

C. P. E. BACH, CONCERTOS W. 4–6: SOURCES AND VARIANT READINGS General Remarks

Although the three concertos edited in the present volume were initially drafted by 1740, each underwent a complex series of alterations that is recorded in multiple manuscript copies made over the next sixty years or so. This report describes and evaluates the surviving sources and traces the revisions undergone by each work, insofar as these can be reconstructed from the extant sources. The latter comprise as many as a dozen or more manuscript copies for each concerto; there are no autographs, save for three partly autograph parts for W. 6 and autograph alterations to parts for W. 4.

Sources for each concerto 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 filiational 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 version of each work that can be documented from surviving sources. Because the composer's working 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.¹ Although a relative chronology for certain

¹ The first substantial discussion of Bach's compositional procedures and revisions in the concertos was Rachel W. Wade, *The Keyboard Concertos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1981). The theoretical basis of Bach's “composition through variation” is discussed, and individual examples analyzed, in David Schulenberg, *The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1984), especially chaps. 3 and 4. Subsequent studies have traced Bach's practices in individual works; see in particular Darrell Berg, “Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs Umarbeitungen seiner Claviersonaten,” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 74 (1988): 123–161 (on the keyboard sonata W. 65/9). See also the editions of early and late versions of the keyboard sonata W. 65/15 in CPEBE I/18 and the alternate and “composite” versions of keyboard sonatas from W. 53 in CPEBCW I/3: 89–97, as well as the edition of the early and late versions of the keyboard concerto W. 24, online at <<http://www.wagner.edu/faculty/dschulenberg/W.24.htm>>.

revisions can be reconstructed, it is impossible to say at what date a particular alteration was made.

In principle, revisions are to be distinguished from alterations made in the course of drafting each composition. But in practice there can be no such clear distinction, for Bach's initial preparation of each of these works presumably included completion not only of a full score but of performing parts. Although autograph scores do not survive for these works, it is clear from extant autographs for other concertos of this period that Bach's scores did not include all of the matter that would eventually be included in individual parts. In particular, doublings of one part by another were not always written out, and performance markings (signs for articulation, ornaments, and dynamics, and basso continuo figures) were at first entered sporadically if at all. Dynamics meant to apply to all parts at a given point might have been entered only in the top staff. Hence even a finished score was in effect a sort of draft, the composition not being fully complete until parts had been copied and marked. Extant autograph scores for Bach's early concertos show various stages of completion in the sense just described; in particular, basso continuo figures and certain other performance markings are often absent or were added later.

Naturally, manuscript copies reflect the particular state of their exemplars or *Vorlagen* at the time the copies were made. Therefore it is possible to reconstruct the history of a work's revisions from its extant copies. Unfortunately, the process is complicated by several factors. First, copies were not necessarily made directly from Bach's composing scores; his performing parts may also have served as exemplars or *Vorlagen* for subsequent copies, and these parts may have contained performance markings (such as continuo figures) and even compositional revisions that did not appear in Bach's scores. Second, both Bach's scores and his performing parts might have been altered in ways that were not always clear or legible comprehensible to copyists. This is particularly likely to have occurred as embellishments involving small note values were inserted into passages originally occupied by larger note values (see Plate 1); as a result, copyists may have sometimes failed to see or understand intended revisions. A third factor is that Bach at some point may have had a new score prepared for a work; although in principle incorporating all of the revisions made up to that point, such a score might have inadvertently left out some alterations while introducing new copying mistakes; errors of both types would persist in subsequent copies that otherwise show revised readings. Finally, arbitrary alterations of Bach's text are likely to have occurred as musicians added their own performance markings and even embellishments and variations.

The most substantial documented alterations in the present works took place in W. 5, whose “*Erneuerung*” of 1762 is recorded in NV 1790. The latter document does not explain what was involved in the process of *Erneuerung*, but from the various extant versions of W. 5 it appears to have included significant formal revision, in which entire passages were inserted, deleted, expanded, and shortened. W. 4 underwent similar although less extensive revisions; details for both works are considered in the respective discussions below. All three concertos show evidence of further alterations, which include:

- refinement of voice leading, especially in inner voices and the bass
- supplementation of performance markings
- ornamentation and embellishment of melody and bass lines
- more extensive alteration of melody and bass lines, described below as variation

“Refinement” often involved a simplification of the voice leading, eliminating what evidently came to be seen as overly contrapuntal part writing or excessive dissonance. Thus some independently moving bass notes as well as suspensions were eliminated from the ritornello of W. 4/ii, as were a few diminished and augmented intervals in the inner voices, both vertical and horizontal.² In W. 6, multiple stops—a dramatic effect that Bach also used in the string parts of the double concerto W. 46—were removed from the viola and basso in several passages of the third movement. Related to these changes, which affected primarily the string parts, is the evidence that exists for altered instrumentation of several passages, that is, re-assignment of passages from soloist to “tutti,” or the addition or elimination of one or more string parts from the accompaniment of solo passages.

The addition of performance markings at first might have involved little more than making explicit what was implied by the autograph score, as in the copying of a dynamic mark from the first violin to the parts beneath it in the score. By 1745, when Bach published the concerto W. 11, in the form of separate performing parts, the necessity for carefully and consistently entering performance indications into each part, including the addition of continuo figures to the keyboard part in tutti passages, would have been clear to Bach. The sources for the late versions of the present works also show complete and generally consistent performance markings, as well as revised readings for many passages. Naturally, the editions of the late versions reflect these features of the sources. But sources for the early versions are less uniform in this respect. The editions of the early versions are reconstructions not of the original states of the lost autograph scores, which, as explained above, were probably incomplete in some sense, but rather the earliest states in which the works might have been performed or disseminated. Hence missing performance signs have been extended to doubling parts, and continuo figures and other essential performance signs are included, since these occur in surviving manuscript parts for even the earliest known versions of these pieces. As usual, all editorial emendations are noted in the Commentaries.

The number of performance markings increases in later versions. The addition of ornament signs (as opposed to generic “tr”) is likely to have taken place only around the time of *Versuch* I or later, as such signs are rare in Bach's earlier autographs. *Versuch* I also describes the use of “tenuto” indications,³ absent from the early versions and thus also probably not added before 1753 or so. By the late 1750s the expression *tenuto* (abbreviated “ten.”) appears frequently in certain pieces (e.g., the sonata W. 50/2 of 1759). Bach also added it to other works such as the concerto W. 24 of 1748, where it is absent in the earliest known versions.⁴ *Versuch* I also provides a probable *terminus ante quem non* for what will be termed “alternate” performance markings; these are present in some sources of the early versions but not in the latest version of any work. Because these markings include many instances of the ornament signs described in

² E.g., the angular viola line at W. 4/ii.6 and 45 was straightened out, and the striking dissonance under the fermata at ii.46 was brightened by changing the bass note (in modern terms, the harmony was changed from a diminished seventh to a dominant ninth).

³ In *Versuch* i.3.22.

⁴ See the critical edition online at <<http://www.wagner.edu/schulenberg/W.24.htm>>.

Versuch I, they are unlikely to have been added before 1753. Yet they occur in what are otherwise early states of the text, implying that they are unauthorized additions by copyists working from old exemplars.

Of greater interest musically is the elaboration of the melody or the bass line. In considering such changes, it will be useful to distinguish between ornamentation, embellishment, and variation. By “ornamentation” will be meant the addition of appoggiaturas and ornament signs; where early versions employed only the cross or plus sign, or the abbreviation “t” or “tr”, later versions use the specific signs described in part 1 of Bach's *Versuch*. Ornamentation in this sense is therefore an aspect of the addition of performance markings, differing from “embellishment,” which involves more complex melodic elaborations written out in regular notes. Even more elaborate decoration, involving the recomposition of the entire texture yet retaining the original harmony—that is, the underlying voice leading or *Gerippe*—will be designated “variation.”⁵ Embellishment and variation are largely confined to the keyboard parts, but all three types of elaboration might have originated in improvisation. Bach might at first have fixed them in notation only when preparing copies for sale to non-professional musicians who would have been less prepared than his professional colleagues to add stylistically appropriate decoration.

Eighteenth-century musicians, including Bach, probably understood both ornamentation and embellishment under the term *Auszierung*, distinguishing the latter from the more elaborate process of *Veränderung*—hence the title “Auszierungen und Veränderungen über einige meiner Sonaten” which Bach (or his copyist Michel) gave to the collection of revised readings for certain solo keyboard works (W. 68).⁶ These revised readings, which were meant to be inserted into existing texts of the pieces, include many that are similar in type to the newer readings for solo passages in the present works, especially in the slow movements. When added as prolifically as in the late version of W. 4/ii and 5/ii, these variations substantially altered the melodic surface of the music, giving the impression of a more elegant, expressive, and up-to-date style, at least by north-German standards; by the 1790s, when Bach's descendants were still distributing copies of these revised pieces, Viennese composers such as Mozart, Haydn, and Beethoven were writing in a quite different style.

Doublings and the notation of the keyboard part

As mentioned in the Introduction, the sources raise questions about the soloist's participation during ritornellos and shorter tutti passages. Surviving autograph scores generally show rests in the upper staves of the keyboard part during tutti passages, but the loss of autograph material leaves it unclear how Bach originally notated the present works. A manuscript copy in score of Bach's first concerto (W. 1), in an early version, includes separate “Fundamento” and “Basso” parts as well as a part for “Cembalo”.⁷ The latter, at the bottom of the score, has written-out

⁵ In *Versuch* ii.41 Bach uses the term *Gerippe* (skeleton) to describe the underlying structure of a fantasia or other improvisation, notated as a figured bass line. For further discussion, see Schulenberg, *The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach*, 31–55.

⁶ See the description of source **A 1** (D B, Mus. ms. Bach P 1135) for W. 53 in CPEBCW I/3: 171.

⁷ D B Mus. ms. Bach P 239.

doublings of the first violin and bass line during tutti passages; continuo figures are present only in the “Basso” part. A manuscript score containing the early version of W. 5 (designated source **A1**) presents what appears to be an intermediate format: the two staves of the “Cembalo Concertato” are now blank in the tutti passages, but continuo figures still appear only in the basso part (see Plate 4).⁸ But manuscript parts (source **A2**) copied directly from that score show a format common among copies of the early versions of the present works, incorporating figures as well as violin doublings into the solo part, which is designated “Cembalo Concerto” (see Plate 5).

The surviving autograph scores for Bach's concertos composed through 1741—that is, W. 2, 3, 46, 7, and 8—appear to be later fair copies, although each underwent varying degrees of later alteration.⁹ Hence they provide no direct evidence for the original texts or notation of these works. Alterations visible in these scores include the small refinements of voice leading (especially of the viola part) that also took place in the present works. But these autograph scores show no systematic embellishment of the solo part nor any formal revisions involving the insertion or deletion of more than a single measure. Nor (with the exception of W. 2) do they include basso continuo figures. Hence the additions and alteration which occurred in these works must have been drafted elsewhere, either in performing parts or in other scores now lost. The dates of composition provided by NV 1790 cannot be assumed to match those of any of the autograph scores; it is possible, however, that the autograph of W. 3 dates from 1745, the date of Bach's *Erneuerung* of the work according to NV.¹⁰ Possibly, too, Bach undertook the less extensive initial revision of the present works, as reflected especially in the partially autograph parts for W. 6, at about the same time.

If so, then it may only have been during the mid-1740s that Bach adopted, in principle as well as in practice, what is now considered the normal disposition of parts for his concertos, with a single keyboard part furnishing continuo in tutti passages. Copies of the present concertos made much later continue to incorporate a doubling of the violin part or parts in the upper staff of the

⁸ Although the keyboard part lacks *custodes* or other indications, brief doublings of the first violin and basso appear at the beginnings of some *ritornellos*, implying that such doublings were meant to be played throughout the tutti passages.

⁹ Wade, *The Keyboard Concertos*, generally viewed the surviving autograph scores as “composing documents” (as on p. 71, with respect to the autograph of W. 17 in D B, Mus. ms. Bach P 352). But rather than constituting a first draft, the surviving autograph score of W. 7 is clearly a fair copy, though a hastily written one, as is evident from a copying mistake on the first page: Bach skipped a measure in the violin parts, but not in the viola and bass; noticing the error only after he had completed the page, he wrote the missing measure for the violins (the fifth before the end of the opening *ritornello*) in the margin. The use of different inks for different simultaneously sounding parts in certain passages of the same concerto apparently is evidence not for compositional changes but merely for Bach's having written certain parts before others.

¹⁰ 10. Wade, *The Keyboard Concertos*, 91, suggested that the two G-major concertos W. 3 and W. 4 might have been confused in Bach's records, as NV 1790 lists a revision of W. 3 as having taken place in 1745, whereas only W. 4 is known to survive in distinct versions. But the autograph score of W. 3 cannot be a first draft, and Bach's handwriting in it is better dated to the mid-1740s than to 1737, the date of composition according to NV 1790. Hence the autograph probably gives the *erneuet* version of W. 3 from 1745, the early version of the work having been discarded at that time.

keyboard part during ritornellos (see Plate 10). Such doublings, even if not actually played, would have allowed the soloist to follow those parts as cues; guided the player in realizing a continuo part; and presented the option of playing without accompaniment when strings were absent. That these doublings actually were played is evident from the idiomatic arrangement of the full orchestral texture given by some sources for certain passages (e.g., W. 4/i.9–16). Yet these arrangements remain incomplete to varying degrees; in W. 4 they leave an open fifth at one point where a solo section gives way to a tutti, and in at least one recurring passage essential material in the strings had to be left out.¹¹

Although Bach himself might have ceased to play the doublings long before he started to enter continuo figures into his autograph scores, when he began writing keyboard concertos he may have conceived the keyboard as the principal or *obbligato* part and the strings as inessential ripieno parts. Whereas we are accustomed to thinking of these works as having a melodic line that is divided between the violins (in the ritornellos) and the soloist (in the solo episodes), Bach might have understood these pieces as involving a single principal part for the soloist that the strings double in the ritornellos and other tutti passages. Evidence for this lies in brief passages in all three concertos where the right hand continues to play while the first violin (or both violins) enters in alternate measures with a doubling of the same line.¹² Today such passages would probably be viewed as a close dialog between tutti and soloist, a conception that evidently emerged only in the course of revisions that filled the upper staff of the keyboard part with rests when the violins enter.¹³ To be sure, the simultaneous conception of solo and ripieno parts as essential partners is evident in other passages, as when the first violin accompanies the keyboard as an independent contrapuntal voice.

Exactly how Bach expected the keyboard player to realize the solo part remains unclear, even in the late version, for certain passages in which the violins enter to double or replace the keyboard in the continuation of what was originally an unbroken melodic line. An example occurs at W. 4/ii.36, where the violins enter on the fourth beat, momentarily doubling the right hand of the keyboard. At this point in the principal source, Bach added the word “tutti” as well as continuo figures for the next few beats. Presumably the player would have ceased doubling the violins at the point where the first figure occurs, but it would be arbitrary for an editor to dictate the exact manner of performance in such a passage. In such cases, because the notation of the principal source was evidently acceptable to the composer, it has been left unchanged.

“House” copies

Scholars have deduced that in his later years Bach, like Breitkopf and other music publishers,

¹¹ Open fifth: at i.76. Essential material from string parts absent: i.157–8, 162–3.

¹² See, e.g., W. 4/i.45–6 and 48–9; W. 5/iii.18–9 and 20–1 (early version; doubling not included in the edition); W. 6/i.130–5.

¹³ In an earlier study of Bach's emerging style, the editor described the emergence of a dialog principle in the rapid alteration of solo and tutti passages within solo episodes; see “C. P. E. Bach Through the 1740s: The Growth of a Style,” in *C. P. E. Bach Studies*, edited by Stephen L. Clark (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 222. What was not evident at the time of that publication was that the impression of a dialog might have been enhanced by the *removal* of the soloist from the tutti passages, which came to be performed by *ripieni* alone.

maintained a set of so-called house copies that served as exemplars for subsequent sale copies. Revisions that Bach made over the years would have been carefully entered into the house copies, for those purchasing music directly from Bach would have expected to receive the latest and most fully annotated versions. This would have been a selling point to counter competition from publishers such as Johann Christian Westphal of Hamburg, who often offered manuscripts giving inferior or unrevised texts, as may have been the case with a copy of W. 4 (source **B2**).

House copies are often identified by the presence of a title page bearing descriptive entries by Bach or, in the case of solo keyboard works, one or two catalog numbers in his hand or that of his daughter Anna Carolina Philippina. No such copies survive for any of these three concertos, but they are rare generally for early works, and Bach is unlikely to have established this system when he first arrived in Berlin. He might already have been selling copies of his music during the years around 1740, but at that point Bach might not have had pupils or paid assistants to entrust with copying, and therefore would not have exercised the same oversight over the process as would be the case later in life. As no autograph copies survive, Bach would appear to have loaned (or perhaps rented) out his own master scores or sets of parts for copying by other individuals, with the consequence that early versions of these works entered circulation somewhat haphazardly.

The letters of Bach's wife and daughter written after his death show that they fully understood and took an active role in what was in effect a music business. It may have been only after establishing a household, with his marriage to Johanna Maria Dannemann, daughter of a Berlin wine merchant, in 1744 that Bach's business was fully organized as such. What seems to have been a systematic revision (*Erneuerung*) of earlier works began in 1743 and continued through 1747, to judge from the datings in NV 1790. As argued above, the surviving autograph scores of Bach's early concertos may have been prepared as part of this process, although it remains to be established whether any of these served as house copies. Certainly none of the surviving sources of the present concertos had such a status, and the relationship of each to Bach's lost material is therefore the prime consideration in the evaluation of the sources for the respective concertos.

The Lists of Variant Readings

For each work, the description and evaluation of sources are followed by separate lists of readings for early, intermediate, and late versions. The lists of readings for the early and late versions are to be consulted in conjunction with the editions of the respective versions. Each of these lists contains separate sections for the three movements of each concerto. 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 occur in the principal source or provide authority for emendations to the latter. Also not reported are added appoggiaturas and misreadings or omissions of ties and accidentals in comparison sources, although markings of all types that were added or altered in the course of a revision are listed with intermediate readings (see below). Not reported are variants involving the verbal entries “solo” and “tutti” in the keyboard part, which have been excluded in the edition as unnecessary. Also not reported is the substitution in copies of “tr” or the short trill symbol 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 score for any of the intermediate versions. Instead, the lists of readings for the intermediate versions comprise lists of individual readings that underwent revision; each revision is briefly characterized, and an indication is provided as to which of the relevant sources contains the original reading and which contains the revision. Hence these lists serve as synopses not only of intermediate readings but of all the points that underwent revision in each concerto. These lists too are divided into sections for the three movements of each concerto, and each section is subdivided into two lists, the first accounting for revisions that affected notes, rests, and larger passages, the second for alterations and additions of performance markings.

Within the lists of readings 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.