherent possibilities.

A different dimension of reworking occurs in the second movement. The structure here, while still making use of the motivic material, is fundamentally rebuilt, and thus the relationship between the solo instrument and the string ensemble is completely redefined. Through the narrow dovetailing of *tutti* and *solo*, a subtle dialogue emerges in the revised second movement of 1744; the original version of 1733 does not contain the slightest indication of this. The second movement thus makes clear what a great distance Bach had traversed as a composer in the decade between his late Leipzig and his early Berlin periods.

And yet, the revision of 1744 did not signal the end of the work history of Wq 1. The original parts show that at some later point Bach marked the articulation and the dynamics of the string parts much more clearly. This new quality of performance indications must also be regarded as a characteristic of the Berlin style. Bach saw therein a development of musical and historical importance and mentioned this subject explicitly in his *Autobiography*, describing his Berlin period as follows: ". . . everyone knows that this was the point in time when in music—with its most accurate and finest performance, in general as well as in particular—a new era began."[11]

Stylistic Traits of Wq 2 and 3

The concertos Wq 2 and 3 are preserved only in the "revised" versions of 1743 and 1745. Not one of the numerous surviving sources contains readings that predate the

10. See also the discussion in Wade, 88–89.

11. *Autobiography*, 201: ". . . wer kennt den Zeitpunkt nicht, im welchem mit der Musik sowohl überhaupt als besonders mit der accuratesten und feinsten Ausführung derselben, eine neue Periode sich gleichsam anfieng."

text of the autograph scores in D-B, Mus. mss. Bach P 354 and P 352 (source **A** for each work, respectively). As opposed to Wq 1, Bach apparently did not allow Wq 2 and 3 to circulate before the mid-1740s. A reason for this is not apparent, but years later—as has been proven—Bach intentionally held back certain works and so perhaps he did the same here.[12] If one compares the revised versions of the concertos Wq 2 and 3 with the reworked version of Wq 1, the stylistic differences are immediately evident. While Wq 1 still bears—even after its revision—many features of the youthful style of Leipzig, the two later compositions appear to have been thoroughly adapted to the style of the Berlin works from the mid-1740s.[13]

Bach evidently sketched his larger instrumental works in the form of single-voiced continuity drafts. Such sketches are preserved, for example, for the Concerto in C Major, Wq 112/1; the Sonata in C Minor for Keyboard and Violin, Wq 78; and the Oboe Concerto in B-flat Major, Wq 164.[14] In sketches made on one staff only, Bach defined the thematic material, outlined the dialogues between two or more instruments, established the proportions of larger and smaller formal sections together with their functions within the whole movement, and set the course of the modulations. All this was accomplished by means of one main voice, with the supporting bass voice and the pattern of the accompanying voices occasionally also being indicated. Only in isolated instances did Bach specifically indicate repetitions, sequences, and non-thematic passages in the main voice. More important than the exact setting of these subordinate passages was their length; he frequently only needed to mark the number of measures (by means of rests). For the final copy of a movement, Bach transferred the material that had been set out in the continuity draft onto the prepared staff lines of the score. Because of the priority of the main voices, the first violin part was as a rule written down first in the ritornellos of keyboard concertos, and then in the solo episodes the right hand of the solo instrument was notated, if necessary, alternating with the first violin. It was only in a second phase that this procedure was expanded by the working out of the accompanying voices. This two-step process is still clearly recognizable in numerous C. P. E. Bach autograph scores.[15] Working with continuity drafts enabled Bach to write out even greater and more complex movements in a relatively fast and clean manner; in preparing his scores, the composer was seldom faced with difficult compositional and formal problems that required extensive corrections.

Studying Bach's compositional method and examining his autograph scores supports the suspicion that he largely recomposed Wq 2 and 3 in the revised versions. Analysis of the handwriting of the autograph scores of Wq 2 and 3 leads to the following conclusions: in a different way from the outer movements of Wq 1, the original versions of Wq 2 (from 1734) and Wq 3 (from 1737) were apparently not preserved intact in the revised versions; instead, they were taken apart and, with the help of continuity drafts, completely formed anew and reassembled—in other words, "revised" from the ground up. Bach's working method in the later versions of Wq 2 and 3 can thus be compared most closely with the procedure that he used in the middle movement of Wq 1 and in the final movement of the trio BWV 1036/Wq 145.[16] As these two examples show, the given thematic and motivic material was changed to a very great extent in the reworked versions, and completely new musical associations were set up; thus, almost nothing remains from the original conception of the works.

Without any direct evidence in the sources, it is only with difficulty that traces of the earlier versions of Wq 2 and 3 can be determined through analytical means. Concerning the first movement of Wq 2, the original time signature may have been $\frac{2}{4}$—a meter frequently used in Bach's early works—and the formulation of the theme may have been similar to that which appears in the opening movement of the earlier version of the sonata Wq 65/12.[17] In the reworked version of Wq 2/i, the ritornello was probably lengthened and expanded with new material (perhaps the sequential figure in mm. 10–12 and the darkened harmonies moving towards E-flat minor in mm. 18–19). In the middle movement, perhaps the pulsing motive in m. 1—so

12. On Bach's practice of retaining certain pieces for his own use, which he called *Paradörs*, see *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1008–10.

13. In the case of the autograph of Wq 2 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 354, fascicle IV), which originates from 1743, some of the corrections and readings described in detail in the critical report show that Bach had also made further improvements even after the revision. The readings in the print by Anton Huberty (source **E**) are consistent with the readings *ante correcturam* in P 354. However, contrary to Wade, 90, they reveal nothing about the original version of 1734.

14. See the facsimiles and transcriptions in CPEB:CW, I/8.1, II/3.1, and III/5, respectively.

15. The process is very clearly recognizable in the autograph score of the Concerto in G Minor, Wq 32 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 352, fascicle XII), especially in the third movement; see CPEB:CW, III/9.10.

16. See Leisinger/Wollny 1993, 174–79; also Christoph Wolff, "Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs Trio in d-Moll (BWV 1036/Wq 145)," *BJ* 95 (2009): 177–90.

17. See CPEB:CW, I/6.2 (facsimile in Berg 1985, 3:242–49).

popular in the 1730s—and the latent four-part setting at the beginning were carried over from the original conception.[18] On the other hand, the unison interjections (in mm. 8, 12, etc.) are typical features of Bach's revisions from the 1740s.[19] The stormy, brilliant finale with its refined, alternating voices, its worked-out dialogue between *solo* and *tutti*, and especially its extended cantilena in the keyboard part—all probably have nothing to do with the original model.

The same applies for the quasi-symphonic language of the ritornello in the first movement of Wq 3. Here the mature and unmistakable style of the Berlin school is already dominant. On the other hand, the slow second movement cannot deny its roots. Here we have a composition based on a model: Bach imitates the middle movement of his father's big D-minor concerto, BWV 1052, in a clearly recognizable way. This must have been a favorite piece in his Leipzig and Frankfurt periods. Presumably the parallels were still more extensive in the early version of Wq 3. In the finale of this concerto, the ritornello was probably expanded and enriched with additional material. One might imagine that the original Frankfurt version had a similar structure to the finale of the sonata Wq 65/8 (composed in Frankfurt in 1737, revised in Berlin in 1743).[20]

Performance Practice

As is the case with most of Bach's concertos, there are no surviving indications about the preferred instrument for the pieces published in the present volume. In view of the date of origin, Bach no doubt would have thought at first about using a harpsichord; later he would have allowed the *Hammerklavier* and other stringed keyboard instruments (*Tangentenflügel*, *Bogenklavier*) as equally valid alternatives. In most of his works Bach uses relatively few ornament signs; he apparently consciously avoided overloading his works with the kind of ornaments found in French keyboard music and also in some (mostly early) works of his father. While Bach provided no explicit opportunity for inserting cadenzas for the solo instrument in the early version of Wq 1, he did provide such opportunities in the revised versions of the first two movements of Wq 1 and 3, as well as in all three movements of Wq 2. Unfortunately, neither the surviving original sources nor the collection of seventy-five cadenzas (B-Bc, 5871 MSM = Wq 120) contain authentic written cadenzas for these three works. The performer will therefore have to model the length and style of cadenzas after those preserved in Bach's other early Berlin concertos. In the case of Wq 2, the performer can also refer to the contemporary cadenzas, one for each movement, found in a set of parts in the hand of Johann Heinrich Grave (in CH-Gpu, Ms. mus. 314). These are published in the appendix.

There are no reliable contemporary reports that specify the number of orchestral musicians that Bach had available for the performance of his concertos in Leipzig, Frankfurt an der Oder, and Berlin. But, in view of the large forces that were regularly used for the congratulatory works performed by the collegia musica in Leipzig and Frankfurt, one can imagine that Bach's ensembles were probably not too small, probably significantly larger than the forces available to him in Berlin.[21] The "Großes Concert" in Leipzig—the organization that succeeded J. S. Bach's collegium musicum—could be expected to have a string contingent of approximately fifteen players in the mid-1740s: five first violins, five second violins, two violas, and three basses.

Doubtful and Spurious Works

The following list gives a brief account of keyboard concertos that are considered of doubtful or uncertain authenticity in the pertinent literature (Wade, Helm, Enßlin); these are omitted from CPEB:CW. For many pieces the actual composer can be named; others remain doubtful for stylistic reasons. In a few cases authentic pieces have not been identified previously; they are included here for the sake of completeness.

Concerto in G Minor, H 481 (Wade, appendix B, X12). This concerto seems to be transmitted exclusively in US-Wc, M1010.A2 B13 L.C. 1 (titled "Concerto Cembalo | Violino Primo | Violino Secondo | Viola | e | Basso | C.P.E. Bach"). The source has no documentable connection with C.P.E. Bach, nor does the stylistic evidence of the piece suggest him as a composer. The copyist of the string parts is also found in a number of sources from the Thulemeier collection and seems

18. See also the first two movements of the sonata Wq 65/9 in CPEB:CW, I/6.2 (facsimile in Berg 1985, 3:212–14).

19. See the slow movement of the suite Wq 65/4, in its two surviving versions, in CPEB:CW, I/8.2, 93–94 and 100–101, as well as the two versions of the sonatina Wq 64/4 in CPEB:CW, I/6.1 (see also Leisinger/Wollny 1993, 160–61, example 6).

20. See CPEB:CW, I/6.2 (facsimile in Berg 1985, 3:210–11).

21. On the latter see David Schulenberg's remarks in the introduction to CPEB:CW, III/9.2, xiv–xv.

to belong to the circle of Christoph Nichelmann (1717–62),[22] while the copyist of the cembalo part did indeed occasionally work for Bach,[23] but apparently was more frequently employed by Christian Friedrich Schale (1713–1800).[24]

Concerto in E Minor, H 481.5 (Wade, appendix B, X19). This concerto seems to be transmitted exclusively in US-Wc, M1010.A2 B13 L.C. 2 (titled "Concerto Cembalo | Violino Primo | Violino Secondo | Viola | et | Basso | Bach"). The source has no documentable connection with C.P.E. Bach, nor does the stylistic evidence of the piece suggest him as a composer. The scribe of the string parts resembles Wade's copyist FF (see Wade, 323); the keyboard part was prepared by Anon. 303.

Concerto in D Minor, H 484 (Wade, appendix B, X30). This concerto is an early version of an authorized composition by J.S. Bach (BWV 1052a). The source (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 350) is in the hand of the young C.P.E. Bach but does not bear an attribution to him. In fact, NV 1790, p. 67, attributes the work explicitly to J.S. Bach (under "Instrumental-Sachen") as a "Flügel-Concert aus dem *D* ♭ mit Begleitung." Furthermore, there is no reason to support the widespread assumption that BWV 1052a is the arrangement of a lost violin concerto by J.S. Bach and that C.P.E. Bach was responsible for its transcription.[25]

Concerto in F Minor, H 484.2 (Wade, appendix B, X7). This work, evidently by Johann Christian Bach (Warburton C 73) is transmitted in the following sources: D-B, SA 2633 (score in the hand of Carl Friedrich Christian Fasch; attribution: "dall Sign C.F.E. Bach"); D-B, SA 2634 (score in the hand of Johann Carl Samuel Possin; attribution: "da C.P.E. Bach"; three parts written by an unidentified copyist); D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 680 (score in the hand of an unknown copyist; attribution: "da Wilh. Friedemann Bach"); D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 482 (set of parts in the hand of an unknown copyist; attribution on the wrapper in the hand of Nichelmann: "dal Sgr. J.C. Bach detto il Milanese riveduto dal Sgr C.P.E. Bach"); D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 483 (set of parts in the hand of an unknown copyist; attribution: "Del Sigr. C.P.E. Bach"); D-LEb, Go. S. 40 (set of parts in the hand of Johann Christoph Farlau and an anonymous copyist; attribution "da J.C. Bach" added by a third hand);[26] D-WRa, Mus. III c:112 (set of parts in the hand of an anonymous copyist; attribution: "C.P.E. Bach").[27] For none of the surviving sources could a direct connection to any of the Bach sons be established. Wilhelm Friedemann and C.P.E. Bach can be ruled out as composers for stylistic reasons. The most detailed attribution (in St 482) has been ascribed to Nichelmann; it seems to be based on firsthand biographical information. J.C. Bach's authorship is also supported by the source in D-LEb, as well as by the stylistic profile of the work, which is close to other compositions from his Berlin period (1750–55).[28]

Concerto in E-flat Major, H 484.3/Wq n.v. 68 (Wade, appendix B, X11). This concerto seems to be transmitted exclusively in D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 522. The source has no documentable connection with C.P.E. Bach, nor does the stylistic evidence of the piece suggest him as a composer.

Concerto in B-flat Major, H 484.4/Wq n.v. 67 (Wade, appendix B, X23). This concerto is found, without attribution, in D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 619, a MS from the Voß collection, along with the authentic concertos Wq 32 and 43/1. It was probably composed by Ernst Wilhelm Wolf (1735–92). The attribution to Wolf can be found in Cat. Breitkopf, col. 432, and is supported by stylistic evidence.

Concerto in D Major, H 484.5 (Wade, appendix B, X18). This concerto is transmitted in three sources: CZ-KRa, II G 1 (attribution: "del Sig. Bach"); D-DS, Mus. ms. 56 (attribution: "Carlo Bach"); and D-B, Mus. ms. 1230, where the composer is identified as Ignaz von Beecke (1733–1803), an entirely plausible attribution.

22. Schwinger, 284, labels him "Thulemeier III" and traces his hand in the following sources: D-B, Sammlung Thulemeier 17 (organ part), 168 (cembalo part), 170 (parts), and 270 (score). In addition, I found this hand in D-B, Mus. ms. 30194, fasc. XVI (Johann Pachelbel, chorale preludes) and D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 773, fasc. II (Wq 118/1 and Johann Philipp Kirnberger, variations on "Ich schlief, da träumte mir").

23. This scribe is found in the house copy of Wq 162 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 241), where he wrote the parts "Flauto Traverso Primo" and "Basso"; he is also found in the earlier house copy of Wq 65/22 (D-Hs, ND VI 3191, fasc. II).

24. See Schwinger, 567, 574, and 583, who calls this scribe "Schale I."

25. Cf. Christoph Wolff, "Sicilianos and Organ Recitals: Observations on J.S. Bach's Concertos," in *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 7, *J.S. Bach's Concerted Ensemble Music, The Concerto*, ed. Gregory Butler (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 97–114, esp. 109–13.

26. Hans-Joachim Schulze's suggestion, adopted by Wade and Helm, that this addition is in the hand of J.C. Bach cannot be verified by a comparison of authentic samples of his handwriting. See Schulze, *Katalog der Sammlung Manfred Gorke. Bachiana und andere Handschriften und Drucke des 18. und frühen 19. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Musikbibliothek der Stadt Leipzig, 1977), 22. On the identification of Farlau see Peter Wollny, "Tennstedt, Leipzig, Naumburg, Halle—Neuerkenntnisse zur Bach-Überlieferung in Mitteldeutschland," *BJ* 88 (2002): 29–60.

27. This MS was destroyed in the fire at D-WRa in 2004; a microfilm survives.

28. A thorough investigation into the problem of attribution was prepared by Elias N. Kulukundis in 2008. I am grateful to him for sending me a copy of his unpublished paper, "J.C. Bach, C.P.E. Bach, and the Keyboard Concerto No. 6 in F Minor: Observations and Speculations."

Concerto in B-flat Major, H 484.6 (Wade, appendix B, X20). Two MS sources (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 144 and D-Dl, Mus. 2662-O-5 [*olim* 3374-O-9]) attribute the piece either to J.S. or J.C. Bach. It was actually composed by Johann Michael Bach (1745–1820), who published the work in 1767 in his op. 1 (RISM A/I/1, B 428).

Concerto in D Major, H 484.7 (Wade, appendix B, X13). This concerto seems to be transmitted exclusively in a MS in private possession (Elias N. Kulukundis, Greenwich, Conn.), titled "Concerto | Per il Clavicembalo | Con Due Violini, Violetta, e Basso | Del Sigr. Carlo Filippo Emanuel Bach". The source has no documentable connection with C.P.E. Bach, nor does the stylistic evidence of the piece suggest him as a composer.

Concerto in G Major, H 484.8 (Wade, appendix B, X21). This concerto seems to be transmitted exclusively in D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 616.[29] The source has no documentable connection with C.P.E. Bach, nor does the stylistic evidence of the piece suggest him as a composer.

Concerto in C Minor, H 484.9 (Wade, appendix B, X24). This concerto seems to be transmitted exclusively in D-GOl, Mus. 4° 4/3 (attribution: "del Sign: Bach").[30] The source has no documentable connection with C.P.E. Bach, nor does the stylistic evidence of the piece suggest him as a composer.

Concerto in F Major, H 485 (Wade, appendix B, X10) = Sonatina in F Major, Wq 99. It is transmitted as a concerto in CZ-KRa, II G 2 ("Del Sig. Emen. Pach"). Helm assigned a new number by mistake.

Concerto in C Major, H 486 (Wade, appendix B, X17). This concerto seems to be transmitted exclusively in CZ-KRa, II F 3 (attribution: "Concerto Del Sig. Bach"). The source has no documentable connection with C.P.E. Bach, nor does the stylistic evidence of the piece suggest him as a composer.

Concerto in D Minor, H 487/Wq n.v. 33 (Wade, appendix B, X1). This piece is attributed to C.P.E. Bach in D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 926 (attribution: "del Sigr. C.F.E. Bach") and A-Wgm, VII 36258 (attribution: "C.Ph.E. Bach" over cancelled entry "di Nichelman") and is transmitted without attribution in B-Bc, 6154 MSM. It can be firmly attributed to Nichelmann on the basis of an autograph composing score (D-B, Sammlung Thulemeier 170).

Concertos in B-flat Major and G Major, H 488–89 (Wade, appendix B, X14–15) = J.C. Bach, op. 1, nos. 1 and 4. Helm included these concertos presumably on the basis of the non-specific attributions ("Del Sigre Bach") in CZ-KRa, II F 2 and II F 5.

Concerto in A Major, H 490 (Wade, appendix B, X6). This piece is found in the following print: CONCERTO II. | PER IL | CLAVICEMBALO, | DUE VIOLINI, | VIOLA | E | BASSO, | DAL | SIGN. GIOVANI CRISTIANO BACH. || IN RIGA, PRESSO GIOVANI FEDERICO HARTKNOCH. The work has been attributed variously to C.P.E., J.C., and Johann Christoph Friedrich Bach. It is the present editor's opinion that C.P.E. Bach's authorship is unlikely.[31]

Concerto in C Major, H 492 (Wade, appendix B, X4) = J.C. Bach, op. 13, no. 1. Helm included this concerto presumably on the basis of the attribution ("Del Sig Carlo Bach") in CZ-KRa, II F 6.

Concerto in E-flat Major, H 494 (Wade, appendix B, X3) = J.C. Bach, op. 7, no. 5. Helm included this concerto presumably on the basis of the attribution ("del Sigl. P.E. Bach") in D-GOl, Mus. 2° 5/6.[32]

Concerto in F Major, H 495 (Wade, appendix B, X25) = J.C. Bach, op. 7, no. 2. Helm included this concerto presumably on the basis of the attribution ("del Sigr: Bach") in D-GOl, Mus. 2° 4/4.[33]

Concerto in B-flat Major, H 496 (Wade, appendix B, X16) = J.C. Bach, op. 7, no. 4. Helm included this concerto presumably on the basis of the attribution ("di Sigre Bach") in D-WRa, Mus. IV c:16 ("di Sigre Bach").

Concerto in D Major, H 497 (Wade, appendix B, X9). A forgery by Henri Casadesus (1879–1947).

Concerto in B-flat major, H 498/Wq n.v. 36 (Wade, appendix B, X2). Helm included this concerto presumably on the basis of the attribution ("Concerto dell Sigr. P.E. Bach") in D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 295. It can be firmly attributed to Nichelmann on the basis of an autograph composing score (D-B, Am.B. 521).

29. On the scribe and provenance see Schwinger, 454, 561.

30. On the scribe and provenance see Leisinger 1993, 31.

31. Mark W. Knoll, "Which Bach Wrote What? A Cumulative Approach to Clarification of Three Disputed Works" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1998), esp. chap. 5, considers H 490 more likely to have been written by C.P.E. Bach than by any of his brothers (if it is, in fact, by any of them). On the other hand, Wade does not dispute the attribution to J.C. Bach, which may have been introduced by Hartknoch, and Ulrich Leisinger, *Bach-Repertorium*, forthcoming, attributes the work firmly to J.C.F. Bach.

32. See also Leisinger 1993, 37.

33. Ibid., 31.

Concerto in F Minor, H 499 (Wade, appendix B, X8). Helm included this concerto presumably on the basis of the attribution ("del Sigr: C.P.E. Bach") in D-GOl, Mus. 4° 5/7.[34] Two concordances (D-B, Mus. ms. 1364 and B-Bc, 5923a MSM) transmit this piece as a work by Georg Anton Benda (1722–95), a much more likely attribution than that to Bach.

Concerto in D Major, H 500 (Wade, appendix B, X22; Kast, Bach-Incerta 37). This concerto is transmitted in D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 624, but without attribution. As Jean K. Wolf discovered in 1965 (note in St 624), the parts belong to D-B, Mus. ms. 20665, which attributes the work to Johann Gabriel Seyffarth (1711–96). Two further concordances transmit the work as a composition by Seyffarth: D-B, Mus. ms. 20776 and Mus. ms. 20776/1.

Concerto in B-flat Major, H 501 (Wade, appendix B, X26). This concerto is transmitted in CH-Bu, Sammlung Geigy-Hagenbach 1627, falsely claimed to be an autograph by J.S. Bach. The work is attributed to Johann Nikolaus Tischer (1707–74) in D-B, Mus. ms. 21917/5 and Cat. Breitkopf, col. 136.

Concerto in D Major, H *deest* (Enßlin, 1:421). This concerto is transmitted in D-B, SA 4731 ("Orgel Concert | von | C.P.E. Bach"), which contains, in the hand of Anon. 303, the organ part of the concerto Wq 35 transposed to D major (see CPEB:CW, III/9.11).

Concerto in B-flat Major, H *deest*. This concerto is transmitted with the attribution "C.P.E. Bach" in B-Bc, 27135 MSM, and without attribution in D-B, SA 3058 and US-BEm, MS 738 A–E. The sources have no documentable connection with C.P.E. Bach, nor does the stylistic evidence of the piece suggest him as a composer. Enßlin, 1:284, points out that Cat. Zelter refers to SA 3058 (*olim* ZD 1580) as sets of performing materials to ten keyboard concertos by E.W. Wolf.

Acknowledgments

In preparing the present volume I received many suggestions and much support from friends and colleagues. A special word of thanks is extended to Darrell M. Berg, Paul Corneilson, and Jason B. Grant for thoroughly examining the whole manuscript, giving me numerous valuable tips, and critically testing my arguments and decisions. For information of various kinds I thank Christine Blanken, Elias N. Kulukundis, and Ulrich Leisinger. My wife Stephanie Wollny participated—as always—in preparing the final version. Finally, I wish to thank all the libraries named in this volume for allowing me uncomplicated access to their sources.

Peter Wollny

34. On the scribe and provenance see ibid., 37–38.