

INTRODUCTION

The early 1740s were a very productive time for Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. This is especially true with respect to the keyboard concerto. Between 1743 and 1745, Bach wrote no fewer than eight original keyboard concertos (Wq 11–18), and he revised three more that he had written ten years earlier (Wq 1–3, see CPEB: CW, III/9.1). Four of those concertos were written in 1745 alone (Wq 15–18); in addition, Bach arranged for the publication in that year of the first of the keyboard concertos that he had written in 1743 (Wq 11, see CPEB: CW, III/7). Taking into consideration the time required for performance of his official duties with the royal musical establishment in Berlin, Bach must have been very busy during this period.

The present volume includes the first three keyboard concertos that Bach wrote in 1745: the Concerto in E Minor, Wq 15 (H 418); the Concerto in G Major, Wq 16 (H 419); and the Concerto in D Minor, Wq 17 (H 420). To the extent that the numbering and dating of the works in NV 1790 reflect the order of their composition, these three concertos were written in a little over three months. Bach explicitly entered the date 5 April 1745 in the autograph score of Wq 17 at the end of the third movement (see critical report). All three works are listed in NV 1790 (p. 29) with a brief incipit in the section devoted to the concertos:

No. 16. *E. moll.* B[erlin]. 1745. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.

No. 17. *G. dur.* B. 1745. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.

No. 18. *D. moll.* B. 1745. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.

None of the three works were published and, with the exception of Wq 17, they were not necessarily widely known. In addition to the autograph score of Wq 15, only three complete and three incomplete secondary copies survive from the eighteenth century; two of the complete copies contain an early version of the work, of uncertain origin. The autograph of Wq 16 is not extant, but seven secondary copies exist, one of which belonged to Bach's half brother Johann Christoph Friedrich. Wq 17, on the other hand, was obviously well thought of and very popular with mid- and late eighteenth-century musicians: fifteen secondary copies exist in addition to Bach's autograph score.

Wq 15–17 were submitted to embellishment and revision subsequent to their composition and initial performance. This is clear in part from changes and corrections in the autograph scores, and in part from variant readings in the surviving secondary sources. 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 constantly tinkered with all three works. For the most part, Bach's revisions affect detail rather than substance, and frequently involve embellishment of an otherwise uncomplicated keyboard part. There is, as a result, at least one authentic variant form of each of the works, and a second of uncertain but possible authenticity for both Wq 15 and 17. For the sake of clarity and convenience, these variant forms will hereafter be referred to as the early version(s) of Wq 15 and the embellished version of Wq 17.

Wq 16 and 17 are listed in the Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue: Wq 16 in Part IV, published in 1763; and Wq 17 in Supplement II of 1767.¹ Wq 17 was also listed (at a cost of 5 Marks) in the catalogue published by Johann Christoph Westphal in Hamburg in 1782.² It is possible that Wq 16 is one of the three concertos in G major listed on the same page;³ the absence of any surviving sources that can be said conclusively to have originated in Westphal's shop prevents confirmation of this. The reference to an E-minor concerto in Westphal's 1782 catalogue almost certainly refers not to Wq 15 but to Wq 24.⁴

1. See *The Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue. The Six Parts and Sixteen Supplements 1762–1787*, ed. Barry S. Brook (New York: Dover, 1966), cols. 132 and 292, respectively.

2. *Verzeichniss derer Musicalien, welche in der Niederlage auf den grossen Bleichen bey Johann Christoph Westphal und Comp. in Hamburg in Commiſſion zu haben sind.* (Hamburg, 1782; a copy is preserved in B-Br, Fétis 5205), p. 189. J.C. Westphal's house copy of Wq 17 survives in the private collection of the editor of the present volume. The editor is very grateful to Ulrich Leisinger for identifying the manuscript as Westphal's house copy.

3. One of them, described as an organ concerto, is certainly the Concerto in G Major, Wq 34.

4. Wq 24, written in 1748, was a very popular work for which a great many secondary copies survive. See CPEB: CW, III/9.8.

A later catalogue published by Westphal (c. 1790), devoted exclusively to the music of C. P. E. Bach,⁵ lists Wq 17 as before and still priced at 5 Marks; the group of G-major concertos has been expanded to five (by the addition of two further organ concertos) and very likely includes Wq 16.⁶ The brief description Westphal provides does not permit a more specific identification. The five works in the G-major group are priced variously between 3 Marks, 8 Pfennig and 5 Marks, 8 Pfennig.

The source record for the three works in the present volume varies somewhat. Autograph scores from Bach's own library survive for Wq 15 and 17, but his personal performing parts do not. It seems quite likely, though, that three of the secondary sources for Wq 17, as well as the Sing-Akademie parts for Wq 15, may have been transcribed directly from his lost performing parts. There is no autograph material whatsoever for Wq 16. At least three of the surviving sets of parts for Wq 16 are reliable, however: the two copied by Johann Heinrich Michel (for Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal and Sara Levy) and the other copied by J. C. F. Bach for his own use. Both Michel and J. C. F. Bach were generally careful copyists, and both had access to C. P. E. Bach's library. The remaining surviving manuscript copies of all three works are located in libraries and private collections scattered around Europe and the United States. While most are of limited value given the existence of authoritative sources, some are helpful in clarifying matters such as basso continuo figures missing in the autograph scores, or the various stages in the evolution of the final versions of each work.

Concerto in E Minor, Wq 15

Wq 15, written in 1745, appears to have been one of the least known of Bach's keyboard concertos. It is a challenging work: uncompromisingly serious in character, extraordinarily demanding for the soloist, and old-fashioned in its frequent reliance on contrapuntal techniques in the orchestral parts. It is not surprising that it did not achieve the popularity of some of its nearly contemporaneous sister

works.⁷ Wq 15 is a very personal work, with idiomatically rhapsodic passagework in the outer movements designed to show off Bach's technical prowess, and an aria-like slow movement illustrating his ability to make the keyboard sing. It was undoubtedly one of those works which Bach composed expressly for his own use and which, conscious of their limited appeal, he kept for himself.⁸

Few sources for Wq 15 survive. Besides Bach's autograph score (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 352, fasc. VII), the most reliable source is a complete set of parts copied mainly by Michel (D-B, SA 2623 [2] and [3]).⁹ The remaining sources include three incomplete sets of parts (B-Bc, 26656 MSM and 27138 MSM and D-B, SA 2623 [4]–[6]),¹⁰ and a score and complete set of parts with a quite different and more conventional solo keyboard part (D-B, SA 2623 [1] and US-Wc, M1010.A2 B13 W15, respectively). The two incomplete sets of parts in B-Bc were prepared by copyists regularly associated with Bach elsewhere, and are thus probably reliable. No such connection can be established unequivocally for the other three manuscripts.

The four sources with definite or probable connections to Bach document two distinct versions of the work—the *Fassung letzter Hand* and an earlier version. The differences are all in the string parts in the first movement and involve detail rather than substance. The authenticity of these variants is confirmed by readings in the autograph score *ante correcturam*. Neither of the two sets of parts in Brussels contains a keyboard part, so it is impossible to determine whether there were any additional differences between the sources. There is no information regarding the circumstances that led Bach to effect the changes. The only eighteenth-century manuscript to preserve all the alterations in the autograph score *post correcturam* is D-B, SA 2623 (2) and (3).¹¹ In the autograph score, these alterations are superimposed directly over the earlier readings.

7. Wq 14 (see CPEB:CW, III/7), Wq 17 (see critical report), and Wq 18 (see CPEB:CW, III/9.6) each survive in more than ten sources. See also Wade, 241–44.

8. See *Autobiography*, 208.

9. It is unfortunate that the set of parts owned by J. J. H. Westphal has disappeared. Those parts were most likely copied, at the request of Bach's widow and daughter, by Michel from Bach's own set of performing parts, and would therefore have been authoritative. They would certainly have reflected Bach's final intentions regarding the keyboard part. The loss is mitigated, however, by the existence of D-B, SA 2623 (2) and (3), apparently copied under Bach's direction for Johann Heinrich Grave. See Wiermann 2010, 249–74, esp. 256, 259–61.

10. B-Bc, 27138 MSM includes a mid-nineteenth-century copy of the autograph score; see critical report.

11. The second keyboard part in SA 2623 also follows the readings of

5. *Folgende des sel. Hrn. Capelmeister C. P. E. Bach musicalische Werke, finden sich in der musikalischen Niederlage bey Joh. Christ. Westphal & Comp. in Hamburg, oder sind zu verschaffen* (Hamburg, c. 1790); reproduced in *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach im Spiegel seiner Zeit*, ed. Ernst Suchalla (Olms: Hildesheim, 1993), 213–17.

6. Bach wrote seven keyboard concertos in G major: Wq 3, 4, 9, 16, 34, 43/5, and 44. Aside from Wq 34, the only other organ concerto listed in NV 1790 is Wq 35, but that work is in the key of E-flat major.

The existence of sources containing the earlier readings—both incomplete sets of parts in B-Bc, as well as the Sing-Akademie score and the string parts in US-Wc—suggests that there must have been a lapse of time between the composition of the work and the revision process. A change in the way Bach wrote trills in the autograph—from “+” to “tr”—suggests that the lapse of time may have been several years. The earlier readings are reported in the commentary, and appear in the string parts for the early version of the first movement published in the appendix.

It is uncertain whether or not the keyboard part preserved in the Sing-Akademie score and the US-Wc parts represents yet another early version of Wq 15. The manuscripts in which that part is found cannot presently be tied unequivocally to Bach. This is certainly true for the US-Wc parts, which were most likely copied late in the eighteenth century. The score in D-B, SA 2623 was copied by Johann Friedrich Agricola from an unidentified source. Agricola was a student of Bach’s father in Leipzig in the late 1730s, and he was present in Berlin and a colleague of Bach there beginning in 1741. The existence of eleven copies of Bach’s keyboard concertos in Agricola’s hand suggests that Agricola had direct access to Bach’s manuscripts and could indeed have found his source for Wq 15 in Bach’s library. It is not known when Agricola prepared his score of Wq 15; it was probably around 1750, when he was freelancing as a keyboard instructor in Berlin.

Agricola’s keyboard part is puzzling: large segments of it duplicate the text of the autograph. And none of the readings *ante correcturam* in the keyboard part of the autograph are identical with the corresponding variant passages in Agricola’s score. The relationship between Bach and Agricola allows for the possibility that the keyboard part of Agricola’s score is authentic, and that it represents a rejected early version rather than a later simplification undertaken by Bach or one of his contemporaries. A full score of the first movement and the solo keyboard part of the third movement of this possibly authentic early version of Wq 15 are published in the appendix; other variant readings are reported in the commentary.

Concerto in G Major, Wq 16

Wq 16 is the most intimate and least venturesome of the four concertos written in 1745. It has the smallest dimensions: the opening ritornello of the slow movement is a

the autograph *post correcturam*. The accompanying string parts, however, are incomplete.

scant six measures, the movement as a whole is only fifty-two measures long. It has the least demanding keyboard part of the three works in this volume, with all activity concentrated in the right hand. The work appears to have been written for intimate surroundings, possibly for family performance in a private household, and may well have been intended for a student rather than Bach himself.¹² The special character of the work undoubtedly affected its popularity: it lacks special effects that would have made it a crowd-pleaser musically, and it affords the soloist little opportunity for technical display.

Seven manuscript sources survive for Wq 16, none of them autograph. The most authoritative of these are the sets of parts belonging to J. C. F. Bach (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 360), Sara Levy (D-B, SA 2576), and J. J. H. Westphal (B-Bc, 5887 MSM, Wq 16). J. C. F. and C. P. E. Bach regularly exchanged musical materials and performed each other’s works. Levy was a great admirer both of C. P. E. Bach and his older brother Wilhelm Friedemann; C. P. E. Bach composed the Concerto in E-flat Major for Harpsichord and Fortepiano, Wq 47, for her. Westphal was another interested admirer who amassed a very significant manuscript collection of Bach’s music in the 1790s; much of the collection was copied expressly for him by Michel from materials in Bach’s library. The relationship between a fourth set of parts belonging to Johann Heinrich Grave (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 499) and materials in Bach’s library is uncertain. Grave was a personal acquaintance of Bach and his family, and apparently had access to manuscripts in Bach’s library as a basis for preparing new copies or correcting existing ones for his own use. Grave’s copy of Wq 16 was, however, a manuscript that he acquired commercially.¹³ He started to have it revised against some unspecified authentic source, but this project apparently was never finished.

The sources preserve two distinct versions of Wq 16. J. C. F. Bach’s manuscript, a Sing-Akademie score (D-B, SA 2628), and all but two of the other copies contain the simpler, earlier version of the work. The two copies prepared by Michel (D-B, SA 2576 and B-Bc, 5887 MSM, Wq 16) transcribe a presumably later version with a con-

12. It is also possible that the work might be a keyboard arrangement of an otherwise undocumented concerto for a solo melody instrument. It shares many features with Bach’s authentic concerto arrangements, e.g., Wq 26, 28, and 29: thin, largely two-part texture; limited range; and concentration of interest in the right hand of the keyboard part with the left hand restricted to a simple, usually non-chordal bass line; but there is no other evidence for this.

13. See Wiermann 2010, 257, 268.

siderably elaborated keyboard part and a number of material structural changes.¹⁴ The present edition contains the later version of Wq 16; the appendix contains the early form of the keyboard part for all three movements, as well as a cadenza written by Grave for the second movement.

Concerto in D Minor, Wq 17

Wq 17 is the most extroverted of the three concertos in this volume. It is a big work filled with flashy and impassioned orchestral effects—passages of descending and ascending scales, wide melodic leaps, *tremolando* violins, insistent unisons—that are calculated to appeal to a public audience. From the start, the pulsating repeated 8th notes in the bass—admittedly a commonplace technique at the time—generate a forward drive which pervades each of the three movements. The solo part places considerable technical demands on the performer, combining long, unaccompanied passages in the manner of Carl Heinrich Graun—in particular, the first *solo* of the first movement—with passages of quickly changing broken chords, scales, and arpeggios, or intense motivic interplay between soloist and accompaniment. In each movement, Bach explores the principal thematic elements introduced in the opening ritornello, dissecting, combining, analyzing, and developing them fully before recapitulating them in their original form at the end by way of conclusion.

The extraordinary slow movement is nearly unique in Bach's oeuvre. Only once before—in the slow movement of the Concerto in B-flat Major, Wq 10—had he dared to combine muted strings and *pizzicato* bass with the contemplative musings of the soloist. He used this instrumental combination again just twice: in the slow movements of the Concerto in C Major, Wq 20 (1746), and the Concerto in F Major, Wq 38 (1763).¹⁵ The slow movement of Wq 17 unquestionably draws its inspiration from the opera house: the soloist as an imaginary heroine contemplating the moment and weighing the course of action on which she is about to embark.

Wq 17 is without question a showpiece, displaying to their fullest degree not only Bach's abilities as a performer, but also his talents as a composer, and his knack for gen-

erating enthusiasm in his audience without compromising his art and his ideals. He is confident and absolutely assured in the handling of his thematic material and in balancing the relationship between soloist and accompaniment. In this work, for the first time in a keyboard concerto, Bach attains full stylistic maturity.¹⁶

Sixteen sources for Wq 17 survive, of which the most authoritative is the autograph score (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 352, fasc. VIII). Like the autograph of Wq 15, it contains a number of corrections mostly affecting detail. These fall into two categories: changes decided upon in the course of composition, and improvements effected subsequent to early performances of the work.¹⁷ The work survives in three different forms: an early version, retaining readings from the autograph *ante correcturam* and adding basso continuo figures in the slow movement; the version preserved in the autograph *post correcturam*, as well as in the parts copied by Schlichting (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 544) and most of the other secondary sources; and a third version with added ornamentation in the outer movements, and an embellished keyboard part and added cadenza in the slow movement. While this last version is of unknown origin, there are good arguments—discussed in the critical report—for its possible authenticity. The present edition contains the later version of Wq 17, based on the autograph *post correcturam* and on Schlichting's parts. The latter are the most authoritative of the secondary sources: Schlichting was an associate of Bach and appears to have had direct access to Bach's materials, in this case Bach's lost performing parts for Wq 17. The variants of the early version and other relevant variants are reported in the commentary. The appendix contains the embellished form of the keyboard part for the slow movement, as well as cadenzas for the first and second movements.

Performance Considerations

Bach expected the solo keyboard player to provide continuo support for the accompanying strings during ritornellos and *tutti* interjections. This is clear from the presence of figures over the bass line in those passages in the keyboard part of all three works. Bach did not provide any realiza-

14. Structural changes include added measures in two places near the end of the first movement, and the deletion of one measure in the slow movement; see commentary.

15. In both later works, the *pizzicato* bass line appears as part of the accompaniment during *solo* sections but not in the ritornellos and *tutti* interjections.

16. The Concerto in E Major, Wq 14, written in 1744 and published in 1760, is also stylistically self-assured. It is not known whether Bach revised the work at the time of publication. The source record unfortunately provides no clues; see CPEB: CW, III/7.

17. The latter are documented by the survival of two sets of parts (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 542 and D-B, Sammlung Thulemeier 12), containing readings in the autograph score *ante correcturam*.

tion of the keyboard part in those passages. In fact, in his autograph scores the upper staff is completely blank, and the performer was expected to realize the continuo part at sight. How this was done—whether by playing simple chords or creating a more complex musical fabric—was at the performer’s discretion. Continuo realization was an important part of musical training in the eighteenth century, and is the main topic of part II of Bach’s *Versuch*.

Numerous eighteenth-century manuscripts of keyboard concertos survive where a copyist has inserted the violin I part in the otherwise empty upper staff of the keyboard part during *tutti* passages. In many of these manuscripts, bass figures are also present. This practice served two purposes: it allowed a performer to play through the work without orchestral accompaniment (a throwback perhaps to the keyboard arrangements of orchestral concertos that were commonplace in the early years of the eighteenth century); and it provided a melodic guide around which the performer could improvise the requisite harmonic patterns. In any event, the soloist was expected to participate in orchestral passages, providing the necessary harmonic support for the strings.

Ornament signs appear throughout Wq 15–17. In the string parts, these are limited to trills, usually noted “+” in Bach’s autograph scores, and “tr” in the secondary sources, and appoggiaturas, for which the performer was expected to adapt the duration of the ornament to the context of the music. In the keyboard part, Bach is much more specific about ornament signs: not only is there a greater variety of them, but each ornament may be further specifically defined by the presence of accidentals above or below the sign in accordance with the context of the passage. There are a few places in the autograph of Wq 15 where Bach writes trills as “tr” rather than “+.” These places usually appear in the context of corrections inserted in the score at a later time.

The autograph scores and secondary manuscript copies of Wq 15 and 17 do not contain cadenzas in context. Only in the late version of Wq 16 do the principal and comparative sources (B-Bc, 5887 MSM, Wq 16 and D-B, SA 2576 [1]) incorporate a cadenza into the main text of the first movement of the concerto; the present edition follows the source in that respect. A few of the secondary copies for these works contain an added leaf with a cadenza. In addition, cadenzas for two of the three concertos (Wq 15 and 17) survive in a manuscript collection of cadenzas for various works of C.P.E. Bach prepared by Michel, Bach’s principal and most trusted copyist in Hamburg (the manuscript is now in B-Bc, 5871 MSM). After Bach’s death,

these cadenzas were collected by his widow and daughter from manuscripts scattered throughout his library, and copied expressly for J.J.H. Westphal under their direction; the collection is therefore authoritative. A copy of the cadenza for the slow movement of Wq 15, probably in the hand of Grave, is included in D-B, SA 2623. The authorized cadenzas for Wq 15 and 17 are published in the appendix, along with a contemporary cadenza for the slow movement of Wq 16, written by Grave and accompanying his copy of that work (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 499).

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my sincere appreciation and thanks to the various libraries that provided films and photocopies of sources in their possession. I would also like to thank those individuals who readily responded to various queries in the course of the preparation of this edition: Stephen Clark, Helmut Hell, Miklós Spányi, Frank Ziegler, and especially Ulrich Leisinger and Peter Wollny. E. Eugene Helm and Rachel W. Wade provided support, advice, and guidance in connection with an earlier edition of Wq 15–17. Finally, I want to give special thanks to Paul Corneilson and Jason B. Grant for their advice, counsel, and efforts to bring this edition into being.

Elias N. Kulukundis