

originale Stimmenverlauf immer dann durch die Hal-sung ausgedrückt, wenn sich durch reine Klangnota-tion im Notenbild scheinbare Stimmführungsfehler ergäben.

3. Einer besonderen Erläuterung bedarf die Rolle des Basses im Secondo-Part. Bach hat für die Bass-stimme des Streicherripienos<sup>3</sup> die Beteiligung des Vio-lone genau bezeichnet. Die Angaben „Vc. e Violone“ bzw. „Vc.“ sind in den Sätzen 1 und 2 in den Klavier-auszug übernommen worden, um – sofern das ver-wendete Instrument entsprechenden Umfang hat – die stellenweise Verwendung der tiefen Oktave zu ermöglichen. Die Tiefoktavierung – die natürlich äußerst dezent gespielt werden muss – ist überall dort am Platze, wo sich in einer im Bassschlüssel notierten Unterstimme eine Violone-Angabe findet. Diese An-gabe wird entweder durch die (aus dem Original ent-nommene) Angabe „Vc.“ oder durch Notierung im Violinschlüssel außer Kraft gesetzt. In Satz 2 hat Bach für die Bassstimme durchweg den Einsatz des Vio-lone verlangt. In Satz 3 ist im allgemeinen auf die

<sup>3</sup> Bach nennt sie „Continuo“, obwohl an eine akkordische Er-gänzung nicht gedacht ist.

Wiedergabe des Continuo im Klavierauszug verzich-tet, sofern er mit dem Cembalobass unisono verläuft, weil nur dadurch gravierende Substanzverluste in den oberen Stimmen vermieden werden konnten.

4. In Satz 3 hat Bach im Cembalo stellenweise eine Art von vereinfachtem Klavierauszug des Streichersat-zes gegeben (T. 1–41, 63–87, 127–152, 175–179, 189 bis 193, 203–219, 225–244). Die in das Solocembalo einge-gangenen Stimmen werden im allgemeinen im Secon-do-Part nicht berücksichtigt. Nur für die Takte 1–22 ist der Verlauf der Streicherstimmen in Kleindruck wieder-gegeben, um anschaulich zu machen, dass in der origi-nalen Besetzung das Soloinstrument hier nicht allein spielt.

Eine spezielle Bemerkung erfordert das doppelte Verzierungszeichen in T. 325 des 1. Satzes (Solocem-balo, linke Hand). Der Pralltriller in beiden Oktav-lagen ist befremdlich und eigentlich nicht ausführbar. Doch Bach hat ihn in dieser Form zunächst in der Partitur geschrieben und dann in der autographen Reinschrift der Cembalostimme in aller Deutlichkeit wiederholt, so dass für die Edition keine andere Mög-lichkeit bleibt, als die Stelle so wiederzugeben.

Werner Breig

## PREFACE

The Concerto in F major, BWV 1057, is the sixth of the harpsichord concertos contained in the autograph score that Bach wrote out in or around 1738 (Berlin Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 234). The initials at the end of the piece, SDGI (“Soli Deo Gloria”), form a pendant to the J.J. (“Jesus Juva”) found at the opening of the D-minor Concerto, BWV 1052. This indicates that BWV 1057 formed the final piece in this six-work opus, the only authentic and self-contained collection of concertos we have from Bach apart from his pres-entation copy of the Brandenburg Concertos (1721).

Like all the other concertos in this series, BWV 1057 is an arrangement of an earlier work, in this case the Fourth Brandenburg Concerto in G major (BWV 1049). In his transcription, Bach thus faced a highly complex task that gave him opportunities to find especially original solutions. Here the original was not a con-

certo for melody instrument and string ripieno, but a triple concerto with solo roles given to a violin and two recorders. In the transcription, the harpsichord largely takes over the original violin part while the two recorders usually derive from the corresponding parts of the Brandenburg Concerto. Nonetheless, the changing instrumental combinations of the model in-spired Bach to find other functions for the harpsi-chord. In the fast movements it sometimes joins the recorders to play long stretches of four-part counter-point with a completely new harpsichord descant. In the slow movement it generally supplants the origi-nal trio of recorders and violin. Moreover, it fre-quently functions as a continuo instrument (with writ-ten out chords) or, as in the final movement, it joins the string ensemble somewhat in the manner of a keyboard reduction.

It appears that Bach deliberately chose to place the F-major Concerto at the end of his opus. Its unusually effective harpsichord part, as well as the wealth of tone colors resulting from the interplay of three instrumental families, make it the culmination of the entire series.

\*

The present piano reduction is intended both as a practical aid to performances with the original scoring and as a means of playing the piece on two keyboard instruments. This work goes beyond all the other two-keyboard arrangements in achieving a sort of equal partnership between the two instruments. True, the keyboard soloist continues to predominate in the virtuoso passages of the outside movements; but otherwise the two instruments maintain an active dialogue for large sections of the piece, thanks to the solo role of the recorders.

The text of the solo harpsichord part<sup>1</sup> is identical to that given in volume VII/4 of the New Bach Edition.<sup>2</sup> In keeping with the principles of that edition, all editorial interventions are identified diacritically, with italics for alphabetical characters, dotted lines for slurs, and small type for other signs such as ornaments. In contrast, all alphabetical characters taken from the source, including dynamic signs such as *f*, *p* etc., are reproduced in roman type.

The pair of staves lying beneath the solo part contain a reduction of the string ripieno and the two recorders for a second keyboard instrument. To keep the notation from becoming cluttered, editorial additions are not specifically identified as such. All dynamic marks are printed in the customary italic type.

The keyboard reduction was prepared in accordance with the following principles:

1. Where the first violin part is identical to the descant of the harpsichord, it is generally omitted from the reduction.

2. We have normally chosen not to identify the crossing of string parts. However, the parts are always stemmed to indicate their original motion where

they would otherwise convey the impression of faulty voice-leading.

3. The role of the bass in the secondo part requires special explanation. Bach has expressly called for the use of a violone for the bass line of the string ripieno.<sup>3</sup> The marks “Vc e Violone” or “Vc.” in movements 1 and 2 have been included in our reduction in order to make it possible in some instances to use the low octave, assuming that the instrument has an appropriate ambitus. The use of the lower octave must, of course, be extremely judicious; it can be employed wherever a “Violone” mark occurs in the lower voice when notated in bass clef. The “Violone” mark is cancelled either by the abbreviation “Vc.” (taken from the original) or by the appearance of a treble clef. Bach calls for the violone to play throughout the entire second movement. In movement 3, we have generally omitted the continuo from the reduction wherever it proceeds in unison with the bass line of the harpsichord. Only in this way was it possible to avoid a severe loss of substance in the upper parts.

4. In some sections of movement 3, Bach has given the harpsichord a sort of simplified reduction of the string texture (mm. 1–41, 63–87, 127–152, 175–179, 189–193, 203–219 and 225–244). Instruments incorporated in the solo harpsichord part have generally been ignored in the secondo. Only in bars 1 to 22 has the line of the string parts been reproduced in small type to indicate that the solo instrument does not play alone in the original scoring.

The double ornament in bar 325 of movement 1 (solo harpsichord, left hand) requires special comment. The inverted mordent in two registers is puzzling and actually unplayable. But Bach first entered it in his score and then distinctly repeated it in his autograph fair copy of the harpsichord part. We therefore see no other alternative than to reproduce the passage exactly in this way in our edition.

Werner Breig

(Translation: J. Bradford Robinson)

1 Bach used conflicting terminology for the solo instrument: *cembalo concertato*, *cembalo certato* and *cembalo obbligato*. None of these terms indicates a difference in the function of the harpsichord. See Matthias Wendt: “Solo – Obligato – Concertato: Fakten zur Terminologie der konzertierenden Instrumentalpartien bei Johann Sebastian Bach”, *Beiträge zur Geschichte des Konzerts: Festschrift Siegfried Kross zum 60. Geburtstag*, ed. Reinmar Emans and Matthias Wendt (Bonn, 1990), pp. 57–76, esp. 67.

2 All printing errors in the first impression of NBA VII/4 have, however, been corrected without comment.

3 Bach calls it “continuo” although he did not intend it to be given a chordal realization.