

# Sonata

J.S. Bach, BWV 1032/1 (completion  
by David Schulenberg)

**Vivace**

The musical score consists of two staves. The top staff is for the Flute, which begins with a short rest followed by a sixteenth-note pattern. The bottom staff is for the Cembalo, featuring a steady eighth-note bass line and sixteenth-note harmonic patterns. The score is in G major (two sharps) and 4/4 time. Measure numbers 1 through 15 are indicated on the left side of the page. Various dynamic markings such as *tr* (trill), *sf* (sforzando), and *mf* (mezzo-forte) are placed throughout the music. Fingerings like 4, 6, 5, 6, 7, 7 6 6, 7 6, 5, and 6 5 are also present.

16

19

22

25

28

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

A musical score for three staves (Treble, Alto, Bass) in 4/4 time, key signature of A major (three sharps). The score consists of five systems of music, each starting with a brace. Measure numbers 46, 49, 52, 55, and 58 are indicated above the staves.

The Treble staff features a melody with eighth-note patterns and sixteenth-note grace notes. The Alto staff provides harmonic support with eighth-note chords. The Bass staff provides harmonic support with eighth-note chords. The music is characterized by its rhythmic complexity and melodic linearity.

A musical score for piano, consisting of five systems of music. The score is written in common time with a key signature of two sharps (F major). The music is divided into measures by vertical bar lines. Measures 61 through 73 are shown, each starting with a brace that spans all three staves.

Measure 61: The treble staff has sixteenth-note patterns. The middle staff has eighth-note patterns. The bass staff has eighth-note patterns.

Measure 64: The treble staff has eighth-note patterns. The middle staff has eighth-note patterns. The bass staff has eighth-note patterns.

Measure 67: The treble staff has eighth-note patterns. The middle staff has eighth-note patterns. The bass staff has eighth-note patterns.

Measure 70: The treble staff has eighth-note patterns. The middle staff has eighth-note patterns. The bass staff has eighth-note patterns.

Measure 73: The treble staff has eighth-note patterns. The middle staff has eighth-note patterns. The bass staff has eighth-note patterns.

76

77

78

79

80

81

82

83

84

85

86

87

88

89

92

## J. S. Bach's Flute Sonata in A Major, BWV 1032: Reconstructing the Fragmentary First Movement

Bach's A-major flute sonata has long been the object of reconstructors seeking to fill the lacuna left when a portion of the first movement was cut away from its sole primary source. A flurry of writings on the subject appeared in the 1980s, probably spurred by the new edition of the work published within the *Neue Bach-Ausgabe*; among these were two articles by Michael Marissen that made it appear that an “authentic reconstruction” of the first movement is within our grasp.<sup>1</sup> By an “authentic” reconstruction Marissen meant one that takes into account all surviving clues as to the nature of the missing music while reducing to a minimum the amount of freshly composed music that must be supplied. As Marissen showed, practically no new music is necessary.

The present score, although slightly emended in 2015, is essentially identical to one that I prepared in 1994 and published online about ten years later. That score incorporated suggestions from Marissen’s articles, although it had originated in an earlier reconstruction first drafted while I was still in college. The present notes offer addenda to Marissen’s discussion and explain how the accompanying score differs from the reconstruction described in his articles.

First, as Marissen established, the sonata must have been a keyboard-obbligato arrangement of an earlier work in trio-sonata scoring. But, as in the case of other arrangements that Bach prepared from now-lost earlier works—including most or all of the harpsichord concertos, and perhaps all of the other obbligato-keyboard sonatas—the extent of Bach’s active revision while making the arrangement is by no means clear, and thus the original version of the work cannot be reconstructed. Hence, even if BWV 1032 originated, as Marissen argued, as a work for recorder, violin, and continuo,<sup>2</sup> many details and perhaps even the large formal outlines of that work may have differed from those of the surviving version.

For example, the autograph shows corrections that strongly suggest that the thirty-seconds in the opening passage were inserted; originally the figures containing passing thirty-second notes consisted of entirely consonant sixteenths.<sup>3</sup> Bach made similar revisions in other works, such as the D-minor prelude from part 2 of the *Well-Tempered Clavier*. The result, although relatively trivial from the point of view of large form, somewhat alters the musical character and might influence decisions about tempo. Bach apparently made these changes at an early point in the

---

1 “A Trio in C Major for Recorder, Violin, and Continuo by J. S. Bach? *Early Music* 13 (1985): 384–90; “A Critical Reappraisal of J. S. Bach’s A-Major Flute Sonata,” *Journal of Musicology* 6 (1988): 367–86.

2 See Marissen, “A Trio Sonata?” Whatever the original scoring, a correction in the autograph (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 612) suggests that Bach was creating the new obbligato-keyboard version as he copied; this would explain a cancelled sharp (a figured bass symbol) in measure 28, visible in published facsimiles and online at [http://www.bachdigital.de/receive/BachDigitalSource\\_source\\_00001680](http://www.bachdigital.de/receive/BachDigitalSource_source_00001680).

3 These and other small corrections are visible in measures 3–4 of the autograph. Among other changes is the substitution of dotted rhythms for equal eighthths in the bass of measures 9–10 and 13–14; this explains some oddities of the chord figures, such as the 6/4/3 on what is now a passing sixteenth in measure 9.

writing of the surviving autograph, then carried out parallel revisions in subsequent appearances of the relevant motives, which show no trace of alteration. There is no evidence of larger revisions—unless these are to be seen in the excision of a portion of the autograph, a possibility denied by Marissen.<sup>4</sup>

Disregarding, then, the possibility that Bach intend to carry out a substantial revision of the work as originally copied out in the surviving autograph, we are on relatively firm ground in reconstructing the extent of the loss. We can, moreover, reconstruct most of the actual missing content as well, especially given a few previously overlooked clues noted in the autograph by Marissen.<sup>5</sup> First, the number of missing measures can be calculated with considerable precision: based on the space taken up by the extant portion—measures 1–62, plus the two final measures of the movement, which remain—approximately 46 measures have been lost. Moreover, the measures on either side of the lacuna consist of transposed restatements of passages that survive elsewhere in the fragment, with the upper parts exchanged.<sup>6</sup> Large portions of other Bach works consist of transposed restatements of previously heard material, often with the counterpoint inverted or the upper parts exchanged, suggesting that the same is true here. Indeed, it appears that the missing material consists of just two segments that restate transposed portions of the existing fragment.

Thus, measure 62, just before the break in the fragment, appears to be the first measure of a sixteen-measure recurring passage, constituting a transposed repetition of the immediately preceding passage. The two passages together would thus form a bilaterally symmetrical block of 32 measures, centered almost exactly on the midpoint of the movement. This block would trace a modulation from B minor (iv of vi) to F-sharp minor (vi), occupying measures 46–78 and leaving just another 31 measures or so to be reconstructed.

The closing measures of the surviving fragment likewise appear to form part of a recurring passage, repeating in transposed form the segment that ends with the cadence in measure 33.<sup>7</sup> It seems hardly a coincidence that the first 31 measures of the movement—transposed, with the upper parts exchanged, and set in front of the two extant final measures—will, together with the 15 measures already reconstructed, produce exactly the required total of 46 lost measures. The only problem, it would appear, is connecting the first reconstructed segment, which ends in B minor, with the second, which, by the preceding logic, should begin with a recapitulation of the opening bars in the subdominant, yielding the following solution:

4 Marissen, “A Critical Reappraisal,” 371–74, argues that the cutting away of a portion of the score was part of an effort to speed the copying of parts for both BWV 1032 and the other work with which it shares the autograph, the Double Concerto BWV 1062.

5 Both articles point out remnants of a few ties and other notational signs belonging to lost passages; these were left when the missing measures were cut away.

6 Measure 62 corresponds with measure 46; the last two measures correspond with measures 32–33.

7 Actually, only the penultimate measure of the fragment corresponds exactly with the earlier passage (that is, measure 32); the first beat of the flute part in the final measure, corresponding to measure 33 earlier in the fragment, had to be altered to avoid the pitch c♯, unplayable on the Baroque flute, and to make for an effective final cadence.

### **Reconstruction of BWV 1032, first movement, through transposed restatements of earlier passages at measures 62 and 78**

keys:	A–E	E–f♯	f♯	b	D–A
measures:	1–35a	35b–45	46–61	62–77	78–110
parallel passage (measures):				46–61*	1–33*

\*upper parts exchanged

Marissen showed, however, that remnants of ties in the manuscript make it unlikely that the flute in the reconstructed measures 78–85 had a transposed restatement of the right-hand part of measures 1–8, as called for in the table above. Rather the evidence of the autograph suggests that these measures restated measures 9–16.<sup>8</sup> In addition, the simple expedient of constructing the entire second half of a movement through the verbatim transposition of previously stated material, all transposed by the same interval (in this case downward by a fifth), is rare in Bach's sonatas and concertos, if it occurs at all.<sup>9</sup> It is particularly unlikely here, where the flute in measures 78–85 would state (together with the bass) a passage which in its first appearance at the beginning of the piece is played by the keyboard. The passage functions like a ritornello in an aria or concerto movement that introduces the initial entry of the soloist (here the flute).

In addition, the problem remains of modulating from B minor to D major at measure 78. One could posit a sudden change of key, the cadence in B minor (on the downbeat) followed at once by the first note of the "ritornello" theme, transposed to a'. Alternatively, measure 78 might consist of a cadence in B minor followed by rests, with the restatement of measures 1–8 (now in the subdominant) beginning in the next full measure. The resemblance to da capo form would have parallels in other Bach works,<sup>10</sup> and the division of the reconstructed fragment into three nearly equal sections would resemble that of a "free" or "modified" da-capo form with a so-called subdominant recapitulation.<sup>11</sup>

### **Ternary form of BWV 1032, first movement, as reconstructed above**

sections:	A	B	A'
keys:	A–E	E–f♯–b	D–A
measures:	1–35a	35b–77	78–110
extent (in measures):	35.5	33.5	33

Yet the result is uncharacteristically bland for a mature work of Bach, thanks to the large portion of the final section—its first fifteen measures—in the subdominant (D major). This solution also leaves the movement without any restatement of the main thematic material in the contrasting

8 See especially "A Critical Reappraisal," 376.

9 The closest parallel might be the E-minor fugue in part 1 of the *Well-Tempered Clavier*.

10 Marissen, "A Critical Reappraisal," 376, mentions several comparable moments in other Bach works at the beginning of a recapitulatory section.

11 E.g., the opening duet "Du wahrer Gott und Davids Sohn" of BWV 23; see my "Modifying the Da Capo? Through-Composed Arias in Vocal Works by Bach and Other Composers," *Eighteenth-Century Music* 8 (2011): 21–51, esp. 37–38.

minor keys of B and F-sharp, apart from several motives developed in the mainly sequential middle section.<sup>12</sup> The present score therefore adopts a less straightforward reconstruction that first restates the flute theme (measures 9–16) in B minor, modifying the end of the phrase to modulate to D major. The phrase is then repeated in the latter key, constituting the beginning of a “subdominant recapitulation,” although a somewhat shorter one than shown above. Moreover, the exchange of parts between the flute and the right hand of the keyboard allows the latter to repeat the ritornello theme in the tonic and in its original form at measure 101. Although the latter constitutes a literal restatement of the very opening of the movement, it actually corresponds with the flute entrance in measure 25, bringing the section (and the entire movement) to a close just nine measures later.

### BWV 1032, first movement, as reconstructed in the present score

keys:	A–E	E–f♯	f♯	b	b–D	D–A
measures:	1–35a	35b–45	46–61	62–77	78–84	85–109
parallel passage (measures):				46–61*	9–16	9–33*

\*upper parts exchanged

There remain some matters of detail to settle. Within the transposed restatements of existing passages, small adjustments are necessary to ensure that each part remains in its proper register.<sup>13</sup> In addition, there is the question, which arises also in other obligato-keyboard sonatas, whether the texture is to be filled in harmonically whenever the keyboard plays alone. When this first happens, in measures 1–9, Bach writes a full chord on the initial downbeat and an inner voice through measure 4. These were presumably additions to the original trio sonata, where the keyboard would have furnished a continuo accompaniment to one of the two melody instruments in this passage.<sup>14</sup> The reconstruction can fill out the harmony of the solo keyboard part when the opening passage is restated verbatim in measures 101–3. But what about the passages reconstructed in measures 85–86 and 89–91, where the keyboard recapitulates phrases originally assigned to flute and figured bass (measures 9–10 and 13–15)? In other obbligato-keyboard works, Bach left such passages to stand in two parts, without adding inner voices. The same is possible here, as the two lines are harmonically self-sufficient, nor is it easy to add a good yet unobtrusive inner voice. One is suggested here nevertheless.

Finally, there is the question of whether this or any reconstruction contributes to what Marissen terms a “critical reappraisal” of the work. This movement seems to resemble what the

---

12 Marissen’s suggestion at this point, to which the present reconstruction is indebted, is to introduce a second bilaterally symmetrical passage, restating measures 9–16 first in B minor, then in F-sharp minor. But to modulate back to the mediant key after previously tonicizing it is atypical of Bach. Moreover, a second cadence to F-sharp minor, posited by Marissen at measure 85, produces a jarring third-relation when it is immediately followed by a passage in D major.

13 Bach himself made such an adjustment in the final note of the right hand in measure 62, which is moved an octave higher than expected in order to avoid passing below c'.

14 The autograph preserves no evidence for the added character of the inner voices in the keyboard part.

eighteenth-century theorist and critic Scheibe called a *Sonate auf Concertenart*—a sonata in the manner of a concerto.<sup>15</sup> Yet despite the resemblance of the opening keyboard solo to a concerto ritornello, the passage never repeats that function within the extant fragment, which in other respects does not particularly resemble a concerto movement. Although the flute enters with a contrasting lyrical theme—as the soloist does in some concertos—nothing that follows approaches very closely to the virtuoso style of a solo concerto. The present reconstruction, therefore, confirms my own view, presented elsewhere, that works such as this are not in fact particularly close to a concerto allegro, even if a younger contemporary of Bach might have described it as being in “concerto style.”<sup>16</sup>

---

15 “A Critical Reappraisal,” 379ff.

16 An expression for such a piece with a stronger historical basis might be “sonata with two themes”; see my “The *Sonate auf Concertenart*: A Postmodern Invention?,” in *Bach Perspectives, Volume 7* (Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2008), 55–96, esp. 87.