

INTRODUCTION

The three works published in the present volume—the Concerto in C Minor, Wq 31, the Concerto in G Minor, Wq 32, and the Concerto in F Major, Wq 33—date from the years 1753 to 1755 in Berlin, and thus belong to the middle period of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. In the estate catalogue (NV 1790, p. 32), the following entries are found:

No. 32. C. moll. B. 1753. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.

No. 33. G. moll. B. 1754. Clavier, 2 Flöten, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.

No. 34. F. dur. B. 1755. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.

Within Bach's concerto production these works represent, together with Wq 34 (published in CPEB: CW, III/9.11), the conclusion of a particularly creative phase. At the beginning of his time in Berlin Bach wrote at least one concerto for solo keyboard and string accompaniment each year,¹ and in this manner began to explore the young genre and further develop it in its artistic possibilities. In the ensuing period only a few other works can be identified that seem like added contributions to the series. In the second half of the 1750s Bach's artistic interest seems to have shifted from the concerto to the symphony, after which he turned his attention to the sonatina for obbligato cembalo and orchestra (a genre developed by him), before he returned to writing concertos.

Whether there were biographical reasons for this shift in emphasis is unknown. In any event, for the years from 1753 to 1755, applications to city representatives in Zittau (1753) and Leipzig (1755) are documented,² as well as a trip undertaken in 1754, which apparently involved the exploration of employment possibilities at the courts in Rudolstadt, Eisenach, Gotha, and Kassel.³

1. Only in the year 1752 is there no concerto listed in NV 1790; there are three works listed for 1753. The gap could be due to Bach's work on *Versuch I*, published in 1753.

2. See CPEB-Briefe, 1:13–39; Arnold Schering, *Musikgeschichte Leipzigs*, vol. 3, *Das Zeitalter Johann Sebastian Bachs und Johann Adam Hillers von 1723–1800* (Leipzig: F. Kistner & C.F.W. Siegel, 1941), 343; and Ulrike Kollmar, *Gottlob Harrer (1703–1755), Kapellmeister des Grafen Heinrich von Brühl am sächsisch-polnischen Hof und Thomaskantor in Leipzig. Mit einem Werkverzeichnis und einem Katalog der Notenbibliothek Harrers* (Beeskow: Ortus, 2006), 339–40.

3. See Percy M. Young, *The Bachs, 1500–1850* (London: Dent, 1970),

Likewise, hardly anything is known about the impetus for the creation or the circumstances of performance of the keyboard concertos. Apparently Bach most often played his concertos in the context of private soirees in the circle of his musician colleagues and friends. In his autobiography Johann Wilhelm Hertel reports on Bach's performance of the Concerto in D Major, Wq 11 at Franz Benda's house in October 1745.⁴ Whether the oft-cited note of Frederick II on Bach's request for a pay raise from the year 1755 refers to a solo appearance involving a concerto for keyboard and orchestra at the court, cannot be resolved beyond a doubt.⁵ Possibly it has some connection with an appearance at the Berlin palace on 28 October 1753, which is alluded to in contemporary daily newspapers.⁶ Perhaps the fact that three of the five original dates in Bach's concerto autograph manuscripts mention the months of April and May suggests a yearly recurring event for which Bach furnished a new concerto.⁷ The 6 May birthday of Bach's close friend, the Berlin doctor and music lover Georg Ernst Stahl (1713–72), could be a conceivable occasion.

As the original sources for Wq 31 and 32 make plain, Bach performed these works at least once at the beginning of his time in Hamburg. This presumably occurred in the context of the public concerts he organized. The Hamburg newspapers mention several times that Bach performed his

173; Claus Oefner, *Die Musikerfamilie Bach in Eisenach* (Eisenach: Bachhaus, 1996), 78–81; CPEB-Briefe, 1:40–41; *Musik am Rudolstädter Hof. Die Entwicklung der Hofkapelle vom 17. Jahrhundert bis zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Ute Omonsky (Rudolstadt: Thüringer Landesmuseum Heidecksburg, 1997), 209; and Ernst Wilhelm Wolf, *Auch eine Reise aber nur eine kleine musikalische in den Monaten Junius, Julius und August 1782 zum Vergnügen angestellt* (Weimar, 1784), 42–43.

4. Hertel, *Autobiographie*, ed. Erich Schenk (Graz and Cologne: Böhlhaus, 1957), 24; cited in CPEB: CW, III/6, xxii.

5. "Er hat ein mahl im Concert hier gespielet nuhn krigt er Spiritus." (He once played in a concert here, and now he's getting cocky.) Quoted in Hans-Günter Ottenberg, *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* (Leipzig: Reclam, 1982), 83; Ottenberg, 57.

6. See Manuel Bärwald, "... ein Clavier von besonderer Erfindung": Der Bogenflügel von Johann Hohlfeld und seine Bedeutung für das Schaffen Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs," *BJ* (2008): 271–300.

7. Wq 17: "d. 5 Apr. 1745"; Wq 23: "Potsd. Mens. Majo [1748]"; Wq 33: "Pots. [17]55 Mens. Majo." The other two only have years: Wq 46: "1740"; and Wq 8: "1741."

TABLE 1. C.P.E. BACH'S CONCERT PERFORMANCES IN HAMBURG

Date	Place	Program Description	Wiermann Document
28 April 1768	Drillhaus	"Clavier-Concerte"	IV/1 (p. 435)
5 May 1768	Konzertsaal auf dem Kamp	"musikalische Stücke auf dem Flügel"	IV/2 (pp. 435–36)
6 March 1769	Konzertsaal auf dem Kamp	"ein Clavier-Concert"	IV/4 (pp. 437–38)
14 and 21 December 1769	Konzertsaal auf dem Kamp	"ein Concert und eine Sonatine"	IV/5 (pp. 438–39)
25 and 28 December 1770	Wurmische Haus	"auf dem Flügel"	IV/8 (pp. 441–43)
12 December 1774	Konzertsaal auf dem Kamp	"ein Concert auf dem Flügel [...] vom Herrn Kapellmeister Bach componirt"	IV/12 (pp. 446–47)
6 April 1778	Konzertsaal auf dem Kamp	"ein Concert und ein Trio auf dem Fortepiano"	IV/19 (pp. 455–56)
22 March 1779	Kramer-Amtshaus	"ein Solo und ein Concert auf dem Forte Piano"	IV/21 (p. 457)
29 March 1779	Kramer-Amtshaus	"auf dem Forte Piano"	IV/22 (p. 458)
14 October 1780	Drillhaus	"auf dem Forte Piano"	IV/26 (p. 460)

own concertos. (Table 1 gives a brief overview of the available evidence.) The orchestral ensemble in these concerts was presumably quite large—at least significantly larger than in the private performances in Berlin; by comparison, Friedrich Gottlob Klopstock reports an orchestral ensemble of "forty instruments" for the performance of the four symphonies Wq 183 in Bach's concert on 17 August 1776.⁸

Concerto in C Minor, Wq 31

Bach described the Concerto in C Minor in a letter of 28 April 1784 to the Greifswald lawyer Johann Heinrich Grave with the following words: "The Concerto in C Minor was formerly one of my show horses. The recitative is written out as I played it without a doubt."⁹ The humorously reinterpreted term "Paradör" is, as is often the case with Bach, borrowed from military parlance, and refers to a show horse in a military parade. He uses the term also in his letter of 25 September 1787 to Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal to describe the demanding and striking keyboard sonatas Wq 65/16, 65/17, and 65/20, and apparently describes with it works that he composed principally for his own use and made available to his friends only at a late point in time.

Wq 31 was written in the same year as the Concertos in A Major, Wq 29, and B Minor, Wq 30 (both published in CPEB: CW, III/9.9). Wq 30 can be considered a sister work to Wq 31, for it displays similar eccentric hallmarks

8. Wiermann, 448–49.

9. CPEB-Briefe, 2:1009: "Das Concert C mol war vor diesem eines meiner Paradörs. Das Rezit. ist so ausgesetzt, wie ich es ohngefehr gespielt habe." The MS sent with this letter was presumably the source now in CH-Gpu, Ms. mus. 341 (see source D 2).

of style. The two works mark extreme positions of Bach's Berlin concerto style. Their extended ritornellos signify a valorization of the orchestral part, which strives for originality and unusual sound effects. In Wq 31 Bach differentiates the color palette of the strings through distinctive playing techniques (*pizzicato*, double stops, *con sordino*) and dynamic effects. In addition Wq 31 features unison playing and repeated 16th notes, which lend the work almost symphonic traits. The crossing of genre boundaries in the slow middle movement, which is organized like a large recitative tableau, is also exceptional. In this fashion the solo instrument becomes somewhat akin to a protagonist in a dramatic action. The use of instrumental recitatives in the 1740s and 1750s in the Berlin School appears to have catered to a certain popular taste. The highly dramatic entry of the solo keyboard in the first movement (after an interrupted cadence) with an augmented version of the main subject and the expressive recitative as well as its *attacca* transition to the last movement seem to indicate that Bach intended to imitate an operatic scene in this work. It is a remarkable example of his artistic striving to redefine the genre traditions of the Baroque concerto.

The similarity to the "Freie Fantasie," which Bach developed in the 1740s, is striking. We first encounter recitative-like middle movements in cyclical works in Bach's first "Prussian" Sonata (Wq 48/1). Further examples can be found in concertos by Christoph Schaffrath (Concerto in A Major; D-B, Mus. ms. 19750/2) and Christian Friedrich Schale (Concerto in D Minor; D-B, Mus. ms. 19758/2). Johann Gottlieb Janitsch employs a recitative in his Trio in G Major (in D-B, SA 3462). As the works by Schaffrath, Schale, and Janitsch cannot be definitively dated, it remains unclear whether Bach adopted a principle

developed by other composers or whether the inauguration of this compositional form can be ascribed to him.

In contrast to many other concertos of the 1750s, Bach changed the musical text of the outer movements of Wq 31 only slightly in later years. Only the middle movement is handed down in a different version from the early Hamburg years that documents Bach's own playing style. (The original version and a facsimile of the revised version of this movement are given in the appendix.) The unusual recitative-like nature of the slow movement inspired Bach to develop a novel, highly experimental *attacca* transition into the finale. Bach marks this with the instruction "das Allegretto fällt nach diesem Adagio, ohne den geringsten Zwischenraum, sogleich ein." (The *Allegretto* follows immediately after this *Adagio*, without the slightest gap.)

The ranking of Wq 31 as "show horse" was cause for Bach's holding back the work and generally avoiding its distribution until the late years of his life. Here we find the hallmarks of a category of popular work by means of which Bach hoped to make a name for himself as a leading composer of demanding concertos. For this reason, apart from the autograph score, autograph short score of the revised middle movement, and original parts (sources A 1, A 2, and A 3a–A 3b), the only extant copies were prepared for J.J.H. Westphal and Grave (sources D 1 and D 2), as well as two—possibly interdependent—copies (sources D 3 and D 4), which remarkably contain the unrevised musical text.

An allusion to the scant distribution of the work is also found on the title wrapper of the original parts: "Ist nicht sehr bekannt." (Is not very well known.) Similar comments are found on the wrappers for Wq 30 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 510: "ist wenig bekannt"), Wq 36 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 530: "ist wenig bekannt"), Wq 38 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 540: "ist nicht sonderlich bekannt"), Wq 39 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 529: "ist nicht sonderlich bekannt"), as well as Wq 164 and 165 (both D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 356: "ist wenig bekannt").

Concerto in G Minor, Wq 32

In contrast with Wq 31, which was scarcely distributed at all, the Concerto in G Minor, Wq 32, composed in 1754, is the most widely transmitted of Bach's concertos. Apparently the composer assisted considerably in the distribution of the work. This is evident from the large number of copies, some of which can be traced back to his years in Berlin. In this connection it is probably significant that Bach had two original sets of parts prepared for this work,

where the function of the second (source A 3), directly copied from the model of the first set of parts (source A 2), remains unclear. One cannot even say with certainty whether the second set of parts remained in Bach's possession or was given away. Duplicate original sets of parts are also extant for the concertos Wq 33 and 34, which were likewise broadly disseminated.

Compared to the two concertos that preceded it (Wq 30 and 31), Wq 32 expresses an unpretentious sentimental tone, which departs clearly from the eccentric style of the 1740s and early 1750s, and apparently was intended to appeal to a larger public. In later years Bach lightly reworked Wq 32, and in so doing he particularly enhanced the accompaniment of the middle movement by adding two flutes, as well as heavily ornamenting the solo voice and lengthening the concluding movement by two measures.

The addition of two flutes has a parallel in Wq 38 (see CPEB: CW, III/9.12), which likewise has a fuller instrumental accompaniment for a Hamburg performance. Source-critical evidence makes clear that Bach likewise added the flutes in Wq 32 for a Hamburg performance (see critical report). Besides source A 2, the two flute parts are found in only one of the later sources, as an attachment to a copy made for J.J.H. Westphal (source D 1).

Apparently the piece so strongly impressed Bach's youngest brother, Johann Christian, who also participated in copying out the original parts, that he used it as a model to create his own Concerto in F Minor (Warb C 59; D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 390).

Concerto in F Major, Wq 33

The Concerto in F Major, Wq 33, composed in 1755, which may be regarded as a sister work to Wq 32, underwent no further revision after its completion. In addition, the autograph score (source A 1) is a clean copy which allows no traces of the compositional process to be made out. Unlike Wq 31 and 32, Bach did not compose Wq 33 by transferring a single-voice continuity draft directly to a definitive score, but presumably first notated a draft score (no longer extant).¹⁰ In the colophon of the score the date is entered ("Potsd. 55 Mens. Majo"). Remarkably, an identical entry is found in the autograph score of the Symphony in C Major,

10. On Bach's usual compositional process, see CPEB: CW, III/9.1, xiv. Of course, the possibility cannot be ruled out that Bach used a continuity draft for Wq 33 as well, which he then transformed into a full score that served as the exemplar for A 1. However, the fact that Bach felt the need to prepare a fair copy of the score rather points to a significantly different composing process.

Wq 174 (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 351). Perhaps Bach composed both works for the same occasion.

The sources provide no information regarding later performances. The relatively large number of contemporary copies, however, hints, as in the case of Wq 32, at a wide reception. Both Wq 32 and 33 were apparently repertoire pieces of the Grosses Concert in Leipzig (and hence directly reached the music dealer Johann Gottlob Immanuel Breitkopf) as well as of the Musikalische Gesellschaft in Halle. The Leipzig reception could have been initiated by Bach himself and might bear a connection with his application for the position of Thomaskantor in Leipzig in 1755. It is quite plausible that Bach offered the pieces on the occasion of a putative visit to Leipzig in order to strengthen his status in the city's music scene. The transmission in Halle, on the other hand, may have a connection with Bach's eldest brother, Wilhelm Friedemann, who as music director and organist of the Halle Liebfrauenkirche maintained close contacts with the Musikalische Gesellschaft at that time. At a later time, both Wq 32 and 33 appear also to have become known through the offerings of the Hamburg music dealer Johann Christoph Westphal.

On Performance Practice

As is true of most of Bach's concertos, for the pieces in the present volume no indications have been handed down as to the preferred instrument type. Considering the time of composition, Bach would surely have been thinking above all of a cembalo (harpsichord); later a fortepiano and other types of stringed keyboard instruments (*Tangentenflügel*, *Bogenklavier*) and an organ would have been admitted as equally acceptable alternatives. The detailed dynamic indications in the piano part of Wq 31, especially the autograph cembalo part in movement ii (source A 3b), points to a touch-sensitive instrument. In most of his works Bach uses relatively few ornament signs; a superabundance of ornaments, such as can be found in French keyboard music

and also in certain works of his father, was seemingly for the most part avoided.

For the opening movement of Wq 31 an original cadenza (Wq 120/45) is extant. For the second movement of Wq 32 two cadenzas exist (Wq 120/50 and 120/64), as well as a fermata for the concluding movement. For Wq 33 we have no original cadenzas, but in a Berlin copy (source D 8) at least one cadenza for the slow movement (by Carl Friedrich Zelter) is found.

No reliable testimony is available regarding the number of orchestral musicians available to Bach in Leipzig, Frankfurt, and Berlin for the performance of his concertos. However, in light of the congratulatory music regularly performed by the collegia musica in Leipzig and Frankfurt an der Oder, one can imagine the ensembles were likely not particularly small. In the middle of the 1740s the Grosses Concert, the successor organization to Johann Sebastian Bach's collegium musicum in Leipzig, could have counted on a string section of about fifteen: five first and second violins, two violas, and three basses.

Acknowledgments

In the preparation of the present volume I have received much encouragement and support from friends and colleagues. My particular thanks are owed to Paul Corneilson, Jason B. Grant, and Ulrich Leisinger, who undertook a thorough review of the entire manuscript, gave numerous valuable suggestions, and critically tested my arguments and decisions. I am also grateful to Elias N. Kulukundis for information of various kinds. My wife, Stephanie Wollny, participated, as always, in the final editing. Finally, I must express my gratitude to all the libraries named in this volume, especially the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv, for the kind permission to use the sources.

Peter Wollny