

INTRODUCTION

The two works in the present volume, the Concerto in E-flat Major, Wq 41, and the Concerto in F Major, Wq 42, are the first two keyboard concertos that Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach composed after his move from Berlin to Hamburg in 1768. NV 1790 (p. 34) lists Wq 41 as no. 42 with the date 1769 and Wq 42 as no. 43 with the date 1770. No more specific information on their composition or early performances survives.

History and Sources of the Concertos

Most likely these concertos were composed in connection with the public concerts that Bach presented in his first years in Hamburg, which featured large vocal works and Bach's performances of his own keyboard concertos.¹ For the winter season of 1768–69 twenty concerts were planned for the new Konzertsaal auf dem Kamp, though the only one that can be documented through an announcement in the Hamburg press is one that took place on 6 March 1769, in which Bach performed a Passion oratorio “by a famous master” and a keyboard concerto.² The latter work might well have been Wq 41. For spring 1770 four subscription concerts were announced in the Wurmb'schen Haus on the Speersort, home of the Hamburg *Handlungsakademie* since 1768.³ During 1770 the *Bachische Privatkonzert* developed

in the form of a regular biweekly series; it was first announced for the following season.⁴ This series was highly successful throughout the 1770s, and as late as 1784 these concerts were described as the best and most frequent among the many similar undertakings in Hamburg.⁵ They would have offered a perfect forum for keyboard concertos, and one may suppose that Wq 42 was also composed for one of these concert series.

If Bach had shown less interest than formerly in the keyboard concerto during his last years in Berlin,⁶ his debut concerto for Hamburg, Wq 41, apparently shows him starting his career in his new home with high ambitions in the genre. In his public and private concerts, whose exclusivity was guaranteed by high ticket prices, he found an elite and devoted audience for his innovative music among the middle and upper bourgeoisie. This was the milieu that Bach needed, and one that he did not always find, as Charles Burney remarked.⁷ Bach's intentions regarding Wq 41 are well documented. There is a score by a copyist with autograph additions in the composite manuscript D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 353 (discussed in detail in the critical report). In addition, two sets of parts survive, one authorized by Bach's heirs in the composite manuscript B-Bc, 5887 MSM, and another of Berlin provenance, D-B, SA 2608. Bach also wrote cadenzas for the first and second movements, Wq 120/59 and 120/53, respectively, which appear as an appendix to the present volume.

The history and text of Wq 42 are not as well documented. For a time the authenticity of the concerto was questioned; it is listed in the Breitkopf Catalogue with an ascription to “Lange” [presumably Johann Georg Lang

1. On concert life in Hamburg in this period, see Josef Sittard, *Geschichte des Musik- und Concertwesens in Hamburg vom 14. Jahrhundert bis auf die Gegenwart* (1890; reprint, Hildesheim: Olms, 1971), 102, 105ff.; Hans-Günther Ottenberg, *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* (Leipzig: Reclam, 1982), 157–61; and Christoph Gugger, “C. Ph. E. Bachs Konzerttätigkeit in Hamburg,” *Der Hamburger Bach und die neue Musik des 18. Jahrhunderts: eine Veranstaltungsreihe anlässlich des 200. Todesjahres von Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach 1714–1788*, ed. Hans Joachim Marx (Hamburg: Grömmmer, 1988), 169–85 (includes a chronology).

2. “Bey dieser Gelegenheit wird der Kapellmeister auch ein Clavier-Concert spielen.” *HUC* (22 Feb. 1769), cited by Sittard, 105, and Wiermann, 437–38.

3. On the *Handlungsakademie*, which was founded by Bach's associates Johann Georg Büsch and Christoph Daniel Ebeling, see Burney, 2:246–48; Gisela Jaacks, “‘Gott behüte meine Nachfolger für dergleichen zur Verzweiflung leitenden Geschäften.’ Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach als ‘Musik-Direktor’ Hamburgs,” *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. Musik und Literatur in Norddeutschland. Ausstellung zum 200. Todestag*

Bachs, ed. Dieter Lohmeier (Heide in Holstein: Westholsteinische Verlagsanstalt Boyens, 1988), 46ff.; and Franklin Kopitzsch, “Die Hamburger Aufklärung zur Zeit Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs,” *Hamburg* 1988, 92ff.

4. Wiermann, 440.

5. Letter from Hamburg dated 10 February 1784, signed “J. G. V.,” in Carl Friedrich Cramer, ed. *Magazin der Musik* 3 (1784): 3.

6. See CPEB: CW, III/9.13, xii.

7. “This man was certainly born to write for great performers, and for a refined audience.” Burney 2: 249–50.

(1722–98)].⁸ The references in the authoritative catalogues and the sources from Bach's environs that have survived leave no room for doubt about the authorship of Wq 42, however. There are an autograph and two other manuscript sources for a solo keyboard version of the piece, H 242 (see CPEB: CW, I/10.1). For the version with orchestra three sets of parts exist, including an authorized copy in B-Bc, 5887 MSM, another set by the composer's brother Johann Christoph Friedrich, D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 212, and a third that was probably copied in Berlin, D-B, SA 2616.

The relationship between H 242 and the orchestral version of the concerto is not fully understood. The Schwerin collector Johann Jacob Heinrich Westphal, who acquired copies of each version from Bach's estate, noted that H 242 diverged markedly from the keyboard part of the orchestral version, which he assumed to be the original.⁹ The autograph of H 242, however, shows Bach still making compositional changes that were carried over into the orchestral version.¹⁰ H 242 appears in NV 1790 as no. 168 under *Clavier Soli* with the date 1770, corresponding to that of the orchestral version, but in CV 1772, where it is no. 158, it is assigned to Potsdam in 1767.¹¹ If the latter information is correct, Bach composed the concerto as a solo and then prepared the orchestral version three years later.

Stylistic considerations also suggest that H 242 was the original version of the concerto. As indicated below, the work lacks the innovative features of the other early Hamburg concertos Wq 41 and 43 and more closely

resembles the late Berlin concertos, which would accord with a composition date of 1767 instead of 1770. While the slow movement is the same length (137 mm.) in both versions, the outer movements are longer in the orchestral version. The figuration in the solo part of the orchestral version is more virtuosic rhythmically throughout (16th notes as opposed to triplet 8ths), and by and large more interesting musically, as one would expect if Bach had revised for his own use a piece originally intended for amateur performers.

Rachel W. Wade has proposed that the second movement in particular resembles a character piece for keyboard and might well have been composed as a solo, though she considered that the outer movements might have been conceived with orchestra.¹² In the second movement of H 242 the first eleven measures of the first solo section (mm. 28–38) are identical with the opening measures of the movement; in the orchestral version Bach not only made the solo entrance more intricate but he also elaborated it further at a later date (see the critical report). Another textual detail suggesting that H 242 is the original appears in mm. 12 and 91, where H 242 descends to f but the violins of the orchestral version substitute a less satisfactory a; this can be explained if Bach had conceived the passage for solo keyboard and then had to adapt it to the range of the violin.

Aspects of the outer movements also point to H 242 as the original version of the concerto. The relationship between the first movements is comparatively straightforward. The first movement of the orchestral version contains only one six-measure passage not in H 242 (mm. 123–28). One relevant detail appears in the opening theme of the first movement. In mm. 2, 4, 77, 79, 131, 133, 190, and 192 (on the last two measures see the critical report) note 4 in the violins is a staccato quarter note, as in the corresponding places in H 242. In mm. 54, 56, 156, and 158 the violins have an 8th note. This notational change is necessary in the corresponding places in H 242 because of the continuation there, but would not be needed in the orchestral version. It is likely to be a relic of H 242 that was carried over into the orchestral version. (Doubling viola and horn parts in Wq 42, mm. 54, 56, 77, 79, 156, and 158, are all notated with an 8th note.)

In the third movement the differences between the versions are greater. The last movement of the orchestral version is longer by a total of seventy-two additional mea-

8. Cat Breitkopf, col. 518. The work is not listed in Shelley G. Davis, "The Keyboard Concertos of Johann George Lang (1722–1798)" (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1972).

9. Westphal listed his copy of H 242 in his catalogue (B-Br, Fétis 5218 [II 4140], fol. 34v), as no. 16 in the section of sonatas under the heading *Claviersachen*, with the comment: "Unter den Clavier-Concerten findet man dieses Concert auch mit Begleitung von Instrumenten, doch weicht dieses Exemplar welches der seel. Verfaßer für das Clavier alleine eingerichtet hat, von der Clavierparthie daselbst merklich ab." See Arnfried Edler, "Prolegomena zu einer Geschichte des Concertos für unbegleitetes Cembalo," *Critica musica. Studien zum 17. und 18. Jahrhundert. Festschrift Hans Joachim Marx zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Nicole Ristow, et al. (Stuttgart: Metzler, 2001), 80 ff.; Arnfried Edler, *Gattungen der Musik für Tasteninstrumente* (Laaber: Laaber-Verlag, 1997), 2:102 ff.

10. Details appear in CPEB: CW, I/10.1, xii.

11. See Christoph Wolff, "Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs Verzeichnis seiner Clavierwerke von 1733 bis 1772," in *Über Leben, Kunst und Kunstwerke. Aspekte musikalischer Biographie. Johann Sebastian Bach in Zentrum*, ed. Christoph Wolff (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1999), 235; also CPEB: CW, I/8.1, xv, where Peter Wollny proposes that the solo version was originally intended for a second set of "Clavierstücke verschiedener Art" that never materialized.

12. Wade, 112.

asures in four different passages. One of these places is a one-measure cadential extension (m. 55), but there are also three passages of virtuoso elaboration not in H 242 (mm. 115–32, 236–65, and 377–99). These passages do not connect altogether smoothly with the preceding material. H 242 has sequential progressions leading to strong cadences in mm. 115, 218, and 329; in the orchestral version the dominant harmony (mm. 114, 235, and 376) is prolonged and not resolved; the cadence is completed only at the end of each passage. This gives the impression that the additional measures are afterthoughts worked into a preexistent composition. Measures 174–82 of the orchestral version appear to be a revision of the corresponding passage in H 242 (mm. 155–63) that was not fully carried out, particularly in the left hand, where some notes from the solo version have been added to the edition in small type (see the critical report). In mm. 45–46 and 423–24 of the third movement (the latter passage corresponds to mm. 360–61 in H 242), H 242 has e^{'''} while the violins of the orchestral version have c^{'''}, though the former would better suit the sequential continuation; the orchestral version looks like a compromise to suit the range of the violins at the expense of musical coherence. Considerations of range might also explain the reading of the violins in mm. 151 and 155 of this movement. In H 242 notes 3–6 of the corresponding mm. 132 and 136 are c^{'''}–a^{''}–f[♯]^{''}–c^{''} and d^{'''}–b^{''}–g[♯]^{''}–d^{''}, respectively, agreeing in transposition with the readings in the parallel mm. 18, 22, 284, and 288 (mm. 235 and 239 in H 242). In Wq 42 the notes in question are a^{''}–f[♯]^{''}–d^{''}–c^{''} and b^{''}–g[♯]^{''}–c^{''}–d^{''}, keeping a slightly lower tessitura. These problematic passages might well have originated from the process of transcription, particularly if Bach was working in haste and did not write out a complete orchestral score of the new version but relied on verbal or written instructions to a copyist to realize the full text. Whether the two versions were created as far apart as three years or in close proximity as part of a single process cannot be determined from the surviving evidence.

Musical Style

Wq 41 shows all the stylistic elements one would expect in a work intended for an elite public. Among its innovative features are its formal layout, its instrumentation, and its treatment of the structural relationship between tutti and solo. Even the key relationships of the movements depart from the expected pattern. The tonality of the second movement raises the tension of the entire cycle; instead of placing it in the relative key of C minor, Bach sets it

in C major. The fantasia-like transitional passage into the third movement, which has parallels in many of the Berlin symphonies of 1755 and after (see CPEB: CW, III/1), emphasizes the unusual relationship in the consciousness of the listener. Bach uses the same tonal relationships in the Concerto in E-flat Major for Harpsichord and Fortepiano, Wq 47, of 1788, his final concerto (see CPEB: CW, III/10). In both works this is not merely an isolated effect but part of an overall conception of the work, incorporating novel juxtapositions of keys.

This tonal structure reflects the influence of the free fantasia style, which is also palpable in the remarkable *Largo* introduction with muted strings, which recurs in the dominant beginning in measure 110 of the first movement.¹³ (Bach is unlikely to have encountered any of Haydn's early experiments with slow openings to symphonies; Haydn's first truly characteristic slow introduction appears in Symphony no. 50 of 1773.¹⁴) The choice of *Prestissimo* for the tempo of the main body of the movement, unusual for Bach, emphasizes the sharp contrast between the introduction and the remainder. Similar allusions to the style of the fantasia appear in the six concertos of Wq 43, composed in 1771; Bach published these works so that they could be played either with orchestra or by solo keyboard.¹⁵

Bach assigns the winds a new role in Wq 41. Though a few of his Berlin concertos have *ad libitum* wind parts, this first Hamburg concerto has obbligato parts for the horns in the outer movements and for the flutes in the entire work. Bach has thus transformed the accompanying string ensemble of the earlier concertos into an orchestra. This parallels the way in which he expanded the instrumentation of many of the Berlin concertos, symphonies, and sonatinas to take advantage of the larger performing forces available to him in Hamburg.¹⁶ Other composers of the late 1760s were also adding winds to their keyboard concertos. In

13. This slow opening has frequently been discussed: Rudolf Klinkhammer, *Die langsame Einleitung in der Instrumentalmusik der Klassik und Romantik: Ein Sonderproblem in der Entwicklung der Sonatenform* (Regensburg: Bosse, 1971), 1–20; Marianne Danckwardt, *Die langsame Einleitung, ihre Herkunft und ihr Bau bei Haydn und Mozart* (Tutzing: Schneider, 1977), 269ff.; Arnfried Edler, "Die Klavierkonzerte C.P.E. Bachs im Kontext der zeitgenössischen Gattungsgeschichte in Norddeutschland," *Frankfurt/Oder 1994*, 271–78.

14. See Stephen C. Fisher, "Haydn's Overtures and Their Adaptations as Concert Orchestral Works" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1985), 395–403.

15. See CPEB: CW, III/8 and I/10.1.

16. On C.P.E. Bach's Berlin symphonies, see CPEB: CW, III/1; on the sonatinas, see CPEB: CW, III/11–13.

1767 Breitkopf advertised the concertos opp. 9, 11, and 12 by Johann Schobert, which add *ad libitum* parts for horns and other winds to works that are essentially accompanied keyboard music.¹⁷ In 1768–69 Adolf Carl Kunzen, organist of the Marienkirche in Lübeck, composed concertos with horns in the outer movements and flutes in the slow movements.¹⁸ This scoring would become commonplace in the coming years; Bach calls for it in Wq 43, and it appears in a set of concertos by Johann Rudolf Holzhalb printed in Zürich in 1777.¹⁹

The relationship of the soloist and the orchestra in Wq 41 is also novel. Instead of the traditional opposition of tutti and solo, which was already becoming less evident in the later Berlin concertos, Wq 41 shows an alternation of different sections of the orchestra in dialogue with the soloist. Bach achieves a striking effect at the first entry of the keyboard in the *Largo* introduction, where the soloist trills for two measures against the muted violins. The new approach to orchestration, with its emphasis on shifts in color within the orchestra and on the relationship between orchestra and soloist, brings the concerto closer to the symphony, foreshadowing the innovations of Bach's four orchestral symphonies, Wq 183, of 1775–76.²⁰ The flutes not merely play in all three movements but go well beyond their usual role of coloristic addition to the violins. At times they create a three-part wind texture with the horns (movement i, mm. 32–34, 45–46, and parallel passages; movement iii, mm. 78–79, 164–67, and the like). The violas are frequently divided, playing two independent lines in contrast to the violins. In movement i, mm. 33–36 and parallel passages, their dialogue with the flutes highlights the thematic contrast of the passage that plays the role of “second theme” in the sonata-form sense—a feature by no means universally found in North German keyboard con-

certos of the 1760s.²¹ Following the entrance of the soloist, this musical material appears in a variety of scorings. Bach calls for pizzicato accompaniment in several solo passages in movement i, with the two violin sections answering one another in mm. 80–83, 156–58, and 209–211, and the *divisi* violas also taking a turn in mm. 167–70. Until its final measures, movement ii has the singular sonority of flutes in their high register doubled by muted violas two octaves below; the violoncellos and basses play muted in their lowest octave, with the keyboard playing *sul tasto* when not fully notated and unmuted violins adding pizzicato arpeggio interjections. This unique coloration sets the movement off from the preceding and following ones just as decisively as the tonal distance between them. The solo sections function not as contrast but as intensification, with the keyboard providing changes of color as well as ornamenting and elaborating the thematic material. Comparison with the second movement of the double concerto Wq 47 shows that the latter is based chiefly on the contrast between the two solo instruments, with the orchestra treated conventionally. In the third movement even the horns step out of their usual role of dynamic reinforcement; in the opening theme and parallel passages they join rhythmically with the violas and the basso in rapid alternation with the flutes and violins.

The German tempo indication *Ziemlich geschwinde* in the finale of Wq 41 is unique in Bach's concertos. While Bach occasionally uses German terms in his autograph manuscripts when indicating instruments or performance instructions (e.g., in the autographs of Wq 44 and 45: *Br* for viola, *Baß* for basso, *mit dem Baße* for *colla parte* between viola and basso, *die Violinen und Bratschen gedämpft* for *con sordini*), his tempo indications in the concertos otherwise adhere to the traditional Italian markings. Despite Christian Gottfried Krause's arguments for German performance markings,²² Bach uses them with any frequency only in his vocal music.²³ In his instrumental music they

17. Cat. Breitkopf, col. 289; Edler, *Gattungen der Musik für Tasteninstrumente*, 2:128.

18. Arnfried Edler, “Zwischen Händel und Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. Zur Situation des Klavierkonzertes im mittleren 18. Jahrhundert,” *Acta musicologica* 58 (1986): 201, 216; Arnfried Edler, ed., *Norddeutsche Klavierkonzerte des mittleren 18. Jahrhunderts: Adolf Carl Kunzen (1720–1781), Johann Wilhelm Hertel (1727–1789)* (München: Katzbichler, 1994), viii.

19. Heinrich W. Schwab, *Konzert. Öffentliche Musikdarbietung vom 17. bis 19. Jahrhundert* (Leipzig: Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1971), 68 ff.

20. See CPEB: CW, III/3; also Ernst Suchalla, *Die Orchestersinfonien Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs nebst einem thematischen Verzeichnis seiner Orchesterwerke* (Augsburg: W. Blasaditsch, 1968), 69, 76; and Jane R. Stevens, *The Bach Family and the Keyboard Concerto: The Evolution of a Genre* (Warren, Mich.: Harmonie Park, 2001), 229–34.

21. Edler, “Zwischen Händel und Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach,” 205 ff.

22. [Christian Gottfried Krause,] “Vermischte Gedanken, von dem Verfasser der musikalische Poesie,” in Friedrich Wilhelm Marburg, ed., *Historisch-kritische Beyträge zur Aufnahme der Musik*, 3 (1758): 533 ff.; also, [Joseph Martin Kraus,] *Wahrheiten die Musik betreffend, gerade herausgesagt von einem teutschen Biedermann* (Frankfurt/Main: Eichenbergsche Erben), 1779, 3–8.

23. Regarding Bach's songs, see Gudrun Busch, *C. Ph. E. Bach und seine Lieder* (Regensburg: Bosse, 1957), 369–71. German designations for instruments and tempo markings became increasingly common in the Hamburg church music of Bach's later years.

notably appear in two late works of a private character: the Rondo in E Minor (*Abschied von meinem Silbermannischen Clavier*), Wq 66 (see CPEB:CW, I/8.1), and the Fantasia in F-sharp Minor for Keyboard and Violin, Wq 80 (see CPEB:CW, II/3.1).

By contrast, Wq 42 is far more conventional than Wq 41. Formally it has the expected three-movement design, with well-defined ritornellos in all three movements; the slow movement is in the subdominant. It is scored for keyboard and strings, with horns reinforcing the rhythmic and harmonic structure in the outer movements. The string writing follows the usual pattern, with the melodic material in the violins and a single viola part closely yoked to the basso. The orchestra and the soloist play more in dialogue than usual in the earlier concertos; one curious effect comes in measures 31–33 of the second movement, where the keyboard right hand has a melodic figure doubled by the violin I a third lower.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my gratitude to the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv, and the Bibliothèque du Conservatoire Royal de Musique, Brussels, for making the sources of the music available to me. Rachel W. Wade gave me invaluable advice and assistance in preparing this edition, and the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft provided funds for travel in connection with the work. I would particularly like to thank my former colleagues Karim Hassan and Hans-Olaf Meyer-Grotjahn for their help with the proof-reading of the volume. I am much obliged to the colleagues who were immediately involved with the production of this volume and CPEB:CW, III/9.13: Stephen C. Fisher for his careful translation and revision of my work as well as numerous useful suggestions, Paul Corneilson for many helpful ideas on shaping the text, and Peter Wollny for his constant readiness to make available his wide knowledge of the sources.

Arnfried Edler