

Afterword

I. The Sources¹

A Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, *Mus. ms. Bach St 431*

This manuscript once belonged to Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach and is mentioned in his *Nachlaß-Verzeichnis* (estate catalogue) as *Trio aus H b für 2 Flöten und das Clavier* [Trio in B minor for 2 Flutes and Clavier].² This wrong key (B minor instead of G major) probably also stood on the original wrapper of A. Carl Friedrich Zelter (1758–1832), director of the Berlin Singakademie to whom the manuscript later belonged, produced a new wrapper inscribed as “Trio / für zwey Flöten und Baß / von / Johann Sebastian Bach / eigenhändig” [Trio for Two Flutes and Bass by Johann Sebastian Bach in his own hand] (though this manuscript is not a Bach autograph!). The manuscript consists of the three parts “Flüte traversiere 1.,” “Flüte travers. 2.,” and “Cembalo.” [1st and 2nd transverse flutes and harpsichord (figured bass)]. The watermark is identical in the three parts. This shows up within the Bach sources in 1726 (Cantata BWV 47) and in other contexts “perhaps from 1735–45.”³ The manuscript was produced by two anonymous copyists.⁴ The cembalo part stems for the most part from Anonymous L39 who appears only this once in the Bach sources. But the words “Cembalo,” “Sonata,” “Adagio” and perhaps also the first bass clef stem from the scribe of the two flute parts.⁵ This again shows that from the outset the three parts probably belonged together. Various attempts to identify the copyist of the flute parts have remained in vain, even after the most recent investigations. He, like Anonymous L39, remains anonymous and singular in the Bach sources. There was the remarkable hypothesis⁶ that Johann Sebastian’s third (and flute playing) son Johann Gottfried Bernhard (1715–1739) prepared the parts around 1737. But if the dating in 1726 (based on WM) is correct, he would have been too young for that.⁷ Later, Anonymous Vn was supposed as copyist.⁸ According to this theory, in 1724 he would have arranged, written out, and played the very demanding flute parts from the cantatas BWV 8, 94, and 101.⁹ Around 1724 his writing was said to be still “extremely mutable” (owing to his young age?), but had “stabilized” when around 1726 he copied the flute parts of *St 431*.¹⁰ Also this hypothesis was convincingly refuted.¹¹ The cantata parts mentioned are now perceived to have been penned by two different copyists, instead of reflecting two different development stages of a single copyist’s handwriting.¹² Whereas the second of these scribes is once again a singularly appearing anonymous copyist, it was surprisingly ascertained that the first scribe, the flutist Anonymous Vn, is identical with the well-known copyist of the Dresden Hofkapelle S-DI-001. His work was focused in Dresden around 1710–15, and he was active as copyist up until 1720–25 at the latest. His music writing was already very stable and mature in 1710,¹³ as is also to be seen in his Leipzig cantata parts acknowledged to date. Although the handwriting of the *St 431* flute parts shows some similarities to the second scribe mentioned, it is now accepted that these parts were written by a third copyist, likewise anonymous and singularly occurring.¹⁴ The only aid for dating *St 431* is thus the WM: “1726, and perhaps 1735–45.” But a certain doubt also remains here: the WM in BWV 47 (from 1726) has been identified as only “very indistinct,” in *St 431* as “indistinct” and in a variant.¹⁵ In summary: A was penned by Anonymous L39 (chief scribe of the harpsichord part) and a second, likewise singularly occurring and

anonymous copyist (flute parts and harpsichord part to some extent), possibly ca. 1726 or around 1735–45.

B Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, *Mus. ms. Bach St 436*

The inscription of the title page of the (figured) bass part reads: “G dur [corrected from B minor] / Sonata. / a / 2. Flauti Trav: / accompagnati. / a / Cembalo. / Del Sigr. J. S. Bach.” That of the two flute parts read “Flauto. 1^{mo}” and “Flauto. 2^{do}.” This source was written around 1800 by Johann Heinrich Michel (C. P. E. Bach’s Hamburg copyist, ca. 1745 until after 1804).

C Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, *Mus. ms. Bach St 437*

The figured and realized harpsichord part was written by Otto Carl Philipp von Voß, Jr. (1794–1836). His copyist Krüger wrote the two flute parts as well as the clefs in the harpsichord part.

D Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, *Mus. ms. Bach P 620*

This manuscript, also prepared by Krüger after 1800, comprises besides BWV 1039 also BWV 1030 and BWV 1033.

BWV 1039 is also extant in two other settings (for further information see below):

For **Cembalo and Viola da Gamba BWV 1027** (hereafter abbreviated as **Gb**):

Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, *Mus. ms. Bach P 226*, fascicle 2; autograph, ca. 1742¹⁶

For **Organ** (hereafter abbreviated as **Org**):¹⁷

Movement I: Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, *Mus. ms. Bach P 804*, fascicle 12, after 1730; written by Johann Peter Kellner (1705–1772).

Movement II: Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin – Preußischer Kulturbesitz, *Mus. ms. Bach P 288*, fascicle 4, ca. 1760–89; written by an unknown hand.

Movement IV: Leipziger Städtische Bibliotheken, *Peters Ms. 7*, fascicle 3, 1730–ca. 1740; written by the main scribe of the Mempell-Preller Collection.

II. Evaluation of the Sources

B is clearly a copy of **A**, as shown by the many identical errors and even by the similar allocation of pages and staves. Michel initially adopts the incorrect key designation from C. P. E. Bach’s exemplar and then corrects it to *g#*.¹⁸ After the publication of the estate catalogue Michel copied, on commission from collectors, many works from Carl Philipp Emanuel’s estate. His copies are for the most part extremely accurate: in this case he even adopted from **A** the majority of the “copyist’s dots,”¹⁹ although musically they are meaningless.²⁰ A dot in the middle of a long note, on a rest, or on a bar line might be useful as a copying sign, but not as articulation.

C and **D** are based on **B** and omit several of these (incomprehensible) dots. **C** shows even fewer of these dots than **D**, is thus probably a copy of **D** (this is also confirmed by several writing errors in **C**). **D** was probably prepared as practice material for Otto Voss.

III. The Various Settings

In comparison with **Org**, the flute parts of **A** have a number of passages transposed up an octave hereby avoiding pitches

below d^1 , at that time the transverse flute's lowest note.²¹ Since a violin can easily play these passages in their lower register, it is surmised that BWV 1039 was originally conceived as a trio sonata for two violins and basso continuo. **Gb** occasionally follows the flute version even where this does not appear necessary; at other places it follows **Org**. Stylistically and technically, the composition clearly belongs to the Leipzig years, thus after 1723.²² For the transcription of the violin trio only the two flute parts, thus the altered material, would have to be newly prepared;²³ the (probably unaltered) bass part along with the figuration could be adopted from the model and entrusted to another copyist. This new instrumentation also explains the very low register of the flute parts throughout.²⁴

The organ versions of the sonata's first, second, and fourth movements do not (all) stem from Bach's direct circle.²⁵ They were probably directly modeled on the putative violin version. Although the organ arrangements definitely reveal shortcomings, they interestingly retain traces of the original violin version: in those passages where the flute parts had been transposed up, **Org** transmits the lower – and also more logical – register. The first violin was placed in the right hand, the second (consistently an octave lower) in the left hand, and the bass in the pedal. The bass line is closer to the flute version than to the gamba version. Wherever the bass part is scored with too much movement, it was simplified or placed in the left hand, and the pitch range was reduced from A_1-e^1 to the pedal-board range of $C-c^1$.

Around 1742 Bach himself reworked BWV 1039 into the sonata for harpsichord and viola da gamba BWV 1027. In the process he (quite unnecessarily) adopted several of the octave shifts from the flute parts. The violin version had possibly thus already disappeared by that time, and **Org** was probably not known to Bach.²⁶ In **Gb** the right hand of the harpsichord likewise takes over the first flute part whereas the viola da gamba executes the second flute part an octave lower. The bass part is no longer purely a basso-continuo part, but was elaborated into an independent and obbligato left-hand part. Here Bach intervenes more strongly: he changes and/or corrects pitches and rhythms. At other places the changes are probably necessitated by the new instrumentation, for instance, when a chord without the third would be heard by omitting the continuo realization.²⁷ Ornamentation and articulation were also remarkably more elaborated or clarified. Bach may perhaps have arranged this trio sonata for the gamba virtuoso Carl Friedrich Abel (1723–1787), who was working in Leipzig at the start of 1740s. Abel might have performed it in the Collegium Musicum that Bach directed up to the end of 1741.

IV. Notes on Performance Practice

Repeatedly, the question arises as to whether in a realization with flutes the variants from **Gb** are to be adopted as a “final authorized version.” In most cases this seems unnecessary because the sources **A** as well as **Gb** are consistent within themselves and cannot be mixed. As continuo part the reworked form of the left hand in **Gb** would probably be too lively; it is also often adapted to the new upper parts. Some of these alterations are perhaps not so very much to be seen as compositional “improvements,” but result from Bach's pursuit of harmonic correctness. Thus, in movement IV of **Gb** he changed the opening motive of measures 2/3–4 and 4/7–8 (the number after the slash pertains to the eighth notes in the measure; hereafter “measure” is abbreviated as “m.”). In **A** and **Org**, the motive of

m. 2/3–4 is always notated in two eighth notes, but in **Gb** only the first appearance of this motive presents these two eighth notes in the right hand and in the gamba part. At the other places, Bach always writes a little grace note (to be executed here – and more often with Bach – probably short and on the beat) and a quarter note. Because the second flute part had been transposed down an octave for the gamba, playing two equal eighth notes in m. 83 would result in parallel fifths (which the transcriber of **Org** did not notice). Probably for that reason Bach altered the motive. In mm. 43/3, 60/3, and 136/3 the first of the two eighth notes is, exceptionally, consonant. Therefore, the bass had to be adjusted. This, incidentally, also smooths several relatively harsh progressions (for instance, the parallel six-four chords in mm. 18 and 89). In the fourth movement of **Gb**, Bach replaced throughout the two eighth notes of the motive that first occurs in mm. 4/7–8 with a quarter note tied to the first note in m. 5 (in m. 4 he put the eighth-note motion in the left hand, since otherwise the passage would sound rhythmically too empty). Thus, he avoids the parallel fifths between the flutes in mm. 45/7–8 and 62/7–8; the latter disappear anyhow because the gamba plays an octave lower than the second flute, but not the former. Somewhat harsh parallel fourths were also avoided in this manner at several places. Bach also eliminated (hidden) parallel fifths between the flutes at the transition from mm. 27/7 to 28 and 112/7 to 113. The earlier were omitted through the octave shift of the gamba part, and in m. 113/1 Bach writes in the right hand d^2 , tied from the d^2 in m. 112/7. Rather than tolerating these parallel fifths, Bach thus sacrifices the melodic consistency; whereas in **A**, mm. 26–27 and right hand mm. 112–113 correspond, this is not the case in **Gb** anymore. Were these parallels²⁸ or harsher chord progressions for Bach all too disturbing in **Gb**'s slower tempo, but still just acceptable in **A**'s *Presto*?

On the Articulation of the Flute Parts

The editor's recommendations are in no way binding, but can be adapted according to the player, instrument, tempo, dynamics, hall acoustics, etc. The absence of slurs does not necessarily mean that notes are to be played *détaché* (thus, in movement III, Flute 2, m. 7/5–6, Flute 1, mm. 12/5–6 and 17/7–8 are probably to be slurred in some way, although no source presents slurs in any of those passages). Anyhow, articulation is to be distinguished from phrasing.

On the Ornamentation

The execution of the harpsichord ornamentation is exemplified by Bach himself in the *Clavier-Büchlein für Wilhelm Friedemann Bach* (begun in 1720); the symbols²⁹ also utilized in the present edition, are explained by Bach thus:



(Bach called the fourth ornament “Accent und Trillo.”)

Even though not expressly demanded, the upper changing note at the start of a trill sometimes ought to be prolonged as suggested by the figuration $\frac{5}{4}$ in movement II, m. 112/5, in movement III, mm. 7/7 and 12/7. Long notes can be supplied with a trill as this is often to be found in **Org** and **Gb**, or with the usual *mesa di voce*.

On the Scoring

Because the flutes often have to play in the lower part of their tessitura, it is recommended to use the “old-fashioned”, wide-bored transverse flutes³⁰ rather than the later and narrower Rococo models. The former most closely conform to Quantz’s sound ideal of the transverse flute:³¹ the sound should resemble more that of a contralto³² than a soprano and more the chest than the head voice. It is worth noticing that in the continuo part, **A** mentions only “Cembalo.” Should a cello or a gamba double the part? This is definitely C. P. E. Bach’s opinion,³³ but does not necessarily also have to apply to his father. The notes A_1 and B_1 in the continuo part argue against the cello; these pitches could be played by a seven-stringed gamba, but at Bach’s time the gamba in Germany seems to have been more a solo instrument than a ripieno bass. An execution without bass string instrument is thus definitely possible and might sound quite well-balanced considering the low flute parts. A scoring of the trio with flute, gamba and basso continuo is nowhere extant, but quite possible. **A** rather than **Gb** should then be taken as starting point.

Quantz commented in great detail on the general interpretation of trio sonatas with regard to the upper parts as well as the bass. His ideas and recommendations concerning structure, relationship between the parts, imitation, ornamentation, dynamics, scoring and realization of the basso-continuo deserve the greatest attention,³⁴ even though his style and taste do not necessarily wholly correspond with those of J. S. Bach.

Gooik, Autumn 2015

Barthold Kuijken

On the Realization of the Figured Bass

Our continuo realization of BWV 1039 is based on directives from J. D. Heinichen’s *General-Bass in der Composition* (Dresden, 1728) and G. P. Telemann’s *Singe-, Spiel- und General-Bass-Übungen* (Hamburg, 1733/34), as well as the harpsichord part of the second movement (*Largo e dolce*) of J. S. Bach’s *Sonate für obligates Cembalo und Flöte* BWV 1030 [Sonata for obbligato Cembalo and transverse Flute], which represents a written-out continuo.

Register of the Continuo’s Right Hand and Doubling of the Solo Voices

Telemann advises f^2 as upper limit of the right hand and respects this directive in his own realizations of the *General-Bass-Übungen*. With regard to register overall, the right hand’s upper voice is steadily turning around c^2 , even regularly doubling or exceeding the solo voice.

Although Heinichen does not give a clear-cut guideline with regard to register, his realizations regularly go slightly higher than f^2 , often up to g^2 . And since they do not include a solo voice and Heinichen did not mention anything about the relationship between the solo voice and the right hand’s upper part, he probably did not consider doublings between both to be a problem. BWV 1030/2 actually confirms these observations: its continuo’s upper part does actually double and occasionally even exceeds the flute part.

Following these examples, our continuo realization for BWV 1039 is worked out in a fairly high register, only making compromises when one or both transverse flutes play in such a low register that a “normal” right hand realization would audibly obstruct them too much.

Number of Continuo Parts

As Heinichen and Telemann assert, a standard continuo realization in their time uses four-part harmony. While Telemann mentions and applies only this four-part setting, Heinichen explains that a more experienced player habitually uses more parts, an accompanying style he illustrates elaborately. As for BWV 1030/2, it is in agreement with both views: chords in both four parts and even more parts occur regularly.

Since the present continuo realization of BWV 1039 is intended in the first place for the less-experienced player – an advanced continuo player usually preferring to play from an unrealized bass part –, a standard, four-part setting has been chosen.

Chord Rhythm and Dissonance Treatment

Both Heinichen and Telemann argue that a continuo should be played differently depending on whether an organ or a harpsichord is used. Their guidelines can be summarized as follows. On the organ, an on-beat dissonance is usually tied over from its preparation, while on the harpsichord, it is struck again. And as for chord rhythm, it is generally quicker for a harpsichord than for an organ continuo. Heinichen explains that a bass in continuous eighth notes in a slow tempo, for instance, would sound too empty on the harpsichord when it is realized with only quarter-note chords. Although according to him this chord rhythm is well suited for the organ, a performance on the harpsichord requires a chord, whether different or not, on each eighth note. Also these directives are reflected in BWV 1030/2. In the *Largo e dolce* a chord occurs on nearly every single eighth note of the $\frac{3}{8}$ time signature, even when the harmony does not change for a whole bar, and each on-beat dissonance is struck, not tied.

Following these standards, our continuo realization of BWV 1039 opts for re-striking every on-beat dissonance and for a fairly quick chord rhythm generally. Only in its third movement (*Adagio e piano*) does the continuo intentionally deviate from Heinichen’s and Telemann’s guidelines with regard to the number of chords per measure. In spite of its slow tempo in $\frac{4}{4}$ with a bass in continuous eighth notes, we did not decide on eighth-note but on half-note chords because of the slurs appearing systematically over each group of four eighth notes. This chord rhythm seems to be confirmed by Bach himself from m. 13, where the eighth notes in the bass are replaced by a quarter-note chord on the first and third beats.

Brussels, Autumn 2015

Ewald Demeyere