

# Preface

The present trio sonata has been transmitted in two versions. There is a version for flute, violin and continuo in G major (BWV 1038), which has survived in a set of parts written by Johann Sebastian Bach around 1732–1735 and housed today at the Germanisches Nationalmuseum in Nuremberg under the shelf mark *Autographen K. 27*. And then there is a version for violin and harpsichord obbligato in F major (BWV 1022), which has come down to us in a transcription from the Peters music library made c. 1800.<sup>1</sup> While the Sonata for violin and harpsichord obbligato was long held to be an arrangement of the Trio sonata for flute, violin and continuo, recent research has shown that both guises of the work are based independently of each other on a lost original version, and that Bach's transcription of the parts of the trio sonata is not a faithful copy of the original, but an arrangement in its own right.<sup>2</sup> However, in the latter case the arranger seems to have made fewer interventions into the musical substance as in the sonata for violin and harpsichord (in which, among other alterations, the second movement is not only subdivided into two sections that are to be repeated, but also expanded through freely composed inserts). These changes principally concern the adaptation of the original to the different instruments called for in the two upper parts. As can be seen in a number of corrected writing errors, Bach arranged the music during the very process of writing out the part. He also prescribed the violin part for "violino discordato", meaning, in this case, that the  $e^2$  and  $a^1$  strings must be tuned a second lower. Moreover, he also transcribed the flute part from a part which was notated one degree lower in the source, but which must already have been in G major there and not in F. Accordingly, it was notated an octave lower in the alto clef instead of the violin clef, and, judging from its register and tessitura ( $d-e^2$ ), must have been intended for the viola.

One particularly interesting feature of our sonata is that it shares its bass with Bach's *Sonata for violin and continuo in G major* BWV 1021. In Bach research, this has given rise to the theory that the bass is from another hand and that both sonatas are the results of compositional experiments. But while Bach's authorship of the violin sonata is ascertained, a number of theories have arisen regarding the trio sonata: the work is often held to have been written not by Bach but by one of his composition pupils, whereby Bach's son Carl Philipp Emanuel has been repeatedly advanced for several reasons. Such speculations have been nurtured by the fact that Johann Sebastian Bach's copy of the parts of the trio contains no mention of the composer; strictly speaking, the traditional attribution of the work to Bach is based solely on his authorship of the parts. On the other hand, the copy (albeit a late one) of the F major version BWV 1022 unequivocally ascribes the work to Johann Sebastian Bach.

A solution to this dilemma only recently began to take shape after it was established that the flute part must have originally been intended for viola, and the original work thus conceived for violin, viola and continuo. This helped draw attention to a work written for the same scoring listed in the catalogue of the estate of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, which was printed in Hamburg in 1790. Although the key is unfortunately not indicated, the work is listed there as "Trio for



violin, viola and bass written in collaboration with Johann Sebastian Bach". Since trio sonatas with viola are a marked rarity, it is quite possible that this is the work in question. Moreover, the experimental character of the composition – the derivation of the trio structure from a given bass – suggests a didactic purpose and makes the mutual collaboration of father and son seem even more plausible.

The present reconstruction is an attempt to regain that lost original for today's performers. The violin part is notated for a normally tuned instrument; the many double stops which Bach apparently inserted during the adaptation of the part to the "violino discordato" (and which significantly do not recur in the F major version BWV 1022) have been omitted. The flute part is reproduced an octave lower for the viola. A notational peculiarity concerning the barlines has also been omitted: in the violin and continuo parts of the second movement, and in all three parts of the fourth movement, Bach notated double measures which he subdivided in the center with a shorter barline. Here we adopt the more common notation of the measure found in the F major version BWV 1022. In all other matters, our edition does not substantially differ from previous editions of the trio.<sup>3</sup> Cadenza trills were occasionally added, as well as slurs based on the principle of analogy.<sup>4</sup> The thoroughbass realization is intended as a suggestion that can be modified at will according to the artists' tastes and the circumstances of the performance.

Copies of the sources were placed at my disposal by the Johann-Sebastian-Bach-Institut in Göttingen. I wish to extend my most cordial thanks to the owners of the manuscripts.

Göttingen, Summer 2005

Klaus Hofmann

- 1 The manuscript, which was long preserved in the music library of Leipzig's Städtische Bibliotheken under the shelf mark *Ms. 10*, has been in private ownership once again since 2004.
- 2 More information on this and the following in my essay *Zur Echtheit der Triosonate G-Dur BWV 1038* in the *Bach-Jahrbuch* 2004, pp. 65–85 (with reduced facsimile of Bach's copy of the parts).
- 3 In movement 1, m. 7, first quarter note in the violin, the Nuremberg manuscript has the rhythm , no doubt by error (see viola, m. 6). In m. 21, violin, the text of the second to third quarters is heavily corrected and not clearly legible. In the closing measure of movement 3, in the violin, Bach notates, again most likely by mistake, the rhythm  in the first half of the measure. In movement 2, m. 27f. (viola), Bach made recognizably intentional alterations while writing out the flute part, and shortened to an eighth note the note ( $e^1$ ) which enters in m. 27 and is tied over into the next measure. In all four cases we follow the music text of the F major version BWV 1022. For further details please see my edition of the sonatas BWV 1022 and 1038 in Vol. VI/5 of the *Neue Bach-Ausgabe* and the relevant Kritischer Bericht.
- 4 As suggested with the broken-line slurs in the third movement, it is recommendable here to adapt the articulation of the violin to that of the viola at several places, in divergence from the source, and to bind four sixteenth notes respectively instead of two times two.