

J.S. Bach – The Authentic (?) Flute Sonata in E-Flat Major

Ricardo M. ALVES¹

Abstract: *Of all the chamber works attributed to Johann Sebastian Bach, the Sonata in E-flat major for transverse flute and obbligato cembalo, BWV 1031, presents one of the most puzzling enigmas. For much of J.S. Bach's instrumental music no primary sources have survived and very often some loose ends are found, concerning the "when" and in "which context" his compositions were written. Following this line of thought, this article aims to develop a review of the bibliography concerning the sonata in E-flat major, BWV 1031, making reference to the existing sources to date and presenting the various issues concerning its authorship. Although a final answer is not given, it is ascertained that both J.S. Bach... and J.J. Quantz shall have played a fundamental role on it.*

Key-words: *Flute, Bach, Quantz, Sonata E-Flat Major, BWV 1031*

1. Introduction

For quite a long time, the Sonata in E-flat major for transverse flute and *obbligato* cembalo, BWV 1031, was thought to have been composed by J.S. Bach, an assumption that may well prove to be erroneous. Nonetheless, such hypothesis does not rule out the fact that it may have been originated from Bach's circle of associates and may have been influenced by him to some extent or even have involved his personal cooperation. In this way, with this article, we propose to develop a literature review, presenting different perspectives concerning BWV 1031 sonata's authorship and dating, without, notwithstanding, offering a definitive answer.

2. Methodology

To carry out this bibliographic review a historical and compiling study was developed, focused on reference editions and editors, as well as papers

¹ Conservatório de Música D. Dinis, Odivelas, Portugal; Lisbon Film Orchestra, Portugal; PhD. Student, Universidade de Évora, Portugal; ralves12@msn.com

published in regular journals,² and two kinds of evidence were considered: 1) external evidence concerning the circumstances of writing, copying and attributing of the BWV 1031 sonata; since we have no surviving manuscript in J.S. Bach's hand, we must consider copies and attributions and attempt to judge their reliability; 2) internal evidence, whereby the work was studied from a stylistic and compositional point of view, concerning the likelihood of Bach's having written it.

3. The sources

According to Alfred Dürr (1975, 41) and Barthold Kuijken (1999, 20), the E-flat major sonata (BWV 1031/H. 545)³ presents five different sources, all placing J.S. Bach as its composer's 649⁴ and P 1056⁵ are considered the most important sources and are based on a common source, independently of one another. One of Robert Marshall's (1979, 472) chief arguments for his support of the authenticity of BWV 1031 is the apparent independence of these two principal sources. But neither the attributions, nor the readings in the two sources are truly independent (Swack 1995, 43). Several shared copying errors in the two principal sources further suggest that both stem from a common parent manuscript. Dürr (1975, 41-42) and Kuijken (1999, 23-24) list the errors that these two sources have in common; these include notes which either do not make harmonic sense or are inconsistent with other appearances of the same passage. Jeanne Swack (1995, 44) states that the

² I make no claim that this review is exhaustive, and I thus apologize to colleagues whose paper(s) may be missing or only briefly described.

³ For the sake of clarity, we shall subsequently call this sonata simply BWV 1031, whereby we do not purport to lay down the authorship with this designation.

⁴ Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Berlin Mus., ms. Bach P 649 (shortened to "P 649"). Both J. Swack (1995, 43) and Kuijken (1999, 20) state that this score was written by Bach's main copyist H (also called Anonymus 4) between August 1748 and October 1749. On the first page, the heading, by H, reads: "*Sonata di J.S.B.*". The tempo indication of the first movement "*Allegro moderato*" possibly stems from the youngest Bach son, Johann Christian. The cover title, "*Es d. Trio Fürs obligate Clavier u. die Flöte Von J. S. Bach*", was penned by C.P.E. Bach, most likely in 1768. The two sources based in P 649 are: Musikbibliothek der Stadt Leipzig, Ms. 10, written around 1800; and Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Berlin Mus. ms. Bach St 461, that consists in two parts, written by C.P.E. Bach.

⁵ Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Berlin Mus., ms. Bach P 1056 (shortened to "P 1056"). Both Swack (1995, 43) and Kuijken (1999, 20) refer that the copyist of the heading "*J.S. Bach*" and of the first movement has yet to be identified (presumably a copyist under C.F. Penzel's direction). The other two movements of the score and the title page "*Sonata a Flauto Travers. ed Cembalo obligato di J.S. Bach. Poss. Penzel*" was copied around 1755 by C. F. Penzel (1737-1801), the former owner of this source. This copy by Penzel is clearly the later of the two principal sources. Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Berlin Mus., ms. Bach P 310, was produced around 1800 and it based in P 1056.

divergent readings between the two manuscripts are typical of copying errors: accidentals read as notes, missing bars, notes on the wrong line or space, notes erroneously copied into the wrong part and then crossed out, etc. They are certainly more typical of different scribes' reading of the same source than of their reading of different sources. Taken as a whole, it seems likely that copyst H, C.F. Penzel and Penzel's anonymous colleagues were copying from the same manuscript (see Footnote 5 and 6).

4. The Dating

The form of the sonata's first movement offers one possible clue as to the dating: the "Sonata in the style of a concerto"⁶ arose shortly before 1730 in the Dresden circle of composers and was probably influenced by Vivaldi's *concerti*. For the time being, the Sonata BWV 1031 is datable to the period ranging from c. 1730 to 1748/49 at the latest (Kuijken 1999, 20).

If all sources name J.S. Bach as author, then one must attempt a stylistic evaluation and seek the purpose for which the work was written. In the 1730s and early 1740s, Bach endeavoured to write in the "new Italian", *galant* style that was

⁶ In a sonata movement "in concerto form", as in the concerto, there are several *solo* entrances interrupted by *tutti* fragments. Vivaldi's *concerti* were widely copied, performed, and imitated in parts of Germany from the first decade of the eighteenth century on. Such works, sometimes scored for as few as three *obbligato* parts, were taken as models by several German composers (e.g. J. S. Bach, Telemann, Quantz, Heinichen, J. G. Graun, etc.). Various designated as *sonata*, *concerto*, or simply *trio* or *quadro*, had little to do with the degree to which the piece resembled either the conventional sonata or the conventional concerto. The fact that the genre was specified only once under the name *Sonate auf Concertenart* in J.A. Scheibe's *Critischer Musikus* (1745), may reflect this very ambiguity: most theorists probably considered such works to be chamber concertos. These pieces would include at least one movement in which a *ritornello* played a key structural role: one instrument (or two in a quartet) may have been assigned the role of orchestra ("*tutti*"), playing the *ritornelli* and interacting with the remaining *solo* instrument during the solo episodes. Trios "in concerto form" were often scored or rescored as sonatas (or concertos) for solo flute, violin, viola da gamba, or oboe and *obbligato* harpsichord. Such works, along with Vivaldi's concertos, were probably Bach's point of departure for his sonatas for flute, violin, or viola da gamba *auf Concertenart* (Swack 1993, 412). Quantz also seems to have been captivated by Vivaldi's works during his tenure at the Dresden court (1718-41). His Dresden trios offer at least three clear examples of the *Sonate auf Concertenart* (QV 2: 9, QV 2: 18 and QV 2: 35). All of them are in three movements, fast-slow-fast, and the first movements all begin with a *ritornello* stated in the violin or cembalo [similarly to BWV 1031]. Of the techniques that Bach employs in his *Sonaten auf Concertenart*, the most pervasive is the gradual integration of material which at the outset of the movement is clearly demarcated as *solo* or *tutti* (*ibid.*, 387-411).

in fashion in Dresden.⁷ The stylistic characteristics - simple consonant harmonies, phrasings in short segments, a structure relatively free of tension and featuring much parallel voice leading instead of the imitations typical of Bach, sweet melodies, an abundance of repeated notes in the LH (= left hand) - are used as arguments both against Bach's authorship as for it (e.g. Figure 2A and 4A).⁸

Hans Eppstein (2018, 84-85) considers that BWV 1031 is, in a certain way, "empty" in his writing and contents and, consequently, it is hardly conceivable that Johann Sebastian would have "give up" certain lower-lying elements of his writing, which belong to the core of his musical language, concluding that the work was shared between him and his son, Carl Philipp.⁹ However, Eppstein adds that J.S. Bach occasionally approached the gallant style, and probably not only after 1730 and, in this way, BWV 1031 could have come from his hand.¹⁰ Such approach can suggest that there is no longer content with bonds, as Marshall (1976) and Sackmann and Rampe (2018) propose. Thus, BWV 1031 would not be a weak, "un-Bachian" work, but rather the expression of a gallant attitude (for example, both C.P.E. Bach and J.J. Quantz in their *Versuch* refer that music should have several affects, being diverse and less unified) that shows a stylistic contemporaneity of the author, that would be not spurned in Berlin.¹¹

⁷ Both Marshall (1979, 473) and Kuijken (1999, 20) refer that the *galant* style of the work points to a date of composition in the 1730s. In addition, both Robert Marshall (1976, 313–357) and Dominik Sackmann and Siegbert Rampe (2018, 51-85) assumed that, about 1730, Bach was disaffected with Leipzig and prompted by his heightened awareness of the outstanding and varied musical life in Dresden, with its Italian opera, he increasingly expanded his musical horizons. As a result, much of the music written during the period 1730-45 would have absorbed elements of this *galant* style, principally operatic elements with predominantly homophonic textures, regular periodic phrase structure and ingratiating melodies. Marshall (1976) adds another motive for such "change": Bach had applied for a court position in Berlin and wanted to ingratiate himself with the Dresden Establishment by a turn to the gallant.

⁸ Such doubts led to BWV 1031 not being included in the *Neue Bach-Ausgabe*, Serie VI/3 (1963; Swack 1995, 31). Friedrich Blume (cited by Dürr 1975, 4 and by Kuijken 1999, 22) in MGG, col. 1013, considered that the authorship was "certainly not by [J.S.] Bach".

⁹ In his essay from 1966, Eppstein (cited by Sackmann & Rampe 2018, 77-78) points out some elements from BWV 1031 that can be considered "un-Bachian", for example: the use of a *petite reprise* in the *Finale* or the preference for small-scale swapping game or the frequent parallel performance of the two upper voices, especially in the last *Allegro* (e.g. **Figure 4A**). In this way, he comes to the conclusion that, from what is so characteristic of Bach's tonal language, density of polyphony "is found next to nothing" ("*findet sich so gut wie nichts*").

¹⁰ Eppstein (2018, 83), Kuijken (1999, 20, note 11) and Swack (1993, 369-414) also mention some examples of works by Bach that can be seen as "*galant*".

¹¹ Sackmann and Rampe (2018, 84; cf. Marshall 1976) consider that, in order to possibly get a job in Berlin, or at least a title, Bach may have linked the dedication of the *Ricercari* and *Canon* of the *Musical Offering* (BWV 1079) to its reputation as a counterpointist and, at the same time, works such as the Trio Sonata from BWV 1079 and the Flute Sonata BWV 1031 were created based on the main stylistic features, almost exclusive, of the Berlin court, by Quantz, Graun and Hasse's.

Sackmann and Rampe, after revising the flute literature by various German (e.g. Telemann, Graupner, Matheson) and French composers (e.g. Hotteterre, Leclair, Blavet), observed that their favourite key signatures were G major, D major, E minor and A major, with almost absence of keys concerning “flats” (2018: 68-69).¹² In opposition, observing the works by Quantz and Frederick “the Great”, one gets the impression that “flat keys” are inner half of the flute literature, when compared to other German-speaking regions, being used almost as regularly as “sharp keys”. Such difference can be explained with basis on organological elements, namely the invention by J.J. Quantz of a second key on the footjoint (the “E-flat key”; see Figure 1), responsible for the emission of the E-flat (differently from the D-sharp), around 1727, when he was still in Dresden. In this way, it is very likely that BWV 1031 emerged in the area of Dresden or Berlin, under the impression of Quantz’s invention, being intended for the court of Berlin (*ibid.*, 70-75).



Fig. 1. Lower center (or right-hand joint) with footjoint attached (copy of a Quantz flute by Wenner Flöten)¹³

Sackmann and Rampe (2018, 60-65) also refer that works such as BWV 998 and the *Musical Offering* share musical similarities with BWV 1031 (e.g. tone repetitions in the bass, clear four-bar periods, unequal treatment of the melody). They observe that these works are dating to the mid-1740s. In this way, BWV 1031 has a double prerequisite: on the one hand it is left in terms of stylistic peculiarities with works by J.S. Bach from the 1740s, especially with the trio sonata of the *Musical Offering*; however, on the other hand, their formal and thematic design seems to be founded

¹² Swack (1995, 31, note 5) points out that, once the basic key of the *traverso* is D major, the further a tonality is from that key the more difficult it is to play in tune, and the softer/poorer it sounds (cross-fingered notes are softer than non-cross-fingered). For this reason, pieces with three or more flats, with the exception of C minor, are extremely uncommon for the transverse flute.

¹³ The larger, curved key, produces D-sharp when depressed; the shorter key produces E-flat. The hole under the D-sharp key is smaller than the hole under the E-flat key. Image retrieved from <https://www.wennerfloeten.de>.

on a trio by J.J. Quantz (QV 2:18; cf. Swack, 1995), dating around 1730 (to be discussed below).

5. An E-flat Major Sonata by Quantz

The dilemmas here arisen could be easily solved if one believes the stylistic analysis and if J.S. Bach did not compose BWV 1031. Although C.P.E. Bach is often mentioned, it is unlikely to be the composer of BWV 1031, since he accepted copyist H's attribution to J. S. Bach when he made the wrapper (see Footnote 5).¹⁴

Observing Johann Joachim Quantz's Trio Sonata QV 2: 18, also in E-flat major, composed c.1730-1735; we find a number of similarities to BWV 1031.¹⁵ The similarities between QV2:18 and BWV1031 extend beyond the use of the same key and a contrapuntally uncomplicated style. In fact, a version from BWV 1031 featuring the flute, violin *and basso continuo*, as in QV 2: 18 (existent also in a version for flute and *obligato* harpsichord), was once preserved in the Berlin Sing-Akademie but did not survive to World War II (Swack 1995, 32, 42; Kuijken 1999, 21).¹⁶ Both sonatas (QV2:18 and BWV1031) are laid out in three movements: an

¹⁴ Even taking into account the passing of many years between the composition of BWV1031 and C. P. E. Bach's addition of the wrapper, it seems improbable that he would not have recognized his own work (Swack 1995, 46; Kuijken 1999, 20). Eppstein (1981, IV), who considers that BWV 1031 may have been composed by Carl Philipp, states that a likely explanation for citing his father as the composer is that the latter may have subjected the work to some subsequent improvement after which Emanuel was reluctant to refer it as his own. In addition, Kuijken (1999, 20-21) defends that BWV 1031 would be equally untypical of the young C.P.E. Bach, which can be seen in a comparison with his Leipzig Trio Sonatas H. 567-571. There we find a greater number of imitations, longer movements, more surprises, irregular rhythms, long, tension-filled suspensions, more fire, more *Sturm und Drang*. BWV 1031, on the other hand, seems exceptionally calm, well-rounded, pleasant, and even a little distant. Another argument against the authorship of C.P.E. Bach as well as of J.S. Bach is the fact that the rH figures are often awkward to play - which explains the simplifications in P 649- and hardly seem to stem from a proficient harpsichordist. Sackmann and Rampe (2018, 75) exclude C.P.E. Bach for the authorship of BWV 1031 based on the idea that it was composed around 1745; there was no reason to assign this work to his father if he had actually done it, at a time that he already was the Prussian court harpsichordist, who knew the Berlin flute tradition from everyday practice. In addition, they support the idea that J.S. Bach is the author, having Quantz QV 2:18 as model (both for BWV 1031 and for BWV 1079/8, *The Musical Offering*) (*ibid.*, 59-60).

¹⁵ Cf. Swack 1995; Kuijken 1999; Olbertz 2013 and Sackmann and Rampe 2018.

¹⁶ However, since the violin part of this version was unusually low and does not lie much more comfortably than the rH, there is no compelling reason to assume that the trio setting was the original (Kuijken 1999, 21). On the other hand, Swack (1995, 40, 41, note 17) suggests that the second movement of BWV 1031 may provide some evidence that the right hand of the keyboard part was originally played by a violin, due to both the right- and left-hand parts having the same pitch at some bars, proposing, also, some solutions in which the violin could fulfil the rH part of the first movement in BWV 1031.

opening fast movement in common time with a *ritornello* structure, a minor-mode *siciliana*, and a concluding bipartite fast movement in 3/8. There are even similarities in construction, thematic material, rhythm and roles assumed by the instruments from the outer movements of both sonatas. In more details, Figures 2A and 2B show the opening *ritornelli* and the beginning of the first *solo* sections of each first movement. The opening theme of BWV 1031 resembles the second segment of the *tutti* theme in QV 2: 18 (labelled “a” in both figures).¹⁷ The opening *solo* sections end with a cadential bar in which the rhythms in the *solo* parts are also identical (Figures 3A and 3B).

Allegro moderato

The image displays a musical score for J.S. Bach's BWV 1031, Allegro moderato, measures 1-3 and 9-12. The score is written for Flauto traverso (flute) and Cembalo (harpsichord). The key signature is E-flat major (two flats) and the time signature is common time (C). The tempo is marked 'Allegro moderato'. The first system shows the beginning of the piece, with the flute part starting on a whole rest and the harpsichord playing a rhythmic pattern. A bracket labeled 'a' spans the first two measures of the harpsichord part. The second system shows the flute part starting with a 'solo' section, marked with a fermata. The harpsichord part continues with a similar rhythmic pattern, and a bracket labeled 'a' spans the first two measures of the second system. The piece concludes with a 'Ritornello fragment' in the flute part, marked with a fermata.

Fig. 2A. J.S. Bach (?), BWV 1031, *Allegro moderato*, mm.1-3, 9-12
(adapted from Bärenreiter Verlag, Kassel 1975).

¹⁷ Both first movements have three *ritornelli* in the same succession of keys, with modulatory *solo* sections connecting them. Each sonata continues with a restatement of the *ritornello* motive, against which the flute plays simple counterpoint.

Allegro

Ritornello fragment

Fig. 2B. J.J. Quantz, QV 2: 18, *Allegro*, mm. 1-2, 11-14 (adapted from Hortus Musicus-Bärenreiter Verlag, Kassel 1987)

Ritornello 2

Fig. 3A. J.S. Bach (?), BWV 1031, *Allegro moderato*, mm. 25-26 (adapted from Bärenreiter Verlag, Kassel 1975)

Ritornello 2

Fig. 3B. J.J. Quantz, QV 2: 18, *Allegro*, mm. 20-21 (adapted from Swack 1995, 36)

The similarities between the respective third movements, like those between the first movements, are also quite notorious, although there is little exact duplication of material (Figures 4A, 4B and 4C; see labels “a”).¹⁸

¹⁸ Each is a bipartite movement in 3/8. Each begins with a bar of harpsichord (or violin) solo before the flute entrance, and in each the flute plays in parallel 3rds with the right hand of the harpsichord in bar 2. Note, too, that each harpsichord (or violin) theme is made of two repeating two-bar units, although in QV2:18 the first bar serves as an anacrusis to the two two-bar units in bars 2-5.

The image shows the first six measures of the Allegro movement from J.S. Bach's BWV 1031. The music is in E-flat major and 3/8 time. The flute part begins with a rest, followed by a melodic line with an 'a' marking above a slur. The piano accompaniment consists of a steady eighth-note pattern in the right hand and a simple bass line in the left hand.

Fig. 4A. J.S. Bach (?), BWV 1031, Allegro, mm.1-6
(adapted from Bärenreiter Verlag, Kassel1975)

The image shows the first five measures of the Allegro movement from J.J. Quantz's QV 2:18. The music is in E-flat major and 3/8 time. The flute part features a melodic line with slurs and accents. The piano accompaniment has a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes in the right hand and a bass line in the left hand.

Fig. 4B. J.J. Quantz, QV 2:18, Allegro, bars
1-5 (adapted from Swack 1995, 39)

The image shows measures 13-16 of the Allegro movement from J.J. Quantz's QV 2:18. The music is in E-flat major and 3/8 time. The flute part has a melodic line with an 'a' marking and a trill. The piano accompaniment continues with its rhythmic pattern.

Fig. 4C. J.J. Quantz, QV 2:18, Allegro, bars
13-16 (adapted from Swack 1995, 39)

In summary, the outer movements of BWV1031 derive their structure and some melodic material from the corresponding in QV2: 18; the second movement of BWV1031 (Figure 5A), on the other hand, borrows only the movement type and shape opening motive from QV2:18 (Figure 5B), as well as, the minor key. In turn, the *siciliano* movement from the *Concerto à 5* in G Minor, RV107 by A.Vivaldi (dating from the late 1720s/ early 1730s; Figure 5C) shows a marked similarity to the *Siciliana* of BWV 1031 (Swack1993, 376), concerning both thematic elements and accompaniment (see labels “a”, “b” and “c”).

The image shows the first four measures of the Siciliana movement from J.S. Bach's BWV 1031. The music is in E-flat major and 6/8 time. The flute part has a slow, melodic line with markings 'a', 'b', and 'c' under slurs. The piano accompaniment features a characteristic siciliana pattern of eighth notes in the right hand and a bass line in the left hand.

Fig. 5A. J.S. Bach (?), BWV 1031, Siciliana, mm.1-4
(adapted from Bärenreiter Verlag, Kassel 1975).

Larghetto

Fig. 5B. J.J. Quantz, QV 2: 18, *Larghetto*, mm. 1-2
(adapted from Hortus Musicus- BärenreiterVerlag, Kassel 1987)

Largo

Fig. 5C. A. Vivaldi, RV 107, *Largo*, mm.1-2
(adapted from Edizione Ricordi, Milano 1949)¹⁹

Further, the flute parts in both pieces by Quantz and “Bach” have an oddly circumscribed top range. The flute part hardly exceeds c^3 : there is only one d^3 in QV 2: 18 and d^3 occurs twice in BWV 1031. This limited range is normal for Quantz, but rather exceptional for J.S. Bach. Such a limitation of range is to be found in none of

¹⁹ Retrieved from https://imslp.eu/files/imglnks/euimg/6/6e/IMSLP395348-PMLP113388-Vivaldi_Antonio-Opere_Ricordi_F_XII_No_6_scan.pdf

Bach's securely attributed flute works, even taking into account the probability that some of these were transposed (Swack 1995, 32; Kuijken 1999, 21).²⁰

Granted, BWV 1031 is much more complex and compelling than QV 2: 18, which suggests that it was written at a later date and was inspired by both the form ("concertstyle") and motifs of QV 2: 18 (Swack 1995, 31, 47; Kuijken 1999, 21; Sackmann & Rampe 2018, 57-60). Perhaps J.S. Bach became acquainted with the piece during a visit to Dresden - Quantz was a flutist at the court of Dresden until 1741 - and copied it for the *Collegium musicum* in Leipzig, which he directed from 1729-37 and 1739-41 (Swack 1995, 31; Kuijken 1999, 21).²¹ While an exact date for QV2:18 cannot be established, the sources indicate that it was copied around 1730-35.

Compared to QV 2: 18, the dating of BWV1031 is even less certain. Certainly, the style of the piece does not suggest a dating before the 1730s. If Bach is the composer, then the work could date from either the 1730s or 40s (Swack 1995, 42-43).²² On the other hand, if BWV 1031 was written by Quantz then Bach's copy would probably date from the 1730s, when Quantz was still in residence in Dresden; in fact, Quantz's departure for Berlin in 1741 would serve as the latest possible date for its composition, since he does not seem to have composed trio sonatas after that date (Swack 1995, 42-43). However, and once Sonata QV 2: 18 is also in a version for flute and harpsichord (M.Th. 179) prepared in Berlin,²³ it is also

²⁰ Christopher Addington (1985: 272) refers that, at that time, it was unusual to draw distinctions between the various types of *flauto traverso*. In France, during the early part of the eighteenth century, the instrument normally played in chamber music was in the *alto* or *bas dessus* range and transposed either a major or a minor third against the keyboard. From about 1730, it became more usual to play the *haut dessus* or concert flute, which was tuned in C (at that time, roughly between a=392-415 Hz); however, the low French pitch practice did not disappear. In Addington's opinion, it is possible that many of Bach's chamber music works for the flute were intended for the *alto* instrument (*ibid.*, 264-265). The flutist at that time would have known from experience when the *alto* flute was being called for. In particular, the use of certain keys would have acted as an "obligatory transposition" sign, such as: E and E flat major, G minor, and C minor (which accidentals would require forked fingerings that cause an unevenness of tone quality and intonation). Tessitura is another important consideration. People have often complained that these pieces lie too low in the range of the flute, however when we transpose for the *alto* flute, the music is "fingered" a third higher than the written (*ibid.*, 270, 273).

²¹ Bach's visit to Dresden in September 1731 may have given him an earlier opportunity to meet Quantz. Johann Sebastian's stay in Dresden in June-July 1733 could also have provided him with the opportunity to examine works by the resident musicians (Swack 1995: 32, note 10, 49).

²² Marshall (1979, 473) states that BWV 1031 could have been written by J. S. Bach in the early 1730s and that it could have served as a model for C. P. E. Bach when he composed the G-minor sonata (BWV 1020) at around the same time (that is, before Emanuel left Leipzig in 1734).

²³ Swack (1995, 31, 42) and Kuijken (1999, 21) point out that Deutsche Staatsbibliothek Berlin M.Th. 179 is no doubt to be dated after 1741, hence after Quantz moved to the court of Frederick II. It is known that Frederick did not like trio sonatas; perhaps Quantz wanted to arrange the work to make it more "modern".

reasonable to consider that Bach heard this version interpreted by Quantz or even by King Frederick II during his visit to Berlin in 1747, in connection with the composition of the *Musical Offering*.²⁴ If it happened this way, it is not surprising that a copy (P 649) was made shortly thereafter (Swack 1995, 47; Kuijken 1999, 21; see Footnote 5). Nevertheless, once BWV 1031 was considered as authentic by the Bach sons, by Penzel, the diligent collector of Bach's works, and by the main copyist H, who worked only for J.S. Bach - if they all agreed on the same attribution, independently of one another -, then it is indeed difficult to refute Bach's authorship on the basis of the sources.²⁵

But if we wish to rely on stylistic critique and exclude the E-flat major Sonata from J.S. Bach's canon of works, then we could assume that Quantz wrote both QV 2: 18 and BWV 1031.²⁶ In such manner, Bach could have copied the sonata himself during a visit to Dresden or Berlin, and then forgotten to mention the author. Because of his handwriting, his sons and copyists would have automatically assumed that Johann Sebastian was the author. Compared to QV 2: 18, BWV 1031 is certainly more mature and finely elaborated, richer and more expressive; so much so, in fact, that one hardly feels Quantz could have written it (Kuijken 1999, 21).²⁷

²⁴ This would explain why the opening theme of the flute in QV 2: 18 (*Allegro*, m. 12 and 30) recurs note for note at the beginning of the second movement (*Allegro*) of the trio sonata in the *Musical Offering* (Swack 1995, 47, note 67; Sackmann and Rampe 2018, 55-56).

²⁵ However, both Penzel and C.P.E. Bach erred once in attributing works to J.S. Bach (Marshall 1979, 472; Kuijken 21, note 30).

²⁶ "But would Quantz [...] returned to a popular and successful piece [QV 2:18] and used it as the model for another sonata in the same key and setting?" If so, "wouldn't copies of Quantz's strongest sonata have been circulating under his name?" (Kuijken 1999, 21).

²⁷ Swack (1995, 47) considers that, although there is no doubt that BWV 1031 is musically more sophisticated than QV2:18, it was probably not beyond the scope of Quantz's technique and invention. In Stephan Olbertz's opinion (2013, 269-270), the two Trios by Quantz, QV 2: 18 and QV 2: 35, inspired the composition of BWV 1031 and, likewise, BWV 1020 (Sonata in G minor), and their key signatures suggest that they were intended to be performed in Quantz's "updated" flute (see page 3-4; cf. Sackmann & Rampe, 2018). Considering BWV 1031 and BWV 1020 as lute trios (lute, violin/flute and string bass; typical indications of original lute compositions are a rhythmically flowing and an upper voice leading, based on the style of S.L. Weiss, which are also present in BWV 1031 and BWV 1020), Olbertz assumes that they may have been composed between around 1720 and 1730. He also suggests C.H. Graun (1703/04-1759), a Weiss's student, has having the requirements for the potential composition of BWV 1031 and 1020, who already had composed two trios in his youth; stylistically, the two trios would also fit well into Graun's chronological data (Olbertz 2013, 271-276). Olbertz also proposes that the works may have come to J.S. Bach's hand (who gave a concert in Dresden in 1731) directly from S.L. Weiss, or via W.F. Bach, who was active in Dresden from 1733. If W.F. Bach had the opportunity to meet with Weiss, it is quite possible that he asked for a copy or made one himself. During a visit to Leipzig, these could in turn have served as models for arrangements or copies in the family circle (*ibid.*, 277).

6. Conclusion

While the evidence at hand does not permit a firm conclusion regarding the actual composer, several possible interpretations suggest themselves. First, Quantz, himself, may be the author of BWV 1031. The style of the work closely matches his other Dresden trios. Perhaps the desire to write a more extensive piece in the same vein as QV2:18, which seems to have been a successful piece, led him to model the new work upon it, enlarging it and greatly enriching its thematic material while maintaining its formal outlines, style, melodic contour and, especially in the first movement, small-scale structure. J. S. Bach, hearing or examining the piece in Dresden, possibly during his stay in 1733, may have copied it out, perhaps intending it for use with the Leipzig *collegium*. He could, of course, have transcribed the piece immediately as an *obbligato* sonata at the same time that he copied it out. Hauptkopist H and Penzel, seeing a sonata in Bach's hand, then mistakenly attributed it to him.

A second possibility is that J. S. Bach may have heard QV2:18 in Dresden and, perhaps out of admiration for the progressive style of the piece, decided to compose a piece closely modelled upon it, making some changes in the first movement to render the right-hand part more idiomatic.²⁸ Hauptkopist H and Penzel then took their attribution directly from Bach's autograph or another copy made from it. However, if BWV 1031 is an authentic work of Bach, then its dating remains a problem. The years 1748-9, the probable period during which Hauptkopist H copied the work, are, after all, its only real *terminus ante quem*. For this reason, we cannot exclude the possibility that Bach composed it in conjunction with his visit to the Berlin court in 1747, during which he must have met or renewed his acquaintance with Quantz and could have heard or seen QV2:18 (cf. Swack 1995; Kuijken 1999; Sackmann and Rampe 2018).

To conclude, BWV 1031 "is untypical of C.P.E. Bach (and W.F. Bach), too thin for J.S. Bach and too good for Quantz" (Kuijken 1999, 21). As a result, only new source findings, biographical studies and stylistic analysis, and a joint effort of these disciplines, can bring more clarity to the subject; until then, one can only offer more or less perspicacious hypotheses. It is certainly too early to dismiss BWV 1031 as an authentic work, but equally too early to accept it unconditionally. It is also fundamental to refer that the exclusion of this sonata from the list of Bach's works

²⁸ The piece, according to this scenario, would still remain stylistically anomalous. The piece lacks the obsessive contrapuntal and thematic working-out of the two securely attributed sonatas for flute and *obbligato* cembalo, the Sonata in B minor, BWV 1030, and the Sonata in A major, BWV 1032. Extending this hypothesis, it is possible that Bach composed this piece expressly to flatter the Dresden court musicians (Swack 1995: 47; Kuijken 1999: 20).

does not imply a verdict on the quality of composition; in fact, its quality doesn't change at all.

Acknowledgements

I thank Professor Monika Streitová (Universidade de Évora), whose insight, advice and valuable comments greatly improved this article.

References

- Addington, Christopher. 1985. "The Bach Flute". *The Musical Quarterly* 71, no. 3.
- Dürr, Alfred. 1975. *J.S. Bach: Sonata in C major, Sonata in E-flat major and G minor*. Kassel: Bärenreiter Verlag.
- Eppstein, Hans. 1981. *J.S. Bach: Flötensonaten II*. München: G. Henle Verlag.
- Eppstein, Hans. 2018. "Zur Problematik Von Johann Sebastian Bachs Flötensonaten". *Bach-Jahrbuch* 67: 77-90.
- Kuijken, Barthold. 1999. *Johann Sebastian(?) Bach (?) : Sonate für Flöte und Cembalo Es-dur*. Wiesbaden: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- Marshall, Robert. 1976. "Bach The Progressive: Observations On His Later Works". *The Musical Quarterly*, 62(3): 313-357.
- Marshall, Robert. 1979. "J. S. Bach's Compositions for Solo Flute: A Reconsideration of Their Authenticity and Chronology". *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 32(3): 463-498.
- Olbertz, Stephan. 2013. "Verborgene Trios Mit Obligater Laute? Zu Fragen der Fassungsgeschichte und Autorschaft der Sonaten Es-Dur und g-Moll, BWV 1031 und 1020". *Bach-Jahrbuch* 99: 261-277.
- Ruf, Hugo. 1987. *Johann Joachim Quantz, Trio Sonata in E-Flat Major*. Kassel: Hortus Musicus-Bärenreiter Verlag.
- Sackmann, Dominik and Siegbert Rampe. 2018. "Bach, Berlin, Quantz Und Die Flötensonate Es-Dur BWV 1031". *Bach-Jahrbuch* 83: 51-85.
- Swack, Jeann. 1993. "Sonate auf Concertenart". *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 46(3): 369-414.
- Swack, Jeann. 1995. "Quantz and the Sonata in Eb major for flute and cembalo, BWV 1031". *Early Music* 23(1): 31-53.