

CONCERTO IN G MINOR, W. 6

Sources: Early Readings**A1: D Bsa SA 2579 = D II 1465^d**

Manuscript score in a hand identified as that of Johann Samuel Carl Possin (four double bifolios plus one single leaf and one single bifolio = 38 pages; 24 x 32 cm). Watermark: (a) large fleur-de-lys in crowned shield with “IESU”, (b) small “LW”¹

The following title appears at the top of the first page: “Concerto per il Cembalo da C. F. E. Bach.” Although each page is ruled in 12 staves, these are grouped sometimes into three systems of four staves each (as on p. 1), elsewhere into two systems of six staves each. There are no title page and no part designations until page 2 at i.38, where two additional staves come into use and the lowest two parts are designated “Cembalo” (two staves) and “Basso” respectively. Red ink is used for double strokes separating systems and for swirling decoration of barlines that mark points of return following the “dal segno” indications at the ends of movements (see Plate 10).

On the copyist, see the discussion of source **A1** for W. 4. The watermark is similar to one that has been found in manuscript copies sold by the Leipzig publisher Breitkopf, but although W. 6 is listed in one of Breitkopf's sale catalogs, **A1** contains none of the markings characteristic of Breitkopf copies.² Pencil numbers appear at various points, e.g., “1” beneath the barline that precedes i.7, “2” at i.19 between the staves for violin 2 and viola, “3” similarly at m. 26, “4” at m. 31, etc. Although these might be casting-off marks used in planning another copy of the score, they do not correspond to the ends of systems in the two other manuscript scores.

There are no continuo figures. Doublings between the string parts are indicated on page 1 by a *custos* indicating the pitch of the first note on an otherwise blank staff, subsequently by verbal abbreviations such as “c V. 1.” (*con violino primo*). The upper staff of the keyboard generally contains rests just before and after solo passages, indicating the boundaries of the latter; doublings of the basso by the left hand are indicated by blank staves and *custodes*. Full measures of rests in the string parts are enumerated by ordinal numbers (1, 2, 3 . . .) entered above successive measures; whole rests appear occasionally in the keyboard part (as at iii.326, left hand), but more often the staves of the keyboard are left empty in tutti passages where the basso rests (as at i.105–10). In many tutti passages, including the opening ritornello of each movement, staves for the keyboard are simply omitted.

Although the right hand part of the keyboard part is notated mainly in treble clef, it uses soprano clef in i.65–6. This probably represents the copyist's immediate correction of an error, as the last note of the previous measure was initially written a third too high, as is also true of the first note on the page (in i.54). These are indications that the copyist was following an exemplar written in soprano clef.

¹ Watermark no. 187 in Enßlin, 232, traced to a paper mill in Glauchau, maker Johann Eucharius Siegfried (active 1742–63); the letters LW stand for Lungwitz in Saxony (Enßlin, 671).

² W. 6 is listed with its incipit in the *Catalogo de' soli, duetti, trii, terzetti, quartetti e concerti . . . parte IVta*, p. 18 (Leipzig, 1763) as “III. Concerti di C. P. E. BACH | a Cl. obl. c. Vio. V. B. Racc. IV., Nr. 1”; facsimile in *The Breitkopf Thematic Catalogue*, edited by Barry S. Brook (New York: Dover Publications, 1966), 132. On watermarks in Breitkopf sale copies, see Kobayashi, “On the Identification of Breitkopf's Manuscripts,” 113.

A2: B Bc 27134 MSM (13)

Manuscript score in an unidentified hand, part 13 (pp. 121–56) within a composite manuscript. Dimensions: 35.5 x 22.5 cm (9 bifolios = 36 pages, the last one blank, the three preceding pages ruled but unused). Watermark: (a) crowned eagle with heart-shaped breast shield

A2 comprises sixteen fascicles (186 pages) containing keyboard and chamber works of C. P. E. Bach and J. C. Bach, two arias by Friedrich II “the Great,” and scores of the concertos W. 6 and 11.³ Together with **A5** it was formerly in the possession of Guido Richard Wagener (1824–96), whose name is stamped at the bottom of page 152 (“Geh. Rath Wagener | Marburg”).

The first page is ruled in five systems of four staves each, without part designations. The remainder is ruled in four systems of six staves each, although the staves appear to have been drawn with a rastrel that produced three-stave systems. There is no title page; the title “Concerto.” appears in the upper left of the first page. Wagener added at the top center “Partitura G moll IV Concerto.”; the roman numeral IV was subsequently altered to VIII. These numbers evidently referred to copies of keyboard concertos by C. P. E. Bach, six of which are now represented in the collection.⁴ A similar entry in the same hand appears on the title page of **A5**.

Doublings between string parts are indicated by blank staves with a custos marking the first pitch; staves for the keyboard part (first present on page 2) incorporate the bass line, the basso staff showing custodes to indicate doublings of the left hand. Silences within the keyboard part are clearly marked by rests, including whole rests for empty measures; there are no continuo figures until i.84, complete figuring beginning at i.147 and continuing thereafter to the end of the piece. The figures appear to be original entries by the copyist. A cadenza in late-eighteenth- or early-nineteenth-century style appears on empty staves at the end of the second movement, in a foreign hand. Although assuredly not by Bach, the cadenza serves as evidence that **A2** was used for performances of W. 6 well after the composer's death; its style suggests that later reception of the work assimilated the concerto to the early-Romantic tradition (see Ex. 23).

The former owner Wagener was a medical doctor from a Berlin banking family; he taught at the University of Marburg from 1867 until his death. His collection, which contained numerous manuscript autographs and copies of eighteenth-century works, was subsequently held for a time by Alfred Wotquenne, librarian of B Bc, who eventually sold substantial portions of the holdings. These are now dispersed, some having gone to A Wn, others now lost.⁵ Nothing is known of the specific provenance of the present copy. Other manuscripts from Wagener's collection have been traced to Gerber and to Schicht (see below), figures significant for the reception of music by J. S. and C. P. E. Bach in the later eighteenth century. Although some of the copies appear to be Breitkopf sale manuscripts, others are by copyists associated with C. P. E. Bach, such as Johann Friedrich Hering.

³ Description from Leisinger / Wollny, 494–500. Accompanying **A2** are eight additional manuscript parts for instrumental works within the manuscript; none are for W. 6.

⁴ W. 1, 6, 11, 15, 33, and 34 (listed in Leisinger / Wollny, 121). The copies bear numbers from I to XII, with a gap between II and VII. W. 6 is one of three works represented in multiple copies.

⁵ Details in Leisinger / Wollny, 98–129.

A3: D B Mus. ms Bach St 532

Five manuscript parts in an unidentified hand (36.5 x 22.5 cm). No watermark

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo.”: 20 pages (the last blank, the first = title page);

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

Each part bears the title “Concerto” in the top left corner of the first page. The title page reads: “Concerto | Cembalo | Concertato | Violino Primo | Violino Secundo [*sic*] | Viola | e | Basso | composto | dall | C. P. E. Bach.” An addition at bottom center reads: “der K. Bibl. | v. [?] | L. Erk | 14. Juli 62.” followed by what the number “9461”. As **B3** bears similar entries, both were evidently given or sold to what is now D B in 1862 by Ludwig Christian Erk (1807–83), folksong collector and pupil of Johann Christian Heinrich Rinck.⁶ An earlier possessor's mark in the lower right reads: “Maria Cattharina | Martini: | geb^e. Lehmannin.”

The keyboard part includes doublings of violin 1 in tutti passages—of all three string parts where the basso rests, the left hand there being labeled “Violetta”. Continuo figures are also present, entered subsequently to the notes (including doublings) but probably in the original hand. Subsequent additions include a few additional figures and ornament signs (some in pencil), as well as a cadenza entered in ink in very small notes, in a foreign hand, on unused space at the end of second movement. This cadenza, although simpler in style than those of Bach, is closer to the eighteenth-century Berlin tradition than is the one in **A2** (see Ex. 24). The string parts include a few corrections and additions to dynamics and ornament signs, some in pencil.

The previous owner of **A3** has not been identified, although the name calls to mind the “Mademoiselle Tochter” of Johann Peter Lehmann, organist at Berlin's Nikolaikirche during the eighteenth century. She was praised by Marpurg in 1754 for her “skillful playing at the keyboard” and “the fine taste with which this fair muse plays.”⁷ Unfortunately Marpurg does not give her full name, and Gerber, whose copy of the present concerto **E1** is described below, confused her with her niece Caroline, a pianist, who married Clementi in 1804 at the age of eighteen.⁸ Both names Lehmann and Martini were common, and several persons of each name appear on the lists of subscribers to Bach's publications. The lists for the keyboard anthologies W. 56, 57, and 58 include a “C. Lehmann” of Dresden, where Lehmann and Martini families were both involved in

⁶ Karl Schultz, *Ludwig Erk: Ein biographische Skizze: Festgabe zur Feier des 10. Juni 1876* (Berlin: Th. Chr. Fr. Enslin, 1876), a pamphlet issued in connection with the observation of seventieth birthday, alludes to Erk's traveling to various libraries across Germany to gather folksong materials and for his edition of the four-part chorale harmonizations of J. S. Bach (Leipzig, 1850), but sheds no light on where he obtained his C. P. E. Bach manuscripts.

⁷ “fertige Execution . . . auf dem Claviere . . . feiner Geschmack, mit den diese schöne Muse spielt.” Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg, *Historisch-Kritische Beyträge zur Aufnahme der Musik* (Berlin, 1754), 505. I am grateful to Peter Wollny for bringing this citation to my attention.

⁸ Carl Freiherrn von Ledebur, *Tonkünstler-Lexicon Berlins* (Berlin: Ludwig Rauh, 1861), entry on Johann Georg Gottlieb Lehmann (p. 319), son of Johann Peter Lehmann. Ledebur mentions Gerber's confusion but apparently did not understand that it might have arisen because both women were accomplished keyboard players. Ledebur's references to “Gerber” are presumably to the latter's *Neues historisch-biographisches Lexikon der Tonkünstler* (Leipzig, 1812).

the making of keyboard instruments. Other women, however, are always singled out in the subscriber lists by “Madem.” or the like, as in “Madem. S. Zenker” of Dresden, also on the list for W. 58.⁹

A4: D Bsa SA 2581, groups 1, 2, and 4

Five manuscript parts in three unidentified hands, each writing on a distinct paper

SA 2581 now comprises eight parts, representing four distinct groups. It is unknown how these parts came to be together in D Bsa; group 3 from SA 2581 is described below as source **C1**.

Source **A4** comprises the following parts:

“Cembalo Concertato.” (group 4): 6 bifolios = 24 pages, the last blank; the first = title page (34.5 x 22.5 cm). No watermark;

“Violino Primo”, “Violino Secondo” (group 1): each a double bifolio = 8 pages (33 x 21 cm). Watermarks: (a) lily; (b) monogram “CVC” (C reversed);

“Viola”, “Basso” (group 2): each a double bifolio = 8 pages (34 x 21 cm). Watermarks: (a) bishop with staff (b) “WID”.¹⁰

These three groups are described together only for the sake of convenience, for at least the keyboard part probably originated separately; it gives consistently early readings, notably at i.28 and iii.165, where the parts for violin 2 and viola give later readings. Despite this, all five parts evidently were used together in performances, possibly under Zelter. All contain numerous pencil markings, including a crescendo wedge in the keyboard part at iii.223–4 that suggests use perhaps into the nineteenth century.

The title page, in Zelter's hand, reads: “Concerto | per il Clavicembalo Concertato | Violino primo | Violino Secondo | Viola e Basso | [incipit].” The incipit is in a distinct ink and hand.

The keyboard part includes very complete doublings of the violin and viola parts in the tutti passages, with continuo figures as well. The watermark in the viola and basso parts is associated with a Saxon maker whose paper has been detected in Breitkopf sales copies.¹¹ but otherwise the parts do not contain obvious signs of originating with the Breitkopf firm.

A5: B Bc 27140 MSM (2)

Five manuscript parts in an unidentified hand (keyboard: 34.5 x 22 cm; strings: 34.5 x 21.5 cm)¹²

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo”: 5 bifolios = 20 pages, the last blank; p. 1 = title page;

⁹ Subscriber lists (*Pränumerantenlisten*) are collected in *CPEB-Briefe*, 2: 1450–1522.

¹⁰ Watermarks from Enßlin, 233, nos. 177 and 11 respectively. The former, like the watermark no. 187 of **A1**, is traced to the paper mill in Glauchau, probably made by Vodel, who was active 1742–63) (*ibid.*, p. 670); no information is provided for mark no. 11.

¹¹ Kobayashi, “On the Identification of Breitkopf's Manuscripts,” 113.

¹² Dimensions from Leisinger / Wollny 1997, 502; they report no watermark.

“Violino Primo”, “Violino Secondo”, “Viola”, “Basso Ripieno”: each a single folio (*Auflagebogen*) = 4 pages.

Each part bears the title “Concerto” in the upper left of the first page. Wagener has added on each part: “VIII Concerto G moll” and “No: 8”; the roman numeral corresponds with that on **A2**. The title page reads: “CONCERTO. G: b. | per il | Cembalo Concertato. | Violino Primo. | Violino Secondo | Viola | e | Basso | dell Sigr. | C. P. E. Bach. | [incipit]”.

The keyboard part lacks figures. In tutti passages it includes doublings of violin 1 and frequently of inner voices.

A6: GB Lbl Add. ms. 31679

Five manuscript parts, possibly in the hand of Friedrich August Cichorius. Oblong format

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo concertato.”: 24 pages, the last blank, the first = title page;

“Violino Imo.”, “Violino IIdo.”: each 8 pages;

“Viola.”, “Basso.”: each 6 pages.

Each part is bound in labeled covers, with the book plate of Julian Marshall on the back of each front cover; the labels appear to be in the same hand as the music. Each part bears the title “Concerto” in the upper left of the first page. On the last page of each part, beneath the last system of music, is an unusual design that includes four continuous loops slanting upwards, of diminishing size; this might be interpreted as a monogram FACIC, albeit with some difficulty (see Fig. 7).

The title page reads: “CONCERTO | per | il Cembalo concertato | accompagnato | da | 2 Violini | Viola | e | Basso | composto | da Carlo Filippo Emanuele Bach | Musico di Camera di S. M. il Re di Prussia etc.” (see Fig. 8). The form of the attribution resembles that employed in the print of the “Prussian” sonatas W. 48 (Nuremberg, 1742) and in other engravings by the firm of Balthasar Schmid (1705–49) and his heirs.¹³ The copy is neat and generally accurate and appears to be the work of a professional, highly competent copyist. The keyboard part includes continuo figures; the upper staff is blank in tutti passages, except in partial measures where rests clearly indicate where the solo passages begin and end. The figures includes frequent dashes to indicate the sustaining or repeating of a harmony, a practice not encountered in other sources.

Peter Wollny has described the hand as likely the same as found in the keyboard part of D-DI, Mus. ms. 2953-O-14, containing a keyboard concerto in C minor by Carl Heinrich Graun. The copyist is identified on the title page as “FACichor,” that is, Friedrich August Cichorius, known to have entered the University of Leipzig in 1745 and documented as a cellist in the “Großes Concert” at Leipzig during the late 1740s.¹⁴ Although the Dresden keyboard part, unlike **A6**, contains doublings of the first violin in tutti passages, the identification of the copyist would be confirmed if the monogram describe above in **A6** has been interpreted correctly.

¹³ I am grateful to Dr. Yoshitake Kobayashi and Prof. Gregory Butler for their efforts to identify the copyist.

¹⁴ The Dresden copy is possibly a Breitkopf house copy (*Stammhandschrift*). Friendly correspondence, 14 March 2006.

It is unknown how **A6** came to be in the collection of Julian Marshall (1836–1903), collector and writer on music. He sold this, his only known C. P. E. Bach source, to the British Museum in 1880.¹⁵

B1: D B Mus. ms. Bach P 712

Manuscript score in an unidentified hand (18 folios, the last page blank; 35 x 22 cm).

Watermark: letters “MS” plus a circular mark 5 cm in diameter, possibly with cursive lettering or a design within

B1 is ruled throughout in three systems of six staves each per page. There is no title page nor an original title; the parts are labeled at the beginning of the first system as follows: “Cembalo obligato | Violino 1 | Violino 2 | Viola | Violoncello”. Later entries include “Von Em. Bach” in red pencil at the top center of the first page as well as numerous additions and corrections to the musical text in ordinary pencil; besides occasional corrected notes and added ties these include numerous additional signs for ornaments and bc figuration. The upright form of the turn sign among these signs suggests a relatively early date for the additions, or at least that they derive from another relatively early copy.

The copyist of **B1** was also responsible for D B Mus. mss. Bach P 708 and P 714, containing the concertos W. 3 and 17, respectively.¹⁶ The copy comprises nine bifolios, from which one folio was removed in the course of preparing the score. A stub remains prior to f. 9 (attached to f. 1); the page had been ruled and clefs and a brace written for the first system, but no notes remain.

B1 is neat but contains many errors, only some of which were later corrected. Unison doublings are rarely written out, notes for the basso (here, “Violoncello”) being written in the lower staff of the keyboard part, with the expression “col altro Basso” or “col altro B.” appearing in the basso staff. Doublings of the violins by the right hand are absent in the tutti passages, and rests are present immediately before and after most solo episodes to indicate where the keyboard ceases to function in a solo capacity. In i.12–15, the notes of the viola were originally copied into the lower staff of the keyboard part (using bass clef), then blotted out, and only a few further doublings of this type occur.¹⁷

B2: US Wc M1010.A2B13 W 6 (case)

Six manuscript parts in two unidentified hands, including the copyist known as Anonymous 302

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo Obligato”: 20 pages;

“Violino 1mo”, “Viola”: each 8 pages, the first (bearing the part label) and last unruled;

¹⁵ As established by a printed notice inserted within the manuscript.

¹⁶ This copyist is Wade's “T.”

¹⁷ In a few passages not only the keyboard but the basso doubles the viola part, and figures are provided; the same doublings (and figures) occur in **B2** and therefore may not have originated with the copyist.

“Violino 2do”: 8 pages, the first (= title page) and last unruled;

“Violoncello”, “Violoncello. Violono”: each 4 pages (*Auflagebogen*).

Only the string parts are by Kast's Anonymous 302. The keyboard part is in a second hand, and a third hand appears on the title page.¹⁸

What is now the title page originally served only as a part label, like the corresponding page of the second violin part, reading “CONCERTO | Violino 2do.” Above this the third hand added the work title “Concerto G. b^b [*sic*] | a 5”, followed by an incipit.¹⁹ Beneath, in the same hand but in lighter ink, appears: “Cembalo Concertato | 2 Violini | Viola | e | Violoncello | e | Violono | dell Sig. C. P. E. Bach”. The attribution is probably a still later addition, as in the copies at US Wc of W. 4 and 5.

The keyboard part includes figures but not doublings; the upper staff is blank in tutti passages. The two basso parts are not absolutely identical, but they are extremely close and share most errors. The presence of a second basso part, as in copies of other concertos from the same collection, must reflect the preferences of an owner rather than a particular state of the work.

B3: US BEu, ms. 728

Five manuscript parts in an unidentified hand. Dimensions: 30 x 24.5 cm. Watermark: lily and arms (“Strasbourg bend”); “C & IH”

The watermark is an eighteenth-century one associated with the Amsterdam firm of Honig.²⁰ The same copyist was responsible for the copies of W. 8, 12, and 32 in the same collection (mss. 729, 731, and 735). Each appears to be on different paper, although ms. 735 shows a watermark possibly identical to that used in ms. 732 (W. 16).²¹

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo Certato”: 14 pages, the first blank, the last ruled but unused;

“Violino 1mo.”, “Violino 2do.”: each 8 pages, the first (bearing the part label) and last unruled;

“Viola.”, “Basso”: each 4 pages (one *Auflagebogen*).

The blank first page of the keyboard was probably intended to bear a title, but it shows only later markings, including a small ink inscription (possibly “GK” = Gwendolin Koldofsky) in the lower left corner and a faint letter “B” in pencil at bottom center. Similar markings are visible in other manuscripts from the same set (further description under source **D5** for W. 5).

The keyboard part contains continuo figures, and doublings of the first violin are present only at the beginning of each movement. Recent pencil markings include added and altered figured

¹⁸ The copyist of the keyboard part is Wade's “FF”; the title page is in the hand of “J.”

¹⁹ The incipit shows the first three measures of the violin and basso parts, reproducing the misplaced trill occurring in m. 3 in this source.

²⁰ Watermark 2950 in Edward Heawood, *Watermarks, Mainly of the 17th and 18th Centuries* (Hilversum: Paper Publications Society, 1969).

²¹ The copyist is Wade's “N.”

bass signs in the keyboard part and measure counts at the ends of some pages in the string parts. These markings probably relate to the preparation of a modern manuscript score and parts now kept with **B3**. These are dated 7 Dec. 1942 and signed by Stephen Bado and V. Totino of Toronto; they are accompanied by photoreproductions of the same. One of the photoreproduced scores bears the marking “used by Landowska | G. K.” and contains what appear to be her performance markings (chiefly fingerings and occasional added inner voices). The initials are those of Gwendolin Koldofsky, widow of Adolph Koldofsky, who conducted radio broadcasts of seven concertos from this set with Wanda Landowska as soloist in 1943. The performance of W. 6 aired on 21 March 1943 together with J. S. Bach's Italian Concerto; no recording of the performance is known.²²

B4: D B Mus. ms Bach St 533

Incomplete set of four manuscript parts parts in two unidentified hands (keyboard: 34.5 x 21 cm; strings: 34 x 21 cm). Watermarks: electoral scepter of Saxony between palm leaves (keyboard); large coat of arms of Schönburg (strings)²³

The parts are as follows:

“Clavicembalo”: 24 pages (the last blank);

“Violino Secundo [*sic*]”: three bifolios = 10 pages (the first two and the last one blank);

“Viola”: double bifolio = 8 pages (the last ruled but unused);

“Bass”: double bifolio = 8 pages (the last two ruled but unused).

The title “Concerto” appears in the upper left of the first page of each part; at the right the keyboard part also reads “di Sigr: Bach”. A wrapper, in a third hand, bears the title: “Concerto | per | il Clavicembalo | di Sigr: Bach”; the letters “C. P. E.” have been inserted by the same foreign hand into both titles. Later additions below indicate Erk's previous ownership, as in **A3**: “der K. Bibl. | v. [?] | 16. Juli 62 L. Erk.” The number 9461 follows. The first violin part has probably been missing since the nineteenth century; its loss might explain why Erk acquired a second copy of the work.²⁴ But although both **A3** and **B4** give W. 6 in an early version, they transmit significantly different texts belonging to separate manuscript traditions.

The string parts contain a number of passages that had to be canceled and rewritten; corrected errors such as the inadvertent copying of a passage from violin 1 (iii.34–7) into the second violin part show that the copyist of the string parts worked from a score. The same was probably true of the keyboard part, which initially includes doublings of violin 1 throughout tutti passages. But doublings of violin 1 largely cease after ii.69, blank staves being left in their stead. On the other hand, doublings of the viola occur systematically in tutti passages where the bass is silent. These passages also include continuo figures, and the viola line is sometimes transposed an octave

²² “Missing Broadcasts,” in *Landowska on Music*, 423.

²³ Description of watermark from Kast.

²⁴ The first page of the second violin part bears a few identifying entries that would normally be expected on the first violin part; these are probably by a nineteenth-century cataloguer.

lower. The figures contain many errors and are omitted in some passages (including i.34 and 148). That the copyist was responsible for the transpositions is evident in iii.44–5, where the notes of the viola were initially entered at their actual pitch.

C1: D Bsa SA 2581, group 3

Three manuscript parts (v1, v2, va) in the hands of Schlichting and C. P. E. Bach, each comprising 2 bifolios (34 x 20.5 and 32.5 x 20 cm, respectively). Watermarks: (1) none; (2) gate with two towers beneath shield²⁵

Five of the eight parts comprising SA 2581 are described above as source **A4**. The present three parts represent an intermediate version, whereas the others present an early text and therefore are unlikely to share the same provenance. The present parts are as follows:

“Violino 1.” Modern foliation: 18–9, 22–3;

“Violino 2.” Folios 20–1, 23a–b;

“Viola.” Folios 24–5, 23c–d.

Each bears the title “Concerto” at the beginning of the first system. In each part the last movement is completed on the second bifolio, which is ruled on only one side. The paper of the latter is thinner and lighter in color. In each part Schlichting wrote all or most of the first bifolio, including title and part label; Bach began writing as follows:

v1: in the course of the last staff on the third page of the part, at ii.97;

v2: at the beginning of the second bifolio, at ii.37. There are corrections in the last three measures of the previous page, where an additional measure appears to have been squeezed in and then crossed out at the very end of the last line; it is impossible to say whether any of these markings are autograph, but none of the original entries on the page appear to be so. The first correction, in ii.35 (f' replaced by b b'), indicates that the part was copied from an exemplar that used alto clef for this passage; alto clef is used in this part in ii.1–8 and in this passage in **A4** and **G1**. Other corrections may also be related to transposition from alto to treble clef;

va: in the course of the seventh of ten staves written (an additional staff is ruled but unused at the bottom of the page), on the fourth page of the part, at ii.103; a few corrections and an added “pp” at ii.82 in the previous line may also be autograph (see Plate 8).

Bach may also have been responsible for some corrections on other pages:

v1: at i.64, “f.” and “p.” inserted; i.115, note 2 changed possibly from b b'' (as in **F1**) to b b'; ii.31, 35, 37, dynamics “p.”, “pp.”, and “p.” inserted;

v2: at i.132, 133, 134, dynamics “f.”, “p.”, and “f.” inserted; i.131, 16th rest possibly altered to dot of augmentation on note 1 (as in early version); i.277, “f.” inserted.

va: at i.35–8, dynamics “p.”, “pp.”, “f”, and “p.” inserted; i.130–35, dynamics “f.”, “p.” inserted in alternating measures, and similar insertions of dynamics below; i.269, “f.” inserted and the notes g' and e' changed to a' and f#', respectively, by enlarging the

²⁵ “. . . zweitürmige Torburg mit Schild oben zwischen den Türmen.” Measurements and description of watermark from Enßlin (his watermark no. 2, for which he provides no further information about origin or date). The division of SA 2581 into four numbered groups is also from Enßlin. The present editor was unable to make out the watermarks when viewing the source.

noteheads and writing letter-names beneath.

Bach appears to have corrected himself in the viola part at iii.74, changing “p” to “forte”.

The pre-correction readings of the first violin at i.115 and the second violin at i.131 are also found in other sources for the early and intermediate versions. Hence the changes made at these points in **C1** may reflect alterations that were also made in its exemplar, presumably the lost autograph score. It is possible that other dynamic markings added to the first violin part of **C1** also represent revisions of an earlier text. But most of the changes made in **C1** probably reflect Schlichting's errors in copying from a score in which notes and dynamics for inner or doubling parts were not fully written out. The dynamics added in the viola part correspond to those present in the same passage in other parts, and the alterations of pitches correct notes present in other parts, where, however, they are notated in different clefs. Schlichting (probably) corrected himself in i.34, where the viola doubles the basso for the first five notes; his original reading placed all six noteheads where they would have belonged in a copy of the basso part written in bass clef.²⁶ Other corrections are less easily explained and may simply reflect the types of mistakes that a relatively young, inexperienced copyist might have made.

It is unclear why Bach began copying in each part where he did. Schlichting's copy is more accurate than most others of this work, but he appears to have failed to enter many dynamic markings (and possibly others, such as slurs) that Bach subsequently added; the errors are of types that would be expected of an inexperienced copyist working from a score in which many such markings were notated only in one of two or three doubling parts. Bach did not catch all of Schlichting's errors, and uncorrected mistakes grow more numerous in the later pages of each part. The use of different paper for the two bifolios comprising each part probably does not mean that the second paper dates from a later period, as Bach's hand appears on the first paper as well, and his handwriting throughout is consistent. However, such parts are more likely to have been prepared for Bach's own use rather than for sale or presentation to a patron. Possibly these copies were *Doubletten* prepared in haste for a concert performance; this would explain why they are not accompanied by original keyboard and basso parts.

Bach's hand in **C1** resembles that in other autographs that have been dated to the 1740s. A more precise dating is not yet possible, but the fact that these parts give intermediate rather than early readings implies a date later than the original composition of 1740. There remain some early readings, notably in a passage that Bach would later alter after discovering parallel fifths.²⁷

D1: B Bc 27140 MSM (1)

Five manuscript parts by two unidentified copyists (keyboard: 34 x 21 cm; strings: 33 x 20.5 cm). Watermark: (a) crowned letter M between palm branches²⁸

²⁶ For a similar error in Schlichting's copy of W. 5, see the description of source **A1** for that work.

²⁷ At i.134 (copied by Schlichting), the first violin part gives the earlier reading, and at iii.165 (copied by Bach), the viola has the early reading that produces parallel fifths. The autograph portion of violin 1 also preserves an apparent error in iii.241–2 that persisted through all versions, although not in all copies (see Commentary for late version).

²⁸ Watermark from Leissinger / Wollny, 501.

The parts are as follows:

[kb]: 9 bifolios = 36 pages, the last two blank; p. 1 = title page. Soprano clef;

“Violino Primo.”, “Violino Secondo.”: each 2-1/2 bifolios = 10 pages;

“Viola.”, “Basso Ripieno.”: each 2 bifolios = 8 pages.

The individual parts bear no titles. The title page reads: “Concerto | pour le Clavecin | avec l'Accompagnement | a Violino 1^{mo} | Violino 2^{do} | Viola | et | Basso ripieno. | da Mons. Bach C. P. E.” Added beneath is “Schicht,” the signature of the Leipzig Thomaskantor Johann Gottlieb Schicht (1753–1823). A later addition in the upper right corner reads “No. 25.” Wagener's stamp (see above under **A2**) appears p. 34 of the keyboard part and last page of each string part.

One copyist was responsible for the keyboard part, another for the string parts; their hands are similar but distinct from those in other sources seen here from Wagener's collection. The keyboard part lacks continuo figures. In tutti passages the right hand doubles violin 1 and occasionally inner parts as well. Only a few gaps in the doubling of the viola (where the basso is silent, e.g., at iii.21–4) would have prevented use of the part for unaccompanied performance, an option perhaps implied by the form of the title.

E1: lost manuscript parts in the hand of E. L. Gerber

Together with copies of W. 18, 32, and 33, **E1** constituted lot 192 of the Prieger auction of 1924. All were described as sets of manuscript parts in the hand of the music lexicographer Ernst Ludwig Gerber (1746–1819), son of the J. S. Bach–pupil Heinrich Nicolaus Gerber (1702–55).²⁹

The lot was purchased by the Polish harpsichordist Wanda Landowska (1879–1959), who, by her own account, acquired “the separate parts . . . copied by Ernst Ludwig Gerber” for several of Bach's concertos at the Prieger sale on 15 July 1924 and afterwards “reconstituted the full scores.”³⁰ Presumably it was on the basis of her transcription of W. 6 that Landowska performed it in 1926 in New York.³¹ It is fortunate that she had no interest in the modern copies **E2**, for these are now the sole traces of Gerber's parts, which, together with Landowska's transcription, were apparently lost during her flight from the Nazis in 1940.³² Coincidentally, just three years later Landowska broadcast performances of a number of these works, including W. 6, with the conductor Adolf Koldofsky, who had acquired his own manuscript sources for W. 6 and other concertos (see above under **B3**). The latter, however, are unrelated to the present copies, as is

²⁹ *Musk-Sammlung aus dem Nachlass Dr. Erich Prieger–Bonn*, entry for lot 192. The latter specifies that W. 6 was copied at Leipzig in January 1767.

³⁰ *Landowska on Music*, 305.

³¹ *Time*, 15 March 1926, quoted in Larry Palmer, *Harpsichord in America: A Twentieth-Century Revival* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 54–5, reported Landowska's performance of a “Concerto in G Minor for Harpsichord and String Quartet, scored by herself from the manuscript parts found in the sale of Krieger's [*sic*] collection at Bonn.” From the reference to the slow movement as a “Largo” it is evident that the work in question is W. 6 and not W. 32, although it is the latter work that is mentioned in *Landowska on Music*, 305.

³² Restout, in *Landowska on Music*, 21, reports that in her and Landowska's “hasty departure” from St. Leu-La-Forêt in 1940, Restout substituted notes from Landowska's master classes for the C. P. E. Bach manuscripts, which were left behind.

clear from the account by Landowska's friend and colleague Denise Restout.³³

E2: CH-Gpu Mss. mus. 325 and 326

Two modern manuscript copies in the same unidentified hand, one in full score (ms. 326), one with string parts notated on two staves in treble and bass clefs, respectively, above the keyboard part (ms. 325)

Both copies are on modern printed staff paper, ms. 325 (the reduction) bearing 16 staves per page, ms. 326 (the full score) bearing 20 staves per page. A modern cover sheet or wrapper includes the comment “No 189 des Prieger-Versteigerung | Bonn 1924,” referring to the auction of the estate of Erich Prieger (1849–1913), to which numerous copies of other works by Bach can be traced. The title page of ms. 325 reads: “Concerto | per | Il Cembalo Concertato | da | II Violini, Violetta | e | Basso | composto | da | Carlo Filippo Emanuele Bach. | [incipit] | E. L. Gerber. | Leipzig. | 1767.”

E2 is in the same hand as the copy of W. 80 now in ms. 357 of the same library; the latter manuscript, together with **E2** and a copy of the flute version of the concerto W. 22, constituted lot 189 of the 1924 Prieger auction.³⁴ In view of its title page, ms. 325 would seem to derive from the lost manuscript **E1**. Despite its compressed format, ms. 325 gives a complete and seemingly accurate recension of the text and is somewhat more carefully written than the full score, which appears to have been copied in haste, omitting many performance indications. The full score does, however, contain several corrections, as well as verbal notes (in German) concerning the musical text, which appears to have been compared with and altered on the basis of another source. Possibly, then, the full score was prepared for study, either from another source or for use in comparison to other sources, whereas the compressed score was intended for performance by two keyboard instruments.³⁵

Sources: Intermediate Readings

³³ Restout indicates, in *Landowska on Music*, 305, that “Early in 1943 Wanda Landowska was asked to identify manuscript copies of several of Karl Philipp Emanuel Bach's concertos, then in the possession of the late Adolf Koldofsky of Toronto, Ontario. Subsequently, she played seven of these concertos on the Canadian Broadcasting System from March 14 to April 25, 1943.” Restout gives additional details in liner notes for a reissue of the one performance for which a recording is known (W. 18 in D): Koldofsky “had acquired manuscript copies of a number of Concertos—presumably by Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach—which had found their way, after a long and complicated odyssey, to a music collector in Toronto.” Landowska authenticated the latter copies as containing works of C. P. E. Bach, based on her experience of having previously obtained manuscript copies of Bach's concertos from the Prieger estate (liner notes to *Landowska Plays Scarlatti Sonatas and Works by J. S. Bach, C. P. E. Bach, and Handel*, Pearl GEMS 0106 [Wadhurst: Pavillion Records, 2001], p. 8). I am grateful to Teri Noel Towe, one of the producers of the recording, for furnishing a copy.

³⁴ *Musk-Sammlung aus dem Nachlass Dr. Erich Prieger–Bonn nebst einigen Beiträgen aus anderem Besitz. III. Teil. . . . Beschreibendes Verzeichnis von Georg Kinsky* (Cologne: Lempertz, 1924), lot 189; the copy of W. 6 is described more precisely as “in Entwurf und Reinschrift,” presumably referring to the full and two-keyboard score, respectively. Stephen Fischer kindly compared the handwriting.

³⁵ The manuscript was examined in photocopy.

F1: D B Thulemeier M. 19

Manuscript wrapper and five parts in a hand identified as that of J. G. Siebe (wrapper: 34.5 x 22 cm; parts: 35.5 x 21 cm). Watermark: “FR” (wrapper: crowned eagle, “I C R”)³⁶

F1 is, like sources **A4**, **B4**, and **D** for W. 4 and source **D3** for W. 5, from the collection of Friedrich Wilhelm von Thulemeier (1750–1811). The copy of W. 6 is one of seven manuscripts from the collection that were located in the Eisenach Bach-Museum after World War II but have since been returned to the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo”: 6 bifolios = 24 pages, the penultimate ruled but unused, the last blank. Soprano clef;

“Violino 1”, “Violino 2”, “Viola”: each a double bifolio = 8 pages;

“Basso”: a single bifolio = 4 pages.

The string parts bear the title “Concerto” in the top left of the first page. The original entries on the wrapper, probably in the same hand, read: “Concerto | Cembalo contertato [*sic*] | Violino 1^{do} [*sic*] et 2^{do} | Viola et Basso”. The copy, which has been dated ca. 1755, has been traced to the estate of Christoph Nichelmann; see under source **B4** for Wq 4.

Despite the presence of numerous erasures and corrections, the copy is among the more accurate ones, particularly in the positioning of indications for dynamics and articulation. J. G. Siebe has been described as a copyist for the Berlin court opera.³⁷ Some corrections may be in a foreign hand, as is probably true as well of certain dynamic indications that appear to have been omitted originally, but these entries are too brief to identify the hand (e.g., as that of Nichelmann). A few errors suggest that the copy was made from one in which the keyboard part was written in treble clef.

The keyboard part includes figures as well as a very thorough doubling of the upper string parts in tutti passages, the latter reflecting careful editing. For example, in ii.16–9, where violin 1 duplicates the pedal point in the basso, the right hand doubles the second violin and viola. In a parallel passage (ii.31–4) the same two parts are doubled, but the viola is transposed an octave lower for easier performance on the keyboard. The multiple stops of the violins in the last movement are revoiced or reduced to single notes.³⁸

The continuo figuration also is carefully written and internally consistent even where it departs from the text of other copies. It is distinguished by the use of the “Telemannscher Bogen” above the figure 5 to indicate the diminished triad. Bach describes the practice in the *Versuch*,³⁹ but not the use of dots between figures to indicate the rhythm of successive chords over a single

³⁶ The watermark is Schwinger's no. 10; on the identification of the copyist, see Schwinger, 467 (citing Christoph Henzel (2000), 88ff.). Bernd Koska (*Bach-Jahrbuch* 2018, p. 156) dates it with copies made “um 1760.”

³⁷ “Berliner Hofopernkopist”; see note 36.

³⁸ A keyboard part for W. 37, copied by Michel and reviewed by Bach, contains similar arrangements (in D B Mus. ms. Bach St 526). See CPEBE, II/15: 82.

³⁹ *Versuch*, ii.4.3. The symbol occurs at i.34 and elsewhere.

bass note.⁴⁰

F2: D B Mus. ms. Bach St 217

Five manuscript parts in the hand of Ludwig Christoph Hopff (23.5 x 30 cm)

F2 appears to be a luxury sale copy, made on very good, thick paper. The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo Concertato”: 8 bifolios = 32 pages, the outer pages unruled; p. 1 = title page;

“Violino Primo”, “Violino Secondo”: each 3 bifolios = 12 pages;

“Viola”, “Violoncello e Violone”: each 2 bifolios = 4 pages.

The title page reads: “Concerto. in G \flat . | à | Cembalo Concertato | Violino Primo | Violino Secondo | Viola | e | Basso | del Sig^{te} C. Ph. E. Bach.”

Despite its expensive appearance, the copy is not particularly accurate. The keyboard part lacks continuo figures, and although the upper staff usually doubles the first violin in tutti passages—as well as the second violin and viola where the basso is silent (see Plate 9—the absence of any such doublings in portions of the second and third movements would have prevented use of this part for unaccompanied keyboard performance. Nevertheless, the multiple stops for the violins in the third movement are revoiced for convenient playing on a keyboard instrument.

The copyist Hopff was in Hamburg from 1740 or earlier, playing viola as a *Chorinstrumentalist* under Telemann and later C. P. E. Bach.⁴¹ He was responsible for many sources containing late works of C. P. E. Bach, some of which bear autograph indications. No such indications appear in the present copy, however.⁴²

Sources: Late Version

G1: B Bc 5887 MSM (W. 6)

Five manuscript parts in the hand of J. H. Michel: v1, v2, va (33 x 20.5 cm); kb, bs (32.5 x 20.5 cm). No watermark⁴³

The parts are as follows:

“Cembalo. concertato”: 6 bifolios = 24 pages, the last blank and unnumbered;

“Violino primo” and “Violino secondo”: each 2-1/2 bifolios = 10 pages, the last blank;

⁴⁰ In ii.25–6 and parallel passages.

⁴¹ Hopff, designated Anonymous 305 by Kast, is identified and his career traced by Jürgen Neubacher, “Der Organist Johann Gottfried Rist (1741–1795) und der Bratschist Ludwig August Christoph Hopff (1715–1798): Zwei Hamburger Notenkopisten Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs,” *Bach-Jahrbuch* (2005): 109–23 (especially 117–21).

⁴² Leisinger / Wollny 1997, 36, state that Anonymous 305 (= Hopff) also worked for the Hamburg publisher J. C. Westphal. They trace copies by Hopff of two concertos to the latter (W. 12 and 32, both in B Bc 5887 MSM; *ibid.*, 337, 344). W. 6 was presumably one of the two G-minor concertos by Bach advertised in a printed catalog of works available in manuscript from J. C. Westphal.

⁴³ Dimensions and watermark information from Leisinger / Wollny 1997, 335.

“Viola”: 2 bifolios = 8 pages, the last blank;

“Violono, à Basso.”: 2 bifolios = 8 pages, the last blank.

Page 1 of the basso part is the title page; original entries read: “G. moll. | Concerto. | a | Cembalo conc. | 2. Violini | Viola | e | Basso. | di. | C. P. E. Bach.” Each part bears the title “Concerto” at the beginning of the first system. The number of measures in each movement has been entered, probably by Michel, at the end of each movement in the string parts.

Sources: Copies of the Cadenza Collection

H1: B Bc 5871 MSM

Seventy-five cadenzas and other short passages, copied mainly by J. H. Michel

This manuscript is described as source **E1** for W. 5. The sole entry for W. 6 is no. 74, the second from the end (the last entry in the hand of Michel), on the fourth system of page 23. It bears the title “Cadenz. zum Adagio des Conc. G moll No. 7.” Except for the presence of one additional cautionary accidental, its text for the cadenza is the same as that in **G1**.

H2: D B Mus. ms Bach P 800

Modern copy of the cadenzas and other matter in Bc 5871

Description as source **E2** for W. 5.

Evaluation of sources

W. 6 survives in a greater number of sources than any of Bach's earlier concertos, and therefore it is not surprising that the sources reflect a greater number of filiational groups, designated here by letters A through H. On the other hand, the work appears to have undergone a relatively limited amount of revision, and most of the filiational groupings probably stem from errors or deliberate alterations of the text by copyists, not from changes by the composer. Of the fourteen or more distinct eighteenth-century sources that transmit W. 6, only **A1**, **C1**, **F2**, **G1**, and possibly **A6** are in identified hands; in addition, **B2** is by an unnamed copyist who evidently had some relationship to Bach. But only **G1** and the part-autograph **C1** can be related directly to the composer, and these transmit different versions of the work.

Compositional history

The sources for W. 6 do not reflect revisions as significant as those seen in W. 4 and 5. This fact, together with the survival of the late version of W. 6 in a single source—by contrast with the multiple sources containing the late versions of W. 4 and W. 5—suggests that the compositional history of W. 6 was distinct from that of the other two concertos, and perhaps also from that of its chronological neighbors W. 46, 7, and 8. Although the latter survive in autograph revision scores from the 1740s, there is no evidence that Bach ever produced a new score for W. 6. On the contrary, **G1**, the source of the late version, retains a few apparent errors and notational oddities that can be traced back to sources for the earliest known version.

Nevertheless, W. 6 did undergo most of the same types of revisions seen in the other

concertos edited in this volume. At a relatively early date, the string parts (especially inner voices and bass) were revised. These revisions probably took place in several distinct stages, as they do not occur in all sources of the early version.⁴⁴ Small changes may have also been made at an early date to the keyboard part, including some additions and changes in ornaments and bass figures (but see below on the latter). Farther-reaching changes in the keyboard part took place later; these involved variation and embellishment in all movements, particularly in the second, although not to the degree seen in W. 4 and 5.⁴⁵ As in other works, the later versions also added many performance indications (slurs, ornaments, and figured bass symbols).

The unique preservation of most of these last revisions in **G1** suggests that Bach did not carry them out until relatively late in life. Yet the existence of numerous copies of earlier versions testifies to the work's popularity, suggesting that for most of his life Bach was willing to let the work circulate in a form relatively close to its original version. Perhaps this was because by 1740 Bach had gained sufficient mastery to be able to write in one draft music that would continue to seem satisfactory for many years without substantial revision. But even if this was so, as in other cases his original score is likely to have grown difficult to read as alterations were added to it. The sometimes puzzling readings of the sources probably reflect this.

As in other works, reduced legibility of Bach's score would explain the co-existence of early and revised readings within individual sources, as at i.34 and parallel passages (i.148, 279) and iii.165.⁴⁶ Corrections made during composition—rather than during a later revision—may also have led to variants if rejected readings or notational irregularities that arose in the course of rapid writing were not clearly replaced. This would account for a number of readings that, although musically plausible, may not have been intended to occur in any actual version of the work.⁴⁷ One such reading involving the alternate instrumentation of two parallel passages in the last movement is discussed below.

Source groups

Only **G1** gives the late version; most sources give early states of the text, a few others transmitting intermediate versions. Differences between the early and intermediate versions are

⁴⁴ The most important of these intermediate revisions are those affecting the viola part, especially the parallel fifths in iii.165, which Bach overlooked in his copy of the part in **C1**. His oversight might have been due to the the two halves of the measure having been written across a line- or page-break. The latter is suggested by the fact that the whole note in the second violin part of the same measure appears as two half notes in **A1**, **A3**, **A6**, **B3**, **B4**, and **G1**.

⁴⁵ The late version shows significant variation or embellishment of the keyboard part in these measures: ii.40, 66, 94, 96–102, 110–8, 122–9, 147 (cadenza inserted); iii.105, 181, 242–7, 254–5, 305, 310, 311, 316, 376–83, and 390–2. The revised versions of these passages occur only in **G1**; two additional measures, iii.309 and 313, are varied not only in **G1** but also in **A4**.

⁴⁶ At i.148 even **G1** retains a slur as a vestige of the original tie, and at iii.165 its continuo figures do not reflect the revised viola part.

⁴⁷ See, e.g., readings listed in Commentaries for all versions (early, intermediate, late) at i.112, 114, 116, 118, 120 (of 112–20) and iii.298–9 (or 298).

relatively insignificant, consisting primarily of readings for isolated notes, dynamics, and other individual signs. Some sources of the early version include what will be designated “alternate” ornament signs for the keyboard part of the slow movement. In addition, **A6** gives the alternate scoring for two passages in the last movement whose origin must be considered.

None of the extant sources is a direct copy of another. Even within sources that transmit essentially the same version, the copies give a bewildering array of variant readings, often combining readings that appear to belong to distinct states of the text. In addition to presenting the late version according to **G1**, the edition reconstructs an early version based primarily on Possin's score **A1**, for which the anonymous score **B1** and the part-autograph **C1** serve as secondary sources. The latter have also been consulted in preparing the edition of the late version, which draws as well on readings from **F1** and **F2**. The latter two sources give the latest of the intermediate readings.

The sources that give primarily early readings—that is, all but **F1**, **F2**, and **G1**—can be divided into three groups:

A: a group that generally gives early readings, but with the alternate ornament signs (sources **A1–6**);

B: another group lacking those signs but transmitting some intermediate readings (sources **B1–4**);

C–E: a miscellaneous group that cannot be clearly related to either of the other two: **C1**, **D1**, **E2**).

These are not closed filiational groups; even within these groups, exhaustive collation of variant readings has failed to reveal clear-cut patterns in the transmission of readings. It is possible that all of these sources derive from essentially the same state of Bach's original autograph material score, the vast majority of their numerous variants having arisen through copyist error or intervention. But although these sources vary in their degree of accuracy, they agree closely on pitches and rhythms except in a relatively small number of readings that are discussed in the Commentary. Only in a few cases is the intended reading seriously in doubt. At issue, rather, are readings of performance markings, especially ornaments and continuo figures; these are discussed separately below. The selection of principal and secondary sources for the early version has been based primarily on their apparent accuracy in transmitting the basic text. Details are presented below in discussions of the individual sources.

Individual sources

Groups A–E: Sources giving early readings

As in W. 4 and 5, the aim of the edition of the early version is to present the text in a state as close as possible to that in which the work first circulated. The partially autograph **C1** contains only the violin and viola parts, hence shedding no light on the most crucial readings, those of the keyboard. Moreover, the extant parts give some revised readings. Nevertheless, as the only source to stem directly from the composer, **C1** can at least serve as a secondary source for the early version, providing readings for the three upper string parts except in the few places where these contain revised readings.

Of the many remaining sources for the early version, those transmitting the alternate ornaments might at first seem unreliable. But unlike the alternate performance markings for W.

4, those for W. 6 are transmitted in a relatively consistent way in the six sources that preserve them. Among the more accurate copies in this group is Possin's score **A1**, which, apart from the alternate ornaments, appears to contain no revised readings even for performance markings. The copyist notates most appoggiaturas as bearing half the value of the large notes to which they are attached, in this respect employing a notational convention first described in Bach's *Versuch* I of 1753; in addition, a number of ornament signs appear that are rare or unknown in Bach's scores from before that date. Otherwise, however, **A1** closely resembles other scores that appear to reproduce features of Bach's early autograph scores as described above. **A1** appears to be free of copyist intervention and may well be a relatively accurate copy of the same material mentioned in the following paragraph. For these reasons **A1** can serve as principal source for the early version, supplemented and controlled by the secondary sources and, in cases of readings that were preserved through all revisions, the late version.

Besides **A1** there is a second score, **B1**, that appears to be an independent witness to an early state of Bach's text. The order in which the parts are presented, with the keyboard on top, was rarely if ever used by Bach.⁴⁸ But the entry of several notes and even one entire line on the wrong staff shows that the copyist worked from an exemplar in score whose parts were dispositioned differently. The two other scores by the same copyist follow the same format, although these place figures in the basso part, not the lower staff of the keyboard. As the latter format occurs in score copies of W. 4 and 5, it is a further indication that the copyist probably had access to exemplars close to the composer's lost composing score. A few alterations by the copyist in the direction of the note stems in iii.194–225 suggest that the correct stemming was present in the exemplar but was not understood by the copyist. Thus **B1** may be relatively close to the autograph despite its apparent anomalies.

Although not particularly accurate, **B1** as originally notated lacks the alternate ornaments and most of the performance markings characteristic of later versions.⁴⁹ It therefore can serve as a control for readings in **A1**. In addition, **B1** supplies continuo figures, which are entirely absent from **A1**. Although there must be some doubt as to Bach's responsibility for these figures (see below), those in **B1** recur in other, independent copies, and as Bach, at least by the time of the *Versuch*, considered figures to be essential elements of a complete score, they are included in the edition.

Other sources giving readings allied to **B1** are **B2**, **B3**, and **B4**. **B2** is particularly close to **B1**, and in places where the keyboard part of the latter has been altered, its original readings can usually be discerned from **B2**. As the keyboard part of **B2** is by a known associate of Bach, it is possible that both copies derive directly from a score that was in the composer's possession at Berlin. For this reason the keyboard part of **B2** has served as a secondary source where readings in **A1** and **B1** are in doubt.

B4 lacks the part for violin 1, and like **B3** it shows numerous omissions and inconsistencies

⁴⁸ The forms of the rubrics indicating the doubling of one part by another, e.g., “col altro Basso” in the basso part, also are not typical of Bach's practice.

⁴⁹ A number of ornament signs were added to the keyboard part, but these are easily recognizable as pencil entries in a foreign hand.

in performance markings. A further sign of carelessness in both copies (as in **F2**) is the incomplete inclusion of doublings of the upper string parts by the right hand of the keyboard in tutti passages. Both also contain some but not all of the revised readings in the string parts. These features together with their uncertain provenance preclude use of either as a secondary source for the early version.

The remaining sources seem for one reason or another to be somewhat further removed from the composer, although some of them are puzzling in that they contain occasional later readings. For example, **A2** generally is an accurate witness of the early version, but in addition to containing alternate ornaments it contains revised readings at i.168 and iii.165, 309, and 313. The last two of these passages contain variations of the keyboard part otherwise present only in **A4** and **G1**. Such readings may reflect correction or updating of its exemplar based on an unknown source.

A6 is of special interest not only because of its copyist (see above) but because of several unique readings. Chief among the latter is the alternate instrumentation of two passages in the third movement. These readings are musically plausible, but because **A6** contains other readings that are almost certainly not Bach's, such as the alternate ornaments and numerous unique continuo figures, his responsibility for the more substantive unique readings of **A6** also cannot be assumed.

Group F: Sources giving intermediate readings

Hopff, copyist of **F2**, appears to have worked on occasion for Bach's widow after Bach's death, but the text of this copy is poor and was not necessarily based on material obtained from the composer. **F1** likewise cannot be traced directly to Bach, and although it is more accurate and more carefully prepared than **F2**, its text shows signs of copyist intervention in several otherwise unattested readings. These include two apparent "corrections" of what may have been perceived as errors in Bach's text.⁵⁰ The readings are musically plausible, but they occur in no other source.

Nevertheless **F1** and **F2** incorporate most of the revised readings for the string parts, including slurs and dynamics that are otherwise present only in **G1**. The two copies therefore appear to be the sole witnesses to relatively late versions of the concerto. Neither provides a completely reliable text, and **F2** lacks continuo figures. Nevertheless, both can serve as secondary sources for the late version, especially where **G1** gives faulty or incomplete readings of performance indications in the string parts.

Source G1: The late version

G1 is in the hand of J. H. Michel, whose long-term association with the composer is well established. Westphal's ownership of **G1** is established by its inclusion in his catalog and the uniformity of its format with other copies from his collection. Unlike his copies of W. 4 and 5 (see sources **B2** and **E1**, respectively, for those works), Westphal's copy of W. 6 was apparently prepared expressly for him from material in the possession of Bach's widow; there is no evidence

⁵⁰ At i.115, where the first violin has $b b''$ rather than $b b'$ on note 2, thus resolving the dissonant c''' (note 1) in its own register; and at i.197–201, where the viola is an octave lower, thereby remaining beneath the violins. Perhaps these readings are to be attributed to Nichelmann, the likely original owner of this copy.

for its having been a replacement for or a corrected copy of a manuscript originally obtained from someone else. But although neatly written and generally accurate, the copy contains a substantial number of errors, as well as signs that the copyist Michel was working from heavily revised or otherwise hard-to-read exemplars. At iii.242 Michel began copying the earlier version of the passage into the keyboard part before substituting the revised reading, and like most other copyists he retained an apparently incorrect reading at this point for the first violin. At i.148 he wrote a slur in the second violin part that corresponds to a tie in the earlier version. Wrong notes at i.36 (lh), i.160 (v2), and iii.242 (v1) appear correctly in other sources. There are also numerous instances of omission or displacement of signs for articulation and dynamics (see Commentary for details).

The presence of so many errors, as well as the absence of autograph entries, is consistent with the view that Westphal obtained the copy after the composer's death. Nevertheless, there is no reason to question the authenticity of the source's unique readings, which constitute an internally consistent text whose style accords with that of other works also revised after being originally composed in the 1740s.

Specific issues of text and performance

Many performance markings seem not to have been initially entered in the same exemplar in which other early revisions were made. **B1**, a score, lacks most of the revised readings of both strings and keyboard, yet it includes many slurs absent from sources that do contain those revised readings, notably the autograph portion of **C1**.⁵¹ At i.34 and parallel passages, **B1** even gives continuo figures that accord with those revised readings and not with the readings of its own second violin part. Thus it is possible that some performance markings were initially entered into performing parts whereas revisions involving notes were made only in Bach's score. Although the latter may have remained the basis for most copies, some scribes (such as Schlichting) may also have incorporated markings from performance parts into their copies. In short, there appear to have been distinct lines of transmission for some of the performance markings and some of the revisions of the string parts; readings from the two lines may not have been united until the late version preserved only in **G1**, which also contains further revisions. The issue requires further investigation, however, and a more complete picture may emerge through continuing study of textual transmission in Bach's early concertos.

Bach's autograph string parts in **C1** lack most of the slurs present in later versions, especially in the ritornello of the slow movement. Initially, as in other works, written slurs were probably confined to a few well-defined short motives. Convention may have dictated slurring certain additional configurations of notes, such as three conjunct pitches in the rhythm dotted 8th + two 32ds. Such figures gradually acquired notated slurs, and over time additional, often longer, slurs were written. This is clearest in the second movement, where a shift toward a less articulate, more uniformly legato conception may also have encouraged the deletion of the bass continuo realization that took place in the late version (see below). Even in the earliest extant version of the concerto, the readings of slurs are not always entirely clear. Later copyists, including Michel (scribe of **G1**), leave many ambiguities in the placement of slurs, as well as inconsistencies

⁵¹ E.g., at ii.1–2 (vn) and iii.234–41 (v1 and v2).

between doubling parts. The edition emends both texts to provide a logical, internally consistent system of articulation for each version (details in Commentary). It is possible, however, that the imprecision of the sources is an indication that exactitude in this matter was becoming musically irrelevant, at least in the late version.

As in W. 4 and W. 5, the late version includes specific signs for ornaments alongside the abbreviation “tr”, which remains the only indication for ornaments in the string parts. Most instances of “tr” in the late versions correspond with its appearances in the early version. In sources of the latter, “tr” is the only sign used, although it was probably substituted by copyists for Bach's original cross or plus sign.⁵² The alternate ornaments for the slow movement, although found in sources that generally transmit the early version, are mostly notated through specific ornament signs. Hence these signs, if Bach's, were probably added to the keyboard part after Bach had already made the revisions to the string parts seen in **C1**, which could date from as early as the mid-1740s. Yet the signs appear in the scores **A1** and **A2**, which lack those revisions.

Bach authorized the substitution by copyists of “tr” for his older +, but the wholesale substitution of other signs and the addition of entirely new ornaments goes well beyond anything implicit in the earlier notation. No two sources of the present work transmit exactly the same set of alternate ornament signs. As in W. 4, the inclusion of the latter in certain copies may represent a tradition of copyists' inserting such signs into a manuscript, rather than a specific set of readings copied from one source to another. Some of the alternate ornament signs recur at the same points in the sole source for the late version, **G1**, but others are contradicted by the latter source. The concordances between **G1** and the alternate tradition are therefore probably coincidental, reflecting the fact that, whether or not Bach's, the alternate signs do conform to Bach's style of ornamentation as described in *Versuch I* and documented in other works.

Basso continuo figures appear in nine sources. But only those in **G1** are assuredly Bach's, and only in that source is the second movement marked *tasto solo*. The other eight sources include figures in the second movement, and these are sometimes of a very detailed character. In particular, four sources (**A2–6**) include detailed continuo figuration throughout the long pedal points at ii.16, 31–6, 78–84, and 159–65, where **B1–4** contain “tasto” or “tasto solo” markings. **F1** omits figures in these passages while continuing to provide a thorough doubling of the violin and viola parts. It is unlikely to be a coincidence that four of the sources containing alternate ornaments also provide figures in these passages (the two other sources for the alternate ornaments, **A1** and **A5**, lack figures entirely). This must cast further doubt over the authenticity of their figures, which might represent a pedagogically inspired tradition of heavy copyist annotation of keyboard parts.

The continuo figuration in the remaining sources is relatively sparse for all movements. This in itself has no bearing on the origin of any of the figures, for a competent musician could deduce most of the figures correctly simply by reference to the string parts. In the absence of autograph figuring, the composer's participation in this aspect of the notation can only be deduced from such features as the consistent application of his personal conventions, or the specification of harmonies that are counterintuitive or not obviously implied by the written parts. A possible

⁵² The cross remains in the autograph portions of **C1**, where, however, it is often followed by a period, suggesting that it is actually a letter t standing for *Triller* or *tremblement*.

instance of the latter is the figure 7 present in **G1** as well as **B3**, **B4**, and **F1** on the downbeat of iii.2; **B1** and **B2** have the same figure in m. 4 and subsequent parallel passages.⁵³ This figure represents what Bach calls a “passing” seventh;⁵⁴ in its place **A2**, **A3**, **4**, and **A6** have the figure 6♯ (or its equivalent), a more obvious but less elegant reading.⁵⁵

To be sure, Bach doubtless first drafted the work without continuo figures, and sources without them, such as **A1**, may reflect a state in which the finished work was disseminated for many years. Figures in some of Bach's surviving autograph scores are later additions.⁵⁶ The throughgoing doubling of string parts by the keyboard, shown in tutti passages in some sources of W. 6, may have substituted for bass figuration in the practice of some musicians, especially those unable to read figured bass. But the incomplete nature of the doubling in some sources, and the fact that it sometimes appears together with figures, indicates that some copyists considered the latter to be essential, as did Bach.⁵⁷ Therefore the edition supplements the text of the early version with figures from **B1**; in cases of doubt, **B2** has been consulted.⁵⁸

These last two sources present several variants that may shed light on the format of Bach's original score. **B1** and **B2** show the left hand of the keyboard doubling the viola with continuo figures in several passages where the basso is silent.⁵⁹ That these were not arbitrary copyist additions is clear from the fact that these two independent copies show identical readings at these places. In **B1**, however, the notes for the first such passage were blotted out and replaced with rests before the figures were written. **A1** likewise contains variants suggesting that the viola as well as the basso may have originally been doubled by the lower staff of the keyboard part.⁶⁰ Possibly the notes (including figures) for all these parts were originally written in tutti passages as part of a continuo part distinct from both left-hand and basso lines, such as occurs in the score of W. 1 in D B Mus. ms. Bach P 239. Doublings of this generic bass line by the viola, left hand,

⁵³ Neither source originally had any figure on note 1 of iii.2, where **B1** shows fig. 7 as a later entry.

⁵⁴ “Die durchgehende Septime,” *Versuch* ii.13.1.19.

⁵⁵ Less elegant because it forces a change of harmony to 6 on the next quarter note, with parallel motion in three parts, even though the prevailing harmonic rhythm of the movement is to move in half or whole notes.

⁵⁶ In D B Mus. ms. Bach P 352, the figures in the copy of W. 18 look like later additions and might have related to a planned publication of the work; in P 354, the figures in the copy of W. 2 may be original, but the score is surely a revision copy of the 1740s or later, not the original version of 1734.

⁵⁷ “Jeder Componist, der mit Recht seine Arbeit gut accompagnirt haben will, ist verbunden, die Baßstimme recht und hinlänglich zu beziffern” (“The composer who, naturally, wishes his work to be accompanied properly must figure the bass correctly and sufficiently”), *Versuch* ii.4.1—an admonition doubtless founded upon personal experience.

⁵⁸ Evidence against Bach's responsibility for the figures found in these sources might be seen at iii.9, where the figures 9/4–8/3 on note 1 belong to the bass note g, a probably spurious variant for b♭ at this point. Several notes for the left hand in the previous two measures, doubling the viola, also bear figures in these sources.

⁵⁹ E.g., in i.12–5 and certain parallel passages (see Commentary for details).

⁶⁰ At i.246, 248.

and basso would all have been indicated by custodes, resulting in occasional copyist confusion or uncertainty as to exactly what pitch or note value to write in each actual part.

Several individual passages present further variant readings of uncertain status. These appear to go beyond simple misreadings or arbitrary alterations by copyists, possibly constituting traces of early or intermediate readings that were subsequently revised. The most important of these is the unique reading of **A6** for iii.228–9 and the parallel passage iii.372–3, both being assigned to the strings, playing *piano*. In all other sources, each of these passages is played by the soloist, the strings entering to repeat the passage *forte* in the next two measures. But variants in other sources suggest that Bach's material was revised in some way at these points.⁶¹

Similar refinement of scoring or instrumentation is also suggested at i.132 and 134, where a number of sources show one or more of the dotted eighth notes in the violins as eighth-note-plus-sixteenth-rest. The meaning of this detailed notation, used nowhere else for the motive in question, is unclear. But it persists in most sources, including **C1** and **G1**, and must have been present in Bach's original material. The notation occurs in a passage containing rapid alternation between tutti and soloist. Possibly the sixteenth rests are vestiges of an earlier reading in which the strings were silent in the solo portions of the passage (i.e., where they are now marked *piano*). The violins would then have had eighth as well as sixteenth rests at the beginnings of mm. 132 and 134.⁶² It is possible as well that the keyboard part in these same passages originally contained the matter now assigned to the violins (e.g., quarter notes *b b''–d''* on the second and third beats of i.131).

Another point involving small variants in the violin parts involves mm. 22 and 24 and parallel passages in the ritornello of the last movement. Here the early version gives eighth notes in place of the appoggiatura-plus-quarter note found in the late and intermediate versions. This might be taken as evidence that Bach equated the two forms of notation. But the consistent presence of the appoggiaturas in sources that give revised readings for the strings, including **C1**, implies that Bach meant to distinguish between the appoggiatura and the regular eighth. The edition adopts regular eighth notes for the early version; the appoggiatura is adopted in the late version, where it may have been intended to be of the “invariable” or short type. The latter interpretation is probably also appropriate for the appoggiaturas in mm. 2 and 4 and parallel

⁶¹ In mm. 228–9, **B1** and **B2** give all but the first note of the left hand an octave lower (= basso in mm. 230–1). **A1** shows a correction at iii.372 (but not iii.228), suggesting that the copyist worked from an exemplar that was unclear here. Also in **A1** at iii.372, staff lines for the first violin are redrawn and rests for the right hand have been erased and overwritten. **A2** gives figures in iii.373, despite the rests in the strings at that point, implying that what appears in the right hand in mm. 372–3 might originally have been a doubling of a violin line that was later cancelled. In **A6**, the keyboard has “Tutti” at m. 228 (not 230), and in **G1**, iii.372–3 were written only once in the parts for first violin and keyboard, with “tutti” appearing between the staves of the latter; repeat signs and “bis” were then added, probably in the original hand. However, the same shorthand is used elsewhere in **G1** (e.g., in violin 1 and viola for iii.1–2), so its presence at iii.372 may not reflect anything in the *Vorlage*.

⁶² Dotted rests are generally absent in the sources of this movement, including **C1**; they appear in the edition as tacit notational modernizations.

passages.⁶³

A final question involves an alternate version of the left hand for i.112 and four subsequent measures in the same sequential passage. The related sources **B1**, **B2**, and **B3**, as well as **D1**, alter note 6 to avoid near-parallel octaves between the right and left hands (e.g., e♭ is changed to c' in m. 112). The parallels, however, are inoffensive at the rapid speed appropriate to the passage. The correction, if Bach's, is absent from later versions.

⁶³ As explained in the Introduction, most appoggiaturas appear as eighths in sources pre-dating *Versuch I*. The notated values of the appoggiaturas in W. 6 often appear in copies as quarter notes, but almost never in the part-autograph **C1**. The edition of the early version therefore emends appoggiaturas to eighths where notated differently in the principal source.