

# INTRODUCTION

---

On 31 May 1740, Friedrich II succeeded his deceased father Friedrich Wilhelm I as King of Prussia. From the outset of his rule, the young monarch instituted a new, if ambivalent, style of leadership. He carried out some reforms in the spirit of enlightened absolutism, officially abolishing torture and taking a stand for religious tolerance. In very short order he established a blossoming cultural life at his court, including the reorganization of the court *Kapelle* which had been dissolved by his father, the “soldier king.”<sup>1</sup> On the other hand, just six months after his accession to the throne Friedrich II marched into Silesia, thereby instigating the War of the Austrian Succession (1740–48), which would spark numerous bloody disagreements between Prussia and other major European powers.<sup>2</sup>

The change of regime in 1740 also meant a substantial change for Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. Only now, though he had already collaborated for two years in the *Kapelle* of the Crown Prince in Ruppin, did he officially enter Friedrich’s service (“förmlich in Dessen Dienste”)<sup>3</sup> and become resident court harpsichordist in Berlin. Alternating with the second harpsichordist (from 1742 Christian Friedrich Schale, from 1745 Christoph Nichelmann), Bach was responsible for the accompaniment of the royal concerts, and was able to work in parallel as teacher and composer. Through this new situation in his life, Bach was spurred on to an extremely productive creative period that expressed itself above all in the genres of the keyboard concerto and sonata. Beyond this, Bach—who for his entire life had linked artistic and commercial ventures—succeeded in attaining a profile beyond the regional through targeted publications. Thus several of his works appeared in print with renowned Nuremberg music publishers: in 1742 the six “Prussian” Sonatas (Wq 48), in 1744 the six “Württem-

berg” Sonatas (Wq 49), and in 1745 the Concerto in D Major (Wq 11).

The general political and cultural upheaval in Prussia, along with the ambitious life trajectory of C.P.E. Bach, form the social background for the creation of the three keyboard concertos published in this volume: the Concerto in B-flat Major, Wq 10; the Concerto in F Major, Wq 12; and the Concerto in D Major, Wq 13. In the composer’s estate catalogue (NV 1790) these works appear as nos. 11, 13, and 15 under the heading “Concerten”:<sup>4</sup>

No. 11. *B. dur.* B[erlin].1742. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.

No. 13. *F. dur.* B. 1744. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.

No. 15. *D. dur.* B. 1744. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.

None of the three works were published and they were not necessarily widely known. The two concertos not accounted for in the list above, nos. 12 and 14 (= Wq 11 and 14), were published during Bach’s lifetime; see CPEB: CW, III/7.

The Concerto in D Major also exists in a version for transverse flute and orchestra (H 416), which was probably the original form of the work, and only later arranged as the keyboard concerto Wq 13. The specific circumstances of the creation of these three keyboard concertos have not been transmitted, nor have details of performance practice.

## Sources and Transmission

The transmission situation is roughly similar for the three concertos published in the present volume. All three compositions were submitted, to varying degrees, to embellishment and revision subsequent to their composition and initial performance. But none of the three works is explicitly noted in NV 1790 as having been fundamentally renewed (*erneuert*), and none of the revisions are as substantive as those in works that were indeed renewed (e.g., Wq 1 or 5). Bach appears, however, to have tinkered with all three works. Thus early and late versions exist for

---

1. See Michael O’Loughlin, *Frederick the Great and His Musicians: The Viol da Gamba Music of the Berlin School* (Burlington, Vt.: Ashgate, 2008), 13ff.

2. Johannes Kunisch, *Friedrich der Große. Der König und seine Zeit* (Munich: Beck, 2004), 259ff.

3. C.P.E. Bach’s autobiography in *Carl Burney’s der Musik Doctors Tagebuch seiner musikalischen Reisen*, vol. 3, *Durch Böhmen, Sachsen, Brandenburg, Hamburg und Holland* (Hamburg, 1773), 200.

---

4. NV 1790, 28; a brief incipit was included with each work.

Wq 10, 12, and 13: in the case of Wq 12 they differ very little from each other, but for Wq 10 and 13 they diverge quite substantially. The early versions date from the 1740s and are documented through a score or set of parts from Bach's circle in Berlin, and in the case of Wq 12 through an autograph score by Bach. The later versions of the concertos were created some decades later, when Bach—then active as music director in Hamburg—revised and updated many of his earlier works. Two Hamburg copyists, Johann Heinrich Michel (Wq 11 and 13) and Ludwig August Christoph Hopff (Wq 12),<sup>5</sup> working together with Bach or possibly his heirs, prepared the corresponding parts. For the most part, Bach's revisions affect detail rather than substance; the differences between the versions consist above all in the shaping of the keyboard parts.

Wq 10 is transmitted in its early Berlin version through a score in the hand of Johann Friedrich Agricola (D-B, SA 2615 (1)), a set of parts by the copyist Theile I (D-B, SA 2615 (2)), and a keyboard part by an unidentified copyist (D-LEb, Go. S. 354). These three sources differ only slightly. The late version of the work was copied by J.H. Michel (B-Bc, 5887 MSM, Wq 10) and shows substantial differences from the first version. Bach changed the keyboard part in the first and third movements by embellishing the right-hand melody, and he made cuts in the final movement. The revisions in the second movement are even more extreme: here Bach decided on a substantially new version of the accompanying string parts. He changed the meter, introduced numerous new figures and motifs, and generally smoothed out the musical expression.

For Wq 12 there exists an autograph score (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 352, fascicle VI) that was prepared in 1744 in Berlin. Evidently this manuscript served as a model for numerous copies of the work prepared during Bach's time in Berlin. Altogether nine further manuscripts exist, which overall demonstrate a high degree of homogeneity. The autograph score contains a range of corrections, cross-outs, and erasures, which Bach undertook at later points in time (but presumably while still in Berlin). In Hamburg, L.A.C. Hopff copied out in a clean set of parts the version of the concerto that had been revised by Bach. Here scarcely any changes to the early version are to be found; only the entry of performance indications and the resulting greater dynamic contrast are worthy of mention.

5. Hopff, designated Anon. 305 by Kast, is identified and his career traced in Neubacher 2005, esp. 117–21.

Wq 13 is actually documented in three different versions: two early versions created in Berlin (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 200 (1 and 2), copied by unidentified scribes, including the copyist known only as “Schlichting”) and the last version of the work, copied by Michel in Hamburg (B-Bc, 5887 MSM, Wq 13). The changes, in places extensive, are almost exclusively in the keyboard part, which becomes more ornamented and more virtuosic from one version to the next. Bach appears to have arranged Wq 13 from an earlier version of the concerto for transverse flute, strings, and basso continuo (H 416), documented in two sets of parts preserved in the archive of the Sing-Akademie (see CPEB: CW, III/4.2 and table 1).

For the sources of the early Berlin versions, which today are found predominantly in the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz (D-B), a clear provenance cannot always be reconstructed. Some manuscripts found their way into the hands of well-known music collectors, for instance, Georg Poelchau, Johann Heinrich Grave, and the Voß family, as well as the archive of the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin.<sup>6</sup> Other sources came from the Lasserre collection<sup>7</sup> to the Library of Congress in Washington (US-Wc) and the Paris Conservatoire (F-Pc, now in F-Pn), and from the collection of Manfred Gorke to the Bach-Archiv Leipzig.<sup>8</sup>

The three sources for the concertos copied in Hamburg came either directly from C.P.E. Bach or from a third party into the possession of the Schwerin organist Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal, who at the end of the eighteenth century assembled with great enthusiasm a comprehensive collection of the works of C.P.E. Bach. In 1835 Westphal's collection came to the director of the Brussels Conservatoire, François-Joseph Fétis, and is today located in the library there (B-Bc).<sup>9</sup>

The sets of parts created in Hamburg were used as the basis for the present edition, for they must be regarded as the latest versions of the works authorized by the composer. But in order to document the substantial changes made to the early versions of the works, the second and third movements of Wq 10 are included in the appendix in full score, as is the keyboard part of the second movement of Wq 13. Further differences among the versions are also reported in the appendix.

6. See Enßlin.

7. See Wade, 45ff.

8. See Schulze, 85.

9. See Leisinger/Wollny.

TABLE I. SOURCES FOR BACH'S CONCERTO IN D MAJOR

NV 1790 Listing	Keyboard CPEB: CW, III/9.4	Flute CPEB: CW, III/4.2
(p. 28): "No. 15. D. dur. B. 1744. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß."	Wq 13 (H 416 = both flute and keyboard versions) B 1 = B-Bc, 5887 MSM (parts) B 2 = D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 200 (1) (parts) B 3 = D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 200 (2) (parts) D = US-Wc, M1010.A2 B13 W13 (parts)	H 416 (Wq <i>deest</i> , flute version) B 1 = D-B, SA 2584 (parts) B 2 = D-B, SA 4845 (parts) Q = D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 200 (1)

### Musical Style

While Wq 10, 12, and 13 do indeed display a high degree of homogeneity, they nevertheless contain individual nuances that should be pointed out. Formally the concertos are set out, as is usual with C. P. E. Bach, in a regular exchange between pure orchestral ritornellos and solo sections for the keyboard (with orchestral accompaniment), with, for the most part, agreement between the *solo* and *tutti* segments as to themes and motifs.<sup>10</sup> As cornerstones in the shaping of the individual movements, the ritornellos lend structure and harmonic orientation.

In the fast outer movements of each concerto, the string orchestra appears with four ritornellos. The introductory and concluding ritornellos are naturally in the tonic, and the second ritornello in the dominant. The third ritornello begins (with one exception in Wq 10/i, mm. 191–202) in the relative minor and generally leads back to the tonic. Repetitions of the ritornello remaining constant to the meter and motif are rare (for instance, second ritornello in Wq 10/i, mm. 103–30; or fourth ritornello in Wq 13/i, mm. 122–40); much more frequently the orchestral interludes are shortened or repeated with variations. Thus it may be that only the beginning (third ritornello, Wq 10/i), the end (fourth ritornello, Wq 10/i, mm. 254–64), or another section (third ritornello, Wq 13/iii, mm. 234–42) of the original ritornello is performed. But fugal or other variations of the ritornello (third ritornello, Wq 12/iii, mm. 226–55) are also possible. A particularly radical shortening takes place in the ritornello in the third movement of Wq 10, where in its last iteration the original sixty-seven measures are shortened to nine. In the slow middle movements, only three orchestral ritornellos occur. For each concerto the third

ritornello is, like the first, in the home key of the movement and presents a shortened repetition. The second ritornello, in the middle of the movement, presents only a short part of the original ritornello in the relative major key (Wq 10 and 13) or in the minor dominant (Wq 12).

The stylistic aspects of these concertos must be seen in the context of the works composed by C. P. E. Bach between 1740 and 1744. If one follows the implications of NV 1790, Bach dedicated himself in this time almost exclusively to works for keyboard instruments. In these first five Berlin years alone, Bach wrote ten keyboard concertos (Wq 6–14 and 46) and twenty-one keyboard sonatas (Wq 48/1–6, 49/1–6, 52/4, 62/3–7, and 65/12–14). Bach also undertook at this time a revision of two keyboard concertos (Wq 1 and 2) and seventeen sonatas composed between 1731 and 1738 in Leipzig or Frankfurt an der Oder (Wq 62/1, 64/1–6, and 65/1–10). From a quantitative point of view, Bach wished to raise his keyboard works to a higher level after his move from Ruppín to Berlin. And in fact the new sonatas distinguish themselves significantly from their earlier counterparts in terms of their scope, their multiplicity of themes, and their technical demands. This is particularly true for the "Württemberg" Sonatas published in 1744, whose music-historical significance Wolfgang Horn summed up: "Bach's significance lies not in the rigid aspects of form, but in the daring with which he assumed compositional responsibility for the 'expressive detail.' Here, the contemporary discussion of the 'original genius' of Bach finds its ultimate justification."<sup>11</sup> C. P. E.

10. See Hans-Günter Ottenberg, *C. P. E. Bach*, translated by Philip J. Whitmore (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987), 69.

11. "Nicht in den starren Plänen der Großform liegt Bachs Bedeutung, sondern in dem Mut, die kompositorische Verantwortung für das 'expressive Detail' zu übernehmen. Die zeitgenössische Rede vom 'Originalgenie' Bach findet hier ihre letzte Begründung." Wolfgang Horn, *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. Frühe Klaviersonaten. Eine Studie zur "Form" der ersten Sätze nebst einer kritischen Untersuchung der Quellen* (Hamburg: Wagner, 1988), 113.

Bach himself saw these early Berlin sonatas in retrospect as outstanding works; thus in 1775 he wrote to Johann Nikolaus Forkel, after sending him some sonatas, among them the “Württemberg”: “and now, you have together all those of my sonatas I regard as the best” (und nun haben Sie das von meinen Solos, was ich fürs Beste halte, zusammen).<sup>12</sup> As explanation for ranking these earlier works even more highly than later ones, Bach added: “Later I chiefly had to write for the public.” (Nachher habe ich meist fürs Publikum arbeiten müßen.)<sup>13</sup>

Thus did the self-determined C.P.E. Bach begin his principal creative phase with the keyboard works of his first Berlin years. The keyboard concertos Wq 10, 12, and 13—which surely came into being at the same time as the sonatas in question—fit this style precisely. Striking themes—often structured around triads—and virtuosic, fantasia-like runs permeate the outer movements of the concertos as well as the sonatas. Often the motifs are similar among these works. This is particularly clear when comparing the start of the Concerto in F Major, Wq 12 to the Sonata in F Minor, Wq 62/6. Both works were composed in 1744 and present a principal theme with the same first seven notes, which in Wq 62/6 appear only in the minor key.<sup>14</sup>

### Acknowledgments

For many helpful suggestions and generous support of my work I thank Peter Wollny and Tobias Schwinger, as well as the colleagues of the music department at the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz.

Bernhard Schrammek

## APPENDIX

### Performance Considerations

Specific information on the solo instruments used, as well as the forces and size of the accompanying orchestra, are not available either for the Berlin or Hamburg versions of Wq 10, 12, and 13.<sup>15</sup> The sources for all three concertos use the Italian word *cembalo*, which is equivalent to the French *clavecin* or the German *Clavier*, as used in NV 1790; only when instruments are otherwise specified did *Clavier* mean “clavichord” and *Flügel* “harpsichord”. In the eighteenth century *cembalo* was a generic term for any stringed keyboard instrument, which could equally mean instruments with plectrums (harpsichord), those with hammer or tangent actions (various sorts of the early fortepiano and, in solo music, the clavichord), or any combination of these actions.<sup>16</sup> Undoubtedly, the harpsichord was the typical solo instrument in keyboard concertos throughout the eighteenth century. However, as plucked and hammered keyboard instruments coexisted and were largely interchangeable until the very end of the eighteenth century, performances of Bach’s concertos on later types of fortepianos should also be considered as quite legitimate. The use of combination instruments is another viable performance option.

During his long life, Bach must have encountered a variety of harpsichords—from more traditional, simple instruments to the luxurious and highly complex English ones which gradually became popular on the continent in the last third of the century. There is, however, hardly any documentation of the harpsichords Bach used during his career. The list of instruments for sale from Bach’s estate in NV 1790, p. 92—which includes one fortepiano, two clavichords, and an ivory cornetto—mentions only one harpsichord: “Ein fünf Octäviger Flügel von Nußbaum Holz schön und stark von Ton.” (A five-octave harpsichord in walnut—beautiful, strong tone.) Only from Bach’s Hamburg period is there documentary evidence of his using both harpsichord and fortepiano for concerto perfor-

12. Letter from C.P.E. Bach to J.N. Forkel of 10 February 1775, cited in CPEB-Briefe, I:485.

13. Ibid.

14. While the first movements of both works have the same tempo marking and meter (*Allegro*, *C*), in Wq 62/6 the theme is notated with 8th notes, but in Wq 12 it is notated with 16th notes.

15. On performance practice of the early Berlin keyboard concertos see the discussions by Peter Wollny in CPEB: CW, III/9.1, xv and David Schulenberg in CPEB: CW, III/9.2, xiv–xvii.

16. Combination instruments must have been far more popular during the eighteenth century than generally assumed. On the development of the early piano and the issue of combination instruments see Konstantin Restle, *Bartolomeo Cristofori und die Anfänge des Hammerclaviers. Quellen, Dokumente und Instrumente des 15. bis 18. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: Editio Maris, 1991), esp. chap. 14.

mances.<sup>17</sup> Certain characteristics of Bach's keyboard writing in some concertos, including dynamic markings that are difficult or impossible to realize on a traditional harpsichord, can be interpreted as signs that Bach may have had occasional access to early fortepianos and considered them as possible solo instruments in his keyboard concertos, even prior to his Hamburg period.<sup>18</sup> Early types of fortepianos were already being built in Saxony during Bach's youth. Later (from about 1746) Friedrich II purchased a number of Silbermann fortepianos for his palaces.<sup>19</sup> Bach, as royal chamber musician, must have played on these novelties regularly. Occasional performances of his own concertos on Silbermann fortepianos are not documented but the possibility cannot be ruled out.

If performances of Bach's concertos did take place at Friedrich's court, they would have been in relatively small spaces;<sup>20</sup> it can further be assumed that in the normal situation—whether the solo instrument was a harpsichord or fortepiano—only a string group with simple forces would be engaged for accompaniment, thereby achieving sonic parity between solo instrument and orchestra. The numerous extant manuscripts from Bach's Berlin period suggest that Bach's concertos quite surely were also performed outside the court in a bourgeois setting, perhaps with larger accompanying forces. Here, the harpsichord may have been the preferred solo instrument.

Not only should the differences between the harpsichord and early fortepiano be taken into consideration, but also the rapid changes in harpsichord building in the second half of the eighteenth century. A large harpsichord of English origin from about 1770 differs radically from a

Berlin or Saxon harpsichord built at the same time or a few decades earlier. Bach's frequent revisions of his keyboard parts may have resulted from the opportunities that developments in instrument building (both of harpsichords and fortepianos) may have given to him.

Wq 10, 12, and 13 can all be successfully performed on the harpsichord. That a powerful harpsichord sound was very much appreciated can be seen from Bach's *Versuch* and from the description of Bach's harpsichord in NV 1790. The keyboard part of Wq 12 is especially well suited to the harpsichord. It may be because of its somewhat serious and stylistically conservative features, together with its suitability to the harpsichord, that Wq 12 underwent the fewest changes of the works in the present volume. The more *galant* style of Wq 10 and 13 resulted in a much thinner keyboard texture. Without excluding the harpsichord, this sort of keyboard texture lends itself very well to performances on early fortepianos. The later revisions in the keyboard part in both Wq 10 and 13—including the addition of ornaments, passagework, and variations, as well as stronger dynamic contrasts—also support the fortepiano as an appropriate solo instrument.

Bach's system of ornament signs underwent radical changes during his long career. Bach codified his system in *Versuch* I, published in 1753, and demonstrated it in the *Achtzehn Probestücke in sechs Sonaten*, Wq 63. It is difficult to establish when Bach began to use this system, as revisions of his earlier keyboard works often (but not always) resulted in modernized ornament signs, thereby adapting them to the system in the *Versuch*. He certainly did not use it before 1744: the six "Württemberg" Sonatas, Wq 49, have simple ornament signs. Another basic problem is that even later—after the publication of the *Versuch*—Bach himself did not use his own system with the consistency called for in the *Versuch*, but adapted it with some freedom. We can, however, discern three basic rules. First, the ornament signs are more explicit in Bach's published works than in the unpublished ones. Second, Bach used much less explicit ornament signs in his keyboard concertos than in many of his solo keyboard works. Third, explicit ornament signs are rare outside the keyboard parts of Bach's concertos and sonatinas—such signs are found mostly in works composed between 1762 and 1765 (e.g., the concertos Wq 36–39 and the sonatinas Wq 96–110); in general, he used only trills and the occasional appoggiatura in the string parts. But string players were probably expected to interpret *tr* using the full range of ornaments described in detail in the *Versuch*. This is particularly clear in passages notated with *tr* for the strings and a more explicit orna-

17. Barbara Wiermann, *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. Dokumente zu Leben und Wirken aus der zeitgenössischen hamburgischen Presse (1767–1790)*, Leipziger Beiträge zur Bach-Forschung 4 (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 2000).

18. It should be remembered that dynamic markings not practical on standard harpsichords could have made sense on the advanced harpsichords of the English school, which were equipped with pedals with the so-called "machine stop" to facilitate quick changes of registration, and quite often had a swell device for finer dynamic gradations. That Bach was eager to accept innovations in harpsichord building to achieve quick changes of stops is shown in his statement about pedals in *Versuch* II:29, §5.

19. On Saxon fortepianos see Restle, *Bartolomeo Cristofori*, chap. 7. On fortepianos in Friedrich's court see Mary Oleskiewicz, "The Trio in Bach's Musical Offering: A Salute to Frederick's Tastes and Quantz's Flutes?" in *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 4, *The Music of J. S. Bach: Analysis and Interpretation*, ed. David Schulenberg (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 98–101.

20. See CPEB:CW, III/9.2, xv.

ment sign for the soloist (e.g., Wq 13/i, mm. 31 and 33, *tr* in vn I played simultaneously with  $\text{trill}$  in cemb I).

In Wq 10, 12, and 13, Bach notates ornaments most of the time with only a few general signs, usually *tr*, though he occasionally uses  $\text{trill}$  or  $\text{trill}$  (Wq 10/i and iii, early version; Wq 12, which also includes explicit mordents; Wq 13, early version; and Wq 13/i and iii, late version). These signs can indicate any of the various forms of trills and turns (and sometimes even mordents). Their realization depends on the character and tempo of the music, as well as the melodic and harmonic context. At other times Bach employs a wider range of ornament signs (Wq 10/ii, early version; Wq 10, late version; and Wq 13/ii, late version).

But even with a more precise level of notation, some ornament signs can have various meanings, depending on the musical context. The *Versuch* suggests this to a certain extent, by explaining the practice of abbreviating ornaments (i.e., replacing signs for longer ornaments with signs for similar but shorter ornaments) and giving numerous examples of this (see *Versuch* I:2.3, §18; I:2.4, §9, 12, 17–18,

27; I:2.5, §3, 6; I:2.8, §3). Thus the various types of trills (*tr*,  $\text{trill}$ , and  $\text{trill}$ ) can be executed in their standard forms—per the *Versuch*—or they may be executed as trills from below ( $\text{trill}$ ) or from above ( $\text{trill}$ ); longer trills normally conclude with a termination. In very fast tempos, trill signs may be executed simply as short appoggiaturas. Turns can also be executed in various ways: the standard turn ( $\text{turn}$ ), trilled turn ( $\text{trill turn}$ ), or even the *geschnellter Doppelschlag* (a five-note turn from the main note; see *Versuch* I:2.4, §33). Even trill signs, in certain situations, should be executed as turns.<sup>21</sup>

Miklós Spányi

---

21. For more detailed discussions of the ornaments in Bach's keyboard music, see *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. Sämtliche Klavierwerke*, edited by Miklós Spányi, 4 vols. (Budapest: Kőnemann Music, 1999), 1:156–63 and Spányi, "Some Practical Thoughts on the Performance of C.P.E. Bach's Keyboard Music," *Clavichord International* 14/2 (2010): 57–62 and 15/1 (2011): 15–22.