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Johann Sebastian Bach’s Partita in A Minor for Unaccompanied Flute BWV 1013 is among his most frequently performed pieces for the instrument, yet its unique source still raises important questions. Although the correct attribution now appears to be settled, the scribe who copied the bulk of the source has not been identified, nor has the date or place of copying, and there remain significant questions about textual matters and performance style.¹ In the absence of concordances, those questions can be considered only through analysis and comparison with other works. This study, carried out in conjunction with the author’s commercial recording of Bach’s flute music, reexamines the work’s provenance, genre, style, and instrumentation. Textual considerations will focus on problems of the musical text in the first and third movements in particular. The article also examines Bach’s early writing for the flute in the context of contemporaneous compositions by other composers, especially those performed at Dresden and Cöthen. A close comparison with those works shows that in composing BWV 1013, Bach was both aware, and at the forefront, of the latest trends in music and dance.

A version of this essay was presented at the Bach Colloquium at Harvard University in April 2019. It contains research in progress toward a monograph on Bach’s flute music. I thus do not seek to address every aspect of the work, nor is it possible here to acknowledge all previous literature about its origin, genesis, or chronology. A recording of BWV 1013, performed by the present author, demonstrates the textual and performance practice findings described here. Mary Oleskiewicz, Bach: Complete Sonatas and Partita for Flute, forthcoming on the Etcetera label. I would like to thank the following people for help in locating various items used in the preparation of this article: Simon Berry, Rob Bethel, Timothy Burris, Paul Cary, Christina Fuhrmann, Andrew Talle, Nancy Toff, and Martin Wagner.

Overview

In its sole surviving manuscript source, BWV 1013 is transmitted as a “Solo” (and not as the commonly used “Partita”) for unaccompanied transverse flute. The first edition, by the Gewandhaus flutist Maximilian Schwedler (Edition Peters, 1917), entitled the work “Sonata” and included an editorial keyboard accompaniment by the Thomaskantor Gustav Schreck. Schwedler’s flute part is heavily edited for a modern instrument, and it contains wrong notes. Two subsequent editions based on that of Schwedler also entitled the work “Sonata.” The title “Partita” first appeared in Hans-Peter Schmitz’s 1963 edition for the Neue Bach-Ausgabe and has been in widespread use ever since.

The work comprises four dance movements for flute alone in A minor:
1. Allemande (C); ambitus: d₁–a³; 46 mm. excluding repeats
2. Corrente (C); ambitus: d₁–d#²; 62 mm. excluding repeats
3. Sarabande (C); ambitus: d₁–d³; 46 mm. excluding repeats
4. Bourrée Anglaise (C); ambitus: d₁–d³; 70 mm. excluding repeats

It survives in a single manuscript prepared by two copyists. The first of these scribes, formerly called Anonymous 5, is now generally believed to be Bernhard Christian Kayser, a pupil of Bach; the second has not been identified. Kayser, a practiced scribe who copied numerous works by the composer beginning in the 1720s, copied the French

---

Footnotes:
2 These two subsequent editions, based on the one by Schwedler, were produced by René le Roy (Paris: Durand et Cie, 1932) and Marcel Moyse (Paris: Alphonse Leduc, 1939). See also Johann Sebastian Bach: Neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Werke, Kritischer Bericht for series VI, vol. 3, Kammermusik 3: Werke für Flöte, ed. Hans-Peter Schmitz (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1964), esp. 7–9. As noted by Schmitz, the original manuscript, from the Nachlass of the Thomaskantor Wilhelm Rust, was discovered by the organist Karl Straube and acquired by the Berlin Staatsbibliothek in 1917.
3 Schmitz had previously included an edition of BWV 1013 in his Flötencode (School of Flute-Playing), vol. 2 (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1955), where the title follows the heading in the source: “Solo pour la Flute Traversière par J. S. Bach.” In the commentary to this edition Schmitz describes the work as a “Suite”; an English translation of the commentary renders this as “partita.”
title, *Solo pour la Flute Traversiere par J. S. Bach*, and also the first five systems of the Allemande. The second copyist, of decidedly lesser skill, completed this movement and the remainder of the work.

Because the Solo has few precedents, many of its features are difficult to evaluate. It was likely composed at Cöthen between about 1718 and 1722—at a time when there was still a paucity of works specifically composed for the transverse flute. It was, moreover, possibly Bach’s first composition to include the instrument. The only other contender is the Brandenburg Concerto No. 5, with its comparatively simple technical demands for the flutist; there are also undemanding flute parts in the secular cantatas *Durchlauchtster Leopold* BWV 173a (1722) and (presumably) the lost cantata BWV 184a (probably 1720 or 1721).

Modern literature about BWV 1013 has not previously included a broad contextual investigation into Bach’s other compositions, contemporary works by other composers, and surviving period instruments, which has often led to doubtful conclusions. Some of the basic questions that have been addressed include the work’s original instrumentation and technical suitability for flute, as well as whether it originated as an unaccompanied piece or in a lost version that included a bass line. Michael Schneider, for example, notes that the title “Solo” was more common for a work with continuo during the period than one carrying the qualifier “sans accompagnement” or “senza basso.”

---

5 The upper half of the title text was cut off when the page was trimmed. Robert Marshall has speculated that the use of a French title may indicate the work was composed for the Dresden flutist Pierre-Gabriel Buffardin. “J. S. Bach’s Compositions for Solo Flute: A Reconsideration of Their Authenticity and Chronology,” *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 32 (1979): 478.

6 Bach-Digital.de dates the manuscript source to “after 1725 (around 1731?)” without further reference. This dating coincides with that proposed by Yoshitake Kobayashi, “Nochmal zu J. S. Bachs ‘Solo pour la flûte traversière,’” *Tibia* 16 (1991): 379–82, based on a study of Kayser’s handwriting. On p. 382, Kobayashi concludes, on the basis of the source situation, that the composition is not necessarily from the Cöthen period, but he does not rule it out.


8 Jesper Christensen and Michael Schneider, “Fresh View on Bach,” *Tibia* 42 (2017): 581–90, esp. 581. The convolute that transmits BWV 1013 also contains earlier copies (ca. 1720) by a different scribe of the six unaccompanied sonatas and partitas for violin, BWV 1001 to 1006, where all but one bear the qualifier *senza Basso*. This designation is also appended to Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach’s only
A more extreme position was taken by Schmitz, who convinced himself of the work’s unsuitability to the flute; he believed it must have originated as a work for keyboard or stringed instrument. Although most flutists would agree today that the work is for flute, a leading database of Bach scholarship still promotes Schmitz’s view.

This study argues that not only is BWV 1013 idiomatic to the early eighteenth-century flute, but in view of its combination of polyphonic textures, wide leaps, and exploitation of the full range of the instrument, Bach must have set out to create a cutting-edge, contemporary piece of music. Bach’s work thus purposefully avoids the older, vocally inspired French flute style in favor of more current French taste. His motivation for composing a fashionable chamber work for flute at this point in time can be best understood within current trends in the German musical landscape.

unaccompanied work for flute, also in A minor, the Sonata per il Flauto Traverso solo senza Basso Wq 132. Marcello Castellani notes that composers such as [Joseph Bodin de] Boismortier and Giuseppe Tartini expressly composed works that could be played with or without bass. J. S. Bach ‘Solo pour la flute traversière’: Köthen oder Leipzig,” Tibia 14 (1989): 572.

9 Hans-Peter Schmitz, “Marginalien zur Bachischen Flötenspielkunst,” in Musa, Mens, Musici. Im Gedenken an Walther Vetter, ed. Heinz Wegener (Leipzig: VEB Deutscher Verlag für Musik, 1969), 169. In the article cited, Schmitz writes that it “kann als sicher gelten, daß ihr die Primogenitur nicht zusteht, muß ihr doch, die in keiner Weise als flötengerecht anzusprechen ist, höchstwahrscheinlich eine uns nicht bekannt und vermutlich für ein Streich- oder Tasteninstrument bestimmte Vorlage zu gründe liegen.” (‘It can be regarded as certain that this is not the original version, since it is in no way suitable for the flute, and is therefore most likely based on an unknown work for a string or keyboard instrument.’) All translations are mine. There is no evidence or documentary basis given for the statement, however.

10 Bach-Digital.de states: “Presumably it is an arrangement of a partita for a different instrument,” citing Schmitz, “Marginalien zur Bachischen Flötenspielkunst.” The comment refers to Schmitz, 169.

11 Castellani, “J. S. Bach’s ‘Solo pour la flute traversière,’” 573, accepts that BWV 1013 is for flute, but rejects the established scholarly source-critical data on chronology presented by Marshall and Wolff in order to suggest a later, Leipzig-period dating (1724) so as to make the work conform easily to an already well-established musical style. Undermining his own argument, however, Castellani notes (p. 569) that the violinization of flute technique had begun already by 1710. Also problematic is Castellani’s conflation of the flute writing and compositional style of BWV 1013 with the quick movements of the Sonata in E Minor for Flute and Continuo BWV 1034, composed by the mid-1720s. Those movements, in the style of the Italianate Sonate auf Concertenart, are unrelated to the body of French-oriented repertory discussed here.
Bach may have first encountered flutists in Weimar as a member of the Ducal Hofkapelle and Chamber Music. Although we do not know who might have played them, transverse flutes were included in a list of court instruments repaired in 1715–1716.\(^\text{12}\) When Bach left Weimar to take up the position of Capellmeister in Cöthen in 1717, his new colleagues included two flutists: Johann Gottlieb Würdig and Johann Heinrich Freytag, the latter also a composer for his instrument.\(^\text{13}\) In the same year, Bach visited the Saxon capital city of Dresden, where there was a growing emphasis on the transverse flute. By 1709 transverse flutists from the Low Countries and France had been installed in the Saxon court orchestra to play in the French theater, yet some still doubled on other instruments.\(^\text{14}\) Four years later, however, the court sought to engage the French flutist Pierre-Gabriel Buffardin who, in 1715, arrived in Dresden as its first dedicated, and highly paid, principal flutist. In 1718, just a year after Bach’s visit to the city, Johann Joachim Quantz notes that switching from oboe to flute at that court presented a significant career opportunity.\(^\text{15}\)

Quantz, who would later recall the dearth of good flute music at the time, reported that flutists in Germany had to arrange music composed for other instruments, including the violin, as best they could, and we will look at one such work below.\(^\text{16}\) His statement might at first appear to support the idea that an ambitious flutist could have arranged BWV 1013 from a violin work. But an examination of the broader historical context shows that, in their attempt to


\(^\text{15}\) Oleskiewicz, “The Flute at Dresden,” esp. 156–57.

fill the void, Bach, Quantz, and other composers in their environs contributed to what has been best described as a conscious “violinization” of flute music: that is, they created a new body of repertory for flute—in contrast to the tender airs, brunettes, and lyrical suites by Jacques Hotteterre, Michel de La Barre, and others at the turn of the eighteenth century—that reinvented flute playing and composition by modeling it on popular Italianate violin music. This trend involved an expanded tonal range extending to more remote key areas, as well as polyphonically inspired passage-work and exploitation of the flute’s second and third octaves. At Dresden, in particular, it led to the creation of numerous Italianate concertos, quartets, and trio sonatas that placed the flute in imitative dialogue with the violin and viola; these genres were cultivated enthusiastically from the 1720s by Quantz, presumably with the encouragement of his mentor and colleague—also a friend of Bach’s—the court concertmaster Johann Georg Pisendel.

The Allemande: A French Prelude?

Range and the Eighteenth-Century Flute

The Allemande of BWV 1013, a binary form comprising 46 measures (excluding repeats), is among the most technically and stylistically formidable pieces in the eighteenth-century flute repertory. It subverts expectations already from the start, since it does not begin with the usual sixteenth- or eighth-note anacrusis, but rather an entire four-beat measure with an initial sixteenth-note rest. The Allemande’s long sequences of sixteenth notes have, more than anything else, raised doubts about the work’s origin as a flute piece, due in particular to the complete lack of rests (i.e., places to breathe) and the movement’s final, dramatic ascent to the highest note of the eighteenth-century instrument (ex. 1). Although this note can be

17 Jean-Marie Leclair’s Premier Livre de Sonates A Violon Seul avec la Basse Continue (Paris: Boivin, 1723) already included two sonatas explicitly labeled as also playable on the flute (Nos. 2 and 6).
18 The Sonata in E Major for Flute and Basso Continuo BWV 1035 could also be counted in this category; however, many of its technical challenges are instead due to its tonality, rather than breathing or range.
19 The subject of the keyboard fugue from the Fantasia and Fugue in A Minor BWV 944, composed by 1715, concludes with a tonic arpeggiation (m. 6) that is almost identical to (but an octave lower than) the final measure of the flute Allemande. Of two other works brought into connection with BWV 1013 by Schmitz
resistant on many eighteenth-century flutes, in fact it speaks quite easily on the few surviving original, early three-piece French flutes—the type of instrument that Bach’s flutists most likely would have known and played in Germany at the time he composed it. Bach, however, avoids the one note that is problematic on virtually all early eighteenth-century flutes: F⁻³. The availability of a greater variety of historically informed copies of early eighteenth-century flutes in recent years has shown that breathing and melodic range in this work are non-issues for a professional performer with a period-appropriate flute and an approach to phrasing and performance practice that incorporates elegant places for repose and time for breath, just as a singer would take time and create space to demarcate phrases. Players of both modern and historical stringed instruments have

Ex. 1: Final cadence, Allemande, Solo pour la Flute Traversiere par J. S. Bach BWV 1013, from Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 968, fascicle 2, mm. 45–46

20 Based on practical field research in numerous private and public collections.

21 Many early eighteenth-century flutes have a reasonably fine F⁻³, g⁻⁵, and a⁻³, and these notes are occasionally found in music of the 1720s and 1730s by flutist-composers including Quantz, Braun, and Blockwitz. The one note that is problematic on most one- or two-keyed flutes is F⁻³. However, the latter note is required by Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach’s unaccompanied Sonata per il Flauto Traverso senza Basso Wq 132 of 1747.

22 On rhetoric in performance and what has been more recently referred to as the “eloquent style,” see Bruce Haynes, The End of Early Music: A Period Performer’s History of Music (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), esp. 165ff.
traditionally taken considerable liberty in the timing and space between phrases in Bach’s other unaccompanied works, and there is no reason to think BWV 1013 should be an exception.

Genre and Textual Considerations

A closer examination of the allemande as a movement type may begin with Johann Gottfried Walther’s *Musicalisches Lexicon* (1732), which describes this type of movement as being “grave and ceremoniously composed and executed, in \( \frac{4}{4} \) meter, [with] two repeated sections of almost the same length, and having at the beginning of both sections an anacrusis of an eighth or sixteenth note, or even three sixteenths.” Johann Mattheson concurs with this *Affekt*, and adds, moreover, that it must be composed “harmoniously, in an arpeggiated style that conveys the image of a contented or pleased mind, sustained by good order and calm.”

Although Bach’s flute Allemande fits Mattheson’s definition in virtually all of these regards, it falls short of Walther’s in having no anacrusis. We can compare its motion in perpetual arpeggiated sixteenths to that of other allemandes by Bach, as in the French Suite No. 4 in E-flat Major BWV 815. Like Bach’s other allemandes, however, the latter features an anacrusis that accords with one of the three types described by Walther. Walther and Mattheson may be describing a type of allemande written mainly for harpsichord. The earliest published eighteenth-century allemandes for flute, such as those by de La Barre (1710) and Jacques-Christophe Naudot (1723) with basso continuo, are of a different type from those described here: some begin with an initial sixteenth-note anacrusis, whereas others begin directly on the downbeat, and they generally avoid arpeggiation.

---

23 Johann Gottfried Walther, “Allemanda,” *Musicalisches Lexicon* (Leipzig, 1732), 27–28, esp. 28: “ernsthaft und gravita¨tisch gesetzet aus gleicher Art executirt werden muß, hat einen vier=viertel Takt, zwei Repetitiones von fast gleicher Lange, und hebt so wol im ersten als zweyten Theile mit einer kurzen Note, nemlich einem Achtel oder Sechzehntheile, bisweilen auch mit 3 Sechzehnhtheilen im Aufschlagen an.” Walther goes on to indicate that the allemande is danced the best by Germans, suggesting it is still a contemporary type of dance; Johann Mattheson, *Der vollkommene Kapellmeister* (Hamburg, 1739), 232, §128, describes it as: “eine gebrochene, ernsthafter und wol ausgearbeitete Harmonie, welche das Bild eines zufriedenen oder vernu ¨gten Gemuths trägt, das sich an guter Ordnung und Ruhe ergezet.”

Bach’s English Suites for keyboard (composed ca. 1715) each begin with a prelude before the allemande. His French Suites (ca. 1722 to 1725), however, begin directly with an allemande. The first two violin partitas also begin with an allemande. But the third (BWV 1006) begins with a Preludio that is in fact much more similar to the first movement of BWV 1013 than to Bach’s other allemandes. Composed by ca. 1720, it bears an uncanny resemblance to the flute Allemande. Although it is in $\frac{3}{8}$, it also begins with a rest and an arpeggiated tonic triad that is immediately repeated (the violin work adds an ornamental turn on beat 1); both also continue with a passage of arpeggiated Fortspinnung that is repeated immediately (exx. 2a–b). Throughout both movements various motifs are often heard twice in succession: in the Allemande, the pattern in m. 2 is repeated verbatim in m. 3, whereas in the Preludio mm. 3–4 are repeated in mm. 5–6. Both movements also feature similar chromatic sequences that are preceded by this kind of motivic repetition (exx. 2c–d): in the Allemande, m. 21 is repeated in m. 22 (with octave displacement of the last three notes), followed by a descending chromatic sequence in mm. 23–24; m. 90 of the Preludio, with motives heard twice in succession on beats 2–3, is also repeated twice in an ascending sequence in mm. 91–92. A descending chromatic sequence follows in mm. 94–96.

Indeed, Bach’s Cöthen-period preludes may have been on his mind as he composed the first movement of BWV 1013. Several of the keyboard preludes from the Clavier-Büchlein vor Wilhelm Friedemann Bach, begun in 1720, start like the Allemande, with a sixteenth rest on the first beat followed by similarly arpeggiated passage-work. The preludes of Bach’s English Suites Nos. 2 and 4 also both begin with a full measure minus a short initial rest, and No. 2 is similar in both its motivic economy and arpeggiated Fortspinnung in persistent sixteenths.

In the flute suites of Bach’s contemporaries, as in some of his French Suites, allemandes sometimes take the position and style of an

---

25 Bach’s Violin Partitas and Sonatas BWV 1001–1006 were compiled by 1720. The autograph manuscript entitles them “Sei Solo, à Violino senza Basso accompagnato.”

26 The Præambulum in F Major BWV 927, the Prelude in F Major BWV 928, and the Prelude in E Minor BWV 932 (the last of these was copied somewhat later by Wilhelm Friedemann Bach, around 1726).
Ex. 2a: J. S. Bach, Allemande, *Solo pour la Flute Traversiere par J. S. Bach* BWV 1013, mm. 1–6

Ex. 2b: J. S. Bach, Preludio, Violin Partita No. 3 in E Major BWV 1006, from Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 967 (autograph), mm. 1–6

Ex. 2c: J. S. Bach, Allemande, *Solo pour la Flute Traversiere par J. S. Bach* BWV 1013, mm. 21–24

Ex. 2d: J. S. Bach, Preludio, Violin Partita No. 3 in E Major BWV 1006, mm. 90–96
opening prelude. The improvisatory quality of Bach’s Allemande in BWV 1013, with its great length, coupled with the extreme motivic economy and emphasis on Fortspinnung, seems to blend the genres of dance and keyboard prelude. But before the meter of the Allemande of BWV 1013 is established in performance, the presence of a sixteenth-note rest on the first downbeat initially creates the illusion of the three-note anacrusis; indeed, flute players today normally interpret the first measure as a long anacrusis to the second measure of the piece, where the first strong accent is given. An allemande with a three-note anacrusis opens the French Suite No. 3 in B Minor BWV 814, of ca. 1722; interestingly, David Schulenberg describes the latter as “the most delicate of the allemandes in the French Suites” and supposes that “one could imagine it as scored for flute and continuo.” His next statement about the movement sounds almost as if he is describing the first movement of BWV 1013:

Virtually every beat contains a statement of the opening motive, which consists of an upbeat of three sixteenths moving to an accented note . . . throughout the movement gestures end on the beat. Even when the accented note is a mere sixteenth, it can be lengthened ever so slightly and separated by a small articulation from the following gesture. This is fussy by later standards of phrasing and gesture, but it is appropriate in a movement that comes particularly close to the “speaking” quality of the music of Bach’s French contemporaries. If we look at suites composed by flutists such as Johann Martin Blockwitz and Jean-Daniel Braun, it becomes clear that neither Bach’s Allemande nor his Corrente made unusual or unreasonable demands on the flute. Blockwitz, an early German player of the three-piece French-style transverse flute, was already an established member of the Dresden Hofkapelle and colleague of Buffardin’s when Quantz arrived at court in 1718. Blockwitz left numerous, mostly

27 As in the allemandes that begin the third and fifth suites of Hotteterre’s *Première Livre De Pieces Pour la Flûte-traversiere, et autres Instruments, Avec la Basse*, 2nd ed. (Paris: Foucault, 1715).


29 Dresden court personnel documents list Blockwitz as “Hautbois” from 1711, and from 1720 as a player of “Flute Allemande”; he continues to be named as a transverse flutist “next to Buffardin” until 1742. See Mary Oleskiewicz, “Quantz and the Flute at Dresden: His Instruments, His Repertory, and Their Significance for the *Versuch* and the Bach Circle,” PhD diss., Duke University (1998), 61, 68.
unpublished, compositions for the transverse flute. An unaccompanied Suite in E Minor appeared (without attribution) in Paris via Braun, in his collection of 1740. 30 Braun’s collection had a lengthy note attached to the title page, indicating that the unaccompanied pieces, composed by himself and “diverse others,” were assembled “expressly for forming the embouchure and accustoming the hand to difficulties.” I have been able to attribute this Allemanda securely to Blockwitz based on its appearance in two pedagogical manuscripts by Quantz (who valued the work for presumably the same reason). 31

Blockwitz’s and Braun’s works provide clear examples of the new style of “violinistic” music for flute. Their allemandes and correntes, although different from Bach’s in certain ways, make comparable technical demands on the flutist. The allemandes are shorter and somewhat more varied motivically, but they fulfill both Walther’s and Mattheson’s criteria by featuring (1) three sixteenths as an anacrusis; (2) arpeggiated, harmonically oriented melodies; and (3) two halves of roughly equal length. The leaping style of melody and overall character of these works suggest the possibility that Bach may have become aware of such contemporary allemandes for the flute in Dresden. Although we cannot securely date Blockwitz’s works, the Allemanda in E Minor (exx. 3a–c) shares a number of features with

---

30 Braun also notes that the pieces may be played on the bassoon, and it is likely that Braun himself played both instruments. Sonate de Mr. Braun a’ flûte traversiére et basse. | Suivie de differentes piecé sans basse, composé espress pour former l’embouchure et accoutumer la main aux dificultez, tant du méme auteur que de divers autres. Ces méme piecé peuvent se jouer également sur le basson en suivant la clef de basse mise au commencement de chaque air (Paris: Boivin and LeClerc, 1740). The practice of doubling on transverse flute and bassoon was not unusual: the French virtuoso Michel Blavet played both, as did the Dresden court musician Jean Cadet, employed from 1714 to 1733. Oleskiewicz, “Quantz and the Flute at Dresden,” 61–62.

31 One of these sources, the manuscript known as Quantz’s Solfeggi, excerpts the Allemanda twice, both times with composer attribution, on pp. 33 (m. 6) and 51 (mm. 0–1a; 25b–26a). Solfeggi. | Pour la Flute Traversiere | avec l’enseignement. | Par Monsieur Quantz, Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibliotek, mu 6210.2528. Several other works by Blockwitz in Braun’s edition can also be attributed on the basis of Quantz’s Solfeggi. The full movement also appears (without attribution) in the manuscript collection Fantasier og Preludier. 8. Capricier (Copenhagen, Det Kongelige Bibliotek, mu 6310.0860, [pp 50–51]), which is attributed on the title page to Quantz; although many of the works it contains are by Quantz himself, it also includes additional works by Blockwitz, as well as Braun and Blavet.
the Allemande of BWV 1013: a long opening motif consisting of an arpeggiated tonic chord (ex. 3a, mm. 0–1); chromatic inner lines (as in the descending chromatic fourth of mm. 2–3); as in the first movements of both BWV 1013 and the Violin Partita No. 3 in E Major BWV 1006, sequences comprising twice-repeated motives (ex. 3b, mm. 19–24); and long chromatic sequences (ex. 3c, mm. 25–28). It is, however, considerably shorter than Bach’s Allemande and conveniently places rests at phrase junctures. Interestingly, in his Solfèges, Quantz excerpts Blockwitz’s Allemanda for the purpose of demonstrating the use of varied articulation syllables and—particularly significant for performance style—the instruction to apply subtle French notes inégaux (rhythmic inequality) to the sixteenth notes (figs. 1a–b). The use of inequality facilitates the “speaking style” of performance described above with regard to the Allemande from French Suite No. 3 in B Minor BWV 814, particularly in works with consistent sixteenth-note rhythms. An Allemanda in E Minor by Braun (exx. 4a–b) would also have been played in this manner. It shares the preceding works’ arpeggiated tonic opening, large leaps, and sequences of twice-repeated motives.

---

Exx. 3a–c: J. M. Blockwitz, Allemanda in E Minor for unaccompanied flute (or bassoon), from J. D. Braun’s edition (1740): (a) mm. 1–4; (b) mm. 19–24; and (c) mm. 25–28

---

32 In moderate and slow tempos, Quantz distinguished between “principal” and “passing” notes in the quickest notes of a piece, in which the first and third notes of a group of four equally notated pitches are slightly lengthened and emphasized and the second and fourth are shortened and unaccented. See his Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversiere zu spielen (Berlin, 1752), chap. XI, §12.
A Long-standing Textual Problem

The first scribe copied the first half of Bach’s flute Allemande, including the second ending, before breaking off his work (figs. 2a–b). At the sixth system, m. 20, the new, less practiced scribe had to begin by copying the next statement of the main motive (a transposition of measure 1 to E minor). But he erred after only one measure, repeating the music of beat 2 on beat 3. At some point someone (presumably the same scribe) noticed the mistake and attempted to correct it by writing over the wrong notes with larger note heads and darker ink. However, in making the correction he erred again, on beat 3. For note 8 of the main motive (the ninth note of the measure), he copied f♯ (instead of e♯). Two stray marks on the same space, somewhat in front of the f♯ note head, have been long assumed to be a sharp sign. It has also been presumed that the apparent accidental was part of the correction layer, but it appears in lighter ink and might have originated before the attempted correction.

The Allemande’s opening motive appears many times before and after m. 20, in various transpositions, but never in any guise
that reproduces the odd note (with or without the supposed accidental). In 1992, Winfried Michel observed that the so-called sharp is in fact not an accidental but a “Fleck” (spot/mark) which, when compared systematically with the remainder of the manuscript, looks nothing like the scribe’s other sharp signs.³³ Further, as Michel convincingly argued, no possible implied harmonization of the passage makes sense of an f₃ in the realm of eighteenth-century counterpoint and voice leading. Yet for most of the work’s modern history the odd note has not been questioned, and players have simply accustomed themselves to the mistake. Even Schmitz, the editor of BWV 1013 for the Neue Bach-Ausgabe, reproduced the error, which has recurred in virtually all subsequent editions and recordings.

Players have become so attached to the wrong note that the most recently published affirmation of Michel’s argument against the f₃ (by Jesper Christensen) was met with an emotional diatribe by the recorder player Hans Maria Kneihs, who argued for the f₃’s necessity. Kneihs’s main point seems to be that Bach would not

³³ It has not yet been possible to reexamine the manuscript in person to rule out that this so-called sharp is not bleed-through from the reverse side of the page. See Winfried Michel, “Ein Ton: Das fis im zwanzigstem Takt von Bachs Flötenpartita,” in Travers & controvers: Festschrift Nikolaus Delius, ed. Mirjam Nastasi (Celle: Hermann Moeck, 1992), 72–73.
have written counterpoint that returns to e¹ three times in a row (cf. mm. 20–21).  

34 Kneihs asserts, without providing an eighteenth-century contrapuntal or harmonic basis, that the f♯ is intended as a change of bass motion; “Und es ist doch ein fis,” Tibia 43 (2018): 123–28, esp. 127. Referring to m. 20 of the Allemande, he writes: “DREIMAL DAS TIEFE E. Man spiele das einmal vor. Was für eine stupide Akkordzerlegung… DAS SOLL EIN KONTRAPUNKTIKER WIE BACH GESCHRIEBEN HABEN? NIEMALS! Es muss die fis als Nebennot
based on rhetorical phrasing, together with the “speaking” style of execution mentioned earlier, renders the latter concern moot.\(^{35}\)

**Corrente**

Bach’s Corrente, the second movement of BWV 1013 (ex. 5), is a sizeable 62-measure binary form with repeats, in \(\frac{3}{4}\) time, that spans two full pages of the manuscript. It begins with an eighth-note anacrusis and ascending scale, followed by wide leaps of tenths and elevenths to create the effect of melody and bass lines. The remainder of the movement continues in similar fashion, with leaps of up to an eleventh and continuous scales and arpeggiated passages; in m. 26, Bach even writes a leap of a fourteenth. There is not a single rest in the entire movement.

Inasmuch as the flute must produce the effect of both melody and bass with wide leaps between the highest and lowest registers of the instrument, the Corrente is similar not only to Bach’s suites for cello and for violin, but—more to the point—to what his contemporaries were composing for the flute. Among other well-known examples of polyphonic solo flute works with persistent, leaping passage-work are Georg Philipp Telemann’s 12 Fantasies for Solo Flute TWV 40:2–13, which make use of intervals up to a thirteenth. Though the Fantasies, published in 1732–1733, were composed somewhat later than BWV 1013, they nevertheless reflected an ongoing trend among composers who were interested in exploiting the full technical possibilities and range of the flute. Telemann’s Fantasies were prized by contemporaries such as Quantz for the

\(^{35}\) As I aim to demonstrate in my forthcoming recording, *Bach: Complete Sonatas and Partita for Flute.*
flexibility of embouchure and skill in articulation that they demanded of the flutist.  

If we compare Bach’s work to correntes for flute by Blockwitz, Braun, and others, we also find binary forms with repeats and 3\4 time. Braun’s Corrente, from the Sonata in E Minor for Flute and Basso Continuo, spans 98 measures. Despite the basso continuo accompaniment, the flute part differs little from comparable works for solo flute. Its eighth-note anacrusis and opening motif (eighth note, dotted quarter note, eighth note, eighth note, eighth note) are overall closer in style to examples by Corelli, in particular the arched motifs of sequential, arpeggiated passage-work (ex. 6a). Braun’s writing, like Bach’s, is highly polyphonic, with large leaps of up to a twelfth between “melody” and “bass.” In Braun’s second section, the extent of this writing becomes extreme in terms of its technical virtuosity (ex. 6b). The arpeggiated final cadence on the tonic (ex. 6c) is, incidentally, reminiscent of the final rising tonic ascent on A minor in Bach’s flute Allemande. Braun’s Corrente, with its utter lack of

36 Quantz challenged his former student Joachim von Moldenit, who claimed to have invented a superior method of articulation, to perform these pieces with him in a public flute duel. See Marpurg, Historisch-kritische Beyträge 3 (1757–1758): 546.
rests, surpasses Bach’s Corrente in length, technical difficulty, and perhaps also the stamina required of the player. The unaccompanied Corrente from Blockwitz’s Suite in E Minor, which was discussed above in regard to the Allemanda, spans 56 measures. It begins similarly to Braun’s, with a single eighth-note anacrusis followed by a dotted quarter note; its sequences of running eighths are regularly interspersed with leaps of sevenths, ninths, and tenths, to create a polyphonic effect of melody and bass.

Arrangements for solo flute by Quantz and Braun have similar technically demanding characteristics. A challenging “Courante” in E minor (ex. 7) was included in both of their pedagogical collections and circulated widely: a copy of it survives in the hand of the Dresden concertmaster Pisse nel (presumably for violin), and several copies with varying readings transmit the movement transposed to D minor as part of a lute sonata by Sylvius Leopold Weiss.

Ex. 7: “Courente” in E Minor, as arranged by Quantz (?) for solo flute, from Quantz’s Fantasier og Preludier, mm. 1–18

37 The movement appeared as an anonymous work in Braun (1740, p. 22, where it is labeled “Bizaria” in 3) and in Quantz’s Fantasier og Preludier in 3 (pp. 43–44) as “Courante”; the work bears no similarity to original works by Quantz but is closer in style to other works by Blockwitz found in both collections. The movement is also found in Weiss’s Lute Sonata No. 11 in D Minor, which survives in five sources, including Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Mus. 2841-V-1,1; London, British Library, Add. Ms. 30387; Warsaw, Biblioteka Uniwersytecka, RM 4136 (olim Ms. Mf 2003/f.69v; in 3); RM 4137 (olim Ms. Mf 2004/f.1v; in 3); and RM 4138 (olim Ms. Mf. 2005/p. 36; in 3). The transcription in E minor by Pisendel (Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Mus. 4155-O-1) has no movement label and follows the Braun version more closely than Quantz’s, including the use of French 3 meter; it has an error not found in other sources in m. 40 (notes 2–3 read d² and e³). The Warsaw sources all label the movement as a “Courante.” Those I was able to inspect (RM 4136 and RM 4138) transmit it as a work for 13-course lute; both
Pisendel and Weiss were close colleagues of Blockwitz and Quantz at the Dresden court, where the movement evidently originated. The piece is as fiendishly difficult on lute and violin as it is on the flute, and the source situation does not make it easily apparent which (if any) of these versions came first. At 85 measures, it is longer than Bach’s Corrente and begins with an anacrusis of three eighth notes. Like Bach’s movement, it immediately establishes the polyphonic effect with large leaps of tenths and elevenths, but the leaps are much more pervasive, as in the Fantasies by Telemann. Braun’s version, which has no rests, is close to the ones for violin and lute. Quantz’s arrangement, which follows a series of “beginner pieces,” introduces slurs, a single rest in m. 18 where there previously was none, French tierces coulées, and several additional cadential points that would help an inexperienced flutist shape the phrases and know where to breathe. Several of the leaping passages are also excerpted in Quantz’s Solfége, further indication of the movement’s difficulty. Although less elegant on flute than Bach’s Corrente (though by no means easy, Bach’s work is more idiomatic to the instrument in certain respects), the arrangements nevertheless require technical agility and stamina. Quantz’s and Braun’s collections contained many unaccompanied works, including additional correntes, allemandas, capriccios, and miscellaneous movement types with extreme technical demands, and others of these may also be arrangements. Yet these were likely no more challenging for flutists of the time than Vivaldi’s newfangled, technically innovative concertos might have seemed to contemporary violinists when they first appeared in print. In short, the preponderance of evidence sources have an error of two extraneous measures. I would like to thank Timothy Burris for his generous help in comparing details of the lute tablatures of the Dresden, London, and Warsaw sources with the flute versions. I am also grateful to Tim Crawford for bringing Pisendel’s copy to my attention.

Tim Crawford questions whether the Courante is an original composition of Weiss, and suggests it might have originated as a work for violin. The copying error in Pisendel’s copy, however, suggests he was not the author. Both Crawford and Burris agree on the movement’s great difficulty when played on the lute (I thank both scholars for their friendly communications on these points). A conclusive judgment about the Courante’s origin must await a more in-depth study.

Quantz’s arrangement also has one wrong note (d♯ instead of c♯) on the fifth note of m. 52.

Quantz, Solfége, Pour la Flute Transverse, 50: mm. 3–4, 9, and 33–34a.
suggests that there is little reason to think that either Bach’s Allemande or his Corrente was unidiomatic or out of step with contemporary flute music.

The Sarabande
An Incomplete Reprise?

A peculiarity of the Sarabande in BWV 1013 is that a passage that can be described as a recapitulation appears to be inadvertently truncated. Many movements from chamber sonatas by Bach’s contemporaries already reveal a three-part design that can be described as an early version of sonata form, including a final recapitulatory section. Although several preludes from the Well-Tempered Clavier (and also the Fantasia from the Fantasia and Fugue in C Minor BWV 906) have similar forms, not many of Bach’s dance movements show the same pattern, particularly not those thought to have been composed before the Leipzig period.

Some of Bach’s earlier sarabandes do incorporate a parallel consequent phrase after the opening, and the material is reprised midway through the second section, as in the Sarabande from the English Suite No. 1 in A Major BWV 806 (exx. 8a–b) A two-measure reprise is also found in the Sarabande of BWV 1013 at mm. 35–36 (fig. 3). However, here the consequent phrase turns after one measure into a sequential passage. This would not be anomalous, except that this reprise repeats not mm. 1–2, but rather the consequent material in m.
Fig. 3: J. S. Bach, Sarabande, Solo pour la Flute Transverse par J. S. Bach, BWV 1013 (excerpt from Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 908, fascicle 2). Probable copying error at m. 36 (fifth system, first measure); another copying error appears in m. 10 (second system, first measure).
5 (\(=\) m. 1), and continues for one measure with the sequential material (\(=\) m. 6).

A broad survey of Bach’s chamber music, including the Brandenburg Concertos and Orchestral Suites, shows that reprises in Bach’s three-part designs, which are in some works perfunctory and in others substantial, always include—at minimum—the first measure(s) of the opening. The Gavotte from the English Suite No. 6 in D Minor BWV 811 provides another example with parallel periodic phrasing, this time with voice exchange (exx. 9a–b). Among Bach’s works it was not possible to find an example of a three-part form that includes a reprise from the consequent phrase (that is, without reprising the opening measures).

My suspicion, therefore, is that the truncated reprise is a mundane copying error. In the source, the first measure of the reprise (m. 35) falls at the end of the fourth system, on the last page of music. It is thus possible that the copyist, who has already been shown to be highly prone to error, copied the first measure of the reprise (\(=\) m. 1), but when his eye went to the system below, he mistakenly continued onward from the consequent phrase with m. 6 instead of m. 2. Line breaks are the most frequent cause of problems in copying or reading.

Exx. 9a–b: J. S. Bach, Gavotte I, English Suite No. 6 in D Minor BWV 811, from Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. Bach P 1072/2 (copy by Kayser): (a) mm. 1–8, with parallel phrases beginning at the upbeats to mm. 1 and 5; (b) mm. 25–28, with reprise at the upbeat to m. 25 (varied by voice exchange between soprano and alto)
music generally, and we have already seen that this scribe found it
difficult to deal with multiple repetitions of the same motive. Insert-
ing four editorial measures (= mm. 1–4) before m. 35 would bring
the movement into line with many others in three-part form by Bach
and would be especially characteristic in a relatively lengthy work
such as BWV 1013.

One additional textual problem in the Sarabande that has long
been recognized by flutists must be mentioned briefly. In m. 8,
a copying error appears to occur in the ascending scale, where it
pauses rhythmically on the third beat (fig. 3, first measure of the
second system). In all three parallel measures (10, 40, and 42), how-
ever, the scale continues its more natural, upward sixteenth-note
trajectory. Many performers and editions judiciously restore the read-
ing to the rhythm of the parallel passages. 41

Ornamentation in the Sarabande

Another important stylistic feature that is often overlooked in the
performance tradition of Bach’s flute Sarabande is the addition of
florid embellishments to the repeats. This seems necessary in such
a substantial work, and—by comparison with Bach’s other sara-
bandes—the movement’s unadorned simplicity seems particularly
wanting. There is certainly a precedent in the French performance
tradition. François Couperin’s first book of harpsichord pieces (1713)
gives “ornemans” for several dance movements, and Bach followed
him by supplying separate “agrément”—florid melodic embellish-
ments as well as simple ornaments such as trills—for the plain ver-
sions of the sarabandes in the English Suites No. 2 in A Minor BWV
807 and No. 3 in G Minor BWV 808. He also composed the
Sarabandes of English Suites No. 1 in A Major BWV 806 and No.
6 in D Minor BWV 811 with ample embellishments, and he pro-
vided a Double for the Sarabande of Suite No. 6, as well as two
Doubles for the second Courante in Suite No. 1. Modern perform-
ances of the Sarabande of BWV 1013 usually present the move-
ment plainly, or with only the addition of a few formulaic ornaments.
But a study of sarabandes and other dance movements shows that the
composer would not have been surprised to hear the sarabande of

41 The error is discussed by Uri Toeplitz, “Zur Sarabande aus dem Solo für die
BWV 1013 performed not only with added *Manieren* (single-note ornaments), but also with a continuous layer of florid melodic adornments. Fortunately for us, Telemann and Quantz both provided relevant, contemporary models aimed at flutists for the art of free embellishment that Bach himself would have known.42

**Bourrée Angloise: A French Contredanse?**

The fourth movement is usually neglected in discussions of BWV 1013. The observations that follow, however, support my general conclusion that Bach’s Solo was composed to be up-to-date and fashionable. The adjective “angloise” (English) that qualifies the title of this Bourrée is an important clue toward that end. The movement stands out for its rather unusual combination of $\frac{3}{8}$ time, eighth-note anacrusis, arpeggiated passage-work, and pervasive, insistent anapletic (snap-like) *figura corta* rhythms on both beats of the measure. In typical Bachian fashion, it also contains elements of chromaticism, with two appearances of a descending chromatic fourth (exx. 10a–b). In contrast to the Allemande, its melodic range lies primarily in the lowest octave of the instrument, as was common in flute music of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries in the French style. The Bourrée Angloise is curious because it resembles nothing else in Bach’s flute music; indeed, there is very little in Bach’s output with which to compare it.

Ordinary danced French bourrées in the early eighteenth century were written in duple meter, with a quarter-measure upbeat, and typically featured quarter-note melodies.43 Those by Bach are

---

42 Telemann, *Sonate Methodiche à Violino Solo à Flauto traverso* (Hamburg, 1728 and 1732); Quantz, *Versuch*, chap. XIV and tables XVII–XIX.

of course stylized, and some contain figura cõrta rhythms (long-short-short) in the mix of quarter notes and passages of running eighth notes. 44 The bourrées from Bach’s English Suites are written in the French meter 2 or cut time and occasionally employ syncopated rhythms (quarter note, half note, quarter note), as in the Bourrée II from the English Suite No. 1 in A Major BWV 806.

Following Bach’s atypical choice of a 2 time signature and the inclusion of prominent anaplectic figura cõrta (short-short-long), the “English” Bourrée of BWV 1013 is probably to be played with more accents than an ordinary bourrée, and thus not too quickly. As Peter Williams has observed, 2 in the early eighteenth century was a very new meter, introduced to indicate a duple tempo that was slower than 3. He argues, however, that the essential characteristic was not so much the tempo but rather the meter’s two “powerful beats.” 45 The Battinerie of the Orchestral Suite No. 2 in B Minor BWV 1067, for example, is typically played much too fast for 2 meter, presumably in order to make the finale sound virtuosic.

Williams’s observation about meter is important because it is related to the tempo and performance style of the anglaise or angloise. This is another term for an English country dance, which Meredith Little describes as having “obvious” downbeat accents, together with wide-ranging and lively melodies, and disjunct motion. 46 According to Walther’s Musicalisches Lexicon (1732), the “Angloise” is “an English dance and musical piece that consists of syncopated [rückenden] notes.” 47 The dances could be in duple, triple, or 6 meter,

---

44 Such as the bourrées of the English Suite No. 2 in A Minor BWV 807, the French Suites No. 5 in G Major BWV 816 and No. 6 in E Major BWV 817, and the Violoncello Suite No. 3 in C Major BWV 1009.

45 Peter Williams, “Two Case Studies in Performance Practice and the Details of Notation I: J. S. Bach and 2 Time,” Early Music 24 (1993): 613–22, esp. 615. Williams notes (p. 614) that 2 did not yet appear among the duple meters included in Sébastien de Brossard’s musical dictionary of 1703, and that when it is called for in French keyboard music, for example, it seems to indicate a stately tempo.

46 Grove Music Online, s.v. “Anglaise.”

47 Walther, Musicalisches Lexicon (Leipzig, 1732), 37: “ein Engelländischer Tanz- und Kling-Stück, so aus rückenden Noten besteht.” Walther defines the latter, in turn, as an advancing or division of a note against the beat; he provides examples of “rückenden Noten” under the entry Syncopatio oder Syncope. See Wallther, Musicalisches Lexicon, 590 and Tab. XX, fig. 6. Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach devoted the entirety of chapter 26, “Von rückenden Noten,” to examples of syncopation in Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen (Berlin, 1753–1762): 2:219–22.
included highly syncopated types like the hornpipe, and they featured lively, often disjunct melodies. English country dances, first introduced into France in the 1680s, became wildly popular in the eighteenth century. Little notes that they were adapted to French taste with the addition of “French steps such as the pas de bourrée or contretemps de gavotte.”\(^4\) If original English melodies were retained, they were also adapted to French dance rhythms, such as bourrées, courantes, and minuets.\(^4\) These French adaptations, which came to be called contredanses (simply the French pronunciation of “country dance”), were normally in duple or \(\frac{6}{8}\) meter and borrowed the anglaise’s characteristic syncopation, weighty accents, and often angular melodic style. French preference was for an anacrusis and for dance patterns that went over the bar line.\(^5\) When “angloise” was used alone at the head of a musical work, it referred to an English country dance, but when it was used as a modifier it indicated the French hybrid. To Bach’s contemporaries, the adjective “angloise” would have immediately called to mind the elegantly rustic French contredanses.

A survey of eighteenth-century contredanse collections published in Paris by Leclerc and others reveals pieces that display clear characteristics in common with the Bourrée Angloise of BWV 1013. Although most are in major keys, minor keys do occur. Many of the contredanses show preference for \(\frac{2}{4}\) meter with an anacrusis and syncopation. Also prevalent are figure corte and, as in BWV 1013, some of these are of the anapestic variety, having reminiscences of the passagework and motives found in BWV 1013.\(^5\) The sampling of dance repertory here, although not exhaustive, clearly shows that Bach’s Bourrée Angloise is in direct imitation of the French contredanse.

\(^4\) Grove Music Online, s.v. “Anglaise.”


\(^5\) Grove Music Online, s.v. “Contredanse.”

\(^5\) Premier [-Troisième] recueil de contredanses . . . avec la basse continue et chiffrée . . . Nouvelle Edition (Paris: Leclerc, [1728–1737]), esp. nos. 101 (Les Fleurs) and 107 (6e. Cotillon); Cinquième recueil de contre danses pour les violons, flutes et hautbois . . . (Paris: Leclerc, 1739), esp. No. 457 (L’Étourdy); Septième recueil de contredanses . . . avec la basse continue et chiffrée . . . (Paris: Leclerc, 1742), esp. nos. 606 (La Libertine), 643 (Les Moines), 672 (La Fertillante), 686 (L’irréolue), and so on. The survey is a sampling of collections available online at Gallica.bnf.fr. A more exhaustive study would be needed to situate BWV 1013 more properly within actual dance repertory.
Bach rarely used the term *angloise* or *anglaise* in movement labels. In the French Suite No. 3 in B Minor BWV 814, which is roughly contemporaneous (ca. 1722) with BWV 1013, an Anglaise follows the Sarabande, taking the place of the gavotte or bourrée found in Bach’s more typical sequence of movements. Baroque movements labeled simply *anglaise*, apart from their duple meter, are reminiscent of the hornpipe, a dance whose music features both strong downbeats and syncopation (as described by Walther). The Anglaise of the French Suite No. 3 is in French 2 meter, lacks an anacrusis (another English trait), and more closely resembles a gavotte that begins on the downbeat (instead of the middle of a measure).52

The closest approach to the last movement of BWV 1013 among Bach’s other flute works is probably the Battinerie of the Orchestral Suite No. 2 in B Minor BWV 1067 (ex. 11a). Rifkin has likened the Battinerie to the eighteenth-century scherzo, but the connection to the contredanse may be just as relevant to its style and Affekt.53 The opening of the Battinerie resembles the opening of the Gigue Angloise from Telemann’s Overture Suite TWV 55: a3 (ex. 11b). Both movements are in a form of duple meter with a half-measure upbeat, opening with an arpeggiated tonic triad repeated twice in a falling sequence. An earlier Bach work that is much closer in style to the final movement of BWV 1013 is the fourth movement of his keyboard Overture Suite in G Minor BWV 822 (ex. 12), which follows a “Gavotte en Rondeau.” Although it lacks a title in its sole source, this movement, composed by 1719, seems to be generically identical to the movement in BWV 1013 in all respects.54

---

52 Some editions have incorrectly labeled the movement as Gavotte. The sequence of movements in the French Suite No. 3 in B Minor BWV 814 is 1. Allemande; 2. Courante; 3. Sarabande; 4. Anglaise; 5. Menuet; 6. Gigue. Other composers also tend to place the anglaise after the sarabande (in lieu of a bourrée), as in an orchestral suite in E minor by Francesco Verrurini (Lund, Universitetsbiblioteket, Saml. Engelhart 231).


54 Bach-Digital gives the date of BWV 822 as ca. 1700–1719. The designation “Bourrée” in Johann Sebastian Bach, *Einzeln überlieferte Klavierwerke II, Neue*
It shares the $\frac{2}{4}$ meter and eighth-note anacrusis; more importantly, it also features the distinctive anapestic figure corte of BWV 1013’s Bourrée Angloise.

Movements in $\frac{3}{4}$ time with an eighth-note anacrusis and prevalent figure corte are also common among early flute compositions by other German composers, including some of the earliest works.

by Quantz and Blockwitz. One such movement that is notable in this context is found in an early collection of flute sonatas composed by Quantz in the 1720s. The third movement (Allegro) of the Sonata in C Minor QV 1:15 (ex. 13) opens remarkably like the untitled movement in the Overture Suite in G Minor BWV 822. And, like the last movement of BWV 1013, Quantz’s movement features 2\(\frac{4}{4}\) time, an eighth-note anacrusis, rustic anapestic \textit{figure corte}, and descending chromatic fourths (mm. 7–9). Another early manuscript anthology of flute music contemporaneous with BWV 1013 includes works by dozens of early eighteenth-century composers active in the same region as Bach. These include Augustin Reinhard Stricker (Bach’s predecessor as Capellmeister at Cöthen); Freytag (one of Bach’s flutists at Cöthen, d. ca. 1720); Johann David Heinichen; Telemann; and Weiss, among others. An Allegro in Freytag’s Sonata in A Major, found in this collection, may be another stylized contredanse: it features 2\(\frac{4}{4}\) meter and weaves into its

Ex. 12: J. S. Bach, Untitled movement [=Bourrée Anglaise?], Ouverture Suite in G Minor BWV 822, from Leipzig, Stadtbibliothek, Musikbibliothek, Peters Ms. 8, fascicle 1 (anonymous copyist), mm. 1–4

55 Martin Blockwitz, \textit{Sechtzig Arien eingetheilet in funfzehn Suitten} (Freiberg: Christoph Matthäi, n.d.). Despite the grouping of these “arias” into numbered suites throughout the collection, there are no movements with dance titles. Suite No. 10 in G Minor, movement 1 (Allegro), is in 2\(\frac{4}{4}\) time, with an eighth-note anacrusis and non-anapestic \textit{figure corte}. In Suite No. 13 in A Major, movement 3 (Allegro) is similar but features eighth-note arpeggiated passages (the arpeggiated passage-work of BWV 1013 is in sixteenth notes).

56 Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. ms. 18020 (no. 3 in the manuscript).

57 Brussels, Conservatoire royal de Bruxelles, Litt. XY 15.115.

58 The numerous flute sonatas by Freytag in this manuscript may be modeled, like those of Stricker, on the sonatas of Telemann or Heinichen. There are no other works in the manuscript labeled “anglaise,” nor anything even remotely similar to the athletic allemandes and correntes of other German flutist-composers of the period, such as Braun and Blockwitz. The composer of the works by Weiss may be Johann Sigismund Weiss, brother of Silvius Leopold Weiss. See Oleskiewicz, \textit{Quantz and the Flute at Dresden}, 174n28.
texture syncopated rhythms and figure corte reminiscent of works previously mentioned, as well as leaps and syncopation (ex. 14). Two “Bourrées anglaises” by Handel are found in the same manuscript: one is from the Sonata for Oboe in C Minor Op. 1, No. 8 HWV 366 (composed ca. 1711–1712), and the other is from the Sonata for Oboe in F Major HWV 363a (composed between ca. 1711 and 1716). That of HWV 366 has typical features of bourrée, such as a quarter-note anacrusis, syncopated rhythms, but also figure corte. The one from HWV 363a likewise has the quarter-note anacrusis and features syncopated rhythms found in

59 The sonata HWV 363a was later transposed to G major as a sonata for flute (HWV 363b) and published in 1732 as Handel’s Op. 1, No. 5. It has an anacrusis, syncopated rhythms and, like the last movement of BWV 1013, anapestic figure corte. The third movement of HWV 366, in common time, has a quarter-note anacrusis and over-the-bar syncopation.
Ex. 15: Anonymous, “Aria Angloise,” Oboe Concerto in G Minor, from Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Mus. ms. 2-O-6,2, mm. 1–6

Handel’s hornpipes; it resembles a contredanse labeled “L’Angloise” in a contredanse collection by Leclerc.\(^{60}\)

Orchestral works performed as part of the repertory of the Dresden Hofkapelle were also inspired by the contredanse craze of the period. It is unclear when contredanses began to be cultivated at the Dresden court, but surely they were danced in the French theater by 1709, and it may have been there that Bach became acquainted with the style. One such example comes from an anonymous oboe concerto in G Minor: the final movement is an “Aria Angloise” in 2/4 with figure corte and, like BWV 1013, chromatic lines (ex. 15). Telemann, too, composed works in this style. The Getreuer Music-Meister of 1728, for example, includes a miniature French dance labeled “Gigue a l’Angloise” in 6/8 for cembalo with French dance rhythms and a strong emphasis on both beats of the measure. A copy of this print from the Dresden Hofkapelle repertory may have belonged to Pisendel.\(^{61}\) Telemann’s orchestral overture suites, some of which also formed part of the Dresden repertory, also contain the similarly titled gigues “angloises” (TWV 55: e9 and TWV 55: a3).\(^{62}\) The Affekt of some

\(^{60}\) Quatrieme recueil de contredanses. Pour les violons, flutes, et hautbois (Paris: Leclerc, 1744), dance no. 318, p. 102.

\(^{61}\) The movement is in the Dritter Lection of Telemann’s Getreuer Mus.-Meister (Hamburg, 1728–1729). Pisendel’s copy is Dresden, Sächsische Landesbibliothek – Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Mus. ms. 2392-B-1. An unaccompanied gigue by Pisendel is included on p. 49 of the print.

of these is particularly rustic due to an avoidance of the characteristic light skipping rhythm of many French gigues (as in TWV 55: a3, discussed in ex. 11b above, where the skipping rhythm is abandoned after the first measure). Telemann also composed movements labeled simply “Angloise”—without anacrusis and with hornpipe-style syncopations—that are instead modeled on English country dances, such as TWV 55: C7 and 55: D13.63

Until now, the nature and genre of Bach’s Bourrée Angloise have been puzzling. Based on this wide survey of works in his circle, we can safely conclude that the movement is not an English country dance, but rather a trendy French hybrid that attaches characteristics of the latter to the bourrée. This twist helps put into context the French-styled title for the suite as a whole, and further underscores his interest in writing a stylish piece.64

Thirty years later, Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach followed in his father’s footsteps by writing an unaccompanied flute work in A minor. Composed in 1747, the Sonata per il Flauto Traverso senza Basso Wq 132 must be the first solo “Sonata” for the instrument, and it pushes the limits of the flute in ways similar to BWV 1013. Naturally, its style is typical of the more up-to-date Berlin repertory of the 1740s, with its sequence of movements slow-quick-quicker. But by this time, Italianate music with passage-work and large leaps was nothing unusual for flutists in Germany, and Carl Philipp Emanuel’s work is nothing short of a poster child for the stylistic features described here. To surpass the level of virtuosity customary in flute music by that date, Carl Philipp Emanuel had to go a bit further than his father. All three movements are polyphonic in style and make use of giant leaps of up to two octaves. Based on the above survey of contredanse-styled works, we find another similarity to his father’s

---

63 Several keyboard suites in Johann Caspar Ferdinand Fischer’s Musicalischer Parnassus (published 1738) feature brief movements called either “Balet Angloise” or “Air Angloise.” The “Balet Angloise” in Fischer’s first suite immediately follows the Sarabande (in place of a bourrée). Regardless of title, all of these movements feature two heavily accented beats via persistent anapestic figure corte and large melodic leaps. The meters are either €2 or common time.

64 Castellani misunderstood the last movement as being specifically “English,” which led him in part to view Bach’s work as having been compiled (“zusammengesetzt”) out of four pieces in different styles, rather than being composed as a coherent work in a unified French style. "J. S. Bachs 'Solo pour la flute traversière,'” 571.
work: the second movement (Allegro) displays all the characteristics of a French contredanse of the bourrée type. By now the rustic type of bourrée was so well understood in chamber music that there was no need to append the modifier “angloise.” A 2/4 binary form with repeats, Carl Philipp Emanuel’s work begins, like the last movement of BWV 1013, with an eighth-note anacrusis and features an angular, leaping melody with two heavy beats per measure and numerous figure corte. Like his father’s Solo, Carl Philipp Emanuel’s work pushes the player’s technique: it makes expanded use of the flute’s range, in this case from d\textsuperscript{1} to f\textsuperscript{3}, a note carefully avoided by Johann Sebastian, Quantz, and most other early eighteenth-century composers. The first movement, Poco Adagio, features the high note prominently in the fifth measure, where its approach is eased by a slur and an ornamental turn, but in the final movement (m. 119) Bach unapologetically introduces it by leap.\textsuperscript{65}

**Conclusion**

Bach’s *Solo pour la Flute Traversiere*, with its many up-to-date French elements, is not quite the anomaly it has been taken to be. The work appealed, on all levels, to current musical taste as well as to the latest European fashion in dance. Its composition coincided with the early popularity of the transverse flute in Germany and closely followed the importation of French flutists to the nearby Saxon elector court. The flute-technical aspects of the work are not unlike those of many other early eighteenth-century works composed, arranged, and published for solo flute with or without continuo, including those by flutists in Paris and Dresden.

Bach’s Allemande follows the style of those works, but other features, including the absence of anacrusis, are more reminiscent of his preludes, particularly that for violin in the Partita in E Major No. 3 BWV 1006. That the initial copyist of BWV 1013 supplied of his own accord the title “Allemande” for what was actually an unlabeled *preludio* in his *Vorlage* might be surmised, though the movement’s binary form would suggest otherwise. The range of the movement,

\textsuperscript{65} My edition of Wq 132 for *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: The Complete Works*, series II, vol. 1 (Los Altos, CA: Packard Humanities Institute, 2008) can be accessed at https://cpebach.org/toc/toc-II-1.html. By this date, makers of one-keyed flutes were producing flutes with narrower bores that favored the high register over the low one, but f\textsuperscript{3} remained more resistant than surrounding notes.
which never dips below d\textsuperscript{1} and ascends to a\textsuperscript{3}, is perfectly suited to the French three-piece flutes of the early 1700s, which were common in Germany until sometime after ca. 1725. Contemporary documents show that, at least in Quantz’s circle, early eighteenth-century flute allemandes by German composers were played in the French style with subtle \textit{notes inégales}. The Corrente, too, is similar in its technical demands to other contemporary unaccompanied correntes for the instrument. Bach’s Allemande and Sarabande both contain apparent textual errors caused by an unpracticed scribe. In particular, it must be considered beyond question that the f\#\textsuperscript{1} in m. 20 of the Allemande should be e\textsuperscript{1}; it is also almost certain that a copying error caused the omission of the first four measures of the reprise in the Sarabande. In the latter movement, Bach also might have expected his flutist to improvise free ornamentation in the repeats, like those written out in several of his keyboard suites from the same period, and (at a minimum) to introduce French \textit{ornemens}. Finally, the last movement, Bourrée Angloise, is neither a hornpipe, nor anything English \textit{per se}, but rather a French-styled contredanse wildly fashionable at the time of composition—a type that Bach seems to have used rarely in other works. However, the musical style of this bourrée does closely resemble that of other contemporary pieces, some of which bear the qualifier “angloise,” including movements by Handel, Telemann, Quantz, and others. In short, a comparison with contemporary works for the flute shows that BWV 1013 was not an unplayable enigma; nor is it reasonable to think the work an arrangement. On the contrary, Bach seems to have set out to compose a modern piece on the cutting edge of fashionable style. How appropriate, then, for Bach to have introduced so many current French touches in a suite of dances for the newly popular \textit{flûte traversière}.

Abstract
Bach’s Partita in A Minor for Unaccompanied Flute BWV 1013 is well known to listeners and especially to flutists, yet the provenance of its sole source remains imprecisely understood, its date and principal copyist unidentified; even the original title is uncertain. There also remain a number of unresolved textual problems. Proceeding from the commonly accepted view that the work was originally composed ca. 1720 at Cöthen, this essay examines BWV 1013 for the first time within the broader context of early eighteenth-century chamber
music. Although technically more challenging than other early flute compositions by Bach—the Brandenburg Concerto No. 5 and one or two Cöthen cantatas—the Partita remains entirely idiomatic to the instrument of the early eighteenth century, and its demands on the player are consistent with those of certain other works of the period. Like a number of contemporaries, however, such as Johann Joachim Quantz, Bach purposefully avoids an older French style of writing in favor of one whose technical demands are influenced by the latest trends in violin music. A study of contemporary sources and Bach’s own music further suggests that eighteenth-century performers might have introduced *notes inégales* and free ornamentation into certain movements. An examination of the four movements with respect to genre, musical text, and style reveals that the Allemande bears comparison with contemporary preludes as well as allemandes; the Corrente similarly shows parallels to works by Johann Martin Blockwitz and Jean-Daniel Braun (including a movement attributed ambiguously to both Quantz and Sylvius Leopold Weiss); the unidentified copyist of the Sarabande may have truncated the phrase in which the opening theme is reprise; and the Bourrée Anglaise, far from being an anomaly, is an example of a stylish type of French contredanse common at the time.