

INTRODUCTION

The present volume contains three keyboard concertos by Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach composed in 1747 and 1748: the Concerto in A Minor, Wq 21 (H 424), in early and late versions; the Concerto in D Minor, Wq 22 (H 425), probably based on an earlier flute concerto; and the Concerto in D Minor, Wq 23 (H 427). The works are listed in NV 1790 (p. 30):

Wq 21: “No. 22. A. moll. B. 1747. E. H. 75. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.”

Wq 22: “No. 23. D. moll. B. 1747. Clavier, 2 Hörner, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.”

Wq 23: “No. 24. D. moll. P. 1748. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche, Baß und 2 Flöten.”

Based on the number of surviving sources and the absence of these three concertos in early music dealers’ catalogues, it seems that Wq 21–23 were not well known outside of Bach’s immediate circle.¹ The only extant source with any autograph material is the autograph score for Wq 23. Other sources exist for all three concertos that were copied by scribes close to Bach, but the lack of autograph entries in them strongly suggests that Bach did not personally review any of them. That no house copies have survived for them can perhaps be attributed simply to the vagaries of eighteenth-century source transmission.

Concerto in A Minor, Wq 21

The “E. H. 75” abbreviation in the NV 1790 listing for Wq 21 indicates that the piece went through a thorough revision process that Bach called *Erneuerung* (literally “renewal”) in Hamburg in 1775. This makes Wq 21 an outlier in Bach’s output. Most of the pieces that are listed in NV 1790 as having been *erneuert* were composed very

1. Cat. Westphal 1778, p. 37, lists one concerto “a 5” in D minor by C.P.E. Bach, and Cat. Westphal 1782, p. 189, lists two keyboard concertos “a 5” in D minor by Bach, but without further identifying information it cannot be determined which particular concerto is meant. (Bach wrote three concertos—Wq 17, 22, and 23—in D minor.) Since by the dates of these catalogues Wq 22 also included two horns (perhaps it always had; see discussion below), presumably it was not included in these entries.

early in Bach’s career, either while he was still living in the family home in Leipzig or during his time at university in Frankfurt an der Oder, and were revised during his first few years in Berlin. Table 1 shows all of the works identified in NV 1790 as *erneuert* along with their dates of composition and revision. Wq 21 is the latest work by far, both in its original date of composition and its date of revision. It is in fact one of only three works that were composed during Bach’s Berlin tenure, and one of only two works that were *erneuert* during his time in Hamburg. Although Bach composed only a handful of keyboard concertos for his own performances in Hamburg, he certainly attempted to maintain his reputation as a keyboard virtuoso there by publicly performing not only his newest concertos but also some of his favorite Berlin concertos.² The revision of Wq 21 must certainly have been a part of this aspect of Bach’s Hamburg endeavors. What is somewhat unusual is that in revising Wq 21 he did not add horns to the outer movements. Bach added horns, and sometimes other wind and brass instruments, to other Berlin concertos, including Wq 22, 27, 35, 37, and 46. Granted, none of these concertos is in the key of A minor, but Bach often called for horns in C in his Hamburg church music, so the instruments (and players) were certainly available to him had he so chosen.

Both early and late versions of Wq 21 are transmitted in the sources. The late date of its revision given in NV 1790, and the fact that the revision took place in Hamburg, give us more confidence than with most earlier versions of Bach’s works that the version transmitted in the early sources is, in fact, the original version of Wq 21 rather than an intermediate version. The two sources for the early version both have a clear Berlin provenance: one was copied by a group of scribes known to have worked for Bach in Berlin

2. The *Sei Concerti*, Wq 43, published in Hamburg in 1772, were intended for amateur players, and although Bach is known to have performed at least one of them in public (Wq 43/1, see Wiermann, 176) and the whole set privately without orchestra for Charles Burney (Burney 1775, 2:271–72), neither performance would have been intended to polish his reputation as a virtuoso. Bach’s public concert appearances on 28 April 1768, 6 March 1769, and 14 and 21 December 1769 included keyboard concertos, but contemporary reviews indicate that they were not newly composed. See Wiermann, 435 and 438–39, and CPEB: CW, III/9.15, xi–xiii.

TABLE I. PIECES MARKED AS ERNEUERT IN NV 1790

NV 1790 Section	Wq No.	Date of Composition	Date of <i>Erneuerung</i>
Clavier Soli	62/1	1731	1744
	65/1	1731	1744
	65/2	1732	1744
	65/3	1732	1744
	65/4	1733	1744
	64/1–6	1734	1744
	65/5	1735	1743
	65/6	1736	1743
	65/7	1736	1744
	65/8	1737	1743
	65/9	1737	1743
Concerte	65/10	1738	1743
	1	1733	1744
	2	1734	1743
	3	1737	1745
	5	1739	1762
Trii	21	1747	1775
	71	1731	1746
	72	1731	1747
	143	1731	1747
	144	1731	1747
	145	1731	1747
	146	1731	1747
	147	1731	1747
	148	1735	1747
	Soli	138	1740

during the 1740s and 1750s (US-Wc, M1010.A2 B13 W21; source B 3), and the other was copied by Johann Friedrich Agricola (D-B, SA 4846; source B 2). Rachel Wade postulated that the version transmitted in the Library of Congress copy was indeed an intermediate version, based on her assumption that the copyist of the keyboard part, Anon. 302, was a Hamburg copyist.³ Other manuscripts in this hand seem to place him exclusively in Berlin, though, and it seems unlikely that he would have followed Bach to Hamburg to copy an intermediate version of Wq 21 sometime after its *Erneuerung* in 1775.⁴ Even if that were the case, however, the issue has since been resolved with the reappearance of the Agricola copy in the archives of the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin that was not available to Wade

at the time of her research. This copy transmits the same version as the Library of Congress copy. If we assume that the date of revision in NV 1790 is not in error, then Agricola died before Bach revised Wq 21 in 1775 and thus could not have had access to any intermediate version.

Because the early version of Wq 21 is unquestionably a rare case of a surviving original version of one of Bach's works prior to its revision, it is reproduced in its entirety in the main text of the edition, immediately following the *erneuert* version. This latter survives in a single source: a copy by Johann Heinrich Michel that is very clean and remarkably free of corrections, copied for Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal, an organist in Schwerin and a collector of C.P.E. Bach's music. Westphal had direct contact with Bach in the late 1780s and with Bach's widow and daughter after the composer's death in 1788. He acquired many manuscripts of Bach's music by ordering them directly from Bach or his heirs, who then commissioned Michel to copy the pieces

3. Wade, 95.

4. Keiichi Kubota, *C.P.E. Bach: A Study of His Revisions and Arrangements* (Tokyo: Academia Music Limited, 2004), 29–30.

TABLE 2. SOURCES FOR BACH'S CONCERTO IN D MINOR

NV 1790 Listing	Keyboard CPEB:CW, III/9.7	Flute CPEB:CW, III/4.1
(p. 30): "No. 23. <i>D. moll.</i> B. 1747. Clavier, 2 Hörner, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß."	Wq 22 (H 425) B = B-Bc, 5887 MSM (parts)	Wq 22, flute version (H 484.1) B = D-B, Am. B. 101 (score) D 1 = D-B, SA 2583 (2 sets of parts) D 2 = GB-Lcm, Ms. 2000 (score) Q = B-Bc, 5887 MSM

from the house copies. Surprisingly, given its unequivocal attribution to C.P.E. Bach in NV 1790, Wq 21 has also occasionally circulated under Wilhelm Friedemann Bach's name. Carl Hermann Bitter listed the concerto as a work by the elder Bach son, based on a copy of it in the possession of a "Herr Lecerf" in Dresden.⁵ No such manuscript seems now to have survived, and Martin Falck corrected Bitter's misattribution in his dissertation on W.F. Bach some forty-five years later.⁶ A copy now in St. Petersburg, formerly in Bremen, also attributes the concerto to W.F. Bach, but this manuscript was apparently copied in the nineteenth century, so there is no reason to give any weight to its attribution.⁷

Concerto in D Minor, Wq 22

The keyboard version of Wq 22 has also survived in only one source, again a Michel copy made for J.J.H. Westphal. The NV 1790 listing for Wq 22 gives only "Clavier" as the solo instrument, but it also exists in a version for flute (published in CPEB:CW, III/4.1; see table 2 above). For other concertos that Bach arranged for different solo instruments except Wq 13 and 22, NV 1790 describes all of the options (e.g., "ist auch für das Violoncell und die Flöte gesetzt"). That NV 1790 does not do so for Wq 22 has led to some speculation that the arrangement for flute was done by someone besides Bach.⁸ The recent appear-

ance of two new sources for the flute version of the concerto (GB-Lcm, Ms. 2000 and D-B, SA 2583), along with the discovery of some excerpts from it in Johann Joachim Quantz's *Solfeggi*, have essentially quashed such speculation.⁹ In keeping with most of the other concertos that he arranged for different instruments, Bach composed the non-keyboard version—here for flute—first, and only later arranged it for keyboard. Barthold Kuijken suggests that the 1747 date given in NV 1790 is for the flute version,¹⁰ but there is little evidence besides the entry in NV 1790 to support a specific date for either version.

The keyboard version, apart from the rewritten solo part, differs from the flute version by the inclusion of two horn parts and by slight changes to the structure of the movements. The measure counts for the three movements in the flute version are 343, 107, and 254; for the keyboard version they are 294, 105, and 259. Whether the addition of horns to the four-part string accompaniment happened at the same time that the solo part was rewritten for keyboard must also remain unanswered, barring the discovery of new evidence.

Concerto in D Minor, Wq 23

The other concerto in the present volume, Wq 23, is the only one of the three with a surviving autograph composing score. It also survives in four other sources, indicating perhaps a greater contemporary popularity than either Wq 21 or Wq 22. It is likely more familiar to modern-day listeners because of its publication in 1907 in the series *Denkmäler deutscher Tonkunst* edited by Arnold

5. Bitter, 2:230. "6. 1 Concert mit Quartett-Begl. in A-moll Allabr." with a two-measure incipit.

6. Falck, 95. "In diese Zählung ist ein bei Bitter S. 230 Nr. 6 angeführtes A-moll-Konzert selbstverständlich nicht einbegriffen, da es von Carl P. Em. Bach ist."

7. See Viacheslav Kartsovnik and Nina Rjazanova, *Handschriften aus deutschen Sammlungen in der Russischen Nationalbibliothek Sankt Petersburg* (Berlin: Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, 2004), 105.

8. See Wade, 110–11 and 310–11, where the flute version of Wq 22 is included in an appendix of concertos of questionable authenticity. Helm lists it as item 484.1 under the heading "Doubtful."

9. See Elias N. Kulukundis, "Thoughts on the Origin, Authenticity and Evolution of C.P.E. Bach's D Minor Concerto (W. 22)," *Festschrift Albi Rosenthal* (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1984), 199–215, and Konrad Hünteler, "Das Flötenkonzert D-Moll von C.P.E. Bach in neuem Licht," in *Frankfurt/Oder 1994*, 324–38.

10. See CPEB:CW, III/4.1, xiii.

Schering.¹¹ For much of the twentieth century this was the only modern critical edition of any of C.P.E. Bach's keyboard concertos, and was therefore performed and recorded more often than any other (or perhaps even more than all of the others combined).

The NV 1790 listing for Wq 23 includes a curious detail that is almost certainly a mistake: it lists two flutes among the accompanying instruments. No flutes appear in any of the sources for this concerto. Bach included two flutes in several of his keyboard concertos, but almost always in the presence of other wind instruments. In only one other concerto, Wq 32, does Bach call for an accompaniment of only two flutes plus strings, and there the flutes are used only in the slow movement. If NV 1790 is not in error for Wq 23, then there must have been a different version of the concerto that has not survived. Indeed, there exists a fragment of an earlier version of the slow movement of Wq 23, but enough of it survives to show that it, too, was scored for just strings without flutes. This fragment is published in the appendix of the present volume.

That there might have been earlier versions of the first and third movements as well as the second is barely hinted at in correspondence concerning one of the secondary sources for Wq 23. Once again it involves a Michel copy made for J.J.H. Westphal. Westphal's intent, as we have seen, seems to have been to amass a complete collection of C.P.E. Bach's music, or at least all of his instrumental works. To this end he began acquiring manuscripts from whatever sources he could find, some of them more reliable than others. After his contact with Bach, and especially after the publication of NV 1790, Westphal increased his efforts not only to collect everything he could, but to ensure that he had accurate copies. Thus he began to send manuscripts that he had acquired elsewhere to the Bach household for checking and correcting where necessary. The onerous task of comparing Westphal's copies to the house copies and entering any corrections seems to have fallen primarily to Michel. When one considers that the house copies were mostly the latest versions of Bach's works, and that Westphal more than likely had collected many early or corrupt versions, it is not surprising that Michel chafed at the work. A letter from Johanna Maria Bach to Westphal from 13 February 1795 tries to explain why she had not yet been able to complete his request for correcting all of the

11. *Instrumentalkonzerte deutscher Meister*, ed. Arnold Schering, DDT, vols. 29–30 (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1907), 62–102. The two volumes also contain concertos by Johann Georg Pisendel, Johann Adolph Hasse, Georg Philipp Telemann, Christoph Graupner, Gottfried Heinrich Stölzel, and Konrad Friedrich Hurlebusch.

concertos that he had sent some time earlier. After listing illnesses and other obligations as two of the reasons, she seems to go to the heart of the matter:

. . . the third reason is the difficulty that the copyist has caused me concerning the checking of the concertos. It is an endeavor that, as he says, is too tedious for him to do unless he has nothing else to occupy him. Therefore I still have the concertos nos. 9, 10, 13, 18, 20 and 24 [Wq 8, 9, 12, 17, 19, and 23] lying here. Everything should be taken care of eventually. For concerto no. 4 [Wq 4] the keyboard part has been copied out completely, while the other parts have been corrected. The concertos nos. 5 [Wq 5] and 25 [Wq 24], however, had to be completely recopied.¹²

The reason that the keyboard part for Wq 4—and all of the parts for Wq 5 and 24—had to be recopied was clearly because the versions that Westphal had sent for correction were so outdated or corrupted that it was easier simply to send him new copies made from the house copies in Hamburg. The copies of the concertos mentioned in the letter that have survived in Westphal's collection show that—apart from Wq 23—these did, in fact, originate outside of Bach's immediate circle and thus were prime candidates to be sent for correction:

Wq	Scribes
8	unknown (cembalo), Anon. 309 (strings)
9	2 unknown; possible J.C. Westphal sales copy
12	Anon. 305; possible J.C. Westphal sales copy
17	Anon. R
19	Anon. S
23	Michel

And the Westphal copies of the three concertos that J.M. Bach indicated had to be partially or completely recopied show precisely the constellation of copyists that the letter suggests would be the case:

12. *CPEB-Briefe*, 2:1322–23. Letter from J.M. Bach to J.J.H. Westphal, 13 February 1795. “. . . die dritte Ursach besteht in der Schwierigkeit, die mir der Notist gemacht hat, die Concerte durchzusehn. Es ist dies eine Sache die ihm, nach seiner Aussage, zu viel Mühe macht, als daß er eher daran gehen mag, als wenn er keine andere Beschäftigung hat. Ich habe deßwegen die Concerte N. 9, 10, 13, 18, 20 u. 24 [Wq 8, 9, 12, 17, 19, and 23] noch bei mir liegen. Es soll aber in der Folge alles richtig besorgt werden. Zu dem Conc. N. 4 [Wq 4] ist die Clavierstimme bloß umgeschrieben, und die andern sind berichtet worden. Die Concerte No. 5 [Wq 5] u. 25 [Wq 24] aber haben ganz müssen abgeschrieben werden.”

Wq	Scribes
4	Michel (revised cembalo part), Jaenecke 49 (strings)
5	Anon. Q
24	Anon. Q

The curiosity here is Wq 23. It was included in the list of concertos that were awaiting correction, suggesting that J.J.H. Westphal's original copy of it was not one that he had acquired from Bach or his circle. That the copy of Wq 23 now in B-Bc is a clean Michel copy indicates that it, too, had been completely recopied; thus Westphal's copy that he sent to Hamburg for correction, which no longer survives, may have been an earlier version, perhaps even one with flutes.

Performance Considerations

The designation for solo instrument for all three concertos in NV 1790 is "Clavier." As with Bach's music for solo keyboard, this designation essentially includes all standard keyboard instruments of the day—harpsichord, fortepiano, organ, and clavichord—as well as experimental ones such as the *Bogenclavier* or the double-manual stringed keyboard instrument with various stops required to perform Wq 69 (see CPEB: CW, I/6.3). For public performances of concertos, however, the harpsichord, fortepiano, or organ would be the most obvious choices. Since NV 1790 does not include "Orgel" as an option for Wq 21–23, one would expect that Bach's own public performances of the present three concertos would have been on either harpsi-

chord or fortepiano. The designation of "cembalo" for the solo instrument in the surviving sources does not necessarily rule out the fortepiano, but the availability of that instrument in mid-century Berlin (besides the ones known to be owned by King Friedrich II) was probably rather limited, so it seems likely that Bach was at the harpsichord for the first performances of these concertos in Berlin. Stylistically, the keyboard writing in Bach's concertos does not differ substantially from that of his solo keyboard music, so a private performance without orchestra could certainly make use of a clavichord with the required range.

Acknowledgments

Many individuals have assisted in the making of this volume. In particular my colleagues at CPEB: CW have provided valuable insights and advice. Peter D'Elia and Lisa DeSiro assisted with proofreading the music. Peter Wollny of the Bach-Archiv in Leipzig has guided the concerto series with a mastery both of the overall development of the genre and of the smallest details of sources and scribes. Wolfram Enßlin, Ulrich Leisinger, and Daniel Boomhower shared their knowledge of the transmission of the concerto manuscripts; to all, I offer my sincere thanks. Thanks are also due to the libraries and institutions who provided access to and copies of the sources required, especially the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin—Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Musikabteilung mit Mendelssohn-Archiv; the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin; the Conservatoire royal de Bruxelles, Bibliothèque in Brussels; and the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C.

Mark W. Knoll