

Bach's "Triple Concerto" BWV 1044 and Its Models

David Schulenberg

A short version of this paper was given April 28, 2018 at the Yale University Collection of Musical Instruments during the biennial meeting of the American Bach Society. As presented, the paper was a collaboration with Mary Oleskiewicz, who offered remarks on the copyist Agricola and on the flute part of BWV 1044 and related works. Interspersed between sections of the talk were performances of BWV 894, BWV 1044, and a reconstruction of the original version of BWV 527/2.

The Concerto in A minor for keyboard, flute, violin, and strings BWV 1044 has always been one of Bach's more problematical pieces. Performed less often than his other instrumental works, it was, like probably all his keyboard concertos, a relatively late reworking of earlier music. Unlike Bach's other keyboard concertos, it was not derived from music for one soloist with strings. Rather, the quick outer movements derive from the prelude and fugue BWV 894. The central adagio is otherwise known as the middle movement of the D-minor organ sonata BWV 527.

The disparate nature of these source movements is only one of several features of the Triple Concerto that have raised doubts as to whether Bach himself was responsible for it. Dietrich Kilian succinctly summarized both sides of the argument in the critical report for his edition, published posthumously as part of the *Neue Bach-Ausgabe* in 1989.¹ The arrangement, which adds solo flute, solo violin, and ripieno strings in the outer movements, also expands those movements considerably, from 98 to 149 and from 153 to 245 measures, respectively. The second movement, for soloists alone, extends the compass of the harpsichord part up to f3, a note nearly absent from all other keyboard music reliably attributed to J. S. Bach and not used by C. P. E. Bach until after 1750.² Kilian only obliquely mentioned the poor preservation of the work in just two independent manuscript copies. Both belonged to Bach pupils, but a score in the hand of Johann Friedrich Agricola is incomplete, lacking the third movement and leaving most of the viola and cello staves blank; it also reveals puzzling aspects of layout and cleffing. The sole complete copy, from the collection of Johann Gottfried M \ddot{u} thel, is highly inaccurate.³

The Triple Concerto is often viewed as a sister work to the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto BWV 1050, which it resembles in its scoring, although adding a second ripieno violin. Unlike the other Brandenburg Concertos, the Fifth, with its solo harpsichord part, was probably played during Bach's last decades at Leipzig, Berlin, and elsewhere, as suggested by the survival of a relatively large number of copies. These included parts or scores in the possession of the Bach sons Carl Philipp Emanuel and Johann Christoph Friedrich, as well as Emanuel's Berlin colleague Christoph Nichelmann.⁴ One or two

¹ *Johann Sebastian Bach: Konzerte für Violine, für zwei Violinen, für Cembalo, Flöte und Violine*, ed. Dietrich Kilian, *Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke* [NBA], 7/3 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1986; *Kritischer Bericht*, 1989).

² In the first volume of his *Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen*, 2 vols. (Berlin, 1753–62), introduction (para. 12), Emanuel Bach writes of e3 as the highest note needed on a "good clavichord" (*gutes Clavichord*); f3 occurs in the lute suite BWV 997 but only in the final movement, which appears to be a later addition for a keyboard instrument.

³ M \ddot{u} thel was certainly responsible only for the title pages of his copy in Berlin, Staatsbibliothek (D B), Mus. ms. Bach St 134; the remainder is in an unidentified hand. Agricola's copy, D B Mus. ms. Bach P 249, includes some entries by its subsequent owner Carl Friedrich Zelter. Information about these and other sources is from *Bach-Digital* (<https://www.bach-digital.de/>).

⁴ Emanuel Bach owned the manuscript D B Mus. ms. Bach St 131, made by a copyist working for him at Frankfurt (Oder), and J. C. F. Bach inherited his father's parts, St 130, prepared at Cöthen.

passages in the Triple Concerto seem to quote from or allude to the earlier work. But in other respects the concertos are very different, particularly in the formal designs of all three movements and the relationships between the harpsichord and the other parts. For this reason Michael Küßner observed that the two works are at best “step-sisters,”⁵ even though the source movements of BWV 1044 are from roughly the same period as BWV 1050.

The source for movements 1 and 3: BWV 894

BWV 894 is surprisingly little known, despite being one of Bach’s most substantial display pieces for harpsichord. One reason may be the substantial length of its two movements, which, although representing different genres—a prelude in ritornello form followed by a fugue—are too similar in general style and material to form an effective contrasting pair. The prelude shares design features with one of Bach’s most ambitious concerto movements, the opening allegro of BWV 1052 in D minor. Both movements of BWV 894, however, are pervaded by running figuration, and the alternating expositions and episodes of the fugue function much like ritornellos and solo episodes, respectively. Both movements also feature particularly virtuosic solo passagework near the middle and again toward the end; each also opens with passages that state the main thematic material sequentially, in the tonic and then the dominant. In the fugue this is part of the normal alternation of *dux* and *comes*, whereas in the prelude these statements occur as successive phrases of the opening ritornello-like passage. In the concerto version, these passages comprise the first two solo entries (see table 1).

Table 1. First movements of BWV 894 and BWV 1052 compared

BWV 1052 (Concerto in D minor for harpsichord and strings)

section	R	S	R'	S		r	S	R'	pw		r	S	R'	ferm.	S			pw	r	S	R	
key	d			a	->	F	->	a	a-e	->	C>	g	g		->	d->	Bb	d	d		d	
m.	1	7	13	22	28	40	46	56	62		91	95	104	109b	113	122		134	146	172	174	184
		α		α	β	γ	δ		ϵ		γ				β			γ'	ϵ'		δ	

BWV 894/1 (Praeludium in A minor for harpsichord)

section	R		S	R	S		pw	r	pw	r	pw	r	S	r	pw	R	
key	a	e	a	C	e	d	d	a	a	e	->	G	G	a	V	a	
m.	1	9	18	27	40	44b	53b	55	56b	58	61	63	65	69b	77	86	92
		α		β									α		β		

R = ritornello *S* = solo passage or episode *pw* = passagework *ferm.* = fermata with cadenza
 || = recurring passages (Greek letters indicate parallel passages)

Nichelmann copied a portion of D B Mus. ms. Thulemeier 3.

⁵ “Es ist kein Schwesterwerk des 5. Brandenburgischen Konzerts, höchstens eine Stiefschwester.” Michael Küßner, “Stammt das sogenannte Tripelkonzert BWV 1044 von J. S. Bach?,” in *Collegium musicologicum: Festschrift Emil Platen zum sechzigsten Geburtstag*, ed. Martella Gutiérrez-Denhoff, 2d, corrected printing (Bonn, 1986), 42–57 (cited: 57).

The prelude of BWV 894 resembles the preludes of English Suites nos. 2 and 3 (BWV 807–8) in its ritornello form, with “solo” episodes in three imitative parts. It is even more overtly concerto-like, however, in its inclusion as well of passagework episodes and in its through-composed design (as opposed to the strict ternary or da capo form of the two preludes from the English Suites). The fugue of BWV 894 similarly resembles the more strictly fugal preludes of English Suites nos. 4 and 5 (BWV 809–10), but it, too, incorporates soloistic passagework while avoiding da capo form. BWV 894/2 also bears comparison with BWV 944/2, another long, concerto-like fugue in A minor; both use a running subject and virtuoso style, culminating in a dramatic coda, although BWV 944/2 incorporates a greater amount of recapitulation.⁶

BWV 894 seems to have been relatively popular with eighteenth-century keyboard players; early copies survive by Bach’s Weimar pupil Johann Tobias Krebs and his Eisenach cousin Johann Bernhard Bach.⁷ The piece therefore is likely to have originated during Sebastian’s Weimar years—probably nearer the end of that period, in 1717, than the beginning, in 1708. But the origins of the work are obscured by the loss of all autograph material and the independence of the sources, which, while preserving slightly different versions, also transmit small errors or questionable readings. Bernhard Bach’s copy transmits a number of readings that appear to be products of minor revisions; further alterations, especially in the prelude, are documented in later copies. These suggest posthumous transmission at Berlin or Halle through Carl Philipp Emanuel or Wilhelm Friedemann Bach, respectively, in copies by Carl Fasch and the distant Bach cousin known as Johann Christian Bach of Halle.⁸ Yet there appear to be no copies from the Bach household itself, as there are for other major works written around the same time, such as the Chromatic Fantasia and Fugue.⁹ This suggests that Sebastian never worked over the text as carefully as he did other compositions, and that BWV 894 was not as frequently studied by his pupils, at least not after his Weimar years.

For these reasons the text of BWV 894 is not as well established as for other major works, and the four or five versions distinguished by Uwe Wolf are probably not equally authentic.¹⁰ Certain readings, including some given as belonging to a “late” version, likely stem from copyist errors or arbitrary alterations.¹¹ Thus the version copied by Bernhard Bach, designated version “III” by Wolf, is the latest that can be considered fully authenticated.¹² There is no particular reason to doubt Sebastian’s

⁶ By “recapitulation” is meant any transposed restatement of episode material (not necessarily confined to a concluding recapitulation section, as in Classical sonata-allegro form).

⁷ By Krebs: in P 801, fascicle 4; by J. B. Bach: in Leipzig, Stadtbibliothek Leipzig, Musikbibliothek (D-LEb), Peters ms. R 9.

⁸ By Fasch: in Berlin, Archiv der Sing-Akademie zu Berlin (D Bsa), SA 4260; by J. C. Bach of Halle: in Leipzig, Universitätsbibliothek (D-LEu), N.I. 10338, fascicle 4.

⁹ For BWV 903 we have P 651, copied by J. F. Agricola at Leipzig during the period 1738–41 and subsequently owned by C. P. E. Bach.

¹⁰ NBA 5/9.2 (1999) gives the prelude twice, in “early” and “late” versions (*Frühfassung*, *Spätfassung*), with an intermediate version displayed on *ossia* staves in the early version. The *kritischer Bericht* (2000) for the volume describes what might be two further intermediate versions, but even Bach’s most substantial revision apparently involved only the addition of two measures near the end of the prelude.

¹¹ As in mvt. 1, m. 30, lower staff, notes 16–19, where the most authoritative sources of the late version (copies by Carl Fasch and J. C. Bach of Halle) give g–e–c, f; not g–e–c, a, as in the NBA’s “Spätfassung.”

¹² Rainer Kaiser, “Bachs Konzerttranskriptionen und das ‘Stück in Goldpapier’: Zur Datierung der Bach-Abschriften P 280 und Ms. R 9,” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 86 (2000): 307–312 (cited: 310–11), places

responsibility for small refinements of the melodic line or the expansion of the solo passagework by repetitions, both in the prelude (ex. 1). But some of the later readings look like coarsenings of the original, as when real if simple counterpoint in three parts is replaced by the same repeated four-note chord (ex. 2). To be sure, even the fugue in the earliest version strengthens a few chords beyond its ostensibly three-voice texture for dramatic effect (ex. 3). On the other hand, its counterpoint rarely goes beyond a type that might resemble what one heard in improvised fugues: statements of the subject in various keys and registers surrounded by largely chordal accompaniment, not always following strict voice leading (ex. 4).¹³ The quick movements of the Triple Concerto, although not always corresponding to precisely any one version of BWV 894, do incorporate many of the later readings.

The source for movement 2: BWV 527a

The slow movement of the concerto is for the three soloists alone. It is unclear whether it could have been arranged directly from the second movement of the organ sonata BWV 527. The keys are different, and the concerto reassigns the upper voices to different instruments while adding a fourth obbligato part, even though the melodic lines of the sonata are already permeated by florid figuration (ex. 5). In the organ sonata, however, the bass line has clearly been adapted for performance on pedals, whereas the bass of the concerto movement is motivically closer to that of the upper parts (see ex. 5, mm. 2–4). This implies that both movements derive from a lost common model. Indeed, the D-minor organ sonata is one of three from the set of six whose autograph score betrays clear signs of having been adapted from a pre-existing version.¹⁴ The latter is generally assumed to have been a trio sonata in the same key; hence it would have been transposed for the concerto. Indeed, the improbably high tessitura of the keyboard part in this movement would be explained if the passages in question were mechanically transcribed up a fifth from an original in F major. Setting the original movement in that key would also place the original parts, whether for recorder, flute, or violin, in a comfortable tessitura, and a reconstruction can be created with almost none of the problems of register that occur in other cases (ex. 6).¹⁵

In reconstructing an original form of this movement, it would be possible also to remove the florid written-out melodic embellishment in sixteenths and thirty-seconds (ex. 7). Yet the autograph of the organ sonata betrays no hint that even the smallest notes were inserted into simpler lines. There is no question that Bach could write quite florid melodic embellishment as part of an initial draft. For this reason, a modern “reconstruction” such as that shown in example 7 is better regarded as a reductive analysis, not a restoration of any likely original version.

Bernhard’s copy after July 1715 and possibly after 1724 (not exactly “um/nach 1724,” as indicated on *Bach-Digital*).

¹³ BWV 902/2, shown in ex. 4b, was later revised to serve as the fugue in G in part 2 of the *Well-Tempered Clavier*.

¹⁴ For a summary of the presumed compositional history of the organ sonatas BWV 525–30, based on the autograph manuscript P 271, see the *Vorwort* (Preface) to the edition by Pieter Dirksen, *Johann Sebastian Bach: Sämtliche Orgelwerke*, vol. 5 (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 2010), 10–12 (English: 21–23).

¹⁵ The trio movement reconstructed in examples 6 and 7 is usually designated BWV 527a/2. Dirksen, however, argues plausibly that the quick movements of the organ sonata BWV 527 were newly composed. If, then, the slow movement was originally joined to two other movements, no sign of those survives, and the designation “BWV 527a” can be applied to the slow movement alone.

Ex. 1. Praeludium in A minor, BWV 894/1, mm. 28–29 and 80bff.: (a) early version; (b) late version

The image displays a musical score for the Praeludium in A minor, BWV 894/1, comparing two versions of measures 28–29 and 80bff. The score is organized into four systems, each with a grand staff (treble and bass clefs).

- System 1:** Labeled (a) for the early version and (b) for the late version. It shows measures 28 and 29. The right hand features a complex melodic line with a triplet of eighth notes in measure 28. The left hand provides a harmonic accompaniment with chords and eighth-note patterns.
- System 2:** Shows measures 80 and 81. Both hands feature a dense texture of sixteenth-note runs.
- System 3:** Shows measures 82 and 83. The right hand continues with sixteenth-note patterns, while the left hand has a more rhythmic accompaniment.
- System 4:** Shows measures 84 and 85. The right hand has a melodic line with some rests, while the left hand continues with sixteenth-note patterns.

Ex. 2. Praeludium in A minor, BWV 894/1, mm. 9–10: (a) early version; (b) late version

(a)

(b)

Ex. 3. Fugue in A minor, BWV 894/2, mm. 15–16

Ex. 4. (a) Fugue in A minor, BWV 894/2, mm. 39–42; (b) Fugue in G, BWV 902/2, mm. 15–23

(a)

subject

(b)

subject

Ex. 5a. Organ sonata in D minor, BWV 527, mvt. 2, mm. 1–6

Adagio e dolce

Musical score for Ex. 5a, Organ sonata in D minor, BWV 527, mvt. 2, mm. 1–6. The score is in 6/8 time and D minor. It consists of two systems of three staves each. The first system shows the beginning of the piece with a triplet in the right hand and a similar triplet in the left hand. The second system continues the piece with a dense sixteenth-note texture in the right hand and a more melodic line in the left hand.

Ex. 5b. Concerto in A minor, BWV 1044, mvt. 2, mm. 1–6

Adagio ma non tanto e dolce

Musical score for Ex. 5b, Concerto in A minor, BWV 1044, mvt. 2, mm. 1–6. The score is in 6/8 time and A minor. It consists of two systems of four staves each. The first system shows the beginning of the piece with a Flauto traverso, Violino concertato (*pizz.*), and Cembalo concertato. The second system continues the piece with a dense sixteenth-note texture in the right hand and a more melodic line in the left hand.

Ex. 6. Trio sonata movement in F, BWV 527a (reconstruction), mm. 1–6

Adagio ma non tanto e dolce

Flauto traverso

Violino concertato

Ex. 7. Trio sonata movement in F, BWV 527a (simplified reconstruction), mm. 1–6

Adagio

Flauto traverso

Violino concertato

BWV 1044: sources

Turning to our main subject, the Triple Concerto, we find first that its sources are fewer and more problematical than for most of Bach's other concertos. Müthel, owner of the sole complete source, is usually described as one of Sebastian's last pupils.¹⁶ His parts are sufficiently inaccurate to suggest that Müthel made them himself early in his career, copying literally from an exemplar that may not always have been entirely clear.¹⁷ A number of obvious mistakes suggest that the copyist understood too little of what he was copying to have been responsible for the arrangement itself.¹⁸ Another peculiarity of this copy is that it uses French violin clef for passages of the keyboard part (upper stave) in the second movement, including the two that ascend to f₃ (where treble clef would have reduced the need for one leger line).

The partial score by Agricola is, on the whole, more accurate, although it shares with Müthel's parts a number of misplaced or missing dynamics and accidentals. Agricola copied parts for other concertos by Bach as well as numerous further works. This score, however, is not only incomplete but disposes its parts in an odd way, placing the ripieno violins at the top of each system (ex. 8). Agricola also incorporated an odd notational feature in his copy of the second movement: the use of alto clef for the pizzicato passages of the violin (added for the concerto version of the movement).

Agricola's copy ends with a "volti" indication, but when one turns over the page the reverse is blank, not even ruled. This suggests that he might not have intended to make a complete copy; if the last movement was present in his exemplar, perhaps there was something was not quite right about it. Peter Wollny has suggested that both Müthel's and Agricola's copies descend from a common source at Berlin, and some common errors support this. But whether the *Vorlage* was a complete fair-copy autograph, a set of drafts for individual movements, or something more fragmentary or hard to interpret is now impossible to say. Fortunately, we can be reasonably confident that we know how the Triple Concerto was meant to sound, for few errors, even in the last movement, raise serious questions about the intended reading. With that in mind we can consider the relationship between the Triple Concerto and its source works.

BWV 1044: adaptation from source works

Both outer movements were expanded by the addition of new contrapuntal lines and the insertion of new passages for the full ensemble. The latter somewhat raised the level of virtuosity for the keyboard soloist. But the most remarkable aspects of BWV 1044 lie in the formal transformation of all three movements. Students of later concertos are familiar with the process whereby Mozart converted several sonata-form movements by C.P.E. and J.C. Bach into concertos; essentially, he inserted ritornellos around the two or three main sections of the original pieces.¹⁹ The late-eighteenth-century theorist

¹⁶ Müthel arrived at Leipzig in spring 1750, when Bach was already incapacitated; his study might have consisted chiefly of making manuscript copies of Bach's music.

¹⁷ Although *Bach-Digital* describes the musical notation of the copy as being in an unidentified hand, Kilian was unable to eliminate the possibility that it was Müthel's own early handwriting.

¹⁸ Müthel went on to become a significant composer of keyboard sonatas and concertos. Particularly telling are incorrect continuo figures in mm. 10 and 11 and wrong notes in mm. 109, 130, 204, and 220 of the last movement. The copyist also repeatedly uses a mordent sign where a trill would be more appropriate.

¹⁹ Mozart applied this procedure to C. P. E. Bach's *petite pièce* "La Boehmer" (W. 117/26), which became the third movement of the Concerto in D, K. 40, and to three sonatas from J. C. Bach's op.

Ex. 8. Concerto in A minor, BWV 1044, opening, copy by J. F. Agricola (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 249)

Concerto. del Sr Gio: Sebari: Bach.

Violino 1. C

Violino 2. C

Flöte C

Flauto tra- verso C

Violino con- certato C *col 1mo Vno*

Cembalo con- certato C

Basso. C *allegro* *col Cembalo*

5, producing the three concertos of K. 107.

Heinrich Christian Koch described concerto-allegro form in essentially the same terms, that is, an ordinary sonata movement whose sections are framed by ritornellos.²⁰ By 1740, concertos by C. P. E. Bach and his future colleagues at Berlin were already following much the same design.²¹

The outer movements of the Triple Concerto emerged through a less straightforward or schematic procedure, leaving it unclear whether the added passages for the full ensemble function as ritornellos in the usual sense. The term *ritornello* nevertheless is used in the following discussion to refer to these passages in both movements. The expansion of the original prelude and of the original fugue proceeded in distinct ways. Although the latter movement saw the greater quantity of inserted matter, the number of distinct passages added was greater in the first movement, as shown in tables 2 and 3 (where carats indicate inserted passages). In other words, the expansion of the first movement involved the interpolation of many small passages, a more exacting procedure requiring a more careful or thoughtful process of revision than that employed for the third movement. The expansion of the latter was limited (on the whole) to a few large blocks. The first movement likewise saw the addition of wholly new sections (as at the beginning and end), but other insertions expanded existing phrases by a measure or sometimes just half a measure.

We can call the larger insertions in both movements ritornellos, but the original prelude already possessed a ritornello form (as shown in table 1). As in other works of Bach, the distinction between ritornello and episode, initially quite clear, grows less distinct over the course of BWV 894/1. But at the outset there is a clear dichotomy between the two types of passages, and later in the movement one hears clearly soloistic episodes comprised of virtuoso passagework (shown as “pw” in table 1; see cf. exx. 1b and 31c). The arranger of the Triple Concerto did not merely orchestrate the existing ritornellos. Further passages for the tutti were added, some of them even incorporating a distinct new motivic idea (see ex. 34 below). As a result, the opening passage of the original prelude, designated a ritornello in table 1, became the first solo entry for the harpsichord in the concerto (ex. 9). What previously served as the first episode remains a solo passage but is delayed until the middle of m. 41; in that passage the arranger adds accompanimental parts for flute and solo violin, subsequently for ripieno strings as well. From this point onward, inserts grow more frequent, the central passagework episode being punctuated with particular frequency and drama by the strings. The result is a complex, irregular design that has little in common with the schematic concerto-allegro form that C. P. E. Bach had adopted by 1740 and was eventually described by Koch.

In principle the final movement was expanded in the same way. But the number of inserted measures was somewhat greater than in the first movement, representing more than 60% of the original fugue as opposed to 52% in the prelude. As table 3 shows, however, most of the added matter occurs within just a few passages; only once is a solo episode punctuated by brief inserted entries for the tutti. One insert, near the end, consists of a cadenza for the soloist; otherwise the added material comprises tutti passages in a style utterly different from the original (ex. 10). The notation of these passages alludes to the *stile antico*, as does the tempo mark now present at the beginning of the movement (*Alla breve*). The note values of the original fugue are doubled, but the solo passages nevertheless seem to move at a different rate from the passages for the tutti, making it difficult for players to find an effective tempo.

²⁰ In his *Versuch einer Anweisung zur Composition*, 3 vols. (Leipzig, 1782–93), 3:333ff.; see Jane Stevens, “An 18th-Century Description of Concerto First-Movement Form,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 24 (1971): 85–95 (esp. 88–89).

²¹ Further discussion in my *Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1984), 130–32, and *The Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2014), 51.

Table 2. BWV 894, mvt. 1, compared to BWV 1044, mvt. 1

section	R					S							S														
key	a					a							e	d													
m.	--	1	5	6		18	20						40	42	44b	48b	49b		51b								
inserts*	^	^	^	^	^	^	^	^	^	^	^	^	^	^	^	^	^	^	^								
m.*	1	10	14	21	22	23	35	41b	43b	44	51	52	57	59b	60b	61	68	73b	75b	76	78b	82b	83b	84b	85b	87b	91
add. mm.	9	7	1	6.5			.5				1	2.5	.5				5.5		.5		1	1			3.5		

section	pw		r			pw	r							pw	r	S	r	pw	R								
key	d		a			a	e							-> G		G	a	V	a								
m.	53b		54	55		56b	58		59a	59b			60	61	63	65	69b	77b	--	86	92		98				
inserts	^		^			^	^		^	^		^							^				^				
m.	93	93b	94	95	96	96b	97	97b	99	100	101	101b	102	102b	103	104	106			108	111b	120b	128	129	135	141	149
addl. mm.	.5		.5			.5	1	.5		.5		.5									(1)**	1			8		

(total: 51)

R = ritornello S = solo passage or episode pw = passagework in 32ds

*in BWV 1044/1

**BWV 1044/1 substitutes three measures (mm. 125–27) for mm. 82–85 of BWV 894/1

Table 3. BWV 894, mvt. 3, compared BWV 1044, mvt. 3

S	Exp.	a	Ep.	Exp.	1	Ep.	Exp.	b---	Ep.	Exp.		
A	e	1		(1)	a		e---					
B	a	1		(1)	d---		a					
m.	1		13	15	24b	35	49	54	74	78		
inserts*	^	^		^								
m.*	1	25	37	40	42	45	54b	65	79	84	104	108
addl. mm.	24		3	3								

S	Ep.	Exp.	1	Ep.	(F)	Coda	(a)	(a)						
A		d												
B		1	g		(F)		(a)	(a)						
m.	90	97	111	118	135	136	143	153						
inserts	^	^		^	^		^	^						
m.	120	144	151	165	172	189	190	191	192	199	209	220	221	245
addl. mm.	24				1	1		11	25					

(total = 92)

Exp. = exposition *Ep.* = episode
S = soprano *A* = alto (middle part) *B* = bass (parentheses = partial entry)
 letters = tonalities of full statements of fugue subject *1* = first countersubject

*in BWV 1044/3

Ex. 9. BWV 1044, mvt. 1, mm. 9–11, with corresponding passage from BWV 894 (mvt. 1, mm. 1–2) on lower staves; empty staves signify no corresponding measure, i.e., an insert in BWV 1044

The image displays a musical score for three measures. The top staff is for Flauto traverso, featuring a melodic line with trills and triplets. The Violino concertato staff is mostly empty, with a few notes in the second measure. The Violino primo and Violino secondo staves are marked *p* and *pizz.* in the first and second measures. The Viola staff is also marked *p* and *pizz.* in the first and second measures. The Cembalo concertato staves show a complex accompaniment with many notes. The Violon e Violoncello staff is marked *p* and *pizz.* in the first and second measures. The bottom section, labeled BWV 894, shows a piano accompaniment with a melodic line in the right hand and a bass line in the left hand, including trills and triplets.

Ex. 10. BWV 1044, mvt. 3, mm. 1–7

Alla breve

subject

Flauto traverso

Violino concertato

first countersubject (cs1)

cs2

Violino primo

Violino secondo

subject

Viola

tr

Cembalo concertato

Violone e Violoncello

6/5 7/# 6/5+ 7/5 6/5 #/2+

cs1

Ex. 11. BWV 894, mvt. 2, mm. 1–4, with subject as given at the opening of BWV 1044 on lower staff

In fact the tutti passages rework the original fugue subject, which is presented in a simplified or reduced form and combined with two countersubjects (compare ex. 11 with ex. 10). There is also a third countersubject, heard at the end of the initial section but only later combined (in modified form) with the three other themes (ex. 12). Linear or melodic reduction also occurs in the first movement, as when the solo flute and violin add an accompaniment to a solo passage (ex. 13). It was in fact a common procedure for Sebastian, as when he added oboes in the organ versions of concerto movements that survive also for harpsichord (ex. 14). But using the reduction by itself, as thematic material, was apparently a new idea.

Ex. 12. BWV 1044, mvt. 3, (a) mm. 18–25, (b) 120–24

(a) third countersubject (cs3)

Flauto traverso

Violino concertato

Violino primo

Violino secondo

Viola

Cembalo concertato

Violoncello

Fingerings: 6 # 6 7 # 4+ 6 4 2 6 5 4 2 6 5 4 2 # 7 5 6 9 5 8 6 7 5 6 5 9 3 7 6 7 #

(b)

cs1

cs2

cs3'

subject

coll'arco

f

[coll'arco]

f

[coll'arco]

f

Fingerings: 9 6 4 #

Ex. 13. BWV 1044, mvt. 1, mm. 24–25 (without ripieno strings)

Flauto traverso

Violino concertato

Cembalo concertato

Ex. 14. (a) Concerto in D minor, BWV 1052, mvt. 1, mm. 1–4, with (b) parts for two oboes and taille from Cantata 146, mvt. 1

(b)

Oboi 1, 2

Taille

(a) **Allegro**

Violino primo

Violino secondo

Viola

Cembalo concertato

Continuo

The final movement of BWV 1044 contains only three full-fledged ritornellos, or, rather expositions of the reduced fugue subject, played by the ripieni. Two nearly identical ritornellos of this type occur at beginning and end; another falls near the exact center (mm. 120–44). This central ritornello or exposition is similar in construction to the outer ones, but the subject and countersubjects enter in different parts and in different keys, and the passage is a measure shorter than the framing expositions. There is also a brief passage early in the movement in which statements of the reduced subject and its countersubjects, played by the strings and flute, twice alternate with brief solo passages for the harpsichord (mm. 37–45). These entries of the ripieni do not, however, constitute full-fledged expositions or ritornellos; the subject is shortened and they serve merely as brief punctuations of an ongoing solo episode. The arranger does not repeat the idea, although the initial motive of the reduced subject does appear later as part of a contrapuntal accompaniment for the solo keyboard (ex. 15).

Ex. 15. BWV 1044, mvt. 3, mm. 199–202

The adaptation of the second movement was less far-reaching than that of the prelude and fugue. To the original three parts a fourth was added, giving the violin at the outset a new line consisting of arpeggiation, played pizzicato (ex. 16a). In addition, the repetition of each half of the original binary form is now written out, with the upper parts exchanged (ex. 16b). Thus the arrangement adds counterpoint as well as new sonorities. The written-out repeats are reminiscent of other pieces with varied reprises, including examples by both J. S. and C. P. E. Bach.²² Perhaps the most relevant

²² An early example by Sebastian occurs in the last movement of BWV 975, an arrangement of a Vivaldi concerto; the idea recurs in the slow movement of the concerto for three harpsichords BWV 963. Emanuel, who described varied reprises in the final chapter of his *Versuch*, vol. 1, first illustrated it in one of the accompanying *Probestücke* (W. 63/5, mvt. 3). Many further examples

example, however, occurs in the disputed G-major trio sonata BWV 1038, which Klaus Hofmann has plausibly explained as deriving from a work composed jointly by Sebastian and Emauel Bach.²³ Its opening movement is a binary form with written-out repeats, varied by the composition of new upper lines over a variation of the original bass line (ex. 17). In the concerto movement, only the scoring is changed on the repeats; thus it would not have exemplified variation (*Veränderung*) in the sense demonstrated by this last example.²⁴ Together with the formal and contrapuntal reworking of the outer movements, which resemble nothing in extant compositions by C. P. E. Bach, this makes it unlikely that the latter was responsible for BWV 1044. But further musical features of the concerto raise the possibility that someone other than Sebastian might have been involved in the arrangement.

Ex. 16. BWV 1044, mvt. 2, (a) mm. 1–2, (b) mm. 9–10

Ex. 17. Sonata in G for flute, violin, and continuo, attributed to J. S. Bach as BWV 1038, mvt. 1, (a) mm. 1–2, (b) mm. 9–10

followed, including the famous sonatas with varied reprises (*VI. Sonates pour le clavecin avec des reprises variées*, W. 50) of 1760.

²³ See his edition, *J. S. Bach / C. Ph. E. Bach: Triosonate für Violine, Viola und Basso continuo G-dur* (Wiesbaden: Breitkopf und Härtel, 2008), which contains a reconstruction based on the argument set forth in “Zur Echtheit der Triosonate G-Dur BWV 1038,” *Bach-Jahrbuch* 90 (2004): 65–85.

²⁴ Also as in the works mentioned in note 22. On C. P. E. Bach’s use of *Veränderung*, see my *Instrumental Music of C. P. E. Bach*, 21–25.

BWV 1044: musical features

Kilian described the concerto as “sovereign,”²⁵ yet an impression such as this hardly constitutes evidence for authorship. Many aspects of the arrangement are consistent with what we know of Bach, such as the seemingly effortless addition of new contrapuntal parts. For instance, the “ritornellos” of the last movement incorporate some densely canonic writing within the string accompaniment for several solo passages (see ex. 15 above). In other passages the orchestral parts add countersubjects (taken from the opening exposition) to what are now statements of the subject in its original, unreduced, form in the solo part (ex. 18). Yet the canonic writing is no more intricate than what one finds in concertos by W. F. Bach, as in example 19. Here, as in example 18, the strings enter imitatively with the first three or four notes of the ritornello theme—which in both cases opens with a rising sixth.

The countersubjects in the last movement of BWV 1044 are also reminiscent of Friedemann, or rather of a work attributed to him. These are derived from the chain of suspensions present in the original countersubject, which is “realized” in four parts during the first solo passage in the concerto entry of the soloist (ex. 20). Such writing recalls an organ fugue with a doubtful attribution to Friedemann (ex. 21).²⁶ This fugue, like the ritornellos in the third movement of BWV 1044, presents numerous permutations of a subject and several countersubjects. In both cases, moreover, the underlying voice leading is a chain of suspensions—and both works barely avoid hidden fifths and octaves (ex. 22).

Sebastian Bach tolerated parallelisms of various sorts, especially in polychoral scores and in heterophonic textures where one part provides a simplified doubling of another. But passages such as those just cited suggest that the arranger of BWV 1044 was unable to produce the genuine counterpoint in six or seven real parts that was intended, leading instead to weak doublings and barely hidden parallel motion. A deeper problem in the fugue of BWV 1044 is the somewhat inconsequential form of the opening ritornello or exposition as a whole, in which the counterpoint is permutational in an almost pedantic or pedagogic way. The subject and two countersubjects are eventually heard in four of their six possible combinations. Yet this passage lacks the clear direction and logic of Sebastian’s late exercises in *alla breve* style, stating the subject three times in the tonic but only once in the dominant. The passage ends almost immediately after two consecutive entries of the subject in the tonic; the second of these is in the bass, but it is not preceded by even a brief rest within that part. As the opening passage is repeated at the end of the movement, the latter concludes anti-climactically, with only a cursory modification of the final passage to signal the end of the concerto.

Of course, the motivic material in the fugue from the Triple Concerto unquestionably derives from a member of the Bach family. The somewhat free counterpoint of the original fugue might have justified the lack of contrapuntal rigor in the arrangement; in both, certain chords are reinforced by the momentary addition of extra contrapuntal parts. The concerto extends this harmonic enrichment to the ripieno strings (ex. 23), whose multiple stops are, as Peter Wollny noted, absent from other works attributed to J. S. Bach. They are, however, a feature of several concertos composed by Emanuel Bach at Berlin during the early 1740s (ex. 24).²⁷

²⁵ “Aber auch die Art der Bearbeitung, die Souveränität, mit der bei der Erweiterung der Ecksätze nicht nur Konzertritornelle eingefügt, sonder der ganze Satz kontrapunktisch bereichert und formal zwingender gestaltet wurde: das weist auf J. S. Bach selbst.” NBA 7/3, *Kritischer Bericht*, 48.

²⁶ On the attribution of this composition, see my *The Music of Wilhelm Friedemann Bach* (Rochester: University of Rochester Press, 2010), 117–18.

²⁷ Peter Wollny, “Überlegungen zum *Tripelkonzert* a-moll BWV 1044,” in *Bachs Orchesterwerke: Bericht über das 1. Dortmunder Bach-Symposion 1996*, ed. Martin Geck (Witten: Klangfarben

Ex. 18. BWV 1044, mvt. 3, (a) mm. 84–86, (b) mm. 108–10, (c) mm. 151–53

The musical score is divided into three sections: (a) measures 84-86, (b) measures 108-110, and (c) measures 151-153. The instruments and their parts are as follows:

- Flauto traverso:** Part (a) starts with a rest, then plays a melodic line with dynamics *mf* and *[mf]*. Part (b) has a rest. Part (c) has a melodic line with dynamics *mf* and *[p]*.
- Violino concertato:** Part (a) starts with a rest, then plays a melodic line with dynamics *mf* and *[mf]*. Part (b) has a rest. Part (c) has a melodic line with dynamics *mf* and *[p]*.
- Violino primo:** Part (a) has a rest. Part (b) has a melodic line with dynamics *[mf]* and *[p]*. Part (c) has a melodic line with dynamics *mf* and *[p]*.
- Violino secondo:** Part (a) has a rest. Part (b) has a melodic line with dynamics *[mf]* and *[p]*. Part (c) has a melodic line with dynamics *mf* and *[p]*.
- Viola:** Part (a) has a rest. Part (b) has a melodic line with dynamics *mf* and *[p]*. Part (c) has a melodic line with dynamics *mf* and *[p]*.
- Cembalo concertato:** Part (a) has a rhythmic accompaniment. Part (b) has a rhythmic accompaniment. Part (c) has a rhythmic accompaniment.
- Violoncello:** Part (a) has a rhythmic accompaniment. Part (b) has a rhythmic accompaniment. Part (c) has a rhythmic accompaniment.

Performance instructions include *coll'arco* for the strings and *pizz.* for the cello. Chord symbols *cs2'* and *cs1* are indicated above the Flauto and Violino concertato parts.

Musikverlag, 1997), 283–91 (cited: 285).

Ex. 19. W. F. Bach, Concerto in E-flat, F. 42, mvt. 1, mm. 43–45

Musical score for Ex. 19, showing Violino primo, Violino secondo, Viola, Cembalo concertato (treble and bass), and Basso staves. The score is in E-flat major, 3/4 time, and covers measures 43-45. The Cembalo concertato part features a complex rhythmic pattern with sixteenth and thirty-second notes.

Ex. 20. (a) BWV 894, mvt. 2, mm. 5–7; (b) BWV 1044, mvt. 3, mm. 26–28

Musical score for Ex. 20, showing (a) subject and (b) countersubject. Part (a) is in 12/8 time and shows a subject in the treble clef and its accompaniment in the bass clef. Part (b) is in common time and shows a countersubject in the treble clef and its accompaniment in the bass clef.

Ex. 21. Organ fugue in F, attributed to W. F. Bach as F. 36, mm. 6b–10. Asterisks mark fifths between alto and bass

Musical score for Ex. 21, showing subject and countersubjects (cs1, cs2, cs3) with asterisks marking fifths between alto and bass. The score is in F major, 4/4 time, and covers measures 6b-10. The subject is in the bass clef, and the countersubjects are in the treble clef. The asterisks indicate the fifth intervals between the alto and bass parts.

Ex. 22. BWV 1044, mvt. 3, mm. 1–7 (reduced version of ex. 5). Asterisks mark octaves between violin 2 and bass

Alla breve

Flauto, Violino concertato

Violino primo

Violino secondo

Viola

Violoncello

subject

first countersubject (cs1)

cs2

subject

subject

cs1 * * *

Ex. 23. BWV 1044, mvt. 3, mm. 91–94

Flauto traverso

Violino concertato

Violino primo

Violino secondo

Viola

Cembalo concertato

Violoncello

f

Ex. 24. C. P. E. Bach, Concerto in G minor, W. 6, mvt. 3, mm. 129–34

The musical score consists of six staves. The top three staves are for Violin 1, Violin 2, and Viola, all marked 'col arco' and 'f'. The bottom two staves are for Cembalo concertato (treble and bass clefs) and Bassi, both marked 'f'. The Cembalo concertato part has a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes in the right hand and quarter notes in the left hand. The strings play sustained chords.

Wollny argued that these string chords were Sebastian’s deliberate borrowing from Berlin style. Sebastian might even have known this feature of Berlin writing from the work shown in example 24, for there is evidence suggesting that Emanuel’s concerto was performed at Leipzig.²⁸ But the idea could have originated with anyone familiar with this device, which comes ultimately from Italian opera and cantata—as in Handel’s *Armida abbandonata*, copied jointly by Sebastian and Emanuel in the early 1730s (ex. 25).²⁹ The heaviest chords in the original fugue are found only in late sources transmitting revised versions (ex. 26). Although four-part sonorities are found elsewhere in the earliest version of the fugue, the further thickening of many chords in BWV 1044 again raises the question whether all the added notes came from Sebastian (ex. 27). Comparable sonorities occur in Friedemann’s concertos, albeit only in the keyboard parts (ex. 28). Together with the presence of double stops for the strings at climactic moments in both outer movements (ex. 29), this amplification of the sonorities of the original fugue creates a more theatrical effect than anything found in similar compositions with reliable attributions to Sebastian.

²⁸ A manuscript copy (London, British Library, Additional ms. 31679) is possibly in the hand of a Leipzig university student who played in the Großes Concert (a successor of Bach’s Collegium Musicum). See the description of source D 11 in *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: Keyboard Concertos from Manuscript Sources II*, edited by David Schulenberg, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: The Complete Works, 3/9.2 (Los Altos: Packard Humanities Institute, 2009), pp. 198–99.

²⁹ The example is from Darmstadt, Universitäts- und Landesbibliothek, Handschriften- und Musikabteilung (D-DS), Mus. ms. 986: three instrumental parts copied jointly by J. S. and C. P. E. Bach, together with a score in an unidentified hand. According to *Bach-Digital* the parts are dated 1731, apparently on the basis of the watermark.

Ex. 25. Handel, *Armida abbandonata*, HWV 105, opening recitative, mm. 14–21 (for voice and two violins without continuo)

Violino 1

Violino 2

Soprano

Fer - mò le stan - che pian - te, E as - si - sa so - pra un sco - glio,

Col - ma di rio cor - do - glio, A quel leg - gie - ro a - be - te, Che il suo ben le ra - pia, le lu - ci af -

fis - se, Pian - gen - do e so - spi - ran - do co - si dis - se:

Ex. 26. BWV 894, mvt. 2, mm. 86–88 (with early version of left-hand part on lower staff)

Ex. 27. (a) BWV 894, mvt. 2, mm. 13–16; (b) BWV 1044, mvt. 3, mm. 40–41, 45–46

Ex. 27 consists of two musical examples, (a) and (b), showing a specific rhythmic pattern in a piano. Example (a) is from BWV 894, mvt. 2, mm. 13–16, and example (b) is from BWV 1044, mvt. 3, mm. 40–41, 45–46. Both examples show a piano with a treble and bass clef. The pattern involves a series of chords and melodic lines in the bass, with the treble clef often playing chords or rests.

Ex. 28. W. F. Bach, (a) Concerto in D, F. 41, mvt. 1, mm. 70–73; (b) Concerto in F, F. 44, mvt. 3, mm. 160–65

Ex. 28 consists of two musical examples, (a) and (b), showing a specific rhythmic pattern in a concerto. Example (a) is from W. F. Bach's Concerto in D, F. 41, mvt. 1, mm. 70–73, and example (b) is from W. F. Bach's Concerto in F, F. 44, mvt. 3, mm. 160–65. Both examples show a concerto with five staves: Violino primo, Violino secondo, Viola, Cembalo concertato, and Basso. The pattern involves a series of chords and melodic lines in the strings and keyboard, with dynamic markings such as *f* and *p*.

Ex. 29. BWV 1044, mvt. 1, mm. 103–5 (for mvt. 3, see ex. 23)

The concerto contains further unusual details. In the last movement the violone twice detaches itself from the cello, something rare in Sebastian’s writing for strings, apart from special cases such as the Sixth Brandenburg Concerto (where the cello has a solo role). This occurs in brief passages where the original subject is played by the left hand of the harpsichord; the two lowest string parts in effect analyze it into bass and inner voice (ex. 30). It is the keyboard part, however, that contains the most curious variants vis-à-vis the original prelude and fugue. Some of these look like gratuitous alterations of the original figuration to incorporate wider leaps or otherwise make it more dazzling; the final passagework section in the first movement is even expanded to incorporate hand-crossing (ex. 31).

This last passage is vaguely reminiscent of several in Friedemann’s concerto F. 45 in the same key (ex. 32). The parallels are not exact, but they are suggestive inasmuch as they involve a passage inserted into the concerto (not present in the original prelude). All these “improved” figures in the concerto pass by very quickly—too quickly, in fact, to have quite the dramatic effect evidently intended for them. For this reason, incidentally, they are somewhat disappointing for the soloist, in view of the effort required to master them. The cadenza inserted near the end of the final movement is comparatively simple and, in its use of several regular sequential patterns, perhaps closer to reliably attributed works by Sebastian. Within this cadenza, the descending series of diminished-seventh chords, beginning in the third measure, echoes one toward the end of the corresponding passage in the Fifth Brandenburg—albeit with the addition of a sustained dominant pedal, which is more reminiscent of an organ prelude (ex. 33).³⁰

³⁰ Comparable passages occur in the G-minor organ prelude BWV 535/1 (mm. 20ff.), the gigue from the First Partita BWV 825 (mm. 34ff.), and the doubtful fugue in D minor BWV 948 (mm. 66ff.). These examples suggest that cascading arpeggios of diminished-seven chords were a

Ex. 30. BWV 1044, mvt. 3, (a) mm. 84–85, (b) 106–7

The musical score is divided into two sections, (a) and (b). Section (a) covers measures 84-85, and section (b) covers measures 106-107. The instruments and their parts are as follows:

- Flauto traverso:** Part (a) has a whole note G4, a quarter rest, and a half note G4. Part (b) has a whole rest.
- Violino concertato:** Part (a) has a whole note G4, a quarter rest, and a half note G4. Part (b) has a whole rest.
- Violino primo:** Part (a) has a whole rest. Part (b) has a half note G4 and a half note F#4.
- Violino secondo:** Part (a) has a whole rest. Part (b) has a half note G4 and a half note F#4.
- Viola:** Part (a) has a whole note G3, a quarter rest, and a half note G3. Part (b) has a whole rest. Part (c) has a quarter note G3, a quarter note F#3, a quarter note G3, and a quarter note F#3.
- Cembalo concertato:** Part (a) has a continuous eighth-note accompaniment. Part (b) has a continuous eighth-note accompaniment.
- Violon e Violoncello:** Part (a) has a whole note G2, a quarter rest, and a half note G2. Part (b) has a whole note G2, a quarter rest, and a half note G2. Part (c) has a whole note G2, a quarter rest, and a half note G2.

Dynamics and performance instructions include *mf*, *[mf]*, *[p] violon.*, and *pizz.*

common element in improvisations by Bach and his pupils.

Ex. 31. BWV 1044, (a) mvt. 1, mm. 138–39; (b) mvt. 3, m. 167; (c) mvt. 1, mm. 125–27.
 Corresponding passages from BWV 894 appear on lower staves: (a): mvt 1, mm. 93–95; (b) mvt. 2, mm. 112–13; (c) mvt. 1, mm. 83–84. Flute and strings are omitted; the rhythmic notation of BWV 894 is adjusted in ex. b to conform with that of BWV 1044 for ready comparison. Asterisks indicate points of difference

The image displays a musical score for three examples (a, b, and c) comparing passages from J.S. Bach's BWV 1044 and BWV 894. Each example consists of two systems of staves. The upper system in each example is for the Cembalo concertato, and the lower system is for BWV 894. Section (a) covers measures 138-39 of BWV 1044 and 93-95 of BWV 894. Section (b) covers measure 167 of BWV 1044 and measures 112-13 of BWV 894. Section (c) covers measures 125-27 of BWV 1044 and 83-84 of BWV 894. Asterisks are placed above or below notes to indicate differences between the two pieces. The notation includes treble and bass clefs, time signatures, and various rhythmic values.

Ex. 32. W. F. Bach, Concerto in A minor, F. 45, (a) mvt. 1, mm. 23–25, and (b) mvt. 3, mm. 205–9

(a)

(b)

Ex. 33. (a) BWV 1044, mvt. 3, mm. 209–21; (b) Fifth Brandenburg Concerto, BWV 1050, mvt. 1, mm. 199–200

(a)

(b)

The added solo parts for flute and violin raise further questions. Inasmuch as they had to be added to an existing virtuoso keyboard part, it is not surprising that they are less genuinely soloistic than the corresponding parts of the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto. This is particularly true in the last two movements, where the added contrapuntal lines in these parts are strictly secondary to the original ones for the harpsichord. In the first movement, however, the flute and solo violin do have their own new material, including a distinctive motive that plays on the diminished third F–D-sharp (ex. 34). Yet in passages where these two solo instruments accompany the keyboard, their new counterpoint does not always precisely complement the latter. A recurring episodic passage is one of several in the third movement that fall into irregular or asymmetrical phrases (ex. 35).³¹ Yet although the sequence in the keyboard part is based on a unit six beats in length, the freely imitative entries of the flute and violin are separated by two full measures—and thus cannot mirror the sequential character of the harpsichord phrase which they accompany. To be sure, it could not have been easy to add two contrapuntal parts at this point that were both sequential and imitative. Yet the arranger settled for merely a suggestion of imitation in the flute and violin.

Ex. 34. BWV 1044, mvt. 1, (a) m. 3, (b) m. 14

The image shows a musical score for two measures, (a) and (b), of the first movement of BWV 1044. The score is arranged in a system with the following parts from top to bottom: Flauto traverso, Violino concertato, Violino primo, Violino secondo, Viola, Cembalo concertato, and Violoncello. Measure (a) shows the beginning of the passage, with the flute and violin concertato parts starting with a distinctive motive. Measure (b) shows a continuation of the passage, with dynamic markings such as *[p]*, *f*, *[p]*, *coll'arco*, *[f]*, and *[f] coll'arco* indicating changes in volume and playing technique. The keyboard part (Cembalo concertato and Violoncello) features triplets and sixteenth-note patterns.

³¹ The passage shown in ex. 35 is recapitulated in mm. 158–64.

Ex. 35. BWV 1044, mvt. 3, mm. 72b–78 (without ripieno strings; brackets show phrases of three beats)

The image shows a musical score for three instruments: Flauto traverso, Violino concertato, and Cembalo concertato. The score is divided into two systems. The first system shows the beginning of the passage, with the Flauto traverso part starting with a dynamic marking 'p'. The Cembalo concertato part is written in two staves (treble and bass clef). The second system continues the Cembalo concertato part, with a dynamic marking '[p]' in the treble staff. Brackets below the staves indicate phrases of three beats.

The arranger's task was comparable to that which Bach faced in adding new counterpoint for the solo harpsichord in BWV 1057, an arrangement of the Fourth Brandenburg Concerto. There, in the third movement (also a fugue), the added line for the soloist's right hand mirrors the sequence of the two other solo parts—at least for the last half of the four-bar sequential unit (ex. 36). Yet Sebastian's failure to give the harpsichord a more precisely sequential line here demonstrates the difficulty even for him of adding an equally compelling or logical part to an existing contrapuntal structure.

Still, in the first movement of BWV 1044, the arranger again failed to respond to a subtle and ingenious detail in the original prelude. Whereas the many sequences of this movement usually proceed, as one would expect, in multiples of whole beats, in two parallel passages the sequential unit comprises a beat and a half (ex. 37). The arranger reveals no awareness of these patterns, adding flute and upper string parts without regard for the counter-metrical sequence in the keyboard (ex. 38). To be sure, Bach himself substituted a different left-hand part, ignoring the cross-metrical rhythm, when the passage is recapitulated near the end of the original prelude (ex. 39).

Ex. 36. (a) Brandenburg Concerto no. 4 in G, BWV 1049, mvt. 3, mm. 159–67; (b) Concerto in F, BWV 1057, mvt. 3, mm. 159–67 (both without ripieno strings; brackets mark sequential units)

The image displays two musical examples, (a) and (b), illustrating sequential units in two different concertos. Example (a) is from the Brandenburg Concerto no. 4 in G, BWV 1049, movement 3, measures 159–67. It features four staves: Flauto 1, Flauto 2, Violino principale, and Continuo. The Flauto 1 part is marked with a bracketed sequential unit. Example (b) is from the Concerto in F, BWV 1057, movement 3, measures 159–67. It features four staves: Flauto 1, Flauto 2, Cemb. certato, and Continuo. The Flauto 1 part is marked with a bracketed sequential unit. The Cemb. certato part is marked with a bracketed sequential unit and a *p* dynamic marking. The Continuo part is marked with a bracketed sequential unit. The Violino principale part in (a) and the Flauto 2 part in (b) are also marked with bracketed sequential units. The sequential units are marked with brackets above the staves.

Ex. 37. BWV 894, mvt. 1, mm. 33–34 (brackets mark groups of nine triplet sixteenths)

Ex. 38. BWV 1044, mvt. 1, mm. 61–62

Ex. 39. BWV 894, mvt. 1, mm. 90–91

Sebastian seems to have had a predilection for counter-metrical sequential writing; his concerto in C for two harpsichords BWV 1061a incorporates a sequence built from an unusual unit of fifteen beats.³² After ripieno strings were added to this concerto, creating BWV 1061, the strings in this passage also move in units of fifteen beats—moreover in imitation (ex. 40). Whoever was responsible for BWV 1044, the rescoring of the passages shown in example 35 and 38 is arguably somewhat cruder than in the C-major work.³³

Further signs that the arrangement of BWV 1044 was incompletely thought through occur with the dynamic markings. Some inconsistencies involving these could be due to inaccurate transmission, yet the issues go beyond that. Sebastian's other concertos rarely go beyond so-called terrace dynamics, with "p" marking passages where the ripieni accompany solo passages. In the Triple Concerto, however, one finds the markings "mf" and "mp," the latter even in the keyboard part at one point (ex. 41). In that passage the dynamic markings clearly are meant to create echoes; the softer measures are inserts, absent from the original fugue. Elsewhere, however, the addition of parts for flute and solo violin evidently caused some uncertainty as to whether these should play as soloists (i.e., loudly) or quietly, as accompaniment to the solo keyboard. The solo flute and violin contain few dynamic markings of any kind, yet the occasional "p" in these parts shows that these were probably expected to play softly where accompanying solo entries of the harpsichord. The first movement has no dynamics for flute or solo violin when the harpsichord first states matter from the original prelude at m. 9. Yet the solo violin has "p" at the parallel passage in m. 23. When, however, these parts begin to add substantial counterpoint a measure or two later, should they remain piano, remaining subsidiary to the keyboard, or should they balance the latter? The absence of clear dynamic indications suggests some uncertainty on this point on the part of the arranger.

The ripieno strings are more clearly accompanimental, and in many such passages they play pizzicato. As in Cantata 209, which contains similar markings, it seems to have been assumed that "pizzicato" also implies playing quietly. Yet this is never marked explicitly, sometimes leaving the dynamic level ambiguous for a subsequent passage that is marked "coll'arco." Neither this nor the inclusion of "mp" and "mf" in the first movement of BWV 1044 necessarily counts against Sebastian's involvement. Late versions of a few works, such as Cantata 82, suggest that Bach sought increased precision in his marking of dynamics, which include "pp," "poco piano," and even "poco f."³⁴ With the further addition of pizzicato, these indications suggest that Bach was reaching for a more nuanced approach to volume as well as sonority. Still, the dynamic markings in the Triple Concerto show little logic or consistency, implying a not entirely worked-out relationship to structure.

³² There is also a sequence built from a five-beat unit in the courante from the Fifth Partita BWV 828; further discussion in my *Keyboard Music of J. S. Bach*, 2d edn. (New York: Routledge, 2006), 336.

³³ Regarding the possibility that W. F. Bach was responsible for the string parts in BWV 1061, see my *Music of W. F. Bach*, 88.

³⁴ All these indications appear in the autograph oboe da caccia part for the aria "Schlummert ein" (St 54), which dates from as late as 1748. On the possible equation of "pp" and "poco piano," and on Bach's use of dynamic indications generally, see Robert L. Marshall, "Tempo and Dynamics: The Original Terminology," in *The Music of Johann Sebastian Bach: The Sources, the Style, the Significance* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1989), 255–69 (originally published as "Tempo and Dynamic Indications in the Bach Sources: A Review of the Terminology," in *Bach, Handel, Scarlatti: Tercentenary Essays*, ed. Peter F. Williams, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985, pp. 259–76).

Ex. 40. Concerto in C, BWV 1061, mvt. 1, mm. 100–107

The image displays a page of a musical score for the first movement of the Concerto in C major, BWV 1061, by Johann Sebastian Bach, measures 100 through 107. The score is arranged in two systems. The first system includes parts for Violin 1 (Vn. 1), Violin 2 (Vn. 2), Viola (Va.), Cello (Cemb. 1), Flute (Cont.), Clarinet (Cemb. 2), Bassoon, Oboe, Bassoon II, Horn, Trumpet, Trombone, Percussion, and Piano. The second system continues the piano part. The music is in common time (C) and features a variety of dynamics, including piano (*p*) and forte (*f*). The piano part is characterized by intricate rhythmic patterns and dynamic contrasts. The woodwind and string parts provide harmonic support and melodic lines. The score is written in a standard musical notation with a key signature of one sharp (F#) and a common time signature.

Ex. 41. BWV 1044, mvt. 3, mm. 188–92

The musical score is divided into two systems. The first system consists of seven staves: Flauto traverso, Violino concertato, Violino primo, Violino secondo, Viola, Cembalo concertato (treble and bass), and Violon e Violoncello. The second system continues the Cembalo concertato and Violon e Violoncello parts. Dynamics are indicated by *[p]*, *pp*, *mf*, *p*, *mp*, and *f*.

Conclusions

If the Triple Concerto is indeed the work of Sebastian Bach, it must come from near the end of his career. Yet, even if its fundamental creative content—the basic plan whereby each movement was produced from an earlier version—is his, it is possible that many details, perhaps even the actual writing out of the lost master score, were the work of one or more assistants or pupils. Many details in BWV 1044 point toward W. F. Bach, as suggested above. To those suggestions might be added a certain falling off in the final movement—not necessarily of imagination but of creative intensity or energy—which left the formal expansion of the fugue so much simpler in conception than that of the prelude.³⁵ On the other hand, the varying method by which each movement of the concerto was created from an earlier composition could mean that more than one person was involved—still, perhaps, with Sebastian as the guiding force.

It is easy enough to find things in BWV 1044 that recall other work by Sebastian himself. The addition of an obbligato part to an existing structure seems to have been a favorite technique. It could be traced back to the cultivation of *Vokal-* and *Soloeinbau* in compositions from the Weimar period, in which a solo vocal or instrumental part enters in counterpoint to a previously heard ritornello. Bach employed essentially the same technique in later adaptations of existing music, including those Leipzig cantatas in which he added vocal parts to instrumental compositions.³⁶ A more specific parallel to the procedure employed in BWV 1044—at least in the slow movement—could be seen in Bach’s addition of an independent fourth voice to the three-part invertible Contrapunctus 13 of the *Art of Fugue* (in the “Fuga a 2 Clav”). Further reminiscent of the *Art of Fugue* was the doubling of note values in the final movement of the concerto.³⁷ Peter Wollny has also noted Bach’s addition of material to existing contrapuntal compositions by Caldara and Kerll.³⁸ Although those represent rather different types of musical adaptation, they do use the same *alla breve* style echoed in the newly added ritornellos in the final movement of BWV 1044.

Other instances of Bach’s tinkering with his own counterpoint might be seen in several variant versions of the gigue from the third harpsichord partita. But these variants, which involved alternative ways of inverting the subject in the second half of the movement, might, as Andrew Talle has suggested, have been inspired but not actually written by Sebastian.³⁹ A similar hypothesis for BWV 1044 would explain the combination of a brilliant basic plan as well as its somewhat imperfect realization.

If the third movement (at least) of the Triple Concerto is by Friedeman Bach, it might represent a continuation of the little counterpoint studies that he wrote together with his father around 1740.⁴⁰

³⁵ Friedemann’s failure to follow through or completely finish certain pieces is a recurring theme in my *Music of W. F. Bach*.

³⁶ In addition to the well-known examples in BWV 146 and other cantatas, Gregory Butler, “The Origins of J. S. Bach’s ‘Wie jammern mich doch die verkehrten Herzen,’ BWV 170/3,” in *Music and Its Questions: Essays in Honor of Peter Williams*, ed. Thomas Donahue (Richmond, Va.: OHS Press, 2007), 227–36, argues plausibly that the second aria in Cantata 170 (actually designated “arioso” in the original libretto) was originally a trio movement, to which the alto voice was added.

³⁷ The same took place in six of the thirteen printed *contrapuncti* of the *Art of Fugue*, as compared to the early versions of the same movements in the autograph score (P 200).

³⁸ “Überlegungen zum Tripelkonzert,” 288.

³⁹ Andrew Talle, “A Print of *Clavierübung* I from J. S. Bach’s Personal Library,” in *About Bach*, ed. Gregory G. Butler et al. (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 157–68 (cited: 164).

⁴⁰ These studies (or sketches), written by J. S. Bach alternating with W. F. Bach, are preserved in D

Indeed, the opening subject of the concerto movement recurs within one of Friedemann's entries, but only as part of an ongoing phrase, and merely as a product of the common use of *stile antico* (ex. 42). Still, the counterpoint studies provide tangible evidence that Sebastian at least once collaborated with a pupil or family member, leading the latter in the working out of various compositional devices.

Ex. 42. W. F. Bach, counterpoint study BR I 1/26, (a) original entry, (b) same with parts exchanged and inverted (bracket marks notes common with subject of BWV 1044, mvt. 3)

The image shows a musical score for a counterpoint study in C major, BWV 1044, movement 3. It is divided into two parts, (a) and (b). Part (a) shows the original entry, with the treble clef part starting on G4 and the bass clef part starting on G3. Part (b) shows the same entry with parts exchanged and inverted, with the treble clef part starting on G3 and the bass clef part starting on G4. A bracket above the treble clef part in (b) indicates notes common with the subject of BWV 1044, mvt. 3.

In the case of BWV 894, one might imagine Sebastian demonstrating, first, how the subject of the original fugue elaborates a simpler melodic line.⁴¹ He might then have proposed making the reduced version the subject of its own fugal exposition; composition of the latter would have included working out several countersubjects. That the resulting working-out of the new subject might be scored for four-part strings, and that this might serve as a ritornello framing passages from the original fugue, would have been distinct steps in the creative process that led to BWV 1044. Perhaps they were inspired by a wish to create another work comparable to the Fifth Brandenburg; the use of fugue to end a triple concerto might have followed logically for Bach, who had previously concluded not only the Fourth and Fifth Brandenburg Concertos but also the two- and three-harpsichord concertos in C (BWV 1061a, 1064) with elaborate fugal movements.

A concerto, of course, required a central slow movement; adding one solved the chief problem of BWV 894, in which the original prelude and fugue are too similar to one another to form a completely satisfactory pair. The insertion of a movement for the three solo instruments, while following the model of the Fifth Brandenburg Concerto, also recalled the similar procedure that had been applied to one, possibly two, of Sebastian's preludes and fugues for organ. Bach apparently authorized at least one student to create a three-movement version of the C-major prelude and fugue BWV 545, possibly also of the prelude and fugue in G (BWV 541).⁴² In those cases, however, the original prelude and fugue

Bsa SA 3650, which Peter Wollny, *Wilhelm Friedemann Bach: Thematisch-systematisches Verzeichnis der musikalischen Werke (BR-WFB)*, Bach-Repertorium, vol. 2 (Stuttgart: Carus, 2012), 258, dates "vermutlich um 1736–39." Further discussion in Schulenberg, *Music of W. F. Bach*, 36–41. The entry shown is numbered 26a by Wollny.

⁴¹ That such thinking was by no means unknown to Bach and his contemporaries is evident from a comparable example in Johann Joachim Quantz's *Versuch einer Anweisung das Flöte traversiere zu spielen* (Berlin, 1752). Quantz explains his melodic reduction for a cadenza in chap. 15, para. 11, illustrated in the separately printed *Tabula* 20, nos. 2 and 3 (see p. 183 in the translation by Edward R. Reilly, *On Playing the Flute*, 2d edn., New York: Schirmer Books, 1985.)

⁴² A copy of BWV 545 by Bach's former Weimar pupil Vogler (Stockholm, Stiftelsen Musikkulturens Främjande, MMS 241) adds a second movement better known as the Largo from Organ Sonata no. 5 (BWV 529). A copy of BWV 541 by Johann Peter Kellner (P 288) appends the opening thirteen

were not so like one another, and later copies preserve the original two-movement conception. The Triple Concerto extends the procedure to a fugue originally for harpsichord, again drawing on a movement also included in the organ sonatas.

Both sources of the Triple Concerto attribute it to J. S. Bach, but as with other arrangements—notably BWV 964 and 968—this evidence is equivocal, as the underlying music is undeniably his.⁴³ The same is true of BWV 1044, yet the compositional anomalies noted above are too numerous to dismiss as errors of transmission. Rather this work, like a number of other compositions and arrangements of uncertain authorship from the Bach circle, is most likely to have been completed by one or more students—with the composer’s approval or encouragement, if not following specific instructions from him.⁴⁴ If so, BWV 1044 is a further document for Bach’s collaborations of various sorts in his later years, as his interests turned from music for the Leipzig churches to concert performances and retrospective counterpoint.

measures of mvt. 3 from the Fourth Organ Sonata (BWV 528), with a note indicating that this was to follow the first movement of the prelude and fugue; whether this idea came from Bach is uncertain, however.

⁴³ These are keyboard versions of movements from the sonatas for solo violin; the principal source (P 218, fascicle 2) is a copy by Altnickol later owned by Müthel.

⁴⁴ Other examples include the trio sonata BWV 1038 and the version of the double concerto BWV 1061 with strings, both mentioned above. On the sonatas BWV 1020 and 1031 for flute (or violin) and obbligato keyboard, see my *Music of C. P. E. Bach*, 23.