

CONCERTO IN E MINOR, W. 24: SOURCES

General Remarks

Although W. 24 was evidently drafted by 1748, a complex series of alterations is recorded in multiple manuscript copies made over the next fifty years or so. This report describes and evaluates the surviving sources and traces the revisions undergone by the work, insofar as these can be reconstructed from the extant sources. Sources are grouped with respect to whether they transmit early, intermediate, or late readings. These groupings are somewhat porous, as it is rare for two sources of any given work to transmit exactly the same state of the composition. Source sigla (the brief abbreviations used to identify individual sources) comprise two elements, a letter and a numeral, e.g., “A1.” The letters indicate filiation relationships, each letter being used for a group of sources giving similar readings. Sources of group “A” always give the earliest readings, and letters B, C, etc., refer to groups of sources giving successively later readings.

Dimensions of manuscripts and descriptions of watermarks are based on first-hand examination of the sources except as noted; if no watermark is mentioned, none could be observed. All sources use the now-traditional clefs, including treble clef for the upper staff of the keyboard part, unless otherwise indicated. Work titles and designations for individual parts appear variously in the sources. Original designations are reported in the descriptions of individual sources but elsewhere are regularized to modern equivalents except for the lowest string part, which is designated the “basso.” Direct quotes from sources (titles, part labels, etc.) always appear within quotation marks; italics are used in quotations only for roman characters within text that otherwise appears in German script. Contrary to normal American usage, quotation marks do not enclose a final period or other mark of punctuation unless the latter is included in the matter quoted.

Versions and revisions

The edition presents in score only the earliest and latest versions of W. 24 that can be documented from surviving sources. Because the composer's own materials no longer exist, the identification of earlier as opposed to later readings is based on what is known of the composer's practices of composition and revision. Particularly important here is the procedure described in contemporary sources as *Veränderung*, which may include not only variation in the usual sense but the wholesale recomposition of an underlying *Satz* or voice-leading pattern.¹ Although a relative chronology for stages in the work's compositional history can be reconstructed, it is impossible to say at what date a particular alteration was made. Most revisions in W. 24 can be assigned to one of the following categories:

- revision of voice leading, especially in inner voices and the bass
- variation of melody and bass lines
- addition of inner voices in the keyboard part
- supplementation and revision of performance markings.

¹ Further discussion in the discussion of sources for W. 4–6, drawing in particular on David Schulenberg, *The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1984), especially chaps. 3 and 4, and Rachel W. Wade, *The Keyboard Concertos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1981).

In addition, two passages were slightly abbreviated: ii.13–14 was reduced to a single measure (ii.13 in the late version), and iii.231–34 was shortened to two measures (iii.231–32). The scoring of several solo episodes was also revised by both the addition and the removal of entries for one or more of the string parts.

The description and evaluation of the sources of W. 24 are followed by separate textual commentaries for the late, intermediate, and early versions of the work. The commentaries for the late and early versions are essentially lists of variant readings, to be consulted in conjunction with the editions of the respective versions. Each of these commentaries contains separate sections for the three movements of each concerto, and these sections are further subdivided into lists of emended readings from the principal source and lists of variant readings in the comparison sources.

Because of the very large number of variants involving misplaced, missing, or alternate performance indications (signs for dynamics, articulation, ornaments, and figured bass, as well as pitches and note values of appoggiaturas), in general such readings are reported only where they involve an apparent error in the principal source. Also not reported are added appoggiaturas and misreadings or omissions of ties and accidentals in comparison sources, or the substitution in copies of “tr” (or the sign for the short trill) for + or “t”, the latter being the usual signs for ornaments in Bach's early autographs.

Because individual passages in each concerto were rarely revised more than once, there is no need to present a complete score for any intermediate version. Instead, the commentary for the intermediate versions lists individual passages that underwent revision; each revision is briefly characterized, with an indication of which sources contain the original reading and which the revision. Hence the commentary for the intermediate versions actually serves as a synopsis of all the revisions that W. 24 is known to have undergone.

Within the commentaries and elsewhere, rests, appoggiaturas and other “little notes” (*petites notes*), and the second of two tied notes are all counted as “notes” within a measure.

Sources: Early Version

A1: D B, Ms. Thulemeier M. 13

Five manuscript parts by an unidentified copyist, 34 × 21 cm; watermark: small “FR”²

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo Concertato.”: 16 pages (page 1 = title page; last page blank)

“Violino Primo.”, “Violino Secondo.”, “Viola.”, “Basso Repienia.” (the last letter possibly altered to “o”): each a single bifolio

Original entries on the title page read: “Concerto. | Cembalo. Concertato. | Violino. Primo. | Violino. Secondo. | Viola. | Basso. Cembalo. | Basso. Ripienia. || di Sig^e. Bach.” Subsequent additions include the key “E moll” and the letters C. P. E. before the composer's last name (both in the same hand), and parentheses around “Basso. Cembalo.” indicating that such a part was

² Dimensions and watermark from Tobias Schwinger, *Die Musikaliensammlung Thulemeier und die Berliner Musiküberlieferung in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Beeskow: Ortus-Verlag, 2007), 35.

already absent at the time of these entries. The title “Concerto” appears in the upper left of the first page of each part.

A1 is from the collection of Friedrich Wilhelm von Thulemeier (1750–1811), a Prussian diplomat and government minister. His father had also been a government minister under King Friedrich Wilhelm I. The younger Thulemeier bequeathed his collection to the Joachimstaler Gymnasium, from which it subsequently passed to what is now B D.³ Thulemeier appears to have been a discerning collector of what are generally accurate copies, and despite serious losses the collection remains an important source of works by C. P. E. Bach and other Berlin composers, notably Quantz. It is especially rich in keyboard concertos and chamber sonatas with obbligato keyboard.⁴ Tobias Schwinger has shown that the older Thulemeier probably acquired many copies, including **A1**, from the estate of the Berlin composer and court keyboardist Christoph Nichelmann (1717–62).⁵

The same hand, Schwinger's “Thulemeier VI,” has also been identified in copies of W. 18, 34, and 70/1 within the Thulemeier collection.⁶ The hand is clear but somewhat cramped and angular, and although generally accurate with respect to notes tends to misplace dynamic indications and omit slurs; on the other hand, slurs appear over virtually all triplet groups in the first movement, together with the figure “3”. Although the copyist caught several errors while writing, another error was left uncorrected.⁷ Figures are present in the ritornellos, as are doublings of the first violin in the upper staff in the first two ritornellos of the first movement; these entries are especially cramped, indicating that they were added after the entry of the bass line. Although other copies in the Thulemeier collection include such doublings throughout (as in ms 19, containing W. 6), in this case the copyist evidently decided not to include them after beginning to do so; this suggests that the doublings were not written out in the exemplar.

A2: D-WRz, Mus. Ms. IV c:9

Five manuscript parts by an unidentified eighteenth-century copyist

The parts are as follows:

³ Information about Thulemeier is from the preface by Robert Eitner to *Thematischer Katalog der von Thulemeier'schen Musikalien-Sammlung*, edited by Eitner as a *Beilage* to *Monatshefte für Musikgeschichte* for 1898–9 (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1899). According to Eitner's introduction, the catalog itself had been prepared in 1860 by Rudolf Jacobs. The title page of W. 24 is one of a number of items in the collection bearing twentieth-century stamps that indicate a period of holding by the Pädagogische Hochschule Potsdam.

⁴ See *Johann Joachim Quantz: Seven Trio Sonatas*, edited by Mary Oleskiewicz (Middleton, Wis.: A-R Editions, 2001), xii, on unique keyboard-obbligato versions for Quantz trio sonatas in the Thulemeier collection.

⁵ Schwinger, 407ff.

⁶ In mss. M. 17, 20, and 43, respectively (Schwinger, 409). Wade, who designated the copyist “KK,” found the same hand only in the copy of W. 18.

⁷ See commentary for early version, entries for iii.9, 277, 298.

“Violino 1^{mo},” “Violino 2^{do},” “Viola,” “Basso.”: each 8 pages (first page of viola and basso ruled, with label of part)

“Cembalo concertato”: 20 pages

There is no title page and there are no titles on the individual parts, save for entries added at the top of the keyboard part: “R IV. 3.” and “No. 9” (upper left) and “No. 12. | 13. Bg [?].” The first of these entries corresponds with the listing of W. 24 as the third work in the fourth *Raccolta* of concertos by Bach advertised by Breitkopf.⁸ In the lower right appears the letter “R.” again.

The copy, which gives the early version, is generally neat and accurate. Unique dashes in the continuo figuration, clarifying the harmony, also suggest a carefully prepared text. But the error in the keyboard part at i.103–6 (see commentary), which can only have arisen through a misunderstanding of the composer's original notation, suggests that **A2** lies some distance from Bach's material. Another such misunderstanding occurs at iii.50.

In tutti passages the keyboard part is notated with rests in the upper staff and continuo figures.

A3: US BEm, Ms. 734

Two manuscript parts by an unidentified copyist (36.4 cm × 23.2 cm; watermark unidentifiable, possibly part of a floral design)

Extant are parts for “Viola.” and “Basso.”, each comprising a single bifolio. The title “Concto.” appears at the beginning of the first system in each.

A3 is one of ten sets of parts for concertos of C. P. E. Bach acquired by the University of California library in 1966 from Gwendolin Koldofsky, widow of the violinist Adolph Koldofsky (1905–1951), who reportedly bought them from a Canadian dealer in the 1930s. The manuscripts are in various hands and formats and on different papers. W. 24 was not among the works from the collection that Kodolfsky later conducted for the Canadian Broadcasting Company with Wanda Landowska as soloist, and the library does not possess a modern transcription of its score and parts, as it does for a number of the other concertos in the set.⁹

Within the musical text, many of the *for* (forte) dynamic indications seem to have been retraced or written over an earlier reading, but the ink appears identical to that of the original entry and it is unclear whether the text was actually altered.

A4: D B, Mus. ms. Bach St 505

Five manuscript parts at least partly in the hand of J. H. Grave, with a page bearing cadenzas in the hand of J. H. Michel

The siglum **A4** refers to the five parts; Michel's copy of the cadenzas is described above as source **F2**. The parts are as follows:

⁸ In *Catalogo de' soli, duetti, trii, terzetti, quartetti e concerti . . . parte IVta* (Leipzig, 1763), facsimile in *The Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue*, edited by Barry S. Brook (New York: Dover Publications, 1966).

⁹ Further details on the provenance of the Berkeley manuscripts in the description of source **D5** for W. 5.

“Cembalo.”: 20 pages (page 1 = part title page, “Cembalo Concertato.”)

“Violino Primo.”, “Violino Secondo.”: each eight pages

“Viola.”, “Violoncello.”: each four pages.

A wrapper reads: “E moll | Concerto | per il | Cembalo Concertato | Violino Primo | Violino Secondo | Viola | et | Violoncello | di C. P. E. Bach. || Grave.” It is possible that the tonality “E moll” and the signature were added later, but they appear to be in the same hand. Each of the string parts bears the underlined title “Concerto” at the top left of the first page. Although the handwriting of the string parts matches that of other copies assigned to Grave, the keyboard appears to be in a different but similar hand (in particular, the form of the bass clef is different).

Johann Heinrich Grave (1750?–1810) is identified as “Herr Advocat Grave” of Greifswald in lists of subscribers for Bach's publications beginning with W. 57 of 1781. Two letters to him from Bach are known through copies by Zelter. The earlier letter, dated 28 April 1784, is addressed “Best Friend” (“Beßter Freund”) and seems unusually personal in tone.¹⁰ **A4** is one of fifteen manuscript copies of concertos at B D either written by Grave or bearing his signature. But although Grave might have obtained his copy of the cadenzas during the period of his known correspondence with Bach, the performing parts must have a different origin as they give the work in an early version, by then surely superseded in the composer's own material. Moreover, like Grave's copy of W. 5,¹¹ **A4** contains performance markings absent from other sources of this version.

These alternative performance markings are particularly numerous in the first violin part. Inconsistencies in the handwriting and form of the entries (e.g., “p.” alternates with “pia:” and “p:”) suggest that the signs were added at different times, not necessarily all by the same hand. Some signs correspond with later versions of the work, suggesting that the copy was edited to conform with a more up-to-date one. For example, in i.6–12, the violin 1 shows dynamic markings otherwise present only in the sources of the second intermediate and final versions. In the last movement, m. 2 of the ritornello appears to have been corrected in violin 1 to show two staccato strokes instead of a slur, the latter being perhaps Bach's original reading, found only in **A2**.

Often, however, the copyist appears to have supplied markings arbitrarily. Many ornament signs are absent from all other sources, and virtually all appoggiaturas are slurred to the following note, a notational practice not generally followed in other sources of W. 5 although it was presumably a normal performance practice. Other markings are stylistically improbable; an example is the mordent in the keyboard on the second note of i.41.¹² In other cases, markings have been added by false analogy to passages that the copyist imagined to be parallel. For example, violin 1 has “f” not only on the downbeat of i.91 but on the downbeats of i.90 and i.94 as well. Moreover, the “f p” of mm. 99, 101, and 103 has been extended back to m. 97.

¹⁰ Bach wrote to J. J. H. Westphal in similar terms in a letter of 25 September 1787, describing “3 Stück von meinen ehemaligen Paradeurs”; see Leisinger / Wollny 1997, 44fn. 63.

¹¹ See the description of source **A2** for W. 4.

¹² Bach, *Versuch*, i.2.5.14, notes the inappropriateness of the mordent for the second note of a “fallende Secunde”.

Sources: Intermediate Versions

B1: D B, Mus. ms. Bach P 709

Manuscript score in an unidentified hand, owned at one time by J. G. Mützel (35 × 24 cm)¹³

The score comprises 33 notated pages, all but the first written in three systems of six staves each. The first page employs three systems of four staves and one of six staves; before the first brace, the parts are labeled “Violino 1^{mo}”, “Violino 2^{do}”, “Viola”, and “Basso”. Beginning in system 4, the keyboard part (never so labeled) occupies staves 4 and 5. Both staves of the keyboard are normally blank in *tutti*, where figures appear in the basso part; this format is the same as in **D4**. Doublings of any sort are almost never written out and are instead indicated by *custodes*.

There is no separate title page, but a page bearing relatively recent librarian entries includes in its lower right corner the entry “Poss: | Mützel”, the signature of the composer Johann Gottfried Mützel (1728–88). The music itself contains no certain entries by Mützel, who is, known, however, to have made his own copies of other works by Bach.¹⁴ Mützel visited Bach at Berlin in 1751 during a journey that also included visits to Leipzig, Dresden, and Naumburg, all points of contact with members of the Bach circle. It is possible that during this period Mützel obtained texts for some of Bach's works directly from the composer. The two composers subsequently corresponded for twenty years.¹⁵ Yet although **B1** is clearly written and appears to be accurate, and its format is that of Bach's surviving autographs, it contains no direct indication that it was copied under the composer's supervision.

B2: D B, Mus. ms. Bach St 208

Five manuscript parts by an unidentified copyist, with titles by a second hand

The parts are as follows:

- “Cembalo”: 20 pages, the first unruled and serving as title page. Upper staff in treble clef
- “Violino primo”, “Violino secundo [sic]”: each 8 pages, the first and last unruled, the first bearing part titles “Violino Primo” and “Violino Secundo”, respectively
- “Viola”, “Basso.”: each 4 pages

The title page, in the same hand as the part titles, reads: “Concerto (I. No: 9) 7^b / Cembalo Concertato / Violino Primo / Violino Secondo / Viola et / Basso / dell Sig. C. Ph. Em. Bach”. A three-measure incipit in a third hand follows. In all five parts the title “Concerto” appears at the upper left of the first page of music.

The parenthesized numerical entry on the title page corresponds with entries found on copies

¹³ Dimensions from Kast^{II}.

¹⁴ Kast lists in addition parts in D B Mus. ms. Bach St 210 (W. 12), St 218 (W. 8), and St 514 (W. 19), and possibly also one part each from St 194 (W. 43/6) and St 501 (W. 34). Mützel also copied a number of Bach's keyboard sonatas now in D B Mus. ms. Bach P 367 (W. 62/6, 8, 10 and 65/9, 10, 16).

¹⁵ On Mützel's relationship to Bach, see Robert Gordon Campbell, “Johann Gottfried Mützel, 1728–1788” (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1966), 23–7.

from the Voss collection, listed in a manuscript catalog of works belonging to the “Herrn Freiherrn von Voss” (D B Mus. ms. theor. Kat. 21). Several copies from the collection, although not **B2**, bear the signature “O v Voss.” Otto Karl Friedrich von Voss (1755–1823) inherited the works from his father Hieronymus and passed them on to his son Karl Otto Friedrich (1786–1864), who in 1851 gave them to what was then the Royal Library in Berlin.¹⁶ The hands found in **B2** recur in other copies from the collection.¹⁷

The first violin part was copied into the upper staff of the keyboard part only in the opening ritornello of the first movement; thereafter the bass is figured, at first sporadically, then fully (but inaccurately) beginning with the final ritornello of the first movement. In addition, the keyboard part includes numerous ornament signs and slurs absent from other sources; like the alternate sets of performance markings found in sources for other works, these are in the style of C. P. E. Bach but cannot be traced to him.¹⁸ The inaccuracy of this source, which includes frequent wrong notes and sometimes omits inner voices of the keyboard part, may be due in part to the difficulty of reading Bach's material (see below) but must also reflect carelessness in copying, if not by the writer of **B2** then by that of a lost parent. The presence of uncorrected gross errors alongside detailed ornament signs implies that the latter were present in the copyist's exemplar, but their provenance cannot be determined and they have not been included in the edition.

C1: CH GPu Ms. mus. 323

Manuscript score in an unidentified hand

The score comprises 48 notated, foliated pages in oblong format, each ruled in two systems of six staves; the parts are labeled “Violini” (between the top two staves), “Viola”, “Cembalo” (between staves 4 and 5), and “Basso.” Following a practice seen in early score copies of other works (such D B AmB 99, a copy of W. 5 by Bach's Berlin copyist Schlichting), the keyboard part is blank in the tutti passages, where continuo figures appear over the basso part.

The sole title is the word “Concerto” at the top left of the first page. A wrapper bears, in handwriting distinct from that of the music, the title “N^o 7. | Concerto | a stromenti | di C. F. E. Bach.”¹⁹ Added beneath in a different hand is “Schicht.”, evidently the signature of the Leipzig Thomaskantor Johann Gottlieb Schicht (1753–1823).²⁰ More recent additions include the number 195 within a rectangle in the center. On the reverse of this is a descriptive entry in the hand of

¹⁶ NBA I/21, KB, 55.

¹⁷ Wade, 20, lists seventeen works from the collection attributed to Bach (one is the doubtful W. n.v. 67). The main copyist of **B2** is Wade's “C,” that of the incipit her “E.”

¹⁸ See the discussions of alternate performance markings for W. 4, 5, and 6.

¹⁹ The source was seen only in a photocopy, from which the physical structure of the manuscript is not entirely clear.

²⁰ The handwriting of the name (always given alone, without forename or initials) varies but is generally similar to the present one; compared here were copies of the concertos W. 6 (B Bc 27140 MSM (1)) and W. n.v. 33 (D B, Mus. ms. Bach P 926) as well as BWV 591 (P 1107), 923 and 951 (P 1094), 1020 (P 1059), and 1079 (P 666).

Erich Prieger (1849–1913) and bearing his initials “E. P.” Presumably, then, **C1** was acquired as part of lot 195 of the auction of Prieger's estate in 1924.²¹

C2: US Wc, M1010.AsB133W24(case)

Six manuscript parts by two unidentified copyists

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo Concertato.”: 20 pages (page 1 = title page; last page blank)

“Violino Primo.” “Violino Secondo”, “Viola”, “Basso. Rippieno”: : each 8 pages (first page = part title page; last page blank in viola and basso)

“Violono”: 4 pages (one bifolio).

The title page reads: “CONCERTO: E: ♭ minor | [incipit] | Cembalo concertato | 2 Violini | Viola | e Bass Rippieno | e Violono | Dell Sigre C. P. E. Bach”. The part title pages give the part label followed by the title “Concerto E minor”; the two lower parts are labeled “Viola di Braccio” and “Basso Violoncello” (the latter adding “del Sig^e. Bach.”).

C2 is one of a number of copies of individual Bach concertos at US Wc. Many, including **C2**, bear the stamped date “JUN 26 1907”, in this case on the last page of the keyboard part on the back of the wrapper, as well as entries of the form “105 729 | 08” here added at the bottom of the title page. Stamped in blue on the reverse of the latter is the number 203069. These manuscripts were reportedly purchased in 1908 from the Berlin firm of Leo Liepmannsohn, which had previously acquired them from Alfred Wotquenne (1867–1939).²²

The keyboard part is by a copyist who was also responsible for the keyboard part of W. 6 in the same collection. The strings are by a second otherwise unknown copyist. Unlike other copyists represented in the collection, neither writer of **C2** is known to have worked for Bach.²³ Nevertheless, like other copies at US Wc of similar provenance, **C2** is an inaccurate copy of a relatively late intermediate version. The writing of both copyists is florid but careless and inexpert, and corrections occur in several parts.²⁴ Some of the corrections, as well as some of the “tr” markings in the keyboard part, are in different ink or in a foreign hand. A French origin might be suggested by the frequent spelling of Bach's *tenuto* indication as *tenü* and by the indication *Fini* at the end of each of the string parts (always in the same hand, though with

²¹ The lot comprised nine concertos in score “von Joh. Gottfried Schicht” (W. 3, 8, 9, 11, 17, 20, 24, 28, and 34); *Musiksammlung aus dem Nachlasse Dr. Erich Prieger–Bonn nebst einigen Beiträgen aus anderem Besitz: III. Teil. . . . Beschreibendes Verzeichnis von Georg Kinsky* (Cologne: Lempertz, 1924), 21.

²² Elias N. Kulukundis, ed., *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: Harpsichord Concerto in D Major W. 27*, Collegium Musicum: Yale University, second series, vol. 2 (Madison: A-R Editions, 1970), page v. Further discussion of these manuscripts under source **B6** for W. 4.

²³ The copyist of the keyboard part, Wade's “FF,” evidently shared the copying of W. 6 with Anonymous 302. But although copies by the latter occur within manuscript collections that include autograph material, Anonymous 302 does not seem to have been responsible for any copies that themselves bear autograph entries.

²⁴ E.g., keyboard, i.99, large flat added on first note in foreign hand; violin 2, iii.329–35 (first staff on last page) erased and rewritten.

various degrees of embellishment).

C3: D B, Mus. ms. Bach St 504

Manuscript copy of the keyboard part of W. 24 in an unidentified hand

C3 is a single part comprising twenty-four pages, bound in covers. Page 1 is the title page for a complete set of parts; the last three pages are ruled but unused. There is no trace of the other parts, which are listed on the title page: “Concerto | per il | Clavicembalo Concertato | Violino Primo, | Violino Secondo, | Viola di B[raccio?] | e | Basso Continuo | del Sig. Carlo P. [sic] E. Bach”. Additions include the tonality “Ex E moll” inserted after the word “Concerto.” The first page of music repeats at top center: “Clavicembalo Concertato.”

The upper staff is blank in tutti passages, with continuo figures above the lower staff; each solo entry is labeled “Solo.” above the top staff. The writing is clear but frequently cramped; two measures were added in the bottom margin of the fourth page to avoid an inconvenient page turn.

Sources: Late Version

D1: D B, Mus. ms. Bach St 363

Five manuscript parts in three unidentified eighteenth-century hands

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo Concertato” by an unknown copyist: 27 notated pages, original (?) foliation.

Oblong format

“Violino Primo”, “Violino Secondo”, “Violetta”, and “Violoncello” by the copyist known as Anonymous 303, with at least one entry in an additional hand: each 8 pages

No title page or wrapper is extant. Each string part bears the title “Concerto” at the beginning of the first system; the keyboard part contains no original title.

Although Yoshitake Kobayashi has described **D1** as a Breitkopf sale copy,²⁵ unlike **A2** it lacks markings pointing to such a provenance, and at least portions were written by a known associate of Bach. Indeed, apart from the copy of the cadenzas described below as source **F2**, the string parts of **D1** are the only source for W. 24 that can be traced to one of the composer's copyists (further discussion below under “Evaluation of Sources”). The distinct handwriting and format of the keyboard part, however, must leave some question, pending direct examination of the paper, as to whether this part originated together with the string parts.

Although there are probably no autograph entries in **D1**, Anonymous 303, copyist of the string parts, was responsible for numerous Bach manuscripts, some of which bear autograph

²⁵ Table 1 in “On the Identification of Breitkopf's Manuscripts,” in *Bach Perspectives, Volume Two: J. S. Bach, the Breitkopfs, and Eighteenth-Century Musical Trade*, ed. George B. Stauffer (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996), 120.

entries.²⁶ Anonymous 303 does not appear to have copied any of Bach's works that were composed after 1764; hence he is most likely to have worked for Bach in Berlin, not Hamburg. However, many of his copies, including the string parts of **D1**, lack autograph entries and were not necessarily products of his association with the composer.

The handwriting of the keyboard part is similar to that of Anonymous 303. The copyists differ in the forms of clefs and in the form, placement, and wording of rubrics for page turns. For the latter the copyist of the keyboard part uses a wide variety of expressions: “Volti Cito” (page 1), “volti” (pages 3, 7, 17), “volti cito” (pages 5, 13, 19, 23), “volto.” [!] (page 9), “volti presto.” (page 21), and “volti subito” (page 25). A third hand has added the last measure of the first movement, on a short staff drawn freehand at the bottom center of page 11. The entry is notable for the tightly coiled form of the bass clef and the repetition of the key signature (one sharp) on the space beneath the staff as well as on the second line. These elements occur occasionally in Bach's autographs from the 1750s onwards, but the entry is too short to permit positive identification. Nor can it be determined who was responsible for the apparent correction of occasional dynamic indications and figured bass symbols. It is possible that some of these, as well as some of the ornament signs, are later entries. Turns, which occur most often as elements in the *prallender Doppelschlag*, are sometimes written in the modern horizontal form but more often in a vertical orientation (as in Bach's autographs from before 1750 or so). At least one sign, the *Triller von unten* at ii.25, might have been entered by Anonymous 303.²⁷ It cannot be ruled out that some other signs, including certain ornaments unique to this source, were also written by another hand.

The keyboard part follows the same conventions for rests and figures described above for **D1**.

D2: B Bc 5887 MSM (W. 24)

Five manuscript parts plus a separate title wrapper, all (probably) in one unidentified hand (34.5 × 21.5 cm). Watermark: (a) crowned letter “C”, (b) “CFB”²⁸

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo”: 5 bifolios = 20 numbered pages (the first = part title page, the last ruled but unused; heading on p. 2: “Cembalo Concertato”). Soprano clef

“Violino Primo”, “Viola Secondo”, “Viola”, “Violoncello”: each 2 bifolios (the last two pages of the viola and the last of the cello ruled but unused)

Original entries on the title page read: “Concerto. | à | Cembalo concertato | 2 Violini | Viola, | e | Basso | di C. F. E. Bach”. The last stroke in the last letter of the composer's name extends into a

²⁶ Copies by Anonymous 303 with autograph entries include a score of the keyboard sonata W. 65/18 (D B, Mus. ms. Bach P 775) and the viola part for the symphony W. 180 (St 239); additional parts by Anonymous 303 for the symphonies W. 176 (St 235) and 179 (St 236), as well as further parts for W. 180, although lacking obvious autograph entries, appear to have been prepared for the composer and now accompany other autograph parts and title wrappers.

²⁷ The three peaks in the ornament sign are very clear, as in a copy by Anonymous 303 of W. 65/15 in US Wc; the same sign is written much less distinctly at ii.54.

²⁸ Dimensions and watermark information from Leisinger / Wollny 1997, 341.

descending spiral containing six loops. Each part bears the title “Concerto” at the beginning of the first system.

D2 is described in a letter from Johanna Maria Bach (1724–95), the composer's widow, to Johann Jakob Heinrich Westphal (1756–1825), organist in Schwerin. Westphal was in the process of amassing what would become a nearly complete collection of the music of C. P. E. Bach, much of it in the form of manuscript copies obtained directly from the composer or his heirs. Most of this collection is now preserved at B Bc; a large number of the copies are in the hand of Bach's long-time Hamburg copyist Johann Heinrich Michel (1739–1810).²⁹ The letter, dated 13 Feb 1795, explains that this concerto, together with W. 5, had to be recopied in its entirety.³⁰ The reason must have been that Westphal had sent his existing copies of those works to the Bach household for correction, only to learn that his copies were of early versions too different from the late one to be updated.³¹ The present unidentified copyist was engaged probably because of the illness of one and the death of another of the copyists usually employed by Bach's heirs.³² Although the hand bears many resemblances to that of Michel, the copy is less accurate than most of the latter's.

Signs of haste in the preparation of the copy include the frequent use of shorthand for repeated notes, the indiscriminate grouping of eighths and smaller values through unbroken beams in place of the more careful beaming found in **D1**, and the careless substitution of one ornament sign for another in the keyboard part. The latter includes occasional corrections, probably made immediately while copying, as well as at least one erasure (iii.187) that suggests copying from an exemplar notated in treble clef. Omissions and crowding increase near the end of the keyboard part, suggesting growing haste. Nevertheless, **D2** supplies many slurs and other performance markings omitted in **D1**. It is also, with **D3**, one of only two sources to give the first violin line in i.53 and 55.

It is possible that some of the “ten” (*tenuto*) marks in the violin parts and the unison indications in the keyboard part are in a foreign hand. The same hand may also have been responsible for the indications “Solo” and “Tutti” in the basso (“Violoncello”) part.³³ The solo indications do not point out all of the solo entrances but only those in which the soloist plays

²⁹ Leisinger / Wollny 1997 is a catalog of the Bach holdings at B Bc; pages 25–74 provide a detailed account of J. J. H. Westphal and his collection. Michel's dates are established by Jürgen Neubacher, “Der Organist Johann Gottfried Rist (1741–1795) und der Bratchist Ludwig August Christoph Hopff (1715–1798): Zwei hamburger Notenkopisten Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs,” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 81 (2005): 121–2.

³⁰ “Die Concerte No. 5 u. 25 aber haben ganz müssen abgeschrieben werden.” Item no. 620 in *CPEB-Briefe* (p. 2: 1323).

³¹ W. 5 underwent more significant revision than W. 24, but evidently both had to be recopied. The copy of W. 5 at B Bc is in the same hand as that of W. 24, Wade's “Q,” as is that of W. 30.

³² As argued by Neubacher, “Der Organist Johann Gottfried Rist (1741–1795) und der Bratchist Ludwig August Christoph Hopff (1715–1798),” 110–11.

³³ These occur as follows. “Solo”: i.91, 175, 226; iii.191, 282, 297, 345. “Tutti”: i.117, 191, 232; iii.249, 291, 308, 385.

long stretches of *arpeggiando* passagework.

The keyboard part follows the conventions of other such parts from this collection: the upper staff is empty in ritornellos, except where a rest is needed to fill out a portion of the first or last measure of a solo episode; continuo figures are included throughout the “tutti” passages.

D3: DK Kmk, Ms. R 402

Five manuscript parts by two unidentified copyists

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo concertato.”: 20 pages, the first = title page

“Violino 1^{mo}”, “Violino 2^{do}”: each 8 pages

“Viola”: 6 notated pages, preceded by part title page (ruled, with part label).

“Violoncello [space] Basso”: 7 notated pages

The title page reads “Concerto, | per | il Cembalo concertato; | da | 2 Violini, | Viola | é | Basso. | Composto, | da: | C: F: E: Bach.” Each part bears the title “Concerto.” in the upper left of the first page of music.

D3 is one of three sets of parts for concertos of C. P. E. Bach in this library; R 401 contains W. 18, and R 403 contains W. 28. The three sets are the work of four copyists, each of whom employed a similar format. The copy of W. 18 is in a single hand, and the string parts of W. 24 and W. 28 are in a second hand. A third copyist wrote the keyboard part of W. 24 and a fourth that of W. 28. All parts appear to have been corrected, probably in a foreign hand. Many of the corrected readings coincide with those of **D2** and **D3** and therefore may be products of proofreading by a more experienced copyist, evidently against a reliable exemplar.

Although the copy was fairly accurate after correction, a number of errors were allowed to stand. For example, in the keyboard part, iii.262–3 (in which the bass line is identical to that of mm. 264–5) was originally omitted and has been indicated by repeat signs. Several errors suggest that the part was copied from an exemplar that used treble clef (as in **A1**, **B2**, and **E1**).³⁴ Measure iii.354 is missing entirely from the the lowest string part, which nevertheless contains solo and tutti indications as in **D2**.³⁵

Some of the corrections, as well as some of the original entries, probably represent arbitrary (if musically intelligent) editing. Among these are staccato strokes in violin 1 at i.192 and 196, by analogy with i.194; slurs over the first two notes of violin 2 at ii.18 and of violin 1 at ii.20; trills added on notes 3 and 5 of iii.153 and 161; and *c b''* at iii.320. In addition, both copyists tended to add slurs to triplets and other groups of small note values beamed together, as well as cautionary accidentals, especially naturals. The figures include some signs possibly meant to supplement the composer's own indications, e.g., the figure 5 on the downbeat of i.30 and parallel passages, perhaps meant to clarify that *unisono* playing (octave doubling of the bass line) does not begin until the following note.

³⁴ The error of *g b''* for *b b''* at i.163 was corrected in a foreign hand; *b''* for *d''* in iii.378 went uncorrected.

³⁵ These are the same as in **D2** except for the omission of *solo* and *tutti* at i.91 and 117, respectively.

D4: D B Amalienbibliothek ms. 94

Manuscript score in an unidentified hand (35.5 × 21.5 cm)³⁶

The bound score comprises 50 pages, the first blank, the remainder written in three systems of six staves each. The staves are labeled “Violino Primo”, “Violino Secondo”, “Viola”, “Violoncello”, and “Cembalo”, in that order. This format, with the keyboard at the bottom, is uncharacteristic of Bach's extant autograph scores but resembles that of D B Mus. ms. Bach P 239/1 an, a copy of W. 1 in a similar hand.³⁷ There is no title page; on the cover is a label in a foreign hand reading “Concerto | Per il Cembalo | Del S.^{grc} C F E. | Bach.” It has been proposed that the handwriting is that of Johann Philipp Kirnberger (1721–83), who served as librarian to Princess Anna Amalia of Prussia, to whom many of his own manuscripts passed after his death.³⁸ The collection passed to the Joachimsthal Gymnasium upon her death in 1787 and was incorporated into the Royal Library in 1914.

The upper staff of the keyboard part is blank in most tutti passages, in which the lower staff is figured. Ornament signs appear in the string parts where other sources have “t” or “tr”. Although unison doublings between the violin parts are usually indicated only by a custos in the second violin staff, both the string bass and the bass of the keyboard part are written out in full in most of the ritornellos; this, together with the writing out of the final ritornellos in the outer movements, suggests that the score was intended for practical use by a keyboard player.

The continuo figures for the first movement include numerous unique readings of doubtful origin, including ties over the barlines to indicate suspensions,³⁹ and figures appear in brief tutti passages that are left unfigured in other sources. Much of the figuration is clearly the work of the copyist; some signs were squeezed between or written over previously entered figures, and there are inconsistencies between the opening and closing ritornellos of the first movement.

Other signs of editing occur as well. At i.134 (right hand, note 4) is a natural sign that does not occur in any other source and appears to have been a later insertion here. Although the variant is plausible, the reading of the other sources is entirely characteristic of Bach's works of the 1740s, despite what today seems the unusual use of the raised sixth degree in the minor mode. An emendation of this sort suggests the intervention of Kirnberger or another editor, either as copyist or as preparer of the exemplar for the present copy (the source shows no unequivocal signs of a second hand).⁴⁰ Kirnberger was for a short time a colleague of Bach's in the Berlin

³⁶ Dimensions from Kast^{II}.

³⁷ P 239 includes a “Fundamento” part above the keyboard and beneath the lowest string part, called “Basso”; figures appear mostly in the latter part.

³⁸ None of the scores is listed as part of her own estate; see Eva Renate Blechschmidt, *Die Amalien-Bibliothek*, Berliner Studien zur Musikwissenschaft, 8 (Berlin: Merseburger, 1965), 25. Kast^{II} identifies the hand as “Kirnberger?”

³⁹ At i.7–12 and parallel passages.

⁴⁰ Other texts preserved in the Amalienbibliothek also show signs of editing. See, for example, the discussion of AmA14 (source for W. 65/20) in *CPEBE I/18*: 133.

Hofcapelle during 1752–3, and the two later corresponded.⁴¹ But there is no evidence that Bach had anything to do with the preparation of the present item.

Sources: The Printed Edition of Longman, Lukey

E1 *A Second Sett of | Three | Concertos | for the | Organ or Harpsicord | with Instrumental parts | Composed by | Bach of Berlin. | pr. 7/6 | London. Printed & Sold by Longman, Lukey & Co. No. 26 Cheapside*

Engraved print of W. 18, 34, and 24 in five part books

Seen here were the two exemplars listed in RISM: one in S Skma, the other in GB Lbl. The latter comprises the keyboard part alone. Both appear to have been printed from the same plates. The work must have been published during the period 1769–75 while James Longman was in partnership with Charles Lukey.⁴²

As with other English prints of Bach's music, there is no evidence that the publication was authorized by the composer.⁴³ The title's designation of the solo instrument as either organ or harpsichord probably reflects English tradition, going back to Handel's Opus 4 concertos (published by Walsh of London in 1738); only W. 34 is otherwise known as an organ concerto. The string parts are designated “VIOLINO PRIMO”, “VIOLINO SECONDO”, “VIOLA”, and “VIOLONCELLO”. Within the parts the three works are designated “CONCERTO I”, “CONCERTO II”, and “CONCERTO III”. Each is given in a shortened version that is otherwise unknown and of doubtful origin (discussed below). The keyboard part is unfigured and incorporates a doubling of violin 1 in the upper staff in “Tutti” passages (so labeled, alternating with “Solo” passages).

Sources of the Cadenzas

F1: B Bc 5871 MSM

Seventy-five cadenzas and other short passages, mostly for insertion into keyboard concertos by C. P. E. Bach, mostly copied by J. H. Michel. Dimensions: 32.5 × 20.5 cm. Watermarks: crowned double C and monogram “SICKTE”; crowned C and Lower Saxon steed in

⁴¹ The dates for Kirnberger's service in the *Capelle* are based on the assumption that he is the “Kirrenberg” named in the *Capelletat* or summary of salary payments for a portion of the fiscal year 1752–3 (Berlin-Dahlem, Geheimes Staatsarchiv, I. HA Rep. 36 Nr. 2452).

⁴² See the article “Longman & Broderip” by Peter Ward Jones, Peter Williams, and Charles Mould in *Grove Music Online* <www.grovemusic.com>, accessed April 3, 2007. Dates given by Wade (1771–75) and Helm (c. 1760) appear to be products of misunderstandings.

⁴³ See the discussions of sources **E 1** of W. 63 and **E** of W. 53 in CPEBCW I/3: 162 and 176. The latter was also issued by Longman & Lukey, who lost a precedent-setting copyright case brought against them by the composer's younger half-brother Johann Christian Bach; see Anne van Allen-Russell, “‘For Instruments Not Intended’: The Second J. C. Bach Lawsuit,” *Music and Letters* 83 (2002): 3–28.

meadow⁴⁴

This collection (listed as W. 120) comprises 57 cadenzas and “fermatas” for Bach's keyboard concertos, as well as one fermata for a sonatina and fifteen additional cadenzas, a fermata, and an “Einfall” for unspecified works.⁴⁵ The four items in **F1** for the present concerto are as follows:

no.	page	title
4	3	<i>Cadenz. zum Adag. des Conc: aus dem E moll. N^o. 25.</i>
6	4	<i>Cadenz zum adag: des Conc: aus dem E moll. N^o. 25.</i>
14	7	<i>Cadenz, zum Adagio des Conc. aus dem E. moll. N^o. 25.</i>
17	8	<i>Cadenz zum Adagio des Conc. aus dem E moll. N^o. 25.</i>

Despite small differences in the form of the title, as well as the omission of clefs in nos. 6 and 14, there are no significant distinctions in handwriting (the two vertical lines that Michel normally draws to the left of his C clef appear at the beginning of no. 6, but he did not complete the clef).

Strictly speaking, no. 17 is more than a cadenza, as it includes as well an embellished or varied reading for the first beat of m. 84 (over bass F \sharp , notated here as a half note). With the exception of no. 46 (for W. 23/ii), every other cadenza in the collection begins over the dominant, notated with or without a fermata. Number 17 is also unusual in its use of treble clef. The latter occurs elsewhere only in cadenza no. 1 (for W. 45/1), in no. 31 (for W. 29/2), and in nos. 72–5 on the last page, and in the four entries that follow no. 17: nos. 18–19 (both for W. 26/2), 20 (W. 29/2), and the “Einfall” no. 20 (for an unidentified work in B \flat).⁴⁶ It is possible that the entries notated in treble clef were composed at a later date than the others. But in any case, the choice of clef does not reflect differences in range or tessitura; all four cadenzas for W. 24 ascend to e''', the highest note used in the body of the concerto (at i.111), whereas f''' occurs in cadenzas notated in soprano clef (e.g., nos. 3 and 4, both for W. 17/ii).

F2: D B, Mus. ms. Bach St 505 (cadenzas)

One manuscript page bearing cadenzas in the hand of J. H. Michel

The siglum **F2** refers only to Michel's copy of the four cadenzas for the second movement; the five parts are described above as source **A4**. The cadenzas appear on a page headed “*Cad. zum Largo.*”; actually this heading applies only to the first cadenza, as each of the three following ones

⁴⁴ Dimensions and watermarks from Leisinger / Wollny 1997, 305. The “Sickte” watermark is similar to a type that Enßlin, 681–2 reports in many of Michel's copies, dating them from the end of the eighteenth to the beginning of the nineteenth centuries.

⁴⁵ Further discussion in CPEBCW III/9.2. Complete inventory in Leisinger / Wollny, 302–5; discussion and list of contents in Philip Whitmore, *Unpremeditated Art: The Cadenza in the Classical Keyboard Concerto* (Oxford, 1991), 84–93. Facsimile of the complete source with introduction by E. Eugene Helm as *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: 75 Cadenzas (H. 264/W. 120)* (Utrecht: STIMU, 1997). A modern copy of **F1** in D B Mus. ms. Bach P 800 was not consulted for this edition (description as source **E2** of W. 5).

⁴⁶ But not in no. 16 (for W. 12/2), as erroneously reported in Leisinger / Wollny, 303.

bears the heading “oder:” (or). Apart from the headings, **F2** constitutes a nearly exact copy of the cadenzas in **F1**, in the same order, but giving the last cadenza (no. 17) in soprano rather than treble clef. An apparent correction suggests that this cadenza was copied from a model that employs treble clef (as does **F1**).⁴⁷

Michel was also responsible for Grave's copies of cadenzas for the concertos W. 5 and W. 25. Unlike **F2**, both of the latter copies include cadenzas absent from **F1** and otherwise unknown. Nevertheless, as with W. 5, Grave is likely to have obtained only the cadenzas directly from Bach (see above on **A4**).

Sources: Evaluation

Although NV 1790 gives the single date of 1748 for the composition of W. 24, the sources provide evidence for at least three stages of revision. The character of each stage of revision and the groups of sources documenting it are summarized in the following table (measure numbers are those of the late version).⁴⁸

Version	Sources	Revisions incorporated in this version
1	A1–4	none (earliest known state)
2	B1–2	occasional revision of string parts (as at i.1, iii.319) occasional variation of keyboard part (as at i.203–4) addition of performance indications (e.g., “ten.” in i.i) revision of continuo figures
3	C1–3	more extensive revision of lower string parts (as at i.6) occasional variation of violin parts (as at i.19, ii.4) extensive variation of solo part addition of inner voices in solo part (as at i.42) added performance markings in solo part, including further revision of continuo figures
4	D1–4	shortening of last two movements by removal of measures after ii.13, iii.231 rescoring of solo episodes to introduce dialog between strings and keyboard (as

⁴⁷ In the last group of triplet thirty-seconds, a superfluous notehead on f' appears to have been written first, then replaced by the note a' a third higher.

⁴⁸ No systematic study of revisions in W. 24 has been previously published. Rachel Wade, in a “Communication” published in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 30 (1977): 163, divided the texts of ten manuscript sources between three versions but did not provide detailed descriptions of the latter. Sources for her version A in fact preserve at least two distinct early versions (1 and 2 as listed here); her version B is the late version (version 4), and her version C is the intermediate version 3. Wade's version D is that of the print **E1**, which she describes as “a clumsy abridgement.” Helm, in his entry no. 428, repeats Wade's information yet also describes the Berkeley source **A3** as “apparently from an earlier a[lternate] v[ersion].” The latter view, offered by Charles H. Buck, “Revisions in Early Clavier Concertos of C. P. E. Bach: Revelations From a New Source,” *JAMS* 29 (1976): 129, is refuted in Wade's “Communication.”

at i.78ff., i.196ff., and iii.53ff.)⁴⁹
 further revisions of lower string parts (as in ii.1)
 further variation of the keyboard part (as in iii.315)
 minor revision of continuo figures

The print **E1** preserves what appears to be an abbreviation of the early version, unauthorized by the composer but possibly incorporating some readings from an otherwise unattested early state of the text.

The above grouping of the manuscript sources is clear despite puzzling variants for the intermediate stages of the work. It is difficult to assign many of these individual variants to a particular stage of revision, as explained below, and therefore it would be misleading to make rigid distinctions between different intermediate versions of the work. For this reason, the successive versions will be referred to as “early,” “intermediate,” and “late,” rather than through numerical designations such as “version 3” that would imply a more distinct series of compositional stages.

Nevertheless, it is clear from autograph manuscripts of other works that added performance markings and embellished melodic lines generally represent later readings. The late version almost invariably contains the most elaborate version of the solo part as well as the most complete indication of performance markings in all parts. By contrast, the earliest version contains the simplest readings.

Except in the trivial case of **F2** (the sheet of cadenzas inserted into **A4**), which was probably copied from **F1**, the sources are independent of one another. As in other works preserved only in independent copies, many discrepancies and anomalies occur between the sources of a single version.⁵⁰ Although many such variants can surely be traced to errors and to arbitrary alterations by copyists, others must reflect uncertainties encountered in reading from the composer's material, which might have comprised one or more autograph scores as well as one or more sets of performing parts. For instance, variants in the early version at ii.73 suggest that the notation of this passage was already imperfectly legible when Bach first offered the work to copyists. This measure is part of a solo episode (ii.69–81 in the early version) that underwent multiple revisions; garbled readings in sources of all but the last version suggest that Bach's material became increasingly difficult to read. The fact that the sources for the late version agree closely, giving a distinct reading for the entire passage, is one of many indications that at some point Bach wrote, or had copied, a new master score or parts.

This conclusion is further supported by numerous instances in which sources for the intermediate versions mix early and late readings, sometimes even superimposing them. For example, at i.73, **C2** gives the early reading for the viola together with revised readings of the keyboard and basso, resulting in parallel octaves. Mixing of early and late versions occurs at

⁴⁹ But at one point, iii.73, Bach changed a brief *forte* entry by the tutti (i.e., a dialoguing entry) to a *piano* entrance by the three upper string parts (i.e., reducing this to an accompaniment).

⁵⁰ See, e.g., the descriptions of sources for W. 4, 5, and 6.

several points within the solo part of **B2**.⁵¹ Similar readings in **C2** and **C3** give the impression of reproducing the literal appearance of the composer's material, in which Bach evidently wrote revised readings directly over earlier ones.⁵² Copyists evidently reproduced what was in their exemplars, in some cases believing that early and late readings belonged to separate voices of a single text (as in **C3** at ii.52, early version).

Two passages in the final movement present a particularly confusing picture (see table below; measure numbers are those of the late version).

Measure	Sources giving early version for this measure
174	A1–2, A4, C2, E
175–86	A1–2, A4, E1 (m. 175)*
187–8	A1–2, A4, B1–2, C1–3
189–90	A1–2, A4, B1
191–5	A1–2, A4, B1, C1–3 (but not B2)
314–16 (l.h.)	A1–2, A4, B1
315 (r.h.)	A1–2, A4, B1–2, C2–3
317–20	A1–2, A4, B2, C1–3 (but not kb of B1)
321–22	A1–2, B1, A4 (but not C1)

***C1** gives an intermediate version for m. 182, otherwise the late version.

The patchwork nature of the transmission of the late readings for these passages suggests that Bach might have entered his revisions in two- or three-measure segments in the margins or other free areas of his score or keyboard part, or possibly on separate slips of paper. Each copyist might have overlooked a more or less random group of revisions.⁵³

An additional factor appears to have been the inconsistent copying of revisions from a master score into a set of parts, or vice versa. Perhaps some revisions were entered initially in a score, others into parts, without fully reconciling the two. Bach himself might have been responsible for oversights of this sort, but copyists responsible for maintaining master or “house” copies (as in a scriptorium such as Breitkopf's) might also have made such errors. This might have been particularly likely to occur when copyists worked from lists of varied readings such as apparently circulated for certain works.⁵⁴ Some such scenario might explain why the revision of i.252 is

⁵¹ E.g., at iii.57–8 (for description, see Commentary for the intermediate versions). That this was no stray error is evident from the recurrence of the reading a third higher in the parallel passage iii.71–2.

⁵² See entries in the list of readings for the intermediate version at ii.22–3, 36–8, 51–6, etc., where early and late readings are superimposed (measure numbers are those for the early version). **C2**, seen in person, contains no sign that the notes belonging to the later version were later entries. **C3** was examined only in microfilm but also shows no obvious signs of having been retouched.

⁵³ It cannot be a coincidence that **C1** also omits a single measure (early version, iii.325) from the violin part of one of these passages; **C1** is a score, yet the first violin fails to accord with the keyboard part for four measures.

⁵⁴ See, for example, the sheet of varied readings for W. 4 (source **D1** for that work; the sheet was previously considered autograph).

already present (albeit inaccurately) in **B2**, a set of parts, yet it is absent from the score **B1**. The situation is reversed two measures later, at i.254. By the same token, the parts **B2** give the revised reading of the viola at i.21–2 but not when the passage is repeated in the final ritornello of the movement at i.260–1; the latter is part of a passage indicated by a “Dal Segno” marking in the two scores **B1** and **C1**, and the need to copy the revision of the passage into the parts at this point would have been easily overlooked.

Since the sources of the late version lack most such errors, they must derive from a newly prepared score or parts. But, as the occasionally divergent readings of **D1–3** show, Bach may have continued to make small changes from time to time. In addition, some new errors crept in, probably as copying errors.⁵⁵ Occasional errors involving continuo figures might have arisen when the latter were altered in parts without consulting a score, as at ii.14.⁵⁶ Further errors in performance markings involve inconsistencies between parts moving in unison. For example, at i.44 a *tenuto* mark is absent from violin 1 in all extant sources (including the score **D4**) yet is present in a number of separate performing parts for violin 2 (in **C2** and **D1–3**). Evidently this *tenuto* indication was never present in Bach's score. Such discrepancies involving readings of individual parts that move in unison suggest that Bach's revised master copy was a set of parts; it is possible that a fair-copy score for the late version never existed. If so, however, the provenance of the score **D4** is unclear; it shows no signs of having been collated from separate parts, yet it gives a generally accurate text.

Some peculiarities of the musical text, although not exactly errors, suggest that, as in earlier concertos, Bach might have originally conceived the solo part of W. 24 as incorporating doublings of the first violin. These doublings probably did not extend to the ritornellos, as they apparently did in his first Berlin concertos.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, the solo part breaks off awkwardly at i.124 and i.235 (early version), during dialogs with the strings—in the latter instance without resolving a dissonant appoggiatura. Such passages suggest that Bach continued to conceive the solo episodes as comprising essentially a single melodic line that could be divided between soloist and first violin.

Individual sources: Early version

As with the late version, no source of the early version clearly stands above the others in terms of either documented proximity to the composer or apparent accuracy of readings. **A1** is designated principal source, inasmuch as other copies from the same Thulemeier collection have proved to give accurate texts for early versions and could have originated close to the composer.⁵⁸ But **A1** is not particularly accurate, especially with respect to performance markings, and therefore its

⁵⁵ See list of variants for the late version at i.179 (rh); ii.42 (bs); iii.143.

⁵⁶ Here all sources of the late version have 6/4 on note 5, which clashes with the viola.

⁵⁷ See the discussion in the evaluation of sources for W. 4, 5, and 6.

⁵⁸ Schwinger, 409, includes **A1** among the copies of eleven concertos traced to the estate of Nichelmann, Bach's fellow court keyboard player, and reports autograph entries in one of these copies, that of the double concerto W. 46 (D B, Thulemeier M.16).

readings must be supplemented from elsewhere. **A2**, a Breitkopf sale copy, was probably not derived directly from the composer's material, for reasons explained in the description of the source. Yet it appears to be more accurate than other manuscripts of similar provenance and therefore is used as a secondary source. Neither **A1** nor **A2** appears to incorporate arbitrary additions, apart from the slurs on triplets and the aborted keyboard doubling of the violins in **A1**.

By contrast, **A4**, Grave's copy of the early version, incorporates alternate performance markings, making it of more dubious reliability.⁵⁹ Some of the alternate performance markings in **A4** may be due to contamination from copies of later versions. Others may be arbitrary additions by the copyist or a later annotator. Because of the presence of such questionable variants, other unique readings of **A4** cannot be accepted. The two extant parts of the fragmentary **A3** (viola and cello) represent the early version but otherwise present few clues as to their provenance.

A2 may give a slightly earlier state of the text than the other sources of the early version, incorporating a few readings otherwise found only in the print **E**.⁶⁰ Several passages omitted in the print also appear in **A2** in unique readings that might stem from an otherwise unattested authentic early state of the work.⁶¹ But these are excluded from the edition due to their uncertain status, as are a few performance indications for the last movement that may also reflect an early version.⁶²

Sources of the intermediate versions

The five sources discussed below provide readings that clearly belong to intermediate versions of the text. Although none is sufficiently authoritative to serve as the basis for a reliable edition, they provide valuable evidence not only about Bach's process of revising his works of the late 1740s, but also about the transmission of these works over a period of probably several decades.

The score **B1** is similar in format to Bach's autograph scores of the 1740s, suggesting that it could be a direct copy of the autograph. Yet it gives many independent readings for the continuo figures, which in certain respects are not typical of Bach's own figuring; for example, **B1** uses ties between figures to indicate suspensions over the barline.⁶³ Figures occasionally disregard the viola part, leading occasionally to clashes of harmony.⁶⁴ In addition, **B1** (together with **D4** and sometimes other sources) gives continuo figures in many brief tutti passages where other sources

⁵⁹ For alternate performance markings in the early version of another work, also owned by Grave, see the description of source **A2** for W. 4. An alternate tradition of performance markings for W. 6 transmitted in no fewer than six sources also gives early readings. The source of these alternate traditions has yet to be determined; because of their use of ornament signs described in *Versuch I*, they would appear to date from no earlier than the latter's first publication in 1753.

⁶⁰ At i.167–8 and ii.46; see list of readings for the early version.

⁶¹ At i.247; ii.57 and 58; and iii.227–8 (see readings for early version).

⁶² These markings affect the articulation of iii.2 (and parallel passages) and the dynamics in iii.297–303; see commentary (early version).

⁶³ This occurs in iii.2–3 and parallel passages. The same notation occurs in **D4**, but at different points.

⁶⁴ E.g., at iii.29, where the figures on notes 2 and 3 read #, 7.

omit them; those sources that do give continuo figures in these passages frequently disagree on them, suggesting that the figures are inventions of the copyists. Apart from the continuo figures, **B1** gives few readings that are not confirmed by other sources. Although its owner Mützel knew Bach, its provenance remains unknown, and the unlikely continuo figures suggest that its text underwent arbitrary emendation.

B2, a set of parts, is the source closest to those of **B1**. It represents a somewhat later state of the work but also serious errors or misunderstandings by copyists. Voss, owner of **B2**, might have known Bach during the composer's Berlin years. But the unusually faulty nature of **B2** points against its having been obtained from the composer. All parts show numerous omissions, misplacements, and arbitrary additions of performance markings, as well as more serious errors, such as the faulty substitution of rests for iii.30–9 in the viola.⁶⁵ These show that **B2** is independent of other sources, but because of its unreliability its readings cannot be accepted as authentic except when corroborated elsewhere.

Similar conclusions apply to the score **C1** and the parts **C2**, although both transmit somewhat later readings on the whole. The format of **C1**, which is ruled uniformly in systems of six staves, is distinct from that of **B1**; this, together with the later date of its one known owner (Schicht), suggests a greater distance from the original autograph. At least one copying error raises the possibility that **C1** derives from a set of parts.⁶⁶ Whether or not that is the case, the simultaneous presence of early and late readings in different parts sometimes results in contrapuntal solecisms and points to derivation from imperfectly revised material. The recurrence of many of the same readings in **C2** implies a close relationship between the two sources, although they are independent of one another.

C3 shares some of the same readings as those common to **C1** and **C2**, but in general it represents a further state of revision. As in **B2**, the faulty text given in **C3** for some passages that underwent revision may reflect the decreased legibility of the composer's material by the time these additional revisions had been made.⁶⁷ Unfortunately, the preservation of the keyboard part alone deprives us of the text for the string parts at this stage of the work's revision.

Individual sources: Late version

Although Westphal's Brussels copies frequently serve as reliable principal sources for Bach's works, **D2** was made after the composer's death by an unidentified writer; it contains numerous small errors and is of no certain authority. **D1**, on the other hand, includes among its copyists one known to have worked for Bach; although it has been characterized as a Breitkopf sale copy (see above), its text is unrelated to that of **A2**, which is more clearly traceable to Breitkopf. **D3** at first appears to be a peripheral source of no particular authority, and indeed its copyists have yet to be identified. Moreover, it shows signs of arbitrary editing, at least insofar as slurs and continuo figures are concerned. Yet it gives some readings otherwise found only in **D2**, from which it is

⁶⁵ See also the entries in the list of readings (intermediate version) for i.199–202, 244, 254; ii.6; iii.57–8 and 71–2, 74–83, etc., for confluents of early and late readings.

⁶⁶ See readings for i.321 (intermediate version).

⁶⁷ See especially the entries in the list of readings (intermediate version) for ii.22–3, 36–8, 45, 47–9, 51–6.

nevertheless independent. Stylistically there is no reason to question the entries for violin 1 that only **D2** and **D3** give in i.53–5; in fact, only **D3** gives a correct reading here.⁶⁸ **D3** also differs from **D2** at ii.85, where it joins only **D4** in giving e in the inner voice of the solo part.⁶⁹

In the absence of evidence either affirming or contradicting the authority of any of these copies, the edition follows **D1** as the principal source for the late version. But **D2** and **D3** serve as secondary sources, providing readings where **D1** is clearly erroneous and at i.53–5 and a very few other places where **D2** and **D3** apparently transmit late revisions that were overlooked by or unavailable to the copyists of **D1**. **D4** has also been consulted, but because its text shows clearer signs of arbitrary editing (see above) it cannot serve as either a principal or a secondary source.

The greatest number of errors in **D1** occur in the string parts, despite the fact that their copyist Anonymous 303 is known to have worked for Bach. The keyboard part appears to be generally accurate and is the sole source for a number of ornament signs and *tenuto* indications. The latter correspond to *tenuto* indications in parallel passages in the string parts. The unique ornament signs in this source might be questioned, but with the exception of the sign in ii.25 (possibly added by Anonymous 303, as explained above), the keyboard part of **D1** does not show entries clearly by a foreign hand. All of the readings unique to this source are stylistically plausible and therefore have been retained in the edition.⁷⁰

Because of the large number of small variants in readings of performance markings (ornaments, slurs, continuo figures, and dynamics), none of which carries the authority of autograph entries, the commentary includes unusually detailed listings of variants in order to document the editorial decisions that have had to be made in order to achieve a text whose internal consistency is similar to that of similar works by the composer from the same period.

Bach evidently did not incorporate any of the work's four known cadenzas into the main text of the late version, as he apparently did for W. 6.⁷¹ For this reason the cadenzas are given separately in the list of variants; although not, strictly speaking, variant readings, they are most conveniently presented in this manner.

The print

Although akin to the early version, the text of **E1** lacks 82 of the 271 measures, or 30%, of the first movement; 35 of the 95 measures, or 37%, of the second movement (early version); and no fewer than 214 of the 413 measures, or 52%, of the last movement (early version). Hence the total length of the work is only 68% of that edited here as the early version. The missing measures are as follows: i.13–20, 52–9, 89–90, 93–4, 97–102, 105–12, 151–61, 180–8, 216–25, 246–55,

⁶⁸ **D2** omits the slur in m. 53 and in m. 55 gives e' in place of f#' for note 4, a palpable error.

⁶⁹ The note e is necessary to resolve the seventh f in the previous measure; Bach could not have intended the note to be omitted.

⁷⁰ Ornaments unique to **D1** occur at i.44, 219, 245, and 247; ii.48 and 49; and iii.152, 156, 160, 186, 241, 242, 247, 360, and 373.

⁷¹ The one extant cadenza for W. 6 was copied into the Brussels manuscript that was prepared for Westphal, the sole source of the late version (source **G1** for W. 6).

258–64; ii.8–13, 15, 17–9, 36–8, 50–4, 56–9, 64–7, 81–4, 88, 89–92; iii.30–9, 73–106, 125–41, 176–230, 233–39, 244–6, 261–80, 297–332, 345, 347, 349, 351, 354–5, 358, 366–72, and 384–401. In addition, seventeen measures differ substantially: i.104, 113, 189–90; ii.14, 35, 55; iii.240–3, 247, 260, 296, 359, 373, and 402. Among the missing measures is a passage containing solo figuration composed over the “B-A-C-H” bass line, which appears frequently in Bach's works.⁷²

In several cases the apparent omission of material leads to awkward transitions, as when the solo passagework skips from i.92 to i.95. Yet in only one instance is the version of **E1** palpably defective. This occurs in the first movement, where mm. 179–90 are truncated to a three-measure passage modulating between the remote keys of F major and B minor (ex. 1). Both exemplars of **E1** show corrections in all three remaining measures in the keyboard part, but neither reading before or after correction is tenable. Corrections are visible elsewhere as well and appear to have been made in the plates before printing.

The image shows a musical score for measures 179-90. The score is arranged in five systems, each with a different instrument part. The first system is Violin 1, the second is Violin 2, the third is Viola, the fourth is Cembalo concertato (with two staves), and the fifth is Bassi. The music is in 2/4 time and F major. The Cembalo concertato part features a complex, rhythmic solo passage in the right hand, while the other instruments provide harmonic support. The score is labeled '179' at the beginning of the first system.

Example w24k1. Passage in **E1** corresponding to i.179–90.

Although probably spurious, many of the abbreviated readings of **E1** are musically plausible, since they involve the omission of echoes or other repeated measures or phrases. Although its text is clearly defective even where it has not been abridged, **E1** is independent of the other sources. Many performance markings included here but absent from version 1, such as the slurs on the

⁷² At i.107–10. On Bach's use of this bass line, see Schulenberg, *The Instrumental Music of C. P. E. Bach*, 42, 142. An earlier use within the solo episodes of a concerto occurs in J. S. Bach's Second Brandenburg Concerto, i.109–12.

Lombardic figures in the ritornello of the first movement, were probably added by the arranger. But several concordances with **A2** (discussed above) raise the possibility that **E1** derives from an earlier state of the work than any other source, and that some passages apparently omitted in **E1** might have been absent from the original version of the concerto.

Issues of Text and Performance

As in Bach's keyboard sonatas, the sources do not settle the question of the instrumentation of the solo part. It is likely that the part designated in most sources as *cembalo* was sometimes played on the fortepiano, examples of which were being acquired at the Prussian court during the period when W. 24 was first drafted.⁷³ Although performance of Bach's music at court is often discounted, late reports of the King's antipathy to Bach and his music did not necessarily hold for this period.⁷⁴ But in any case the royal court was hardly the only possible venue for performances of this work, which might also have been heard in the several semi-public concert series documented at Berlin during the 1740s and later.⁷⁵ Any performance, however, is likely to have employed a single player on each part, as there is no evidence for doubling other than in a single source (**C2**) that includes a second copy of the basso part. Performed by a small ensemble within a relatively small room, W. 24 would be suited to the very quiet pianos of the mid-eighteenth century, especially as this work lacks the more extroverted writing of others composed during the same years (notably W. 23, also of 1748). The *Tangentenflügel*, heard in this work in a recent recording, might have been another choice used in later performances.⁷⁶ But the harpsichord was certainly the most common instrument used for such a piece until well into the second half of the century.

The second basso part in **C2** calls for *violone*, but whether this term invariably meant a double-bass instrument is uncertain even at the relatively late date, perhaps in the 1760s, when that source was produced.⁷⁷ Although **C2** and other sources clearly document the use of a second basso instrument in some performances of Bach's concertos, the composer himself apparently did not call for a double-bass instrument, even though the notated bass line of W. 24 passes above the

⁷³ For King Frederick's acquisition of one instrument in May 1747, documented by a receipt signed by Quantz, see Mary Oleskiewicz, "The Trio in Bach's *Musical Offering*: A Salute to Frederick's Tastes and Quantz's Flutes?," in *Bach Perspectives, Volume 4: The Music of J.S. Bach: Analysis and Interpretation*, edited by David Schulenberg (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999), 98–9.

⁷⁴ See Mary Oleskiewicz, "Like Father, Like Son? Emanuel Bach and the Writing of Biography," in *Music and Its Questions: Essays in Honor of Peter Williams*, edited by Thomas Donahue (Richmond, Va.: Organ Historical Society Press, forthcoming).

⁷⁵ Further discussion in *CPEBCW* II/1 and in the critical apparatus for W. 4, 5, and 6.

⁷⁶ See the excellent recording by Miklós Spányi and Concerto Armonico (led by Péter Szűts) on *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: The Complete Keyboard Concertos, Volume 7* (Djursholm: Bis, (p) 1998). 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.

⁷⁷ See the discussion of other manuscript copies from the same collection under source **C1** for W. 5.

viola in two passages (i.83, iii.11–12). On the other hand, it is possible that *solo* and *tutti* indications in the lowest string part of two reliable sources of the late version (**D2** and **D3**) might have been interpreted by a violonist as directions to drop out in passages marked *solo*, leaving only a cellist, if the latter shared the part.

The absence of a truly authoritative principal source exacerbates the common problem of determining the precise reading of performance markings; a few important cases concerning recurring ritornello material are discussed below. Another recurring question is whether the markings added at various stages of revision represented changes of intention or merely greater precision of notation. A distinct change of mind may be documented in the variants for articulation in iii.2, where Bach seems to have originally written a slur, replaced at an early stage by staccato strokes or dots.⁷⁸ A number of changes in dynamic markings, particularly in the last movement, left similar traces in the sources of the earlier versions. Less clear is whether any practical difference was intended in the supplementation and occasional replacement of the original indications for ornaments, which are confined to “t” or “tr” in the earliest version. Even in the final version of the concerto, the solo part retains those abbreviations at some points while elsewhere giving more explicit symbols, such as those for the turn and the *prallender Doppelschlag*. Even among sources of the late version, **D1** has “t” or “tr” at several points where **D2–4** give various ornament signs.

Similar substitutions occur in copies of some of Bach's keyboard sonatas from the 1740s, but whether they had the composer's authorization cannot always be determined.⁷⁹ In two copies of W. 24, **C2** and **D4**, even the string parts often contain ornament signs.⁸⁰ In several passages in W. 24 the signs correspond with indications in the keyboard part where the latter repeats the same material; from these passages it is clear that “tr” on a dotted note within the string parts (as in the violins at i.2) actually represents a turn played after the note, at least in the late version of the concerto.⁸¹ Because the signs in question occur within the keyboard part of the principal source, the edition includes them as well in the parallel passages in the string parts as documented in the following table:

⁷⁸ See list of readings for early version.

⁷⁹ For a detailed discussion, see *CPEBE I/18*: 121–2.

⁸⁰ At the time W. 24 was composed, Bach would not have expected string players to understand the ornament signs included in the keyboard part, as he indicated in *Versuch I*, 2.4.17: “man ausser dem Claviere das Zeichen des Doppelschlages eben so wenig kennen.”

⁸¹ The same interpretation of “tr” is called for elsewhere, as at ii.19 (violins, note 6), although here, in the absence of clear indications in the secondary sources, the reading of the principal source has been retained.

Version	Source	Reading (figures = note numbers)		
		<i>violin 1 (i.2)</i>	<i>violin 2 (i.2)</i>	<i>keyboard (i.34)</i>
1	A1	no sign	no sign	no sign
	A2	no sign	no sign	no sign
	A4	“tr” between 5 and 6**	no sign	turn between 5 and 6**
2	B1	no sign	doubles violin 1	no sign
	B2	no sign	no sign	no sign
3	C2	turn on 5*	turn between 5 and 6**	turn between 5 and 6*
	C3	(no part extant)	(no part extant)	turn between 5 and 6
4	D1	“tr” on 5*	“tr” on note 5*	turn between 5 and 6
	D2	“tr” between 5 and 6*	“tr” between 5 and 6*	turn between 5 and 6
	D3	“tr” on 5	“tr” on 5	turn between 5 and 6**
	D4	turn between 5 and 6*	(doubles violin 1)	turn between 5 and 6
print	E1	no sign*	no sign	no sign

*also a slur on notes 5–6
**position ambiguous

Just as Bach appears to have tolerated certain imprecisions in the notation of ornaments, at least in the earlier version of the concerto he appears to have left unstated many signs for articulation. Among these are the slurs that were later added before certain trills on unaccented beats: with the addition of these slurs, the performance of the ornaments as *Pralltriller* becomes explicit.⁸² Slurs probably were understood in a number of other figures as well, such as the Lombardic groups in the first movement and some or all of the trills with written-out terminations,⁸³ although the slurs do not always appear even in the latest version.

Some of these markings may have become necessary as the conventions of the 1740s became less familiar to later musicians. The so-called bow vibrato apparently called for by the slurred repeated notes at iii.197 in the basso part may have already been obscure by the middle of the century. J. S. Bach invariably indicated this effect through a slur alone, without dots, and this was most likely C. P. E. Bach's original notational practice. But a number of sources of the present work follow the common alternative practice of using dots in addition to the slurs. The two different forms of notation do not necessarily indicate a distinction in performance; it is unlikely that the notes should be executed with the portamento (more properly, portato) that the notation with dots would indicate to a modern string player.⁸⁴

Although parallel passages usually clarify the reading of ambiguously placed slurs and

⁸² See, for example, i.255, where most of the sources of the earlier version lack the slur and indicate the ornament by “tr”.

⁸³ E.g., i.18 and perhaps iii.3. Slurs were certainly understood in the case of Lombardic figures; see *Versuch* I, 3.24.

⁸⁴ Further discussion of this issue in the critical apparatus for W. 4, 5, and 6.

ornaments, a few problematical cases remain. These are discussed in the Commentary.⁸⁵ Another doubtful issue is the rhythm of ii.19 and parallel passages, where the dot lengthening note 1 of the violins appears to have been added in one of the revisions. But the requisite beam may not have been added immediately to the following notes, and the slur over the figure is placed inconsistently even in the principal source. Copyists usually drew the slur only over the four small note values that follow the dot, but the edition follows the occasional reading in which the slur begins on the dotted note (see Commentary).

Staccato strokes, which often imply an accent in Bach's usage, seem to have been added arbitrarily in many sources. Even in **D1**, the principal source of the late version, staccato strokes in i.119 and i.127 raise questions, as they are absent from parallel passages and fall here on the resolution of an appoggiatura, normally unaccented. Yet other sources give this sign in parallel passages and doubling parts, leaving little question that at least some of the strokes drawn under slurs are authentic, although it is unclear what they were meant to convey.

A question of ornamentation arises in the case of a turn following an appoggiatura at iii.336. This is one of the few contexts involving ornaments not treated in *Versuch I*. Presumably the appoggiatura should be understood as tied to the first note of the turn, as in a trill or *Pralltriller* of the sort at iii.314.

⁸⁵ For one recurring passage, see the entries in the commentary for the combination of slur and trill in the late version at ii.8, 10, and 67; the trill falling at the end of the slur was evidently meant to be a short *Pralltriller*.