

CONCERTO IN G, W. 4
Sources: Early Version

A1: D Bsa SA 2590 (b)

Five manuscript parts in a hand identified as that of J. S. C. Possin. Watermark: (a) crowned eagle with FR monogram on its breast and “CROSSEN” (b) double-lined cursive monogram “MS”? Dimensions: 34 x 20.5 cm¹

SA 2590 comprises both a score and a set of parts. The two components are unrelated to one another, although both were owned by Zelter; the score is described below as **B3**.

A wrapper in Zelter's hand bears the same index number found on the first page of **B3**; the number is repeated on the first violin part of **A1**, indicating that the two sources were kept together in his collection. Zelter's title page reads: “Concerto | [incipit] | per il | Clavicembalo concertato | Due Violini | Viola e Bassoripieno | Di | Carl Filippo Emanuele Bach. | composto nell anno 1738.” Added beneath is a later entry in lighter brown ink, “Il quarto del Catal.” presumably meaning “the fourth [concerto] in the [estate] catalogue,” that is, NV 1790, which was probably Zelter's source for the date of composition.

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo certato.”: 16 pages (the last unused);

“Violino Primo.”, “Violino Secundo.” “Viola.” “Basso.”: each a single bifolio

(*Auflagebogen*) = 4 pages.

Each part bears the title “Concerto” at the beginning of the first system.

Zelter obtained a significant number of works by C. P. E. Bach from Johann Samuel Carl Possin (1753–1821), who reportedly left his collection with Zelter prior to departing Berlin in 1791.² The copies now traced to Possin contain a substantial fraction of Bach's complete output for keyboard instruments; many, although not this one, bear index numbers suggesting that Possin was systematically collecting the composer's works, as J. J. H. Westphal would do during the following decades.³

The keyboard part lacks figures; in tutti passages the upper staff includes doublings of the first violin and sometimes also the second violin and viola. These doublings include a few articulation signs also present in the string parts of **A1** but unlikely to have been in Bach's

¹ Watermark and dimensions from Enßlin, 240; the watermark is his no. 60 from the paper mill Crossen in Neumark (now Poland), maker possibly Lorenz Francke (1765–at least 1786).

² Accounts of Possin and his music collection depend largely on remarks in *Carl Friedrich Zelters Darstellungen seines Lebens*, edited by Wolfgang Schottländer (Weimar: Goethe-Gesellschaft, 1931). The identification of the present hand as Possin's also derives from Zelter, who added a note in D B Bsa SA 1412 stating that the latter manuscript was written by Possin (see *CPEBCW* I/8.2: 179fn. 97). Enßlin's *Abbildungen* 42–5 show several quite different samples of handwriting that are said to be Possin's; all resemble the hand in the present source to varying degrees.

³ The index numbers correspond to those in a thematic index of solo keyboard works prepared by the composer in 1772 (in D Bsa SA 4261).

original.⁴ The doublings also include ornament signs not found in the string parts, suggesting that the keyboard part was intended to serve as an arrangement playable without strings.⁵ Besides these ornaments the source also contains the additional “alternate” performance markings described below.

A2: D B Mus. ms. Bach St 498

Six manuscript parts in three (?) hands

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo” in the hand of J. H. Grave: 18 pages, the last blank (33.5 x 22 cm). Watermarks:

(a) large fleur-de-lys and “J KOOL”, (b) “VI”;

“Violino Primo”, “Violino Secondo”, “Viola”, and “Basso Ripieno”: each four pages

(*Auflagebogen*, 32.5 x 20.8 cm). Watermarks: (a) large crowned medallion, lion holding staff (scepter?) and arrows, (b) smaller medallion beneath crown, “CR”

“Violono”: four pages (33.7 x 20.2 cm), slightly yellower paper. Watermarks: (a) large lion rampant over “A G [C?] A . . . V [W?] A”, (b) crown over “M N”.⁶

There is no title page or wrapper. The hand of the *Violono* part is very similar to that of the keyboard, which is by Grave, and might be his own copy made at a later date, presumably to add an additional bass instrument to the ensemble.⁷ Each part bears the title “Concerto” at the beginning of the first system.

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.⁸ Bach describes the concerto W. 31 as “one of my show pieces” and mentions a “trio,” presumably a work for keyboard and violin, in which he was “inimitably accompanied at court” by Franz

⁴ In i.22 the first four notes bear both dots and a slur; in other sources of W. 4 this type of notation is restricted to repeated notes. Perhaps in an earlier copy, note 1 had borne a dot or stroke intended to distinguish it from the slurred notes that follow, but through misunderstanding both dots and slur were extended to cover all four notes.

⁵ E.g., at i.6, app. (b', 8th, with slur) prior to note 1 (= early version); i.12, app. (c'', 8th, with slur) prior to note 1; i.14, *Anschlag* (d''–f''), 16ths) prior to note 1.

⁶ Mary Oleskiewicz provided a detailed physical description of A2, including watermarks.

⁷ EnBlin, 680, traces several watermarks of the “KOOL” type to the Dutch paper maker Jan Kool (d. 1816). The latter acquired the paper mill known as De Bonsem at Koog aan de Zaan in 1774. Unfortunately this is insufficient to provide a precise time frame for the preparation of the five main parts of A2, and the watermark for the “Violono” part could not be observed clearly enough to provide a positive identification.

⁸ 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.

Benda.⁹

A2 is one of fifteen manuscript copies of concertos at B D either written by Grave or bearing his signature. But it is unlikely to be one of the three concertos that Bach mentions sending him in the 1784 letter, as by then Bach must have completed the revisions documented in **B1**, if not **C1**, and these revised readings are absent from **A2**. On the other hand, the source is particularly rich in “alternate” performance markings as described below, notably at the first entrance of the solo keyboard (see Ex. w4v2 in the list of variant readings for the early version). The keyboard part is figured throughout; the upper staff contains doublings of the violin parts in the opening ritornello of each movement but is usually blank in subsequent “tutti” passages.

The *Basso Ripieno* and *Violono* parts are not identical, the latter (not the former) being a ripieno part that rests during most solo passages; moreover, some notes are written an octave higher than in the basso part. As the *Violono* part never descends below A, it appears to be Grave's own arrangement of the basso part for an instrument sounding an octave below written pitch whose lowest string was AA. This would correspond with the French seven-string *basse de viole*, but music for the latter was normally written at pitch, and the Italian term *violono* was rarely if ever applied to it. The part is incomplete, breaking off at the end of the second page (after iii.29); the remaining two pages are ruled but unused. The transpositions are often musically inconsequential, involving isolated notes within a line,¹⁰ and although possibly representing a customary performance practice cannot derive from Bach. The part is silent for several extended portions of the solo episodes.¹¹

A3: D DI Mus. ms. 3029-O-5

D DI Mus. ms. 3029-O-5 comprises five manuscript parts in at least three different hands.¹² The first violin part gives a later version of the work and is discussed separately below as source **B7**. Of the remaining parts, the keyboard is bound in a cover bearing a handwritten label with entries in several hands that read: “Concerto | g # | # # | [crossed out:] C^o V^a | Nr: 4. | D. Feuerstein | b423.” The title page, which is in the same hand as the remainder of the keyboard part, is headed

⁹ *CPEB-Briefe*, item 469 (2: 1009): “Das Concert C mol war vor diesem eines meiner Paradörs. Das Rezit. ist so ausgesetzt, wie ich es ohngefähr gespielt habe. Das Trio hat mir mehrmals bey Hofe der alte Franz Benda unnachahmlich accompagnirt.” The translation of “Paradörs” (French *paradeurs*) is from *CPEB-Letters*, 204fn. 3. The “recitative” must be that found in the slow movement of W. 31, for which Bach's autograph revisions are extant in D B Mus. mss. Bach P 711 and St 524; the same work is mentioned in J. M. Bach's letter of 30 April 1793 to Westphal (no. 18 in Schmid, p. 507). The trio might be the violin sonata W. 74 in D or, more likely, the impressive C-minor work W. 78; the latter work is suggested by Bach's joking praise of Grave for the latter's strong “musical stomach” and taste for “sturdy nourishment” (“Sie haben einen sehr guten musikal. Magen, deßwegen erhalten Sie hierbey starke Speisen”). Grave owned both of the latter sonatas in copies by Michel (D B Mus. mss. Bach St 560 and 514).

¹⁰ For example, in i.3 note 1 (only) is transposed from G to g, and in i.4 note 2 is similarly transposed, both times resulting in a leap of a seventh between eighth notes. Occasionally an octave leap is replaced by a single note; e.g., in i.35–6 the eighths d–D and G–g become quarters d, g.

¹¹ Notes in the basso part are replaced by rests from note 2 of i.50 through i.68 and in i.112–39 and ii.14–7.

¹² **A3** was seen in photocopy only.

by an incipit which is followed by: “G. Dur. | CONCERTO | a 5. | Concerto Cembalo. | Violino Primo | Violino Secondo. | Viola | e | Basso Ripieno || di Sigr: Emanuel Bach.” Later additions include a handwritten price beneath the attribution and library stamps. The three remaining string parts (violin 2, viola, basso) bear no titles or attributions and are identified only by their part labels.

The keyboard part is entirely in the hand of Johann Gottfried Grundig (1706?–73), a Dresden copyist known to scholars of Vivaldi and Quantz as “Scribe A.” The state of this copyist's hand in **A4** appears to postdate the latest previously recognized one, which Manfred Fechner designated state 4 and dated no later than December 1741.¹³ The same hand is evident in the violin 2, viola, and basso parts in the part headings and in the tempo markings, initial clefs, and key and time signatures for each movement. Elsewhere Grundig shared responsibility with a second copyist, not always with happy results; in violin 2, at the point where the second scribe took over the writing of the last movement (after m. 44, at the end of the opening ritornello), he or she copied the wrong music. The copyist completed three lines (iii.106–65) before realizing the error, crossing out the mistaken bars, and continuing (see Fig. w4k1). All four parts give an inaccurate text for the early version of work; the presence of alternate performance markings, including trill and mordent signs in place of the cross or + sign, confirms that these parts are remote from the tradition of C. P. E. Bach. The keyboard part, like that of **A1**, lacks figures but contains throughgoing doublings of violin 1 and occasionally violin 2 and viola in tutti passages.

The cover is reported to have been “made from a Hamburg lottery form” bearing the incomplete date “177_”.¹⁴ As in the similar case of **B3**, this suggests a date of origin around 1780. But this date would be too late for copies by Grundig and therefore could apply only to the first violin part. The signature added to the label on the cover is that of the Mozart biographer and music collector Dr. Johann Heinrich Feuerstein (1797–1850), who also owned the similarly bound copy of W. 5 now also at D DI (source **B2** for that work).¹⁵

It is curious that separate parts copied by members of both the Dresden and Berlin courts should have been united at Dresden, apparently by Feuerstein. But there can be no certainty that the latter was responsible for the present disposition of the parts, which, apart from the cover, apparently contain no evidence of Feuerstein's ownership. It has been claimed that the latter could have been mentored in his youth by August Eberhard Müller (1767–1817), who worked in Berlin and Leipzig (as Thomaskantor) before coming in 1810 to Weimar, where Feuerstein

¹³ Manfred Fechner, “Studien zur Dresdner Überlieferung der Instrumentalkonzerte von G. Ph. Telemann, J. G. Pisendel, J. F. Fasch, G. H. Stölzel, J. J. Quantz und J. G. Graun: Untersuchungen an den Quellen und Thematischer Katalog” (Ph.D. diss., University of Rostock, 1991), 82–3; further discussion in Steven David Zohn, “The Ensemble Sonatas of Georg Philipp Telemann: Studies in Style, Genre, and Chronology” (Ph.D. diss., Cornell University, 1995), 549, and Mary Oleskiewicz, “Quantz and the Flute at Dresden: His Instruments, His Repertory, and Their Significance for the *Versuch* and the Bach Circle” (Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1999), 653–4.

¹⁴ Wade, *The Instrumental Concertos*, 48–9.

¹⁵ Wade, *ibid.*, reports use of the same paper for source **B 8** of W. 5.



Figure w4k1. W. 4, beginning of third movement in second violin part of A3, showing transition from the hand of Johann Gottfried Grundig to that of an unidentified copyist

attended gymnasium.¹⁶ As Müller expressed his admiration for C. P. E. Bach in print, it is conceivable that he provided a line of transmission from Berlin or Leipzig to Feuerstein.¹⁷

It also has been claimed that Grundig ceased to work for the Dresden *Hofkapelle* in December 1741, that is, at the time Quantz left Dresden for Berlin. If so, **A3** might represent a private sale copy made after that date in Dresden and acquired there at some point by Feuerstein.

A4: D B Thulemeier M. 18

Thulemeier M. 18 (henceforth Thul. 18) comprises one complete set of manuscript parts for W. 4 as well as a separate cello part and a manuscript addendum (*Einlage*) that contains embellishments and at least one cadenza for the second movement. All are in distinct hands. Only the cello part is designated **A4**; the remaining components are described below as sources

¹⁶ Eric Offenbacher, "Linkage to Mozart: The Life Story of Johann Heinrich Feuerstein (1797–1850): Part I," *Mozart-Jahrbuch* 1993: 8–9. Müller is reported to have been a pupil of J. C. F. Bach (Gunter Hempel, article on Müller, *Grove Music Online*, accessed 8 June 2006 at <www.grovemusic.com>);

¹⁷ Müller writes admiringly of Bach's keyboard music, but only in the most general terms, in the brief introduction to his *Anweisung zum genauen Vortrage der Mozartschen Clavier-Concerte* (Leipzig: Breitkopf, 1796).

B4 and **D1**, respectively.

A4 is a single bifolio headed “Violoncello.” with dimensions 21.2 x 34.2 x cm. The title “Concerto” appears at the left above the first system, followed by “—Nro 2” in a later hand and lighter ink.

All three components of Thul. 18 are apparently from the collection of Friedrich Wilhelm von Thulemeier (1750–1811), Prussian ambassador (*Gesandter*) to Holland and later minister of state. 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.¹⁸ 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. Tobias Schwinger has shown that the older Thulemeier probably acquired many copies from the estate of the Berlin composer and court keyboardist Christoph Nichelmann (1717–62).¹⁹

The three components of Thul. 18 give different versions, particularly of the last movement, and therefore could not have been used together. Their preservation together may have no bearing on their origin. Two substantial corrections within **A4** are the work of the copyist and do not appear to have any ramifications for the text.²⁰

Sources: Intermediate Versions

B1: D B Mus. ms. Bach St 618

Five manuscript parts in an unidentified hand, with corrections and revisions by C. P. E. Bach. Watermark: eagle with crown. Dimensions: 22.4 x 34.9 cm

The parts, all on the same now worn, browning paper, are as follows:

“Cembalo”: 4 nested bifolios = 16 pages (the first and last pages unruled);

“Violino Primo”, “Violino Secondo”, “Viola”, “Basso”: each 2 bifolios = 8 pages (the first and last unruled, page 1 repeating the part designation).

There is no wrapper or title page; the unruled first page of each part merely repeats the part

¹⁸ 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. Some items in the collection, including source **D 3** of **W. 5**, bear twentieth-century stamps indicating a period of holding by the Pädagogische Hochschule Potsdam.

¹⁹ Tobias Schwinger, *Die Musikaliensammlung Thulemeier und die Berliner Musiküberlieferung in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Beeskow: Ortus-Verlag, 2007), 407ff. See *Johann Joachim Quantz: Seven Trio Sonatas*, edited by Mary Oleskiewicz (Middleton, Wis.: A-R Editions, 2001), xii, on the unique cembalo-obbligato versions for Quantz trio sonatas in the Thulemeier collection.

²⁰ The rests after iii.72 were initially followed by a repetition of iii.37–64, and iii.102 was originally followed by m. 107. The copyist corrected the first error by crossing out the erroneous passage and continuing; the omitted mm. 103–6 were added on an unused staff at the bottom of the last page, in darker ink but probably the same hand. Several further errors were later corrected in pencil.

heading from the top of p. 2. Added in red crayon on p. 1 of the kb part, beneath the word “Cembalo” is “g#”. Later markings by librarians appear above and below; an ink or wax mark is at the right. Each part bears the title “Concerto” at the beginning of the first system.

The main hand is unidentified,²¹ but the copyist must have worked from material furnished by the composer, whose hand is recognizable in numerous alterations and additions (see Plate 1). Many of these take the form of notes written over erasures, hence substituting revisions or corrections for earlier readings. Also recognizably autograph is the indication “ten” (*tenuto*; see Fig. w4k2), added frequently in the violin parts. Many further additions are recognizable as such through their brownish tint, as opposed to the black ink of the original entries; a large number of these additions are also likely to be autograph, although it is impossible to verify this in most individual cases.²² The additions, although often cramped because of the small spaces into which they were inserted, are too neat to have been drafted in the present manuscript and must have been copied from another, lost source.



Fig. w4k2. Opening of first violin part for W. 4 in B1, showing autograph “ten.” added to copy in an unidentified hand

It will be useful to distinguish between the original state of the manuscript, which will be designated **B1**, and its final revised state, designated as **C1**. It is not possible to date **B1**, but as the latter already presents a revised state of the work, it could be significantly later than 1738, the date of composition given in NV 1790. **C1** also cannot be accurately dated, although an origin during the 1750s would be consistent with what is known of Bach's handwriting and of his use of *ten* and other performance markings, such as the turn sign, which here generally takes the horizontal form rather than the upright orientation found in earlier sources. On the other hand, the presence of a few ornament signs in the string parts (as opposed to the abbreviation cross or

²¹ Wade, *The Keyboard Concertos*, 91, refers to the copyist as Michel, although elsewhere (p. 236) she describes the hand as unidentified. On Michel, see below under **B2**.

²² Peter Wollny (friendly communication) considers autograph the following: in the keyboard part, all continuo figures, some of the “tutti” and “solo” markings in movement 1, and many of the ornaments in movements 1 and 2; in the string parts, some dynamics and some ornaments.

+) could suggest a somewhat later date. Bach would eventually use such signs routinely in instrumental parts, but in 1753 he noted that at least one sign, that for the turn, was rarely understood by those other than keyboard players.²³

The missing title page might originally have been supplied by a wrapper. In its absence, it is impossible to be certain whether **B1** served as a house copy, but because its text is independent of that of **B2**, it was more likely a sale copy that was updated by the addition of later readings from Bach's revised autograph score. It is possible that the revision of **B1** came about in the same way as that described below for **B2**: as a correction undertaken in the Bach household of a copy whose owner, having obtained it from somewhere else, wished to have an unupdated version of the work.

The keyboard part is figured throughout; the words *tutti* and *solo* appear at the beginning of respective tutti and solo passages, starting with the solo passage at i.43. The upper staff is generally blank in ritornellos, but shorter tutti passages often contain a doubling of the first violin part, and isolated notes of the first violin are also present in the upper staff at the beginnings and ends of some tutti passages.²⁴

B2: B Bc 5887 MSM (W. 4)

Five manuscript parts, one in the hand of J. H. Michel (keyboard: 30.5 x 20 cm), four in that of J. S. Borsch with additions and corrections by Michel (strings: 31 x 25.5 cm). No watermarks.²⁵

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo”: 4 bifolios = 16 pages (the first = title page, the last blank);

“Violino primo”, “Violino secondo”, “Viola”, “Basso”: each 1 bifolio (*Auflagebogen*) = 4 pages.

Original entries on the title page read: “Concerto. | Cembalo Obligato. | Violino Primo | Violino Secondo. | Viola. | e | Basso. | da C. P. E. Bach | Thema [incipit follows]”. Each part bears the title “Concerto” at the beginning of the first system.

B2 is clearly 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 his collection is now preserved at B Bc;²⁶ a substantial portion of it is in the hand

²³ *Versuch*, i.2.4.17: “man ausser dem Claviere das Zeichen des Doppelschlages eben so wenig kennet”. Ornament signs appear as follows (in the violin parts except as noted): trill, i.35, i.68, ii.33 (vn); turn, ii.26; trilled turn or *prallender Doppelschlag*, i.33 and 152 (va), ii.46 (v1).

²⁴ E.g., in i.42 and in ii.24, where the last note *f''* is the first note of the following ritornello; the next five measures of the upper staff are blank.

²⁵ Dimensions and watermark information from Leisinger / Wollny 1997, 334.

²⁶ 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.

of the Hamburg tenor Johann Heinrich Michel (1739–1810). Michel served Bach throughout the latter's Hamburg years, making countless copies of works by the composer and members of his family; he continued to do so after the composer's death.²⁷ The letter, dated 13 Feb 1795, explains that the keyboard part of “Concerto no. 4” has had to be completely rewritten, and the remaining parts, that is, the strings, have been corrected.²⁸ In this correspondence, works are cited by the numbers attached to them in NV 1790; hence Concerto no. 4 is the present work.

Westphal had begun corresponding with and obtaining manuscript copies directly from Bach only during the composer's last few years. The process was interrupted by the composer's death on 14 December 1788, and only in 1790 or 1791 did he again receive copies directly from the Bach household. In the interim he evidently purchased items from the Hamburg music dealer Johann Christoph Westphal (1727–99)—who was unrelated to J. J. H. Westphal—and from the estate of the Schwerin composer Johann Wilhelm Hertel (1727–89). By 1791, however, J. J. H. Westphal had realized that some of the copies in his possession either were faulty or did not contain Bach's latest versions of the compositions in question. Letters to him from Bach's heirs contain frequent references to manuscripts which he sent to them to be “looked over” (*durchgesehen*) and either replaced or corrected by Michel.

B2 is one such copy. In a letter dated exactly one year after the one previously mentioned, on 13 Feb 1796, Bach's daughter Anna Carolina Philippina Bach (1747–1804) mentions the “uncommonly troublesome work” (*ungemein mühsame Arbeit*) of the copyist in reviewing the copies of concertos that Westphal has sent her. She also apologizes for the cost—which was evidently higher than Westphal had expected—and includes an account for the corrections carried out on copies of twelve concertos. Those for W. 4 cost 12 Schilling, somewhat less than for the eleven others, probably because of the relative brevity of the present work.²⁹ Michel's corrections are evident throughout, most obviously in the replacement of the original “da capo” ending of the third movement (see Fig. w4k3) but also in the addition of ornaments, dynamic markings, and slurs throughout the string parts (see Fig. w4k4).

²⁷ Michel's dates are established by Jürgen Neubacher, “Der Organist Johann Gottfried Rist (1741–1795) und der Brachist Ludwig August Christoph Hopff (1715–1798): Zwei hamburgener Notenkopisten Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs,” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 81 (2005): 121–2.

²⁸ “Zu dem Conc. N. 4 ist die Clavierstimme bloß umbeschrieben, und die andern sind berichtigt worden.” The letter is item no. 620 in *CPEB-Briefe*, 2: 1322–3. This and other letters written in the name of Bach's widow are actually in his daughter's hand.

²⁹ The letter is edited in Manfred Hermann Schmid, “Das Geschäft mit dem Nachlaß von C. Ph. E. Bach: Neue Dokumente zur Westphal-Sammlung des Conservatoire Royal de Musique und der Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique in Brüssel,” in *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach und die europäische Musikkultur des mittleren 18. Jahrhunderts: Bericht über das Internationale Symposium der Joachim Jungius-Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften Hamburg 29. September–2. Oktober 1988*, edited by Hans Joachim Marx (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 509–11.



Figure w4k3. End of basso part for W. 4, third movement, in **B2**, showing original “da capo” replaced by ending in Michel’s hand



Figure w4k4. Opening of first violin part for W. 4, second movement, in **B2**, showing ornaments and other additions by Michel to the copy by Borsch

The previous history of **B2** cannot be reconstructed with certainty. Ulrich Leisinger and Peter Wollny trace the string parts to the Hamburg dealer J. C. Westphal on the basis of “paper and handwriting,” referring to the copyist Johann Stephan Borsch (1744–1804), whom they regard as having worked for Westphal.³⁰ J. C. Westphal’s published catalogs list two G-minor concertos attributed to C. P. E. Bach. These are presumably W. 6 and 32, although their identity cannot be verified, as no incipit or other information is given. In any case, J. J. H. Westphal would have acquired his copy not directly from J. C. Westphal but via the Hertel estate. Hertel had heard Bach perform at least one concerto at Berlin and had studied violin with Franz Benda;³¹ it would have been natural for the collector Westphal to assume that copies of Bach’s music in Hertel’s possession were reliable.

³⁰ Leisinger / Wollny 1979, 39n. 55; the basis for associating Borsch with J. C. Westphal is not stated.

³¹ See *Johann Wilhelm Hertel: Autobiographie*, edited by Erich Schenk (Cologne: Hermann Böhlaus Nachf., 1957), 24, 29. The concerto was W. 11 in D, which Hertel heard at a Berlin concert in 1745, the year of the work’s publication; J. J. H. Westphal owned Hertel’s copy of the printed edition (Leisinger / Wollny 1997, 38).

The keyboard part of **B2** is figured throughout; the upper staff is blank in “tutti” passages. The revised version of the present source is designated **C2**.

B3: D Bsa SA 2590 (a)

Manuscript score in an unidentified hand (3 nested bifolios = 12 pages: 34.5 x 21 cm).

Watermarks: (1) crowned eagle with monogram “FR” (?) | “W. WINKEL”; (2) (a) crowned scepter between branches; (b) letters within a ribbon³²

In addition to the present score, SA 2590 contains an unrelated set of manuscript parts described above as **A1**. Both sources bear entries identifying them as parts of the collection of Carl Friedrich Zelter (1758–1832), director of the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin from 1800 until his death.³³ The score **B3** is bound in marble paper with a glued-on inner backing of unused lottery tickets (“Königl. Preussische Zahle-Lotterie in Berlin”); these show the uncompleted date “177_”. Hence **B3** may date from the following decade, when the tickets presumably would have been of value only as scrap paper. A label on the front cover reads “Clavier-Concert von | C. Ph. E. Bach | [incipit]”.

The first page is headed: “Concerto per il Cembalo del Sige C. Ph E. Bach.” Each page is written on as many as thirty staves grouped into systems of four or six staves. The four staves of the initial system are labeled “V. 1. | V. 2. | Viola | Bass”. Two new staves designated “Cembalo” are added above the bottom staff at the top of page 2, coinciding with the first solo episode at i.43; in the last measure of page 1, the lowest staff bears two parts, the top one labeled “Basso del Cembalo”. The writing is necessarily small but clear; the impression of economy in the use of paper is contradicted by three expanses of unused empty space within a movement, which suggests inexperience in the copyist.

Throughout, figures are placed in the bottom (“Bass”) staff, not the lower staff of the keyboard (where present; see Plate 2). In systems of six staves, both right- and left-hand staves contain rests in tutti passages, despite the presence there of a figured bass line. That the keyboard player nevertheless was expected to play continuo in these passages is suggested by the “Basso del Cembalo” part in i.42; the latter is, however, the only instance of this double use of the bottom staff. There are no “solo” or “tutti” indications, and doublings of the first violin by the right hand of the keyboard are present only the same brief tutti passages in which they occur in other sources.

B4: D B Thulemeier 18

B4 is a set of five parts preserved together with sources **A1** and **D1**, described above and below, respectively. It comprises:

³² Description of watermarks from Enßlin, 239 (nos. 88 and 248). Enßlin, 659, traces the first mark to the paper mill Wolfswinkel in Eberswalde, maker Johann Tobias Hantó (active 1768–90). The present editor was able to make out only indistinct traces of a watermark in the thick paper of the source.

³³ The catalog number “ZD 1467^a” in pencil at the foot of the first page of **B3** and in blue crayon on the cover (superseding an earlier entry “D II 1467” which is crossed out in blue crayon) is typical of the markings found on copies from Zelter's collection.

“Cembalo Concertato.”: 16 pages (probably 4 nested bifolios), the first and last unruled; p. 1 bears only the part label, which is repeated at the head of the music on p. 2. Watermark: stag. Dimensions: 33.2 x 21.0 cm. Soprano clef;
 “Violino Primo”, “Violino Secondo”, “Viola”, “Basso” (each a single bifolio): watermark and dimensions as for “Cembalo Concertato”

The keyboard part of **B4** is fully figured and lacks doublings of the violins in tutti passages except for isolated notes. A number of pencil entries, including several ornaments, do not coincide with other sources and must be arbitrary additions.

The four string parts were considered lost until their return to Berlin in 2007 from the archive of the Hochschule für Musik “Franz Liszt” in Weimar.³⁴ These parts are occasionally inaccurate with respect to pitches and durations, and they also are inconsistent in the transmission of performance markings, many of which appear to be wrong or carelessly entered, as shown by numerous inconsistencies between v1 and v2 in unison passages. Errors in pitches include:

- i.32 va note 6 d'' not e''; no slur on notes 5–6
- i.38 v1 c'''–h'' not e'''–d'''
- i.70–1 va these measures omitted
- i.151 va note 4 c'' not d''
- i.170 bs note 3 G not F#

Thus the source is unlikely to have been copied directly from the composer's own material, although it appears to give readings close to **B1–3**. Because it is less accurate than any of those sources, variant readings from **B4** are not included in the lists of readings for the intermediate version, which provides a synopsis of the composer's revisions from the early to the late version. However, **B4** does serve as a secondary source, providing independent authority for a number of emendations to the text of the early version.³⁵

B5: D MEIr, Kapellarchiv BI 14

Five manuscript parts (keyboard and strings) in an unidentified hand. Each is in upright format, 12 staves per page, with the title “Concerto” in the upper left and “di Emanuel Bach” in the upper right of the first page.³⁶ The script throughout is neat and the text is close to that of **B3** and **B6**. The keyboard part, in soprano clef, is figured after the first four measures and lacks doublings of

³⁴ See Schwinger, *Die Musikaliensammlung Thulemeier*, 465. The description of the four string parts and the identification of Nichelmann's hand are reported by Schwinger, 40, who lists the copyist of the keyboard and string parts as “Schaffrath II” and the copyist of the additional cello part (**A4**) as “Thulemeier VIII”; the watermark is his no. 13.

³⁵ Schwinger, 472, describes **B4** as preserving, together with **A4**, “the earliest extant source layer [*Quellenschicht*]” for W. 4, overlooking the preservation of earlier versions in **A4** and other sources.

³⁶ Seen here, in photocopies only, were “Clavecin Obligat” (19 pages of music), “Violino 1.” (8 pages), and “Violino 2.” (8 pages). RISM A/II (record no. 200.017.949) lists viola and basso parts in the same format as well.

the strings in tutti passages.

B6: US Wc M1010.A2B13 W4

Five manuscript parts in at least two unidentified hands

The parts, all upright, are in a wrapper reading “Bachsche Concerte.” The word *Bachsche* is probably a later addition, as is “No. 3.” beneath. The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo concertato.”: 16 pages, the first unruled and bearing the title “Concerto Cembalo. || del Sigr: Bach.”;

“Violino Primo.” “Violino Secondo.” “Viola.” and “Violoncello.”: each 4 pages, without title.

The string parts are in a hand distinct from but similar to that of the keyboard, which is figured and doubles only isolated notes of violin 1 in tutti passages.

B6 is one of a number of copies of individual Bach concertos at US Wc. Many, including **B6**, bear the stamped date “JUN 26 1907” on the back of the wrapper, as well as entries of the form “105717 | '08” in pencil on the front. These manuscripts were reportedly purchased in 1908 from the Berlin firm of Leo Liepmannsohn, which had previously acquired them from Alfred Wotquenne (1867–1939).³⁷ Wotquenne, librarian of B-Bc from 1894 to 1918, also dealt in music privately.³⁸ Some of the manuscripts at US Wc bear stamps connecting them with a Lasserre or Lasserré in Châtelleraut whose estate was sold off in the late nineteenth century. But the latter may have been only an intermediary, as many sources in US Wc have been traced to the library of Eduard Grell (1800–86), director of the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin.³⁹

Unlike the sources at US Wc for W. 5 and 6, **B6** contains nothing in the hand of a recognized Bach copyist, nor are there any obvious marks of ownership. Nevertheless, like the copies of W. 5 and 6 and other manuscripts at US Wc of similar provenance, it is an inaccurate copy of an intermediate version.

B7: D DI Mus. ms. 3029-O-5 (first violin part)

B7 is one of five parts preserved together as D DI Mus. ms. 3029-O-5; four of the parts are described above as source **A3**. The first violin part is in a hand that Horst Augsbach identified as that of Markus Heinrich Graul, a soldier who also served as cellist in the Berlin *Hofkapelle* from

³⁷ 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.

³⁸ See, e.g., Leisinger / Wollny 1997, 98–100.

³⁹ Wade, *The Keyboard Concertos*, 45, describes the stamp, which, as she points out (p. 47), is sometimes erased “so that only its general shape remains visible on the page”; copies that passed through Lasserre are linked by common handwriting, paper, and format. Peter Wollny, “On Miscellaneous Bach Sources,” in *Bach Perspectives*, vol. 5: *Bach in America*, edited by Stephen A. Crist (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2003), 148, states that “ciphers on the title pages indicate that the bulk of these sources came from the estate of . . . Grell.” A group of C. P. E. Bach sources in F-Pn is also reputed to have come from Lasserre; see François Lesure, “The Music Department of the Bibliothèque National, Paris,” *Music Library Association Notes* 35 (1978–9): 258. Other copies with the same provenance have been identified in D DI and US-CAh (see CPEBCW I/8.2: 162).

1763 to 1798 (see Fig. w4k5). Augsbach dates the copies in this hand of works by Quantz to the period 1748–56, finding this hand especially in concertos by Quantz copied for use at the palace of Sanssouci.⁴⁰ But both the identification of the copyist and the dating appear to have no objective basis, although the hand is clearly that of an important copyist of works by Quantz. Only this part gives a title (“Concerto”), at the beginning of the first system. That this part originated separately from the others is evident in its transmitting intermediate readings rather than the early version found in the other parts.



Figure w4k5. Opening of first violin part for W. 4, in B7, in the hand of a Berlin court copyist

Sources: Late Version

C1: D B St 618

C1 is the state of source B1 as revised by C. P. E. Bach; see above for full description.

C2: B Bc 5887 MSM

C2 is the state of source B2 as revised by Michel; see above for full description.

Sources: Embellishments and Cadenza(s) for the Second Movement

D1: D B Thulemeier 18 (addendum)

D1 is a set of embellishments and other matter preserved together with sources A4 and B4, both described above. It comprises a single oblong bifolio (4 pages) in a hand identified as that of Christoph Nichelmann, ruled in 10 staves per page, containing [p. 1] embellishments and a cadenza for W. 6/ii, as well as two cadenzas for an unidentified work or works; [pp. 2–3] J. S. Bach, Prelude and Fugue in G, BWV 884 (= *Wohltemperiertes Clavier*, part 2, no. 17); [p. 4] cadenza for an unidentified movement in G major. Watermark: “IESV” beneath heraldic lily and

⁴⁰ Horst Augsbach, *Thematisch-systematisches Verzeichnis der Werke Johann Joachim Quantz* (Stuttgart: Carus, 1997), xx. Graul is Augsbach's copyist “B3” (the name usually appears as “Grauel” in the so-called *Capelletats*, annual summaries of payments to the *Hofkapelle* in Berlin-Dahlem, Geheimes Staatsarchiv, I. HA Rep. 36 Nr. 2468ff.).

four-part mark between bands. Dimensions: 23.3 x 31.3 cm.⁴¹

The first page is labeled “Einlage zu Th. M. 18” in the same librarian's hand seen on the first page of the keyboard part of **B4**. Despite small differences in appearance, all of the original entries are probably in the same hand.⁴² The sheet has been previously examined as a source for J. S. Bach's *Wohltemperiertes Clavier*, but it proves to be of negligible value for the text of the latter work, as its provenance is unknown and it transmits no distinctive readings.⁴³ Only this entry bears a title (“Preludio” for the first movement).

The greatest interest attaches to the first page. The original ink entries, occupying all but the last two thirds of the bottom system, consist of brief fragments of the melody and bass lines of W. 4/ii, generally without barlines; in each case the melody is embellished (see Plate 3). Hence they resemble the variations (*Veränderungen*) prepared by Bach for insertion into some of his published works,⁴⁴ and they were doubtless intended to serve the same purpose. The last of these fragments, also the longest, is a cadenza. Although some of the variations resemble embellishments present in the late version of W. 4, all, including the cadenza, are unique and otherwise unknown.

Two cramped entries in pencil occupy the remaining space on the page. These are difficult to interpret, as they are now faded and were written hastily, probably as quick sketches on what had become scrap paper. They appear to constitute portions of a cadenza for a movement in B ♭; the second entry may be an embellished version of the first one (up to the first note d''). The last page shows a third cadenza in G major, written in ink and occupying just one and a half of the five systems. All of these entries are transcribed in Ex. w4k1.⁴⁵

⁴¹ Watermark (“Heraldische Lilie mit angehängter Vierermarke zwischen Stegen, darunter: IESV”) and dimensions of the addendum from NBA V/6.2:114. The four pages of the addendum are numbered 1–4 in the modern pagination that runs throughout Thul. 18.

⁴² The hand is not autograph, as claimed by Wade, *The Keyboard Concertos*, 86.

⁴³ The addendum is source CA34 in NBA V/6.2.

⁴⁴ See the description of source **A 1** for the sonatas W. 53/1–6 in *CPEBCW I/3*: 17; facsimile in *Berg*, 5: 233ff. and 6: 161ff. Schwinger, 40, describes the contents of **D1** as comprising only “BWV 884 sowie Skizze zu einer Kadenz.”

⁴⁵ Precise pitches and rhythmic values of some notes in the cadenza or cadenzas at the end of page 1 are doubtful due to the difficulty of reading the manuscript (the entries are too faint to be clearly reproduced in Plate 3).

The image displays a musical score for W. 4: Sources, p. 16, consisting of six systems of piano accompaniment. Each system includes a treble and bass clef staff. The score is annotated with measure numbers and specific performance instructions:

- System 1:** Measures 11, 13, and 14. Measure 11 features two triplets. Measure 13 features two triplets.
- System 2:** Measures 19b-20a and 32. Measure 32 includes a fermata.
- System 3:** Measures 34, 39, and 40. Measure 34 includes the instruction **[ms: f crossed out]*.
- System 4:** Measures 42b and 49. Measure 49 features two triplets.
- System 5:** Measure 50. Includes the instruction **[ms: 32d]*.
- System 6:** Measure 58b (cadenza). Includes the instruction **[ms: ♯]*.

Example w4k1. Embellishments and cadenzas for W. 4/ii from DI (continues on next page)

Additional entries, pencil, p. 1 (bottom)

Additional entry, p. 4

None of the cadenzas is included in Bach's collection of cadenzas (see source **E1** under W. 5). This is no proof of inauthenticity, as source **E1** for W. 5 includes three otherwise unknown cadenzas for which Bach's authorship cannot be seriously doubted. But the cadenzas in B \flat appear to have been drafted by the copyist of **B4**, probably for another work.⁴⁶ The G-major cadenza is even less likely to have been intended for the present work, for in neither quick movement does the last solo passage contain a final cadence incorporating the traditional 6/4-chord that occurs at the beginning of the cadenza in **D1**.

⁴⁶ If Schwinger is correct in identifying the copyist as Nichelmann, the additional cadenzas might well be for one or more his concertos, although the cadenza could be used in W. 4 to elaborate the cadence at ii.24.

Sources: Evaluation

W. 4 is the first concerto for which a revision (“Erneuerung”) is *not* listed in NV 1790. Nevertheless W. 4 underwent all of the types of revision described previously, each type of revision probably taking place in several distinct stages. For instance, the voice leading of the viola on the first two beats of ii.2 had already been revised when **B1** and **B2** were copied; the later reading for these two beats also appears in **B3** and **B6**. But another alteration on the following beat of the same measure, in the same part, appears only in **C1** and **C2**. Hence **C1** incorporates voice-leading revisions made on at least two separate occasions.

In general, however, most revisions of a given type were probably undertaken at the same time. As a result, the groups of sources delineated below are characterized by the presence or absence of particular types of revised readings. Neither the sources nor the stages of revision can be precisely dated, but the character of the autograph entries in **C1** suggests that the final stage of revision, represented by this source, could have occurred as early as the mid-1750s. This would make the latest version of W. 4 significantly earlier than the late versions of the two other concertos edited in this volume. The distinction might reflect the fact that W. 5 and 6 are larger and more challenging works, for which demand might have increased as Bach's personal style came to be more widely recognized and understood. Performances and requests for copies of such works might have grown more frequent with time, whereas demand might have diminished for a less boldly characterized piece such as W. 4.

By far the greatest number of revisions were those involving the elaboration of the keyboard part, which involved numerous small changes and additions. Far more conspicuous, however, were two alterations to the formal structure of the work that took place probably at a much earlier date. These affected the ends of the last two movements: in the adagio the end of the last solo episode was altered to give the soloist an opportunity for a cadenza, and the final ritornello of the third movement was shortened. Although the early version of the third movement was thirty-two measures longer, the abbreviated later version took up more space in copies, as the final ritornello was now written out instead of being represented by a “da capo” indication.⁴⁷ These two formal revisions were accompanied by smaller changes especially to the inner string parts. The presence of the longer version in four independent sources leaves little doubt that it represents the composer's early version, yet three of the same sources (**A1–3**) also transmit alternate performance markings of uncertain origin, discussed below.

Source groups

The sources fall into three main groups, designated by the letters A, B, and C:

- A: sources preserving the earliest readings (sources **A1–4**);
- B: sources containing formal revisions of movements 2 and 3 as well as changes of detail primarily in the string parts (sources **B1–7**);
- C: sources containing the above revisions as well as ornamentation, embellishment, and variation of the keyboard part (sources **C1–2**).

⁴⁷ The revised final ritornello is equivalent to mm. 23–6 + 37–44; there is a corresponding revision of the keyboard in iii.186.

Further divisions can be delineated within each group. Within group A, only **A1** gives all of the earliest readings; within group B, **B3** usually but not always gives the early (pre-correction) readings of **B1** and **B2**.⁴⁸ Although most elaboration of the keyboard part is documented only in group 3, some slurs and ornament signs already occur in the sources of group 1, even though they are absent from **B3**. Hence it appears that Bach owned at least two copies of the work, probably a score and a set of parts, and did not always enter revisions into both of them, at least not simultaneously. Possibly group 1 derives from parts, group 2 from a score that might have been recopied before **B1** and **B2** were made; preparation of a new score would explain why the latter two sources contain common errors absent from earlier copies.⁴⁹

Standing apart from the above is **D1**. Its unique readings, if Bach's, would require considering **D1** a representative of a distinct group.

Group A (sources of the early version)

Of the three complete sources of this group, **A2** and **A3** are particularly close, probably deriving ultimately from the same inaccurate copy of an early state of Bach's material.⁵⁰ A number of readings in **A2** appear to represent arbitrary attempts to correct errors that remain in **A3**;⁵¹ the corrections in question were not made by the copyist of **A2**, which shows no alterations at these points (although it does show corrections elsewhere), but rather in some exemplar. It is possible that some of these errors originally arose because of changes in Bach's score that an early copyist found illegible, but others are probably due simply to poor copying. Despite their inaccuracies, **A2** and **A3** together represent an independent witness of an early state of the work, as is evident from a common error that they share with the later sources **B1** and **B2**.⁵²

A1 appears to be somewhat closer to Bach's tradition, although its copyist Possin remains a shadowy figure. Whether he had direct access to any original Bach manuscripts is uncertain, although that is a possibility in the case of his manuscript score of W. 6 (source **A1** for that

⁴⁸ **B3** gives later readings than **B1** and **B2** at i.83–4 and in several “pp” markings; these passages therefore must either represent a distinct stage of revisions, or amended readings that for one reason or another were overlooked when **B1** and **B2** were first copied. By the same token, **B6** shows a revised reading for the va at i.83–4 but not at iii.106–7; the first of these revisions was present in **B2** but was a later addition in **B1**, whereas the second revision is present only as a later addition in both **B1** and **B2**.

⁴⁹ At i.114, 131, and 182.

⁵⁰ **A2** and **A3** share errors in i.138–9 (lh), i.182 (rh), and ii.5 (va); their reading in ii.46 (v2), although apparently shared with **B2**, occurs in a passage that clearly gave Bach some trouble (two other readings are attested). Here and below, violin 1 part **B7** is disregarded, as it belongs to a different group. **A4** contains too small a number of distinctive readings to be clearly evaluated.

⁵¹ E.g., at iii.35 and 119–24, passages in which the viola of **A3** lacks a measure.

⁵² At i.182 (see list of variant readings).

work). His copies, although neat, are not particularly accurate.⁵³ But they do often give very early versions, as does **A1**, which also contains significantly fewer errors than **A2** and **A3**. Yet like them **A1** contains unique performance markings that are unlikely to derive from the composer; these include the bowings mentioned above in the description of the source. Probably in the same category are the clearly spurious continuo figures added in **A1** on the surprising harmonies of ii.46.⁵⁴ These figures, although surely not Bach's, confirm that keyboard players might have added a continuo realization even when performing from a part that generally has a doubling of the violin parts in place of figures. Nevertheless, **A1** is too unreliable to serve as principal source of the early version. Yet in many cases it gives unique readings for the notes, and the consistency with which these readings appear in parallel passages makes it likely that they represent Bach's otherwise unattested early versions; these readings are adopted in the text of the early version.

A peculiarity of group A is that the three complete sources include alternate performance markings that are unlikely to derive from Bach, although they superficially resemble his tradition, using ornament signs described in his *Versuch*. Yet the underlying text of these sources must be from a time when Bach was not yet using ornaments such as the trilled turn (*prallender Doppelschlag*) or three-note slide (“inverted turn”). Although some of the alternate performance markings merely supplement what is implicit in other sources, as in the addition of slurs to certain triplet groups, in general they cannot derive from Bach, as they occur with little consistency from one source to another. Moreover, the frequency and nature of the alternate markings in **A2** makes it at times more an arrangement than than a copy, and its use of certain ornament signs is somewhat more enthusiastic than typical of Bach.⁵⁵ Numerous signs for mordents in **A1**, where trills or turns are implied by the context, are also contrary to Bach's usage.⁵⁶ As valuable as these alternate performance markings might be for study of the reception and performance history of the work, it is impractical to report them in full, and therefore only a representative selection is described in the list of variant readings.

Group B (sources giving intermediate readings)

This is a somewhat miscellaneous set of sources, each of which may represent a somewhat different state of the work. **B1** and **B2** in their original states appear to have given relatively late

⁵³ Ulrich Leisinger expresses similar views about this copyist in his essay “Zur Geschichte der Bach-Sammlung der Sing-Akademie zu Berlin” in *EnBlin*, 526: “Nach bisherigem Kenntnisstand zeichnen sich Possins Abschriften nicht durch besondere Sorgfalt aus, was ihren Wert—ungeachtet der Frage der jeweiligen Vorlagen—relativiert.” Peter Wollny, examining various other sources attributed to Possin, concludes that none of them derive directly from Bach's house copies; see *CPEBCW* I/8.2, descriptions for sources **D 41** and **D 46–8** (pp. 180–1).

⁵⁴ Those are the only figures in **A1**, with the exception of the nonsensical figures two measures later (see list of variants for both readings).

⁵⁵ For example, in ii.17, third beat, a trilled turn on an unaccented sixteenth note follows two instances of the same complex ornament in the first half of the measure.

⁵⁶ Possibly the mordent signs in **A1** are later additions; some of these signs resemble the letter “t” and in certain cases are almost indistinguishable from the cross or + indications.

versions, although it is impossible to make out all of their original readings. **B2** gives a few readings not in **B1** and therefore could not have been copied from the latter.⁵⁷ A further distinction, perhaps representing only the working habits of the copyists, is that **B2** tends to beam the thirty-seconds of movement 2 in groups of four, not eight as in **B1**.

Of the remaining intermediate sources, the score **B3** appears to be closest to Bach's material, possibly even a direct copy of his original composing score in its initial revised state. **B3** lacks many signs for ornaments and articulation, but not those that are motivically essential (such as the slur in i.1 and the strokes in i.18). Some errors (e.g., in ii.54, violin 1) suggest that it derives from an exemplar that originally showed earlier readings whose revisions were not entirely clear. Its uncertain provenance and unidentified hand make it impossible to edit a reliable text from **B3** alone. But together with the sources of group 1 it can be used to reconstruct a version earlier than any given verbatim in any source.

The keyboard part of **B4** is generally close to that of **B3**, although it incorporates the continuo figures that the latter assigns to the basso part. It also lacks the distinctive note values that **B3** occasionally assigns to the last note of a solo episode (see below). Because it appears to contain few errors, and lacks alternate performance markings, **B4** is unlikely to transmit arbitrary alterations to the text. It therefore serves as a secondary source for the edition of the early version, despite its unknown provenance.

Because Nichelmann, the probable scribe of **D1**, was a capable composer and keyboard player in his own right, it is possible that he was also the author of the unique embellishments and cadenza preserved on this sheet. But Bach's responsibility cannot be ruled out; the style appears to be his, and these readings could represent a revision subsequent to that represented by **B3**. If so, Bach subsequently discarded or disregarded these readings, for **B1** and **B2** show no traces of them. Instead, when Bach created the final version of the second movement, containing a much more elaborate set of written-out embellishments, he apparently added the latter to what was still essentially the early version of the keyboard part.

B5 and **B6** are independent copies of an intermediate version close to that of **B3**. Both are inaccurate, and because neither presents a distinctive version or is known to come from close to Bach, they are disregarded for purposes of the edition. The same holds for **B7**, which, although allegedly copied by a colleague of Bach's in the Berlin *Capelle*, is too inaccurate to have been copied from the composer's own material.

Group C (sources of the late version)

Although both are updated copies of earlier versions, the two sources of group 3 represent somewhat different states of the work. Most of the autograph alterations in **C1** correspond with alterations in **C2**, which although later is less accurate and contains no readings that can be understood as further revisions. Rather, **C2** gives earlier readings at certain points (e.g., viola in i.2, 4) and is sometimes less precise in the placement of slurs and dynamic signs. The presence of early readings in the keyboard part, which Michel copied anew (rather than updating an earlier copy as he did for the string parts), indicates that his exemplar had not been revised to reflect all of the subsequent readings of **C1**. This could be because some readings found only in **C1** were

⁵⁷ See list of variants for readings, e.g., in v2 at i.61–4 and ii.17.

revisions made by the composer in the process of marking that source. But most differences between these two sources must reflect the fact that **C2** dates from some six years after Bach's death. By then the aging Michel had suffered an "illness" and was experiencing "difficulty in correcting the concertos."⁵⁸

Nevertheless, **C2** is independent of **C1**, the revisions in both probably having been copied separately from a lost autograph score. It is possible that Bach and Michel also collated readings from a revised set of parts as well. In any case, Michel's difficulties would have lain not only in the physical work of meticulously correcting the previously copied string parts of **B2**, but also in interpreting an old autograph score (and possibly parts) containing numerous revisions. Even Bach's corrections in **C1** are not perfect, and although that manuscript naturally serves as the principal source of the late version, **C2** must supplement it as a secondary source.

The Embellishments and Cadenzas in D1

A possible parallel to the embellishments in **D1** is provided by a copy from the same collection of W. 25; contrary to what is implied in CPEBCW III/7: 177, the "embellished version" of the slow movement of W. 25 in this source (Thul. 15) at one point (m. 28) gives a reading intermediate between the early version of the work printed in the main text and the "embellished solo keyboard part" printed in the appendix of the same volume.⁵⁹ There is no chance that the copyist of Thul. 15 merely overlooked the embellished reading for m. 28, since the reading there (8ths a'/f''-g'/e'', f''-g''-a''-b[b]') is already a variation of the presumably original reading, which moves in quarter notes. It is conceivable that the copyist of Thul. 15 worked from a set of embellished readings resembling the one in **D1**. If, as Schwinger argues, both **D1** and Thul. 15, containing embellishments for W. 4 and 25, were owned by Nichelmann, the latter might have received these readings from his colleague at a date prior to Bach's final revision of both works.

Reconstruction of the early version

As argued above, the format of the score **B3**, with a figured basso part and rests for the keyboard in most tutti passages, probably resembles that of Bach's lost original score. Although **B3** gives an intermediate state of the text, it is relatively accurate and lacks the numerous errors and alternate performance markings of **A1–3**. The reconstruction of the early version therefore follows **B3** except where **A1–3** provide earlier readings. As explained above, the latter comprise a relatively small number of common readings involving details in the inner string parts, as well as the earlier endings for the second and third movements.

The early version contains a number of inconsistencies between parallel passages,

⁵⁸ In her letter of 13 Feb 1795 to J. J. H. Westphal, Joanna Maria Bach mentions "eine Krankheit die meinem [sic] Notisten befiel" and the "Schwierigkeit, die mir der notist gemacht hat, die Concerte durchzusehn" (*CPEB-Briefe*, item 620 [p. 1322]). In addition to omitting numerous performance markings, which might also have been absent from its exemplar, **C2** contains a number of more substantive errors as well (listed with other variants).

⁵⁹ Presumably based on the copy by Michel in GB Lbl k.7.i.10; another copy, in B Bc 14885, gives the same readings as Michel's copy, with small variants.

particularly with respect to slurs and other performance markings.⁶⁰ Emendation would, however, require fairly arbitrary editorial decisions and therefore has been avoided. On the other hand, all sources for the earlier versions clearly contain errors of omission and commission, and most also incorporate arbitrary additions to Bach's text. Such readings have been eliminated where they can be clearly identified by comparison of sources.

Specific issues of text and performance

The greatest number of editorial problems in W. 4 concern the early version, especially the role of the keyboard during tutti passages. **B3** explicitly directs the soloist to rest in most such passages, occasionally giving different note values for a pitch shared by the left hand and the basso at points where a solo episode ends and a ritornello begins.⁶¹ These aspects of **B3** may reflect Bach's autograph score, but already in Schlichting's score for W. 5 the soloist is usually directed by custodes to double the basso part at the end of each solo passage.⁶² An apparent error in **B3** suggests that some of the rests may not have been in the original.⁶³ Bach may only gradually have clarified the separation of the left hand and basso at the ends of tutti sections; readings at these points occasionally suggest that revisions had taken place, leaving copyists unsure which notes to assign to each part.⁶⁴ However Bach's score of W. 4 originally read, all scribes other than that of **B3** copied the keyboard part as if it had been notated as in Schlichting's score of W. 5. The edition consequently presents the early version of W. 4 in the same format, that is, emending the readings of **B3** to conform with the pattern seen in both the late version and the sources of group 1. The continuo figures, attached in **B3** to the basso line, are transferred to the keyboard part.

Other issues involving doubling arise in solo episodes where the sources of group 1 show both violins, not just violin 1, playing an obbligato accompaniment.⁶⁵ A copyist working from a score might easily have overlooked a rest or some other indication that such a doubling was to cease at a certain point, and indeed one such error appears to occur in **A1**.⁶⁶ But the fact that the other sources of group 1 lack the latter error, yet transmit this type of doubling elsewhere, suggests that the more elegant scoring in which a single violin provides the obbligato had not yet

⁶⁰ See in particular i.11, 32–3, and 151–2. These passages continue to appear inconsistently in sources of the late version, implying that Bach's material remained unclear or ambivalent at these points.

⁶¹ E.g., at i.76; see list of variants for original readings.

⁶² See below under source **A2** for W. 5.

⁶³ See list of variants for early version at ii.50–1. Also supporting the same conclusion is the entry of the left hand on the downbeat of iii.107, doubling the basso for three notes before the independent left-hand part begins; this is the type of notation one would expect if the left hand had been doubling the basso in the preceding measures.

⁶⁴ See list of variants for i.50 (early version).

⁶⁵ See early version at i.61–4 and 103.

⁶⁶ At i.112 (early version).

occurred to Bach at the earliest stage of the work.

What may be another related issue concerns a reading in the sources of group 1, according to which the left hand contains an inner voice that doubles the first violin in ii.15–6 (and parallel passage ii.54–5; see Exx. 15a–b below). Because the doubling is at the octave, it is unlikely to have been intended for performance when the strings are present; it might instead be a vestige of an early draft in which v1 rested in this passage, or an optional version for solo keyboard. But an inelegant dissonance on the last note of m. 17 casts doubt over Bach's responsibility for the entire passage in this version.

A rhythmic variant in the ritornello of movement 1 may or may not be the product of a revision. Sources of groups A and B are ambivalent in their notation of i.34 and its parallel passage in m. 153. The discrepancy is eliminated in the late version; it is possible that Bach indeed changed the rhythm, perhaps influenced by his adoption in the 1750s of the rule that governs the length of the appoggiatura on the downbeat.⁶⁷

⁶⁷ See *Versuch*, i.2.2.11.