

# INTRODUCTION

---

Three keyboard concertos by Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach are included in the present volume: the Concerto in B-flat Major, Wq 28 (H 434); the Concerto in A Major, Wq 29 (H 437); and the Concerto in B Minor, Wq 30 (H 440). All three works are listed in the catalogue of Bach's estate (NV 1790, pp. 31–32) in the section devoted to the concertos:

No. 29. *B. dur.* B[erlin]. 1751. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß; ist auch für das Violoncell und die Flöte gesetzt.

No. 30. *A. dur.* P[otsdam]. 1753. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß; ist auch für das Violoncell und die Flöte gesetzt.

No. 31. *H. moll.* P. 1753. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß.

While Wq 28–30 are numbered successively in NV 1790, these works differ in their histories in ways that have left a mark on the nature of the pieces themselves. The last of the three, Wq 30, was composed in Potsdam in 1753 after a virtually unprecedented period of two full years in which Bach wrote no concertos initially designed for a keyboard instrument. Perhaps he was fully occupied with his *Versuch*—part I of which appeared in 1753—and simply had insufficient time for his customary composing and performing activities, or maybe he was concentrating on keyboard sonatas. Yet in retrospect, we can see this break in keyboard concerto production—the first since the year before his move to Berlin in 1738—as the initial sign of what would become Bach's diminishing attention to the genre in the years after 1750. That this hiatus nevertheless did not represent a fundamental change in Bach's goals for the keyboard concerto is evident in Wq 30 itself, which continues in the developmental path established during the previous decade of prolific concerto composition, and shows Bach at the height of his compositional skills for large-scale pieces with solo keyboard. The two preceding works, originally written in 1751 and 1753, are less easily accommodated into such a simple model of continuing development, however. Both Wq 28 and 29 also survive in versions for flute and for violoncello, and both were almost certainly written at first for one of those instruments and later arranged for solo keyboard. Especially with regard to the solo part, these arrangements sometimes lack much of the figural adventurousness and idiomatic inventiveness of

Bach's original keyboard concertos. The sources transmitting the three works similarly reflect their differing histories; whereas we have the composer's autograph score and house parts for Wq 30, no such authoritative documentation survives for either Wq 28 or 29.

## Concertos in B-flat Major and A Major, Wq 28 and 29

Wq 28 and 29 are the second and third of three concertos that, in the words of NV 1790, were “also set for violoncello and flute.”<sup>1</sup> Along with Wq 26, these were the first documented instances in which Bach wrote multiple versions of a concerto for different solo instruments (see table 1), a practice that remained exceptional for him.<sup>2</sup> We do not know the occasion for these pieces, which now seem most probably to have been written originally for solo violoncello (and in that case, for a particular cellist). But the subsequent arrangement for C. P. E. Bach's own instrument is not so unexpected: many years earlier, Johann Sebastian Bach had arranged his violin concertos for harpsichord, having already arranged several solo concertos by other composers for unaccompanied keyboard, arrangements

---

1. The first was the Concerto in A Minor, Wq 26, published in CPEB: CW, III/9.8.

2. Well over ten years later Bach composed two oboe concertos (Wq 164 and 165, written in 1765; see CPEB: CW, III/5) which he then arranged for keyboard (Wq 39 and 40; see CPEB: CW, III/9.13). A sixth concerto, Wq 34 in G major (see CPEB: CW, III/9.11), was composed originally for keyboard and subsequently arranged for flute (Wq 169). Elias Kulukundis has argued that a flute version of the Concerto in D Minor, Wq 22, dated 1747 in NV 1790, may very possibly be authentic, and may in fact have been the original version of the work (see CPEB: CW, III/9.7 and “Thoughts on the Origin, Authenticity and Evolution of C. P. E. Bach's D Minor Concerto (W. 22),” *Festschrift Albi Rosenthal*, ed. Rudolf Elvers [Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 1984], 199–215). A flute version of a still earlier keyboard concerto, Wq 13 in D major (1744; see CPEB: CW, III/9.4), which survives in two Sing-Akademie MSS, also appears to have existed during Bach's lifetime, since the Berlin bookseller Christian Ulrich Ringmacher offered it for sale in 1773 (discussed in an unpublished essay of 1994 by Kulukundis, who suggests that this work as well may have originated as a flute concerto). The G-major, D-major, and D-minor flute concertos are published as Wq 169, H 416, and H 484.1, respectively, in CPEB: CW, III/4.2.

TABLE I. SOURCES FOR BACH'S CONCERTOS IN B-FLAT MAJOR AND A MAJOR

Work NV 1790 Listing	Keyboard CPEB:CW, III/9.9	Flute CPEB:CW, III/4.1	Violoncello CPEB:CW, III/6
Concerto in B-flat Major "No. 29. B. dur. B. 1751. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß; ist auch für das Violoncell und die Flöte gesetzt."	Wq 28 (H 434) B 1 = B-Bc, 5633 MSM* B 2 = B-Bc, 5887 MSM (cemb part) B 3 = D-B, SA 2591 (1 & 3) (score and cemb part) D 1 = CH-Gpu, Ms. mus. 333 (score) D 2 = D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 221 (parts) D 3 = D-B, SA 2591 (2) (parts) D 4 = D-B, Sammlung Thulemeier 21 (parts) D 5 = DK-Kmk, R 403 (parts) D 6 = Private MS (parts) [D 7] = Prieger lot 196 (parts), lost	Wq 167 (H 435) B = B-Bc, 5516 II MSM (parts) Q 1 = B-Bc, 5633 MSM Q 2 = B-Bc, 5887 MSM	Wq 171 (H 436) B 1 = B-Bc, 5633 MSM (parts with additional basso part)* B 2 = D-B, SA 2592 (parts with additional basso part) B 3 = S-Skma, Alströmer saml. Wq 171 (parts)
Concerto in A Major "No. 30. A. dur. P. 1753. Clavier, 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Baß; ist auch für das Violoncell und die Flöte gesetzt."	Wq 29 (H 437) B 1 = B-Bc, 5887 MSM (parts) B 2 = D-B, SA 2618 (score) D 1 = D-B, SA 2617 (score) D 2 = US-Wc, M1010.A2B13 W29 (parts) [D 3] = Königsberg, Rf β 49 fol. (parts), lost	Wq 168 (H 438) B = B-Bc, 5515 II MSM (parts) Q 1 = B-Bc, 5633 MSM Q 2 = B-Bc, 5887 MSM	Wq 172 (H 439) B 1 = B-Bc, 5633 MSM (parts) B 2 = S-Skma, Alströmer saml. Wq 172 (parts)

\* = orchestral parts shared for Wq 28 and 171

that had all been critical in the establishment of the keyboard concerto as an independent genre.<sup>3</sup>

In their form as keyboard concertos, both Wq 28 and 29 may have enjoyed some currency among performers, since the Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue listed the two concertos in 1763 (Wq 29) and 1768 (Wq 28).<sup>4</sup> Despite the likelihood that these pieces were known primarily as keyboard concertos, persuasive arguments based in documentary evidence and stylistic considerations have led to the current opinion that both were originally composed for violoncello and subsequently arranged for flute and for

keyboard.<sup>5</sup> Most telling is the fact that the sole surviving autograph material for the related keyboard, flute, and violoncello concertos is a holograph of Wq 170, the violoncello version of the Concerto in A Minor. Also compelling is a manuscript containing authentic keyboard cadenzas identified—somewhat confusingly—as pertaining to the three cello concertos (B-Bc, 5871 MSM; see appendix). Additionally, a letter from Johann Christoph Westphal, the Hamburg music dealer who offered Wq 171 and 172 (the cello versions of the Concertos in B-flat Major and A Major) in his 1782 catalogue, claimed that they bore Bach's own markings, and had been prepared for a friend who had found them too difficult.

3. See Stevens, chap. 2.

4. *The Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue. The Six Parts and Sixteen Supplements 1762–1787*, ed. Barry S. Brook (New York: Dover, 1966), cols. 132 and 292. This sales catalogue included works for which MS parts could be purchased.

5. Robert Nosow has laid out this evidence in the introduction to his edition of the violoncello concertos; see CPEB:CW, III/6, pp. xv–xxi.

Wq 28 and 29 differ from their counterparts for flute (Wq 167 and 168) and cello (Wq 171 and 172). Whereas Nosow finds the cello solos both idiomatic and inventive, the solo flute versions are judged by Barthold Kuijken (see CPEB: CW, III/4.1) to be awkward and unidiomatic. Similarly, the keyboard solo parts fail to exploit the instrument in the ways that Bach's other keyboard concertos do. Except for a few instances in later versions of Wq 29 in which passages of the cello and/or keyboard versions have been expanded beyond the bounds of the extant flute version, the keyboard arrangements retain the accompanying string parts of the violoncello and flute versions without change, and almost always adopt the original basso line for the *solo's* left-hand part. The right hand, however, often includes a melodic elaboration of the solo line of one or both of the other two versions, and sometimes adds more idiomatic scale and broken-chord patterns. Only very occasionally, and more often in Wq 28 than in Wq 29, does the left hand abandon the doubling bass line and join the right hand in more characteristic two-hand figuration.

Although no autograph sources survive for either of these works, both were copied in the early 1790s by Johann Heinrich Michel from sources supplied by the composer's survivors; these late copies form the basis of the present edition.<sup>6</sup>

#### Sources for Wq 28

The relatively large number of sources for Wq 28, most of them in parts, indicate a degree of popularity of this concerto. Two of these copies (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 221 and a privately held MS) suggest some currency among amateurs because of the use of soprano clef for the upper staff of the keyboard part and the addition of written-out cadenzas for the second movement. Although only Michel's parts (B-Bc, 5633 MSM and 5887 MSM, Wq 28) can be considered authorized, their virtually complete agreement with the score copied in the 1760s by Bach's court colleague Carl Friedrich Christian Fasch (D-B, SA 2591 [1]) suggests that both copyists were working from sources with common descent from Bach's original mate-

6. On Michel, Bach's most trusted Hamburg copyist, see Jürgen Neubacher, "Der Organist Johann Gottfried Rist (1741–1795) und der Bratschist Ludwig August Christoph Hopff (1715–1798): zwei Hamburger Notenkopisten Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs," *BJ* (2005): 109–23; see also Georg von Dadelsen, *Bemerkungen zur Handschrift Johann Sebastian Bachs, seiner Familie und seines Kreises*, Tübinger Bach Studien 1 (Trossingen: Hohner, 1957), 24. The copies were made for the Schwerin organist and collector Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal, who is extensively discussed in Leisinger/Wollny 1997, 23–74.

rials. In fact, all but one of the many sources for Wq 28 transmit the same version of the piece; the single exception is a set of parts copied by August Kohn(e) (D-B, SA 2591 [2]; see critical report). Little is known about Kohn; even though he came to Berlin in 1750, he did not enter the royal employ until ten years later, and he had no known connection with Bach. It seems unlikely that he would have made his copy much earlier than either Fasch's score or a MS made most probably in the 1750s by another Berlin musician (D-B, Sammlung Thulemeier 21). Yet Kohn's copy does appear to transmit an earlier version of Wq 28, retaining vestiges of the violoncello concerto from which it was probably arranged. In numerous passages in which the cembalo *solo* plays without any string accompaniment, Kohn's basso part follows the comparable part of the cello concerto (Wq 171), doubling the *solo's* left-hand line. Kohn's copy also includes many more indications of articulation than the other two early copies. While this source raises tantalizing questions about its origins, it nevertheless lends strong support to the notion that Wq 28 was arranged from another version of the concerto.

The apparent independence of Kohn's musical model from that of other copyists is supported by confusing disparities among the sources for Wq 28 in the meter given for the first movement (*Allegretto*; see critical report). Beginning with the earliest copies this meter is given as **C** in both cembalo and flute versions, an indication that is repeated by nearly all later copyists; yet for the cello version, Wq 171, the meter is overwhelmingly **♩**. Here again, Kohn's MS represents the only consistent exception, giving **♩** in all parts. Furthermore, the marking *Allegretto*, together with the *galant*, rather dance-like style of the movement, make **♩** seem much more plausible than **C**. The present edition has adopted **C**; but performers are advised to use their own judgement about the tempo and affect appropriate to this movement.

#### Sources for Wq 29

While fewer in number than the sources for Wq 28, the sources for Wq 29 transmit two distinct versions of the concerto, an earlier and a later one. As with Wq 28, there is an extant score copied by C. F. C. Fasch (D-B, SA 2618), who himself dated it 1764; this version of the piece is transmitted as well by two later sets of parts (D-B, SA 2617 and US-Wc, M1010.A2 B13 W29). At some time after Fasch made his copy, Bach returned to the piece to make revisions to the right-hand line; these were subsequently recorded in Michel's parts of 1792 (B-Bc, 5887 MSM, Wq 29). Bach added substantial embellishment as well as

more rapid figuration in scale and broken-chord patterns, often in place of long notes that would have been difficult to sustain on the cembalo. In a very few instances he broke up the left-hand bass part—which usually conforms to the basso line of the cello and flute versions of the concerto—to write more characteristic keyboard figuration, in which the two hands join in a single rapid line of broken-chord patterns. Even in the revised version, such passages are less frequent than in the minimally idiomatic Wq 28; thus it was perhaps a performer’s desire for a more idiomatic solo part in Wq 29 that caused the later addition in Fasch’s early score of a series of figures between the two cembalo staves. These figures, entered in pencil by an unknown hand in measures 156–84 of the third movement, are consistent with the repetitive and harmonically meager figuration in the upper staff, but not with the parallel passages of the flute and cello versions of the concerto, from which it was probably derived. It is certainly possible that a keyboard performer might have wished to add his own improvised figuration to the decidedly basic version given by the score, and added figures to serve as a guide. Such possibilities serve as a reminder that a written solo part in the eighteenth century was not considered an inviolable text, and that performers felt free to modify a score to fit their own needs.

### Concerto in B Minor, Wq 30

The sources for Wq 30 present few discrepancies in their transmission of a single musical text. In addition to Bach’s autograph score (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach P 354, fascicle I) and house parts (D-B, Mus. ms. Bach St 510), only three other complete sets of parts exist, confirming Bach’s note on his house parts that the work was “little known.” It seems likely that the parts copied in the early 1790s in Hamburg for J.J.H. Westphal’s collection (B-Bc, 5887 MSM, Wq 30) were based on Bach’s house parts, to which they faithfully conform. A variant reading occurs in only one passage, in measures 63–64 of the second movement: in the autograph score, Bach entered a more elaborate version in place of the original passage, which can still be tentatively deciphered (see commentary).

While the compositional and transmission history of Wq 30 is less complex than for Wq 28 and 29, the contrary might be said of the musical work itself. Whereas Wq 28 and 29—both originally conceived in terms of solo melody instruments—must be seen to stand somewhat outside Bach’s continuing development of the solo concerto for keyboard, Wq 30, with its undeniably greater musical

resources, is one of a small group of works composed in the 1750s that represent a high point of Bach’s concerto composition, a culmination of his achievements in the preceding decade.<sup>7</sup> Much of what is notable in Wq 30 may be traced to the complex relationship between the keyboard *solo* and the string *tutti*, worked out in their respective stylistic characters, together with their formal interactions. For example, the first movement draws on an idea used by Bach in some of his works from the 1740s, in which a solo part in the style of Bach’s most *empfindsam* modern sonatas is set against a stereotypically old-style ritornello. In this case an almost aggressively old-fashioned opening ritornello, with a strong contrapuntal polarity of melody and bass emphasized by frequent doublings and driving repetitive rhythms, is countered by the very different character of the initially unaccompanied *solo*, which enters in a high register. The *solo*’s short, breathless phrases are dominated by a sighing appoggiatura, projecting the declamation of a single individual; tentative where the strings were decisive, weak where they were strong. As the movement progresses, the *solo* becomes less tentative, asserting itself in a statement of a new, clear theme in a new key, as well as in passages of virtuoso figuration; but these elements merely serve to expand the individual nature of the *solo*, which remains distinct from the strings. Bach’s concern with establishing the differing characters of his two “protagonists” extends as well to the strings, which sometimes accompany but more often inject their own ideas in persistent interactions with the *solo*.<sup>8</sup>

### A Note on Performance

As is generally the case for the concertos Bach wrote while he was living in Berlin, we know little or nothing about the specific circumstances surrounding the composition of Wq 28–30. Since evidence is lacking for regular performances of Bach’s keyboard concertos at court, it seems most likely that he played them in small social gatherings of his immediate circle of friends and colleagues. Both spaces and performing resources would thus have been more limited in size than those afforded by the larger public concerts that were just beginning to be common in Berlin during the middle years of the century. It is not surprising, then,

7. That Bach thought highly of this work is suggested by the new set of parts copied in about 1770 in Hamburg, very possibly for his own use in concert performance; see critical report.

8. For an extended discussion of Wq 30, see Stevens, “Formal Design in C.P.E. Bach’s Harpsichord Concertos,” *Studi musicali* 15 (1986): 257–97.

that the string ensemble parts of these concertos are considerably more intricate than, for example, those of Bach's symphonies of the 1750s. Despite far from universal agreement about the performing forces appropriate to Wq 28–30, this editor believes that the string accompaniment was most probably intended for a group of four or five instruments, doubled at most by two, with an optional double bass joining the violoncello (basso) at the lower octave.

Such forces would also have been compatible with the composer-soloist's use of some sort of fortepiano, versions of which were beginning to appear in northern Germany at this time. It is not possible to determine the exact identity of the solo instrument that Bach would have played in performing these concertos, partly because he is likely to have used different instruments at different times and in different circumstances. Since the organ was not a usual chamber instrument in Germany, and the clavichord is far too weak for large ensemble performance, it is often assumed that Bach wrote his concertos for harpsichord. But Bach was actively interested in new instruments; and in the introduction to part II of the *Versuch*, published in 1762, he expressed his preference for the fortepiano over the harpsichord, not just for improvisation, where its expressive capabilities competed with those of the clavichord, but also for continuo accompaniment.<sup>9</sup> Bach's enthusiastic engagement with attempts to achieve a more perfect keyboard instrument is reflected in reports from 1753 (the year in which Wq 30 was composed) that he had performed at court a concerto on a new keyboard instrument described as a *Bogenflügel*, which produced sound by drawing a bow across gut strings.<sup>10</sup> Yet another choice for solo keyboard

instrument might have been the *Tangentenflügel*, heard in recent recordings of Wq 28–30.<sup>11</sup> It seems clear that there is no one "correct" instrument on which to play Bach's concertos; only a close analysis of each individual work can help us to determine how best to perform it.<sup>12</sup>

### Acknowledgments

Like any critical musical edition, this one has depended on the help of many libraries and librarians in both this country and Europe, to all of whom I am grateful. I owe thanks as well to the editorial board, particularly Peter Wollny; the editorial office, especially Jason B. Grant and Paul Corneilson; and to Stephen C. Fisher; their expertise and patience with my many queries has been invaluable to me. In an earlier stage, my work on Wq 28–30 benefited from the important help and guidance of Rachel W. Wade and E. Eugene Helm, who also made available to me the meticulous transcription of the autograph of Wq 30 by Louis S. Bagger. Last, but far from least, my own work has depended on essential information provided at various times by several of my companion concerto editors, including Elias N. Kulukundis, Robert Nosow, Barthold Kuijken, and Arnfried Edler.

Jane R. Stevens

9. *Versuch* II: *Einleitung*, §6: "Das Fortepiano und das Clavicord unterstützen am besten eine Ausführung, wo die größten Feinigkeiten des Geschmacks vorkommen." (The pianoforte and the clavichord provide the best accompaniment in performances that require the most elegant taste.) Translation in C.P.E. Bach, *Essay on the True Art of Keyboard Playing*, trans. and ed. William J. Mitchell (New York: W.W. Norton, 1949), 172. With regard to improvisation, Bach asserted in *Versuch* II:41, §4: "Das Clavicord und das Fortepiano sind zu unserer Fantasie die bequemsten Instrumente. . . . Das ungedämpfte Register des Fortepiano ist das angenehmste, und . . . das reizendste zum Fantasiren." (The best instruments for our purpose are the clavichord and pianoforte. . . . The undamped register of the pianoforte is the most pleasing and . . . the most delightful for improvisation.) *Essay on the True Art of Keyboard Playing*, 431.

10. See Manuel Bärwald, "' . . . ein Clavier von besonderer Erfindung': Der Bogenflügel von Johann Hohlfeld und seine Bedeutung für das Schaffen Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs," *BJ* (2008): 271–300. Bärwald speculates that the concerto in question may well have been Bach's Concerto in C Minor, Wq 31 (see CPEB: CW, III/9.10), also composed in 1753.

11. See the recordings by Miklós Spányi, soloist, with Concerto Armonico, led by Péter Szűts, of Wq 28 and 29 on *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: The Complete Keyboard Concertos*, vol. 7, BIS-CD-857 (1998); and of Wq 30 on *idem*, vol. 8, BIS-CD-867 (1999). The *Tangentenflügel* or "tangent piano," resembling a large clavichord, was primarily an instrument of the later eighteenth century, although similar mechanisms occur in earlier instruments.

12. For further discussion of the keyboard instruments that Bach knew, see Stevens, 215–19.