

CONCERTO IN C MINOR, W. 5  
Sources: Early Version

**A1: D B Amalienbibliothek ms. 99**

Manuscript score in the hand of Schlichting (2 gatherings of 8 bifolios each: 34.5 x 21.5 cm).  
Watermark: a small circular mark about 4.5 cm in diameter

The score **A1** is kept in a recent case that includes, in separate modern blue folders: (1) a report on conservation including repairs of paper and binding, dated 10 April 2002; and (2) flyleaves or end papers from an older binding, one of which bears the mirror image of f. 16', which originally faced it. The present binding includes marble paper covers bearing an eighteenth- or nineteenth-century label.

The title page (f. 1) reads: “Concerto per il Cembalo | del Sig<sup>te</sup> C. P. E. Bach | C. b. [library stamp:] GYMNASIO | REG: JOACHIM: | LEGAT: AM ILLU- | STRISS: PRINCIPE | AMALIA | [signature, lower right:] Kirnberger”. The part designations at the beginning of the music on f. 1' read downward from the top left corner to an extended title: “Concerto | a | Violino 1 | Violino 2 | Viola | Cembalo | Concerto | et | Basso ob | ligato” (see Plate 4). Added in pencil in a later hand to the right of the first word, across the top of the page: “per Cembalo di C. P. Bach [sic]”.

The signature, added to the title page in a somewhat lighter brown ink than the original entries, is that of Johann Philipp Kirnberger (1721–83), a pupil of J. S. Bach who served briefly as violinist in the Berlin *Hofcapelle* during 1752–3 and was subsequently librarian to King Friedrich's sister Anna Amalie.<sup>1</sup> Kirnberger's signature on the title page indicates that this is among the manuscripts that passed from his personal collection to that of Amalie, whose music library went in turn to the Joachimsthaler Gymnasium and subsequently to the Royal Library, Berlin, forerunner of D B.

Little is known about the copyist Schlichting, who was responsible also for **A2**, which bears a date from the 1750s (see below).<sup>2</sup> As **A2** appears to have been copied from **A1**, the latter is presumably somewhat earlier. A number of Schlichting's copies of keyboard sonatas were of early or intermediate versions revised by Bach.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, the format of **A1** is close to that of surviving autograph scores for concertos from the 1740s, and, despite numerous small errors (see the list of variant readings), **A1** could be a direct copy of a lost composing score. The ornament sign + is used instead of “tr” or more explicit symbols; dynamics are rarely indicated, although some are presumably implicit in the “tutti” and (less frequent) “solo” markings found in both the first violin part and the upper staff of the keyboard part.

---

<sup>1</sup> The dates for Kirnberger's service in the *Capelle* are based on the assumption that he is the “Kirrenberg” named in the *Capelletat* for a portion of the fiscal year 1752–3 (Berlin-Dahlem, Geheimes Staatsarchiv, I. HA Rep. 36 Nr. 2452).

<sup>2</sup> Copies by Schlichting, including **A1** and **A2**, are listed in Wolfgang Horn, *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: Frühe Klaviersonaten* (Hamburg: Wagner, 1988), 178–9; Horn mentions that only the copyist's last name is known.

<sup>3</sup> See, for example, the facsimile of D B Mus. ms. Bach P 786 in Berg, 3: 251–7, a house copy of the sonata W. 65/12 with autograph revisions.

Although autograph entries are absent from **A1** (and from **A2**), Schlichting himself appears to have revised the score at some point; added entries are distinguished either by brown (as opposed to black) ink, or by being smaller in size. Additions include the tempo mark for the first movement, “Moderato”, added in brown ink at the beginning between the staves of the keyboard part, and slurs and dynamics as well as some extended portions of the string parts when accompanying solo episodes. Evidently in the latter passages Schlichting had copied the keyboard part first, returning later to add the strings.

The keyboard part is generally blank in tutti passages; figures usually appear in the basso part. But the first violin part is doubled by the right hand in a few brief tutti passages, including two in which a few figures appear as well in the keyboard part (at iii.39–43, 64–6). The words “solo” and “tutti” appear regularly in the keyboard part as well.

## **A2: D B Mus. ms. Bach St 197**

Five manuscript parts in the hand of Schlichting. No visible watermarks

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo concertato.”: 20 pages (thick brown paper, about 33 x 21 cm, trimmed variously);  
 “Violino 1”, “Violino 2do”, “Viola”, “Violoncello”: each a single bifolio (thin brittle paper, ranging from 32 x 20 to 33.5 to 21.5 cm, depending on trimming).

The keyboard part is bound in paper covers bearing a later label reading “Concerto c<sup>b</sup> | per il Cembalo | comp. dal Sge. C. F. E. Bach”. The first page of the part is a title page in Schlichting's hand reading: “CONCERTO | â 5 voc | Cembalo Certato | duo Violini | Viola | e | Violoncello | di Sigre. Bach | è C. b. | [incipit]”. Added in the upper right corner is a later entry in brown ink possibly reading “N<sup>o</sup> [?] 4. 1759”, but this has been abraded and is no longer clearly legible; the date could be 1751, 1758, even 1754.<sup>4</sup> Any of these readings would be consistent with the fact that **A2** transmits a version that predates the *Erneuerung* of W. 5 in 1762. In the lower right is an entry in the same ink consisting of two cursive characters (d? M?) within an oval. At the bottom of the last page music is the entry “C. D. Ebeling | 1770” in brown ink, similar in color but not ductus to the additions on the title page. Christoph Daniel Ebeling would be one of the translators of Burney's *Travels*, published at Hamburg in 1772–3. But although Bach had been in the city since 1768, Ebeling unlikely to have acquired **A2** from the composer, for in addition to giving an early version the copy is inaccurate.

As in Schlichting's score (**A1**), there are many later additions, including the tempo mark “Moderato” on the first page of music in the keyboard part (see Plate 5). Pencil markings were subsequently added in one or more other hands. That Schlichting was copying from a score—that is, **A1**—is evident from a number of errors and subsequent corrections. In particular, in copying the first violin part at the beginning of movement 3, Schlichting initially skipped a system after the first line break in his exemplar and therefore had to insert mm. 7–15 into the bottom margin of the part; this was because in **A1** the initial ritornello of the movement appears in systems of three rather than the usual six staves.

The keyboard part contains doublings of the first violin throughout the tutti passages, which

---

<sup>4</sup> Wade, *The Keyboard Concertos*, 41, reads “Nov. 4, 1758”.

also include figures. The + sign is practically the only ornament sign used, apart from a few mordents.

### **A3: D B Mus. ms. Bach P 295**

Manuscript anthology of solo keyboard pieces by various composers in an unidentified hand (342 pages: 26.5 x 31.5 cm). Thick fine paper, no watermark visible.

The title reads “Clavier-Stücke | von | J. S. Bach. C. P. E. Bach, Hertel | Schale Kleinknecht, Kreysing Kirn- | berger, Marpurg, Sack, Graun, Sey- | farth, Richter, Marcello [added later:] A. Scarlatti.” Pages 64–71 contain a version of W. 5/iii for solo keyboard (Kast's W. n.v. 40), identified as “Allegro von C. P. E. Bach” in a later list of contents at the end of the volume, which is also a source for W. 62/13 and W. 117/17–8.

Despite its large size, **A3** is an integral volume (not a composite manuscript) containing a selection of serious, substantial keyboard pieces. It has been previously described by Peter Wollny, who traces it to the collection of Caspar Siegfried Gähler, from whom it passed to the Hamburg music dealer J. C. Westphal and the counts Voß.<sup>5</sup> The main hand is otherwise unknown; the contents point to an origin in the period after 1750. The repertory falls into two main groups, the first consisting mainly of works by Berlin composers of the mid-eighteenth century—Bach, Marpurg, Hertel, Sack, Kirnberger, Nichelmann, Schale—although the first entry is a sonata in G minor attributed to Kleinknecht. At p. 198 the character of the repertory changes, beginning with an anonymous fugue in F, thereafter a fugue by “Scarlatti,” several “Marcello” sonatas, a sinfonia by “Graun,” and many pieces by Kreisig, several of which echo works of J. S. Bach.<sup>6</sup> Several short pieces were added later in a foreign hand, as were many headings supplementing the original titles.

W. 5/iii falls in the first, “Berlin” portion of the collection, bearing the original title “Allegro”; the attribution “del Sige. P. E. Bach” was added later in lighter ink. The entries “Solo” (m. 17) and “T” (m. 20) are original, indicating that the copyist was aware of the piece's origin in a concerto. Indeed, it is one of several items evidently intended to serve as solo keyboard versions of ensemble works; the following piece is a fragmentary copy of a Concerto in B-flat (W. n.v. 36) attributed in the manuscript to Bach, identified by Karyl Louwenaar as by Schaffrath and by Wollny as by Nichelmann.<sup>7</sup>

### **Sources: Intermediate Versions**

---

<sup>5</sup> See the entries for source **D 23** in CPEBCW II/8.1: 176 and for **E 1** in NBA V/9.1, *Kritischer Bericht*, 87. Gähler was responsible for a label fixed to the front cover.

<sup>6</sup> The gigue of a prelude and suite in B-flat (pp. 213–21) recalls that of English Suite no. 4 (BWV 809), the prelude of a suite in E-flat (pp. 208–12) echoes the gavotte of the French Suite in the same key (BWV 815); and there are echoes of the Partitas. Kreisig might also have composed the Largo and Allegro in G (pp. 223–5) here attributed to J. S. Bach. The latter's Italian Concerto BWV 971 (pp. 288–96, without the slow movement) appears in close proximity to Kreisig's Concerto in E (three movements, pp. 272–9).

<sup>7</sup> Louwenaar: note on a card kept with the manuscript; Wollny: CPEBCW II/8.1: 176.

**B1: D WRz Mus. IV c:8**

Five manuscript parts in a single unidentified hand. Approximate dimensions: 30.5 x 23 cm<sup>8</sup>

The parts are as follows: “Cembalo concertato” (16 pages); “Violino Primo.”, “Violino Secondo.”, and “Viola.” (each 7 pages); and “Violoncello” (6 pages). The sole title is the word “Concerto.” at the top right corner of the first page of each part. Subsequent additions at the top of the keyboard part are: “[R.?] IV.2.” and “No. 10” (upper left), “del Bach | No. II. | 12. Gr [?]”. The first of these entries corresponds with the listing of W. 5 as the second work in the fourth *Raccolta* of concertos by Bach advertised by Breitkopf.<sup>9</sup>

The keyboard part is figured in tutti passages, which lack doublings of the upper string parts except in brief passages, some of which also contain figures (e.g., at i.185). “Solo” and “tutti” indications are also present.

**B2: D DI Mus. 3029-O-6**

Five manuscript parts in one or more unidentified hands. Dimensions: 22 x 30 cm oblong. Watermark: crowned fleur-de-lys + “ICH”, countermark “K B” (“R B”?)

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo certato”: 28 pages, the first originally blank, title added in a later hand;

“Violino 1.”, “Violino 2.”: each 12 pages, of which the outer pages are blank;

“Viola.”, “Violono.”: each 8 pages; the last page of music is written on the back of the first.

The title page reads: “Clavier-Concert | mit 2 Violinen, Bratsche und Bass | von | C. P. E. Bach.” In the lower left is the signature “D. Feuerstein”; an entry in the upper left has been crossed out: “(e V<sup>æ</sup>”.<sup>10</sup>

The bass clef of the keyboard part does not precisely match that of the “Violono”, which also uses an archaic form of key signature with duplicated B and A flats; treble clefs in the keyboard and in the two violin parts also fail to match exactly. But the hands and paper are nevertheless very close to uniform, and the watermark resembles one associated with the Saxon mill of Johann Christian Hertel (d. 1748) that has been described as being found in copies sold by the Leipzig music dealer Breitkopf.<sup>11</sup> These features all distinguish the copy from source **B7** of W. 4, which also belonged to Feuerstein before passing to D DI.

The keyboard part is generally figured in tutti passages, which also include doublings of the

---

<sup>8</sup> The source was seen in photocopy. The copyist is not the same as in **B2**, contrary to what is implied in Wade, *The Keyboard Concertos*, 147n. 22.

<sup>9</sup> In *Catalogo de' soli, duetti, trii, terzetti, quartetti e concerti . . . parte IVta* (Leipzig, 1763), facsimile in *The Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue*, edited by Barry S. Brook (New York: Dover Publications, 1966).

<sup>10</sup> A similar sign appears in D DI Mus. 3029-O-9, a copy of W. 25.

<sup>11</sup> Yoshitake Kobayashi, “On the Identification of Breitkopf’s Manuscripts,” in *Bach Perspectives, Volume Two: J. S. Bach, the Breitopfs, and Eighteenth-Century Music Trade*, edited by George B. Stauffer (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996), 113.

first violin. “Solo” and “tutti” indications appear consistently; the expression “accomp.” indicates the end of a *tasto solo* passage, a notational feature contrary to Bach's practice but shared with **B1**, which may also be a Breitkopf copy.<sup>12</sup>

### **C1: US Wc M1010.A2B13 W5**

Six manuscript parts by the unidentified copyist known as Anonymous 302

The parts are as follows: “Cembalo=Concertato” (20 pages, the first = title page, the last blank); “Violino=1<sup>mo</sup>,” “Violino=2<sup>do</sup>,” (each 8 pages, the last blank); “Viola,” “Violoncello,” “Basso. Grosso.” (each 8 pages, the first blank save for title “CONCERTO” and part label, the last blank). The title page reads: “C minor | CONCERTO. C moll b b b | [incipit] | Cembalo Concertato | 2 Violini | Viola | e | Basso et Violono | Dell Sigr C. P: E. Bach.” The attribution is probably a later addition, as is the entry “N. 22.” above and to the left of the incipit, as in the copy of W. 6 in US Wc. Although the lettering on the title page appears to match that in the parts, the musical notation in the incipit does not.<sup>13</sup>

**C1** is one of six sets of parts at US Wc partly or entirely by Anonymous 302; all are for concertos by Bach composed at Berlin. For this reason the copyist has been assumed to have worked for Bach before 1768.<sup>14</sup> But although copies by Anonymous 302 occur within two manuscript collections that include autograph material,<sup>15</sup> the scribe does not seem to have been responsible for any copies that themselves bear autograph entries. Nevertheless, Anonymous 302 and other scribes represented at US Wc appear to have had access to rarely copied intermediate versions. This raises the possibility that a group of copyists enjoyed a fairly close connection to the composer at a relatively late date in the revision history of certain works, including W. 5. Because **C1** gives a version of the latter work that appears to have originated shortly before its *Erneuerung* in 1762, the activity of these copyists might be localized to around 1760.

The keyboard part is fully figured in *tutti* passages, without doublings of the upper string parts. The two basso parts are identical musically despite small differences in format.

### **Sources: Late Version**

#### **D1: D B Mus. ms. Bach St 523**

Five manuscript parts, with a copy of four keyboard cadenzas on a separate sheet, all (?) in the hand of J. H. Michel. Fine, very thick paper (except for the cadenzas), watermark: “B. |

---

<sup>12</sup> In *Versuch*, ii.23.7, Bach indicates that chord realization after a *tasto solo* passage is indicated by the reappearance of figures, as in i.37, where **D1** gives the normally unnecessary figure 5 (3 in **A1**, transmitting the early version).

<sup>13</sup> The hand on the title page is Wade's “J.” Library entries include “105718 08”.

<sup>14</sup> Wade, *The Keyboard Concertos*, 93, describes **C1** as the work of one of “Bach's copyists.”

<sup>15</sup> D B Mus. mss. Bach P 364 and P 365.

SICKTE”<sup>16</sup>

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo concert.”: 12 folios = 24 pages, the first = title page, the last unused (33 x 21 cm); soprano clef;

“Violino Primo”, “Violino Secondo”, “Viola”, “Basso”: each 2 nested bifolios, the last page of each unused (34 x 21 cm).

The title page reads: “Concerto. | à | Cembalo. obligl: | Violino Primo. | Violino Secondo. | Viola. | è Basso. | dà. C. P. E. Bach.” At the top is “C moll.”, probably a later addition, and in the lower right corner in lighter ink the signature “Grave.”

The cadenzas are on different paper (33 x 19.5 cm) ruled with a different rastrum, each staff just under 1.0 cm wide, as opposed to about .85 cm in the parts (see Plate 6). Like the keyboard part, the copy of the cadenzas uses soprano clef. Only the first of the cadenzas is included in **E1**. Previously the cadenzas have been described as being in the hand of Grave,<sup>17</sup> but the cadenzas are quite clearly in Michel's hand, although evidently copied at a different time as the forms of clefs are different and the accidentals in the key signature are arranged in the way now customary (which is not the case for the remainder of the source; compare Fig. w5k1). On the other hand, small inconsistencies between the parts raise the possibility that here Michel was assisted by a second copyist with a hand very similar to his, or that the parts were not all copied at the same time. In particular, the keyboard part uses dotted rests, as opposed to quarter-plus-eighth rests, in the second movement, and it beams together many eighths and other small values in the first movement that are broken up into smaller groupings in the basso part.

The keyboard part is fully figured, with no doublings of the strings in tutti passages and only an occasional “Solo” indication.

---

<sup>16</sup> This mark was clearly observed only on the last page of the keyboard part; traces of a floral or heraldic design were visible on one other page of the keyboard part.

<sup>17</sup> Thus Kast, followed by Wade, *The Keyboard Concertos*, 236–7. On Grave, see above under source **A1** for W. 4.



*Figure w5k1. W. 5, keyboard part, movement 1, mm. 48–59, in the hand of Johann Heinrich Michel, from D1*

**D2: B Bc 5887 MSM (W. 5)**

Five manuscript parts in an unidentified hand (34.5 x 22 cm). Double paper, watermark: (a) crowned double “C”, (b) “CFB”<sup>18</sup>

The same letter of J. M. Bach to J. J. H. Westphal that refers to the copying of source **B2** of W. 4 mentions that this concerto, together with W. 24, has had to be recopied in its entirety.<sup>19</sup> In the case of W. 5, the reason must have been that Westphal had sent his existing copies of those works to the Bach household for correction, only to learn that his copies were of early versions too different from the late one to be updated.<sup>20</sup> That the present unknown copyist was engaged was probably due to the illness of one and the death of another of the copyists usually employed

<sup>18</sup> Dimensions and watermark information from Leisinger / Wollny 1997, 334–5. The hand is Wade’s “Q.” The source was studied in photographs taken by Mary Oleskiewicz with the kind permission of the library.

<sup>19</sup> “Die Concerte No. 5 u. 25 aber haben ganz müssen abgeschrieben werden.” Letter of 13 Feb 1795 to J. J. H. Westphal, in *CPEB-Briefe*, no. 620 (p. 2: 1323).

<sup>20</sup> W. 24 also underwent significant revision, but not to the extent that W. 5 did. Therefore it is unclear why W. 24 had to be recopied; the extant manuscript in B-Bc of W. 24 is nevertheless in the same hand as that of W. 5, Wade’s “Q.” Leisinger / Wollny 1997, 39fn. 54, suggest that Westphal’s “leider verschollenen Kopie der ursprünglichen Fassung von W. 5” might have been obtained from the Schwerin composer Johann Wilhelm Hertel (see above under source **B2** of W. 4).

by Bach's heirs.<sup>21</sup>

Many indications for dynamics and ornaments appear to in lighter ink and possibly a foreign hand, and the text is inaccurate, with many small errors.

### **D3: D B Thulemeier M. 10**

Five manuscript parts in a single unidentified hand. Dimensions: 37 x 22.5 cm (keyboard), 36 x 22.5 (strings). No watermark visible

A wrapper bearing a nineteenth-century (?) title similar to that seen in other copies in the Thulemeier collection holds the following parts:

“Cembalo Concertato.”: 6 nested bifolios (= 24 pages, the first bearing only the part label, the last blank); soprano clef;

“Violino Primo.”, “Violino Secundo.”: each a double bifolio (8 pages);

“Viola”, “Basso”: each a double bifolio (8 pages, the last blank).

The hand (Schwinger's “Thulemeier V”) resembles that of Michel; the copy is close to **D1** in text, format, and line and page breaks. (For additional matter on the provenance of the Thulemeier copies, see under source **B4** for Wq 4.)

### **D4: D DS Mus. ms. 970**

Five manuscript parts in two hands, including that of J. C. F. Bach. Dimensions: 37.5 x 24 cm<sup>22</sup>

Johann Christoph Friedrich Bach (1732–95), the composer's half-brother, was responsible for the title wrapper (see Plate 7) and for the following parts: “Cembalo Concertato” (12 pages), “Viola.”, and “Basso.” (both bifolios). An unidentified hand copied “Violino Primo” and “Violino Secondo” (each comprising 8 pages, the last unused). The original title reads: “Concerto | per il | Cembalo Concertato | accompagnato | da | 2 Violini | Viola | e | Basso. di. C. P. E. Bach || [incipit]”. Added to the right of the first word are the tonality “C. b.” and, at the bottom in a later hand, “Von der Hand des Bückeburger Bach.” Similar markings appear in copies of four other concertos in D B, all wholly or chiefly in the hand of J. C. F. Bach.<sup>23</sup>

The title is on paper that may first have been intended for use as a letter wrapper, bearing on what is now the inside back cover the words “pour Monsieur | Wacker | a Rinteln”, probably in the same hand as the title. Also on the title wrapper is the stamp “BREITKOPF & HÄRTEL ARCHIV”, and probably for reason **D4** has been included in a list of Breitkopf “house

---

<sup>21</sup> As argued by Neubacher, “Der Organist Johann Gottfried Rist (1741–1795) und der Bratchist Ludwig August Christoph Hopff (1715–1798).”

<sup>22</sup> The source was seen in photocopy; dimensions are from the image of the library catalog card included in the copy.

<sup>23</sup> Mus. mss. Bach St 193 (W. 20), St 212 (W. 42), St 271 (W. 18), and St 360 (W. 16). St 271 (W. 18) lacks the later entry identifying the hand. In St 212 (W. 42) the viola part appears to be in a foreign hand after the beginning of the first line.



manuscripts.”<sup>24</sup> Similar manuscripts at D B show no such stamp, however, nor is the text of the present copy related to that of **B2** and **B1**, possible Breitkopf sales copies that give an earlier version of the work.

The keyboard part follows the same conventions as **D1** but is independent of the latter in layout.

#### **D5: US BEu Ms. 727**

Five manuscript parts in an unidentified hand. The title page is signed “Grell”, presumably Eduard Grell (1800–86), director of the Sing-Akademie zu Berlin.

This is one of ten sets of parts for concertos of C. P. E. Bach acquired by the University of California library in 1966 from Gwendolin Koldofsky, widow of the violinist Adolph Koldofsky (1905–1951) who reportedly bought them from a Canadian dealer in the 1930s.<sup>25</sup> The manuscripts are in various hands and formats and on different papers. Adolph Koldofsky conducted radio broadcasts of seven concertos from this set with Wanda Landowska as soloist in 1943. The performance of W. 5 aired on 28 March 1943; no recording of the performance is known.<sup>26</sup>

**D5** is neat and generally accurate, and although textually close to **D1**, **D2**, and **D3**, independent of them in terms of line and page breaks.

### **Sources: Copies of the Cadenza Collection**

#### **E1: B Bc 5871 MSM**

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

---

<sup>24</sup> Kobayashi, “On the Identification of Breitkopf’s Manuscripts,” 118 (table 1).

<sup>25</sup> Wade’s account (*The Keyboard Concertos*, 51) parallels that in *Landowska on Music*, “collected, edited, and translated by Denise Restout, assisted by Robert Hawkins” (New York: Stein and Day, 1965), 305. The ten works are as follows: W. 5 (Ms. 727), W. 6 (Ms. 728), W. 8 (Ms. 729), W. 11 (Ms. 730), W. 12 (Ms. 731), W. 16 (Ms. 732), W. 18 (Ms. 733), W. 24 (Ms. 734), W. 32 (Ms. 735), and W. 39 (Ms. 736). See also the discussions below of sources **D 4** and **D 10** for W. 6. The group was first described by Charles H. Buck III, “Revisions in Early Clavier Concertos of C. P. E. Bach: Revelations From a New Source,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 29 (1976): 127–32. A letter by Rachel Wade, published in the same *Journal* 30 (1977): 162–4, pointed out flaws in Buck’s inventory and in his argument for re-dating some of the works on the basis of the Berkeley copies. Nevertheless, Buck rightly noted that variants in the string parts of several works, including the addition of dynamic markings, represented previously overlooked stages in the revision of these works.

<sup>26</sup> “Missing Broadcasts,” in *Landowska on Music*, 423.

meadow<sup>27</sup>

The seventy-five brief musical entries in this collection (listed as W. 120) comprise 57 cadenzas and “fermatas” for Bach's keyboard concertos, as well as one fermata for a sonatina and fifteen additional cadenzas, a fermata, and an “Einfall” for unspecified works.<sup>28</sup> Each (including the two cadenzas for the double concerto W. 46) is set out in two-stave keyboard score, usually with soprano clef, although treble clef also appears. The 26 pages constitute 6-1/2 bifolios; pp. 24–5 are ruled but unused, p. 26 blank. Pages 2–23 bear original pagination; p. 1 is a title page reading “Cadenzen / von / C. P. E. Bach.” The items were originally unnumbered; numbering has been added in a modern hand. Each item is headed by a title that in most cases identifies the work for which the item was intended. Several items bear headings that refer to the cello concertos W. 170, 171, and 172, but there is nothing musically or notationally to distinguish these entries from the others, and the three-part texture at the end of no. 31 (for W. 172) implies keyboard performance.<sup>29</sup>

Most of the cadenzas are short by later standards although somewhat longer than those given by Bach's colleague Quantz.<sup>30</sup> Most, furthermore, make little if any reference to the thematic content of the movements for which they are intended, although there is usually a similarity of meter or motivic character, at least at the outset. Cadenzas from **E1** are sometimes incorporated into within complete copies of concertos, either inserted into the main text of a keyboard part (as in source **A1** for W. 6) or on a separate sheet (as in source **D1** below). Such copies, which are usually if not always in the hand of Michel, are close to but probably independent of the present copy, which must therefore derive from a separate exemplar, perhaps a lost autograph. It is not known for what reason Bach wrote these cadenzas or when; the absence of integral copies other than the present one implies that they did not circulate as a set. Rather, like his “Veränderungen und Auszierungen” W. 68, they apparently served as additions and revisions that updated the

---

<sup>27</sup> The final cadenza (no. 75) was copied by J. J. H. Westphal, and the heading for no. 28 is in the hand of Anna Carolina Philippina Bach. Dimensions, identification of hands, and watermarks from Leisinger / Wollny 1997, 305. The “Sicke” watermark is similar to a type that Enßlin, 681–2 reports in many of Michel's copies, dating them from the end of the eighteenth to the beginning of the nineteenth centuries.

<sup>28</sup> Complete inventory in Leisinger / Wollny, 302–5; discussion and list of contents in Philip Whitmore, *Unpremeditated Art: The Cadenza in the Classical Keyboard Concerto* (Oxford, 1991), 84–93. Facsimile of the complete source with introduction by E. Eugene Helm as *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: 75 Cadenzas (H. 264/W. 120)* (Utrecht: STIMU, 1997).

<sup>29</sup> Item no. 31 includes an alternate version (marked “vel”) that appears on the lower staff, which is headed by a bass clef; nevertheless, the notes on this staff are evidently meant to be read as if on treble clef, with the exception of the initial note e as well as three additional e's at the end of the staff, which accompany the parallel sixths written in the upper staff at that point. The fact that the heading for this cadenza, like others, refers to “Violonc: Conc.” implies that W. 26, 28, and 29, which exist in versions for keyboard, flute, and cello, were referred to in the Bach household as cello concertos and perhaps supports the view that they were first written for that instrument.

<sup>30</sup> Quantz, *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen* (Berlin, 1752; facsimile, Kassel: Bärenreiter, 2000), chap. 15.

musical texts of older works, and this, in addition to their pedagogic value, would have served as an inducement to would-be purchasers to obtain copies of the complete works from Bach rather than from other sources.

The sole item in **E1** for the present concerto is no. 34, the first entry on page 13, bearing the title “Cadenz. zum Adagio des Conc: N<sup>o</sup>. (5.)” The number, like others in the source, corresponds with the numbering of Bach's concertos and sonatinas in NV 1790; the meaning of the parentheses around the number, which appear only for this item in **E1**, is unknown, although parentheses appear around similar numbers in other Bach manuscripts. W. 5 is the earliest work for which an item appears in **E1**; the latest is the concerto W. 45, Bach's last solo concerto composed in 1778 according to NV 1790. However, apart from W. 45 the latest concertos for which cadenzas are included are W. 34 of 1755 and W. 41 of 1769. The final entry, by Westphal, is for a work of 1762, the sonatina in D for keyboard, 2 horns, 2 flutes, and strings; the absence of this entry from the copy in **E2** implies that Westphal added it independently from a separate exemplar.

As W. 5 was revised in 1762, it is therefore in a sense one of the latest works for which cadenzas are included; however, the heading for its cadenza refers to the tempo mark of the slow movement in the early version (“Adagio non molto”), not “Arioso” as in the late version. Nor does **E1** contain the three additional cadenzas for W. 5 that were included in **D1**, the principal source for the late version (where they are headed “Cad. zum Arioso”). Hence it is possible that the present cadenza, as well as most of the others in **E1**, goes back to a relatively early date, perhaps before Bach's departure from Berlin in 1768. The text of the cadenza for W. 5 is the same as in **D1**, save for an error in the chord that accompanies the final trill (see list of variant readings).

## **E2: D B Mus. ms. Bach P 800**

Modern manuscript copy of the cadenzas and other items in **E1**

Written in ink on printed staff paper, this is an early twentieth-century copy of a lost manuscript from the former Königl. Akademie für Kirchenmusik, Berlin, according to Philip Whitmore. It contains the same repertory as **E1**, save that no. 75 is absent and no. 60 follows no. 61.<sup>31</sup> The manuscript contains no indications of ownership; the first (title) page bears the indication “M 1909.759”, the back inside cover “1912.312”.

## **Sources: Evaluation**

Although NV 1790 gives the single date of 1762 for the *Erneuerung* of W. 5, the sources provide evidence for three stages of revision.<sup>32</sup> The revisions included refinements of voice leading and

---

<sup>31</sup> Whitmore, *Unpremeditated Art*, 84.

<sup>32</sup> Schwinger, 466fn. 325, noting that Nichelmann died on 20 July 1762, suggests that the date of 1762 given in NV 1790 for the *Erneuerung* of Wq 5 could be inaccurate, or that **D3**, unlike other copies from the Thulemeier collection, might not have been among those which Schwinger argues were acquired from Nichelmann's estate.

variations of melodic material, as in W. 4, but each stage was also marked by formal alterations—the replacement or addition of passages—that in one instance went far beyond the relatively limited revisions of this type seen in W. 4. Hence the versions of W. 5 are most conveniently characterized by reference to the passages that were expanded or otherwise altered; in two of the three stages of revision this involved the insertion of a few measures into the ritornello of the third movement. Much more extensive alterations involving all three movements took place subsequently; presumably this was part of the *Erneuerung* of 1762.

Despite its more thorough revision, W. 5 presents fewer difficulties for the editor than W. 4, as its earliest as well as its latest versions are preserved in multiple copies by scribes known to have been associated with the composer. Therefore the evaluation of the sources is primarily a matter of sorting out which version of the work is preserved by each. There is no need to reconstruct the early version from disparate sources as was the case with W. 4. Whether the “early” version of W. 5 is also the *original* version remains unknown, however, in the absence of an autograph composing score.

### Source groups and revisions

The sequence of revisions and the groups of sources documenting them are summarized below:<sup>33</sup>

A: earliest known state, with fourteen-measure ritornello in movement 3 (sources **A1–3**);

B: ritornello of movement 3 expanded to sixteen measures (sources **B1–2**);

C: variation of iii.10b–12a (source **C1**);

D: ritornello of movement 3 expanded to nineteen measures; formal revisions of movements 1 and 2 as well, and variation and other alterations throughout (sources **D1–5**).

As with W. 4, the list of variants for the intermediate versions includes lists of readings that serve as a synopsis of Bach's revisions at all four stages. These lists also provide a concordance of measure numbers in the early and late versions, which are of different lengths as a result of Bach's formal revisions.

Stage 2 saw not only the expansion of the ritornello of movement 3, but also refinements of voice leading throughout, especially in inner parts (violin 2, viola); at least one doubling of violin 1 by violin 2 during a solo episode was also removed (at i.45–6). Similar revisions took place in W. 4 and 6 at a relatively early date. The presence of early readings in **A1** and **A2**, evidently copied during the 1750s, suggests that in W. 5 the alterations of this type might not have occurred until that decade, but Schlichting's exemplar could have been written before then. Stage 3, which involved primarily melodic variation in the third movement, is preserved in only one source, **C1**, and might have preceded the final, much more extensive stage of revision, by only a short period. The formal revisions at stage 4 affected above all the first movement; by coincidence, the shortening of some solo episodes and the expansion of others resulted in no net change in the movement's total length. Both the second and the third movements underwent net expansions, and Bach also elaborated the keyboard part throughout the solo episodes in the manner previously seen in W. 4.

---

<sup>33</sup> The only previous consideration of revisions in W. 5 is by Wade (*The Keyboard Concertos*, 92–5), who did not take into account the intermediate versions. The final entry in her table listing “corresponding passages” in **A2** and **D1** (p. 147n. 24) should be emended to show that iii.165–75 in **A2** correspond to iii.179–99 in **D1**.

The preceding summary account of Bach's revisions does not adequately convey his care for detail and concern for perfection. These emerge in a close examination of his revisions of the ritornello of the third movement. Here Bach first inserted two measures after the original m. 8.<sup>34</sup> Probably at the same time, he also altered the viola part, although retaining its original movement in quarter notes. This is evident in **B2** and **B1**, which differ in small details but must both represent stage 2 of the work's revision (see Exx. w5v7 and w5v8). At stage 3 Bach varied the melody, bass, and inner voice of what were now mm. 10–11; evidently he again revised the viola part as well, yielding the version preserved, with apparent errors, in **C1** (see Ex. w5v9). He would refine the viola part yet again, presumably in the course of making the sweeping alterations that characterize stage 4. It is a testament to Bach's commitment to perfection that, in addition to the obvious attention given to revising the solo part and the formal design of the work, he took perhaps even greater pains to refine the voice leading of the least prominent part in the ensemble.

*Groups A–C (earlier versions)*

Of the earlier versions, only the first is well attested in reliable sources close to the composer. The score **A1** was almost certainly the direct *Vorlage* for the parts **A2**. In copying the latter, Schlichting entered the first violin part into the upper staff of the keyboard in tutti passages, which also contain the figured bass transferred from the basso part of the score. But most readings of **A1** are mechanically reproduced, including an error in which Schlichting mistakenly entered notes into the staff for violin 2 that belong to the bass line.<sup>35</sup> On the other hand, occasional discrepancies suggest that in copying **A2** Schlichting also consulted a second exemplar (a set of parts?) or relied on aural tradition.<sup>36</sup> Nevertheless, **A1** must serve as principal source for the early version, as it is more likely to derive directly from an early state of the autograph. Corrections in **A1** must be disregarded, however, as their provenance is unknown and they differ at times from readings of other sources. **A2** serves as a secondary source for the purpose of clarifying original readings of **A1** that can no longer be made out.

The unaccompanied version of the third movement in **A3** almost certainly derives from the concerto movement, rather than the other way around. Nevertheless, **A3** is independent of the

---

<sup>34</sup> More precisely, Bach made the insertion after the first beat of m. 8. Evidently Bach had recognized that in its original version the middle section of the ritornello was asymmetrical; his revisions in effect expanded a four-bar sequence with extension (mm. 8–9 + 10–11 + 12–13) into a regular sequential period of eight measures (8–11 + 12–15).

<sup>35</sup> At ii.95, Schlichting copied notes originally written in bass clef into the same positions on the staff for violin 2, which is notated in treble clef. Another copying error that shows Schlichting to have been working from **A1** is described above in the description of **A2**; Schlichting corrected the error only after completing the page.

<sup>36</sup> For example, at iii.92 **A2** gives a reading for the solo part also found in other sources, including those of the late version, that is not in **A1**.

other sources, showing a few revisions of the text as found in **A1** and **A2**.<sup>37</sup> The downward transposition of the violin line in m. 100 by an octave could have been undertaken by the copyist to avoid a leap of a tenth after the first note of the measure; it is therefore unlikely to reflect an alternate reading of the composer's. The use of ornament signs in place of “tr” suggests a relatively late date.

The two copies of group 2, although in very different hands and formats, share distinctive notational features, notably the use of alto clef for certain passages in the lower staff of the keyboard part (as in i.49–56) and “accomp.” to cancel “tasto solo.” At least **B1** appears to have been a Breitkopf sale copy, and it occasionally gives a more satisfactory text than **B2**, which reproduces a number of errors also in **A1** and **A2**. Both **B2** and **B1** therefore serve as independent witnesses to version 3, but their obscure provenance and inaccuracy make them useless as secondary sources for the other versions.

**C1**, the sole member of group 3, is anomalous in a number of ways. Its text is not closely related to that of any other source, and its continuo figuration, largely distinct from that in other copies and often incorrect, is likely to be in part a copyist's arbitrary addition. But the consistent presence of what are indubitably intermediate readings—especially for inner voices, but also in the ritornello of the last movement—shows that **C1**, like the copy of W. 24 in the same collection, must descend from what were probably by this point heavily revised autographs.<sup>38</sup> The presumed illegibility of the latter would explain some but not all of the readings of these copies, which must also reflect arbitrary copyist intervention.

#### *Groups D and E (sources of the late version and cadenzas)*

The copies of the latest version are all close in terms of text, but none shows indications of having served as a house copy. **D1** and **D2** are particularly close, their independence being apparent only in minuscule variants.<sup>39</sup> **D3** also is close to **D1**, but the latter is to be preferred inasmuch as its copyist Michel was a known associate of Bach, whereas the copyist of **D3** is unidentified. The same holds for **D2**, which is unusual among copies from Westphal's collection in both its unknown hand and its relatively inaccurate text. **D1** is more clearly independent of **D4**, which lacks numerous performance markings (slurs, ornaments) present in **D1**; the latter, on the other hand, lacks certain accidentals and ornament signs present in **D4**.<sup>40</sup> **D4** and **D5** are related by the absence of m. 101 or 102 in both. Other inaccuracies in the latter two copies make them

---

<sup>37</sup> Besides adding a slur on the figure first seen on the third beat of m. 2, as well as a number of trills, **A3** shows the later reading of the left hand in mm. 64 and 104. What may be an intermediate reading in m. 138 is shared with **B2** and **B1**.

<sup>38</sup> See the discussions of US Wc M1010.A2B13W24(case), source B1 in the critical report for the editor's online edition of W. 24, at <http://www.wagner.edu/faculty/dschulenberg/W.24crit.pdf>, especially p. 20. Figures were probably absent from the lost autograph score that served as the ultimate *Vorlage* for these copies.

<sup>39</sup> For example, at i.44 (kb), **D2** correctly places the stroke on the bass note rather than in the treble.

<sup>40</sup> Accidentals: e.g., i.127, but not i.112; ornament signs: ii.45. The frequent omission of necessary accidentals for the note A suggests that Bach might have originally notated W. 5 with a key signature of only two flats.

poor candidates to serve as principal source, a role therefore best served by **D1**. But **D4**, copied primarily by the composer's younger half-brother but certainly not under Emanuel's supervision, can serve as a secondary source.<sup>41</sup>

**D1** is the sole source for three of the four cadenzas inserted on its last page. These show a somewhat different state of Michel's handwriting from the remainder of the manuscript, and therefore might have been supplied separately to the original owner of **D1**. The other source for the first cadenza, **E1**, contains an error in the final chord (f in place of d); the error is absent from **D1**, indicating that both copies derive independently from another *Vorlage*.

---

<sup>41</sup> J. C. F. Bach left Leipzig in 1749 to take a position at Bückeburg, where he remained for the rest of his life; he subscribed to Emanuel's publications and no doubt exchanged music with the latter, but the provenance of his copies remains unclear. The latter do, however, provide evidence in support of Ernst Suchalla's observation (*CPEB-Briefe*, 2: 1059) that "C. P. E. Bach's contacts with this brother seem to have been closer than one might conclude from the sparse literature concerning them."