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Abstract

Building on the existing analytical literature, I examine ornamentation in C. P. E. Bach’s keyboard works, looking particularly at the interaction between the ornamentation and deeper aspects of the music, including motifs, harmony and voice-leading structure.

It is natural for people to assume that embellishments are not essential elements of a composition. The Oxford English Dictionary defines an ornament as “an accessory or adjunct, primarily functional, but often also fancy or decorative.” Felix Salzer (1986) observes that typically, “at best, ornaments are granted an animating effect,” and that any “deeper significance” is rejected. On the other hand, Salzer credits Heinrich Schenker with contributing to the understanding not only of practical performance issues, but also of “the profound meaning of ornaments, their inner content, and their psychological effect;” or in other words, “the true meaning of Bach’s embellishments.”

Eight keyboard sonatas and sonatinas composed by Bach during the 1740s exist in two versions, the later of which arise from revisions made several years after the original composition. These works are collected in a multivolume catalogue called Nachlassverzeichnis (NV) that was published in 1790. According to David Schulenberg’s observation (1988), “the description of the revised versions as erneuert (renewed, in NV) suggests that Bach regarded [the superficial aspects of his mature style such as the florid written-out melodic embellishment] as involving a profound refashioning.” By making a detailed comparison between the early and later versions, looking especially at the additional ornamentation in the latter, I demonstrate the importance of Bach’s ornamentation as a significant constituent of his musical
material through its interaction with underlying structures, establishing that, for Bach, ornamentation should not be considered to be merely adjunct decoration.
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Introduction

The sonatas and sonatinas of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach are amongst the most prominent works of eighteenth-century keyboard music. Extensive resources\(^1\) may be found which examine the musical language in the keyboard works, including the tracing of his compositional intention, the analysis of his compositional techniques and process, discussions of his employment of musical form, in particular the novel aspects of his style. The broader discussions centering on C. P. E. Bach concern his historical position within the transition from Baroque to Classical styles, his shift in style away from the influences of his father and towards that of the Viennese Classical composers, and his influence on the later generation of Classical composers. However, although there are some references to or brief analyses of Bach’s ornamentation, to date there has been no comprehensive and focused study of C. P. E. Bach’s embellishments in his keyboard works.

Building on the existing analytical literature, I will examine ornamentation in selected keyboard works of C. P. E. Bach, looking particularly at its interaction with deeper aspects of the music, including motifs, harmony and voice-leading structure. My aim is to demonstrate that ornamentation in Bach’s keyboard music serves more than a decorative purpose but contributes to the expression of the music’s structure and rhetorical design.

Utilizing *The Collected Works for Solo Keyboard by Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach*, edited by Darrell Berg, the works chosen for analysis are the Sonatina in F major Wq 64/1, Sonatina in E minor Wq 64/4, Sonatina in C minor Wq 64/6, Sonata in D minor Wq 65/3, Sonata in E flat major Wq 65/7,

---

Sonata in B flat major Wq 65/9, Sonata in A major Wq 65/10 and the Sonata in G major Wq 65/12. These works are all presented in two different versions, the original composition for most of those sonatas was around the 1730s and the revisions were made around the 1740s.² As discussed in Chapter 2,³ David Schulenberg has pointed to the significance of these revisions, referring particular to the extensive addition of written-out embellishments. The second movement of some of the sonatas in their revised versions is a completely new movement, in which case comparison was not considered appropriate. My investigation into these sonatas includes the exploration of possible motivations behind Bach’s revision of the earlier works. The discussion is also informed by consideration of sonatas of particular interest that were composed beyond this period or sonatas that were not revised, for example, the Sonata in B minor H. 245/W. 55, 3, composed in 1774 and the Sonata in A major H. 29/ W. 48, ⁶ of 1742. Darrell Berg discusses Bach’s creation of varied and embellished versions of sonatas after 1760, however he does not attempt to explain individual choices of embellishments.⁴

In my analysis, I employ voice-leading reductions following the method used by Robert Gauldin in *Harmonic Practice in Tonal Music*⁵ rather than undertaking Schenkerian analysis, as Gauldin approach proved sufficient for my purpose. I should also point out that where there are frequent occurrences of similar uses of ornamentation, not every instance is discussed individually.

Bach’s *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments* naturally serves as the starting point for an examination of his ornamentation. The emphasis that he places on ornamentation is indicated

---
² The Critical Notes of the collection by Berg present the details of the date of earlier and later composition, except the Sonata in G minor Wq 65/12 where the date of revision is unknown.
³ See the relevant discussions at page 24.
clearly in the opening paragraph:

The True Art of playing keyboard instruments depends on three factors so closely related that no one of them can, nor indeed dare, exist without the others. They are: correct fingering, good embellishments, and good performance.6

The first part of the Essay consists of Bach’s extensive discussion of the various ornaments: appoggiatura, trill, turn, mordent, compound appoggiatura, slide and snap. It contains Bach’s monition as to how to perform the embellishments properly, through comprehensive demonstration and explanation, but at the same time it reflects Bach’s concern with harmonic considerations. Bach repeatedly emphasises the integration of the upper melody and the underlying construction, and guides the performer to adequately balance these two in order to avoid the disruption of the structure of the whole. For example, expressing his dissatisfaction with the inappropriate and excessive use of ornamentation by some performers, he cautions the performer to ensure a proper combination of the appoggiatura and bass “in order not to disturb the flow of the harmony.”7 Such statements suggest that embellishment must be considered far beyond its decorative value; it has its implications for other aspects of the work and should be understood as part of the compositional construction and design. In approaching music that is so full of adventure and surprise, the composer’s own voice should not be overlooked, and Bach’s Essay has been a vital resource for the analysis undertaken here.

---

7 Bach, Essay, 427.
Chapter 1: Discussion of the Analytical Literature

1.1 Schenker’s view of Bach’s ornamentation

Felix Salzer remarks that,

…the embellishments in Bach’s works are frequently perceived only as insignificant components of his melodic writing. While they are recognized as a characteristic of Bach’s individual style, they are thought to play an entirely subordinate role in the structure of a work…It might seem surprising to speak of the profound meaning of ornamentation, since the word “ornamentation” is colloquially used as a synonym for “decoration,” thus signifying something not really essential to a work of art.8

It is natural for people to assume that embellishments are not essential elements of a composition. The *Oxford English Dictionary* defines an ornament as “an accessory or adjunct, primarily functional, but often also fancy or decorative.”9 Salzer observes that typically, “at best, ornaments are granted an animating effect,” and that any “deeper significance” is rejected.10 On the other hand, Salzer credits Heinrich Schenker with contributing to the understanding not only of practical performance issues, but also of “the profound meaning of ornaments, their inner content, and their psychological effect;” or in other words, “the true meaning of Bach’s embellishments.”11

Schenker describes Bach’s treatment of each embellishment as “a living individual organism” which retains “a special and unique expressiveness;” and due to the particularity and independency of each embellishment, their functions are individually unique and should not be misjudged for another. Therefore, in spite of the presentations of some embellishments being quite close to each other or seemingly identical, Bach still makes clear difference between them. Moreover, Bach attaches high

---

8 Salzer, 16.
10 Salzer, 16.
11 Salzer, 16.
importance to each alteration of an embellishment as the subtle distinction within the embellishment will result in the variation of inner expression. Schenker summarises that “in short, [Bach] regards every embellishment not merely as decoration but also as actual and self-contained expression.”12

However, Schenker has observed that Bach’s employment of embellishment also incurs various disputes. He discusses criticisms of Bach’s works which describe them as “overladen with embellishments.” He explains the reasons for these disputes in relation to the proliferation of music drama, which, he says, diminishes the functions of embellishment and causes the ignorance of its effect. It is considered that depth and accuracy of expression mainly rely on the text and music, and that embellishment lacks conviction and emotional affect. Ornamentation is credited merely with the function of overcoming the deficiencies of the clavichord, helping to link the sounds and enliven its sonority.13

Regarding the claimed inadequacies of the instrument, we can start with the following statement from Bach’s autobiography:

My chief effort, especially in recent years, has been directed towards both playing and composing as songfully as possible for the clavier, notwithstanding its lack of sustaining power…14

Schenker notes that Bach discouraged keyboard players from attributing any limitations of their musical expression or technical difficulties to the limited sustaining power of their instrument.15

Schenker’s observation is inspired by the introduction to Bach’s Essay, where he elaborates on the

13 Schenker, 21.
15 Schenker, 22.
importance of the aforementioned “correct fingering, good embellishments, and good performance”:

Owing to ignorance of these factors and their consequent absence from performance…Their playing lacks roundness, clarity, forthrightness, and in their stead one hears only hacking, thumping and stumbling. All other instruments have learned how to sing. The keyboard alone has been left behind, its sustained style obliged to make way for countless elaborate figures. The truth of this is attested by the growing beliefs that to play slowly or legato is wearisome, that tones can be neither slurred nor detached, that our instrument should be tolerated only as a necessary evil in accompaniment. As ungrounded and contradictory as these charges are, they are, nevertheless, positive reactions to the false art of playing the keyboard.16

Bach points out the mutual relationship between keyboard instruments and embellishment:

…most of them have a long and close association with the keyboard and will undoubtedly always remain in favor…those who are adept at it may combine the more elaborate embellishments with ours…He who observes such principles will be judged perfect, for he will know how to pass skillfully from the singing style to the startling and fiery (in which instruments surpass the voice) and with his constant changing rouse and hold the listener’s attention. With these ornaments, the difference between voice and instrument can be unhesitatingly exploited. For the rest, as long as embellishments are applied with discretion no one need pause to decide whether a played passage can or cannot be sung.17

Thus ornamentation is seen as providing a means to create a singing style on a keyboard instrument. Schenker attributes to Bach the view that “every embellishment should be regarded as a melodic component […], a true part of the melody and a true contributor to its beauty. Like all melody, embellishments have life and expression.”18 Moreover, “embellishments are an inherent part of keyboard music” and “are necessitated by the very nature of the instrument which, because of the mobility it affords, permits a certain intrinsic brilliance.”19

---

16 Bach, Essay, 30.
17 Bach, Essay, 80-81.
18 Schenker, 23.
19 Schenker, 22.
Bach’s attention to the performance of embellishments is much in evidence throughout the *Essay*, for example:

There are many who play stickily, as if they had glue between their fingers. Their touch is lethargic; they hold notes too long. Others, in an attempt to correct this, leave the keys too soon, as if they burned. Both are wrong. Midway between these extremes is best. Here again I speak in general, for every kind of touch has its uses…[the trill and the mordent], such embellishments must be full and so performed that the listener will believe that he is hearing only the original note. This requires a freedom of performance that rules out everything slavish and mechanical. Play from the soul, not like a trained bird!21

---

1.2 Embellishment and its relation to the underlying structure

In regards to the interrelationship between the motif and compositional structure in Bach’s works, Charles Rosen remarks that,

C. P. E. Bach’s treatment of the striking and memorable motif, however, was crucial for the history of the sonata forms. Unity of theme and unity of sentiment were almost synonymous for the North German school. The theme had not only to be immediately expressive, but capable of conveying by itself the developing formal significance from polarization to resolution demanded by sonata style. In other words, the themes of C. P. E. Bach are capable of transformation, of “development,” and remain sufficiently memorable for their identity to be clear through the transformations. Both the strikingly individual motif and development by transformation and fragmentation exist in Baroque style, but it was C. P. E. Bach above all who made them available for sonata style and showed how they could be used in the creation of forms.22

Salzer goes much further when he observes that,

When we inquire into the true meaning of Bach’s embellishments, we find that only isolated examples display an exclusively enlivening intent. By far the greater number of embellishments; because of their lively involvement with the musical structure, exhibit a much deeper meaning. Bach’s ornaments are rarely empty; they do not act like ornaments pasted on, as it were, merely for the sake of enlivenment. Rather, they actively participate in shaping the motives, and frequently even influence the voice leading.23

In fact, in regards to the interrelationship between ornamentation and the underlying harmony, Bach himself has been known to assert the necessity of integrating ornamentation into the “emotional affect of the piece, taking harmonic requirements into account, and must have some claim to be at least as good as the original.”24

In his Essay, Bach states that,

No one disputes the need for embellishments. This is evident from the great numbers of them everywhere to be


23 Salzer, 16. The formatting of this quote is a personal emphasis, and not in any shape or form highlighted in the original text. The bold characters are my own emphasis.

They are, in fact, indispensable. Consider their many uses: They connect and enliven tones and impart stress and accent; they make music pleasing and awaken our close attention. Expression is heightened by them; let a piece be sad, joyful, or otherwise, and they will lend a fitting assistance. Embellishments provide opportunities for fine performance as well as much of its subject matter. They improve mediocre composition. Without them the best melody is empty and ineffective, the clearest content clouded.

Es hat wohl niemand an der Nothwendigkeit der Manieren gezweifelt. Man kann es daher merken, weil man sie überall in reichlicher Menge antrifft. Indessen sind sie allerdings unentbehrlich, wenn man ihren Nutzen betrachtet. Sie hängen die Noten zusammen; sie beleben sie; sie geben ihnen, wenn es nöthing ise, einen besondern Nachdruck und Gewicht; sie machen sie gefällig und erwecken folglich eine besondere Aufmerksamkeit; sie helfen ihren Inhalt erklären; es mag dieser traurig oder fröhlich oder sonst beschaffen seyn wie er will, so tragen sie allezeit das ihrige darzu bey; sie geben einen ansehnlichen Theil der Gelegenheit und Materie zum wahren Vortrage; einer mäßigen Composition Kan durch sie aufgeholfen werden, dahingegen der beste Gesang ohne sie leer und einfältig, und der kläreste Inhalt davon allezeit undeutlich erscheinen muß.

This statement shows Bach’s view of embellishment as an important element of the composition. This is amplified by Robert Donington, who comments that embellishment is endowed “for the melodic function, smoothness; for the rhythmic function, sharpness; for the harmonic function, expressiveness.”

Wayne Christopher Petty chooses to emphasise the concept of “diminution.” In his later discussion of the relationship between “melodic diminution” and the underlying motion, he says:

The surface diminutions unfolded against a thoroughbass background, literal or implied, in an environment where boundaries between performance practice and composition were fluid […] These melodic diminutions, through technically ornamental, were anything but incidental to a piece. When used in moderation and properly performed, they lent connection, expression, and emphasis to the composition, and they helped stir the proper attentiveness and feeling in the listener.

Moreover, Petty sites Bach’s comparison between the improper execution of ornamentation by a performer and the incorrect usage of diminuations in speech that would be reflected in a performance:

---

25 Bach, Essay, 79. The bold characters are my own emphasis.
26 Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen (Kassel and New York: Bärenreiter, 1994), 51.
28 Petty, 12.
29 Petty, 20.
Otherwise, I would commit the same error as orators who try to place an impressive accent on every word; everything would be alike and consequently unclear.30

Salzer observes that diminutions on the surface level may be interpreted as having an ingenious link to the deeper level of voice-leading. His discussion mainly focuses on the places where the ornamentation presents a version in reduced rhythmic values of the underlying motion – either anticipating or repeating it. This may occur at various levels of depth.31 Although Salzer’s focus is upon the specific functions that he identifies, which are to be discussed later in this chapter, his approach brings to light the interrelationship between the ornamentation and the fundamental harmonic structure.

Rosen states that “ornament must be related to a style, and it is necessary to decorate only when the musical sense requires it.”32 There are two paragraphs in Bach’s Essay that show his trepidation about the appropriate selection and insertion of an embellishment. He remarks,

In view of their many commendable services, it is unfortunate that there are also poor embellishments and that good ones are sometimes used too frequently and ineptly […] good embellishments must be distinguished from bad, the good must be correctly performed, and introduced moderately and fittingly. Because of this, it has always been better for composers to specify the proper embellishments unmistakably, instead of leaving their selection to the whims of tasteless performers.33

While the above comments reveal Bach’s lack of trust in the musicians of his day, his solution is especially informative for my investigation:

Above all, to understand many things more clearly, the performer must possess a knowledge of thorough bass. It is a matter of experience that those who are not well grounded in the study of harmony fumble in darkness when they use embellishments and must thank their good fortune rather than insight when they are successful.34

30 Bach, Essay, 81.
31 Salzer, 39.
33 Bach, Essay, 79.
34 Bach, Essay, 82.
Bach’s comments echo the views of Andreas Werckmeister, as described here by Dietrich Bartel:

…the theoretically informed composer was now given the highest ranking as the true *musicus poeticus*, replacing the medieval *musicus-theorist*. Werckmeister’s explanations of the roles of theorist and practitioner clearly point to the superiority of one who has mastered both disciplines. While the theorist only knows the rules but cannot practically apply them (by playing or composing) and while the practitioner can compose or play according to the rules but cannot comprehend or explain them, the ideal musician is expert in both areas.35

In discussing the proper use of the slide, Bach states that “the behaviour of all ornaments is determined largely by their relation to the accompanying bass.”36 Petty comments that Bach’s view is “harmony and melody [are] fully interdependent,”37 as expressed in Bach’s own discussion of inappropriate choices made in realizing appoggiaturas:

The examples suggest no middle parts, or at most, no natural or good middle parts. This is an unmistakable sign of a poor or poorly conceived piece. Those who wish to think correctly about composition must give simultaneous consideration to melody and harmony.38

In a letter sent to one of his friends in 1777, Bach remarks upon the importance of amateurs possessing a certain degree of analytical skill:

In my opinion, in instructing amateurs, several things could be omitted that many musicians do not, indeed, need not know. A most important element, analysis, is lacking. True masterpieces should be taken from all styles of composition, and the amateur should be shown the beauty, daring, and novelty in them. Also, he should be shown how insignificant the piece would be if these things were lacking. Further, he should be shown how errors, pitfalls, have been avoided, and especially how far a work departs from ordinary ways, how venturesome it can be, etc.39

As Petty observes, aside from this advice from Bach to be conscious of the mutual dependence

37 Petty, 9.
39 English translation by William J. Mitchell in a note to page 441of the *Essay*.
between melody and harmony from a composer’s perspective, Bach also shows his concern for this from a listener’s perspective:

[The accompaniment] need feel no anxiety over his being forgotten if he is not constantly joining in the tumult. No! An understanding listener does not easily miss anything. In his soul’s perception melody and harmony are inseparable.40

Finally, we may note Schenker’s laudatory assessment of Bach’s contribution:

… we must assert that Bach should by no means be reproached for his use of embellishments; on the contrary, in precisely such use does he reveal his particular genius for keyboard writing. His use of original ornaments and figuration leads one to conclude that he is indeed the truest poet of the keyboard. I would go so far as to rank him, as a keyboard composer, even higher than Haydn or Mozart, whose primary orchestral and symphonic outlook had begun to undermine their idiomatic keyboard style.41

40 Bach, Ḗssay, 368.
41 Schenker, 26.
1.3 Notated embellishment and written-out embellishment

The various discussions above, in particular Bach’s own view, stimulate a deeper investigation of C. P. E. Bach’s ornamentation and its interaction with harmony, and hence, musical structure, demonstrating its function beyond a purely embellishing and decorative value. My approach of comparing early and later versions brings to light the question of notated and written-out embellishment. The two versions of the first movement of the Sonata in F major Wq 64/1 demonstrate this issue. The most obvious difference between the two versions is that the notated trills in the early version have been replaced and with a written-out turn figure (see the following musical examples Figures 1 and 2). An explanation for this may be connected with Haydn’s change of notation for the publication of his keyboard sonatas in the 1770s. Tom Beghin comments that since Haydn’s works had been more widespread, in order to respond to “a new double reality in Vienna – that of music publishing, on the one hand, and a new and growing market of amateur players, almost exclusively women, on the other,” he started to make more clear and precise notations on the score to make sure his musical intention could be accurately understood and performed.42 In the present example, there is a wholesale replacement of the trill with written-out turn figures, which cannot be viewed as a response to specific details of voice leading or harmonic context. This kind of change is therefore not the focus of my analysis.

Wq 64/1 (early version)

Sonata
Allegro
Cembalo Solo.

Wq 64/1 (later version)

Sonata per il Cembalo solo. C.P.E. Bach.
Allegro.

(Figure 1)
Wq 64/1 (early version): Development
Wq 64/1 (later version): Development


(Figure 2)
Salzer introduces his discussion of the appoggiatura as follows:

I should state at the outset that I do not regard the long appoggiatura as an ornament, since – and this is especially true of Bach’s time – it is simply a different and more subtle way of writing an ordinary accented dissonance, and should never take on the character of an ornament when performed correctly. For instance, Bach notes bars 13 – 14 of the second movement of the Wurttemberg Sonata No. 1 as in Example 5. When written out, as they would be today, the descending accented passing tones would never be perceived as ornaments (Example 6). The nature of the short appoggiatura on the other hand, is essentially different, since it must always be regarded as an ornamental accented dissonance, and today always appears as a small note with a slash through it.43

However, Salzer’s assertion allows room for debate when compared with Bach’s view as expressed in the Essay. In the second chapter, Bach makes it clear on his approach towards the notation of embellishments:

Embellishments may be divided into two groups: in the first are those which are indicated by conventional signs or a few small notes; in the second are those which lack signs and consist of many short notes.44

Die Manieren lassen sich sehr wohl in zwey Classen abtheilen. Zu der ersten rechne ich diejenigen, welche man theils durch gewisse angenommene Kennzeichen, theils durch wenige kleine Nötgen anzudeuten pflegt; zu der

---

43 Salzer, 16-18.
44 Bach, Essay, 80.
Although Bach has distinguished clearly between the embellishment with notation and the written-out embellishment, he regards both as ornaments. The following description is more explicit:

Appoggiaturas are sometimes written in large notation and given a specified length in a bar. At other times they appear in small notation, and the large notes before which they stand retain their length visually although in performance they always lose some of it to the ornament.

The usual rule of duration for appoggiaturas is that they take from a following tone of duple length one-half of its value (Figure 73, Example a), and two-thirds from one of triple length (b). In addition to the examples of Figure 74 and their executions should be carefully studies. Appoggiaturas which depart from this rule of duration should be written as large notes.

Therefore, for the purpose of my analysis, I will adopt Bach’s approach, and count written-out embellishment as ornamentation.

Through the investigation of Bach’s sonatas, Fox observes that the ornamentation plays a prominent role of enlivening a melodic line with “complexity of melodic detail.” Hence, she points out that the enrichment of the basic structural skeleton lies in the decoration and connection of the ornaments; especially through the written-out embellishments which “convey the feeling of spontaneous variation.”

In her discussion of Bach’s revisions, Rachel W. Wade argues that Bach’s intention in employing the written-out embellishment in the later versions was partly to avoid excessive additions by the performer. Support for this notion is offered by Bach’s criticism of the excessive use of embellishments:

---

45 Bach, Versuch, 52.  
46 Bach, Essay, 87.  
47 Bach, Essay, 90.  
48 Fox, “Melodic Nonconstancy,” 36.  
49 Fox, “Melodic Nonconstancy,” 36-37.
Above all things, a prodigal use of embellishments must be avoided. Regard them as spices which may ruin the best dish or gewgaws which may deface the most perfect building. Notes of no great moment and those sufficiently brilliant by themselves should remain free of them, for embellishments serve only to increase the weight and import of notes and to differentiate them from others. Otherwise, I would commit the same error as orators who try to place an impressive accent on every word; everything would be alike and consequently unclear.50

Earlier, Bach observes that “care must be taken to use [ornaments] sparingly, at the correct places, and without disturbing the affect of a piece.”51 The focus of Bach’s general caution can point to three different perspectives: composer’s choices, performer’s choices, and then prescription on the part of the composer.

As far as composers are concerned, Schenker highlights Bach’s criticism of the excessive use of embellishments; that embellishment is regarded as “a special asset” of the keyboard but overuse will result in its devaluation. Misinterpretation by “mediocre composers” of an ornament’s function increases the abuse.52 On the other hand, Wade’s interpretation is more inclined towards the fact that the performer’s own choice of embellishment or inadequate adoption of the embellishment may “offend or displease the composer.” Therefore, Wade points out the importance of carefully “studying manuscript copies of embellished versions, which might have been written by performers.”53 A discussion of the trill in Bach’s Essay provides an indication of the way a performer may relate a particular type of ornament to a particular affect:

While discussing this matter, I must point out an exception in slow tempos where, because of the affect, a trill maybe replaced by a soft turn, the last tone of which is held until the following note enters.54

However, Fox remarks that “Bach’s attempt to notate his compositional intentions clearly reveals an

50 Bach, Essay, 81.
51 Bach, Essay, 80.
52 Schenker, 27.
54 Bach, Essay, 115.
important change in attitude in the mid-eighteenth century – a change from performance freedom to compositional prescription,” something which became an essential component of his “compositional philosophy.” Further, Wade points to research which shows that detailed elaborations were often notated by composers. This is supported by William J. Mitchell, the translator and editor of Bach’s Essay who observes a trend since the period of J. S. Bach:

Ornamentation at the time of the Essay was of two kinds. There were first the optional elaborations which performers were expected to interpolate into the pieces they played. Ornamentation in this sense was a dying practice. Johann Sebastian Bach had already subscribed to the writing out of every note that was to be performed.

Wade identifies three reasons for the phenomenon of writing down the embellished versions. Firstly, “a composer’s or soloist’s desire to share his performing version with a friend in another city obviously necessitated its notation,” as exemplified in recital versions of keyboard works that were sent by Bach to Westphal in Schwerin, and included embellishments as may have been performed by Bach.

Secondly, Bach took into consideration students or technically weaker performers who may face the difficulty of spontaneous improvisation. Wade cites Bach’s comment in the preface to the first edition of the Sonata W. 50 (1760), where she observes that he has written out the varied reprise to save beginner and amateur students the trouble of obtaining such a version for themselves. Schenker comments that at least from 1760, instead of leaving the right of prescription to the performer, Bach rather chose to write out the embellishments explicitly in advance, to avoid

55 Fox, “Melodic Nonconstancy,” 46.
56 Wade, 96.
57 Bach, Essay, 14.
58 Wade, 97. Darrell Berg also refers to this point. See Berg, “C. P. E. Bach’s ‘Variations’ and ‘Embellishments’ for His Keyboard Sonatas,” 170.
misinterpretations by the amateur performer.\textsuperscript{59} He also emphasises that for the performer, they need to execute the embellishments strictly on the basis of composer’s accurate intention.\textsuperscript{60} Johann Abraham Birnbaum’s defence of J. S. Bach in 1738 also sheds some light on this issue. He remarks,… it is certain that what is called the “manner” of singing or playing [the addition of ornaments] is almost everywhere valued and considered desirable. It is also indisputable that this manner can please the ear only if it is applied in the right places… But only the fewest [performers] have a sufficient knowledge, and the rest, by an inappropriate application of the manner, spoil the principle melody and indeed often introduce such passages as might easily be attributed, by those who do not know the true state of affairs, to an error of the composer. \textbf{Therefore every composer, including the Hon. Court Composer, is entitled to set the wanderers back on the right path by prescribing a correct method according to his intentions, and thus to watch over the preservation of his own honor.}\textsuperscript{61}

Finally, Wade states that an experienced performer and composer may create an embellished version of a score for pedagogical purposes, citing Westphal’s indication in his thematic catalogue of such a manuscript as been intended “for students.”\textsuperscript{62}
Chapter 2: Ornaments and their functions in Bach’s keyboard works from the 1730s-1740s

In this chapter, I introduce Salzer’s theory of the functions of ornaments. This theory is then applied to selected examples from Bach’s keyboard works, especially exploiting the opportunity to compare movements that exist in two versions.

2.1 Bach’s Nachlass-Verzeichnis: early and later versions

In The Present State of Music in Germany, the Netherlands, and United Provinces, Charles Burney gave a general appraisal of Bach and his music. As Schulenberg points out, Burney observed that “Bach, as a player, was capable of ‘every style; through he confines himself chiefly to the expressive.”

Burney states,

…His productions for his own instruments, the clavichord, and piano forte, in which he stands unrivalled…for though his genius is equal to everything in music… however, each candid observer and hearer, must discover, in his slightest and most trivial productions, of every kind, some mark of originality in the modulation, accompaniment, or melody, which bespeak a great and exalted genius…for more than thirty years, Carl. P. E. Bach, and Francis Benda, have, perhaps, been the only two, who dared to have a style of their own; the rest are imitators…

Christoph Wolff states during the years from around 1730 to the last years of his life, Bach was fully committed to the composition of keyboard works. These works have been praised as “lying at the heart of his creative work.”

---

appreciation towards Bach’s use of harmony in 1796 with the comment, “no instrumental music had previously appeared in which as rich and yet well-ordered a harmony was united with such noble song, so much beauty and order with such originality, as in Bach’s first two sonata collections engraved in Nuremberg.”\textsuperscript{67} Schullenberg points out that the 1730s and 1740s were the years when C. P. E. Bach conceived his idiosyncratically stylistic keyboard sonatas and concertos;\textsuperscript{68} and during which Bach’s style matures on deeper levels.\textsuperscript{69} Moreover, Fox emphasises that it was through the 1740s that Bach gradually defined his musical style with “an extremely broad developmental context,” characterised by “the experimental and increasingly bold style.”\textsuperscript{70} Schullenberg regards the works of the 1740s as representing “the perfection of Bach’s unique expressive language,” and is revealed by the use of “intense rhetoric founded upon sudden pauses, shifts in surface motion, harmonic shocks, and occasional formal experimentation.”\textsuperscript{71}

In addition to the techniques mentioned above, Schullenberg points out that along with the increased use of dynamics, the more prominent aspect of Bach’s “style shift” is his occasional employment of “symphonic style,” a harmonically and melodically assertive approach originating from the Italian opera \textit{sinfonia}. He observes that although this style had appeared in other contexts, from the mid-1740s it was specifically adopted in the keyboard sonatas.\textsuperscript{72}

Fox makes a comprehensive summary of Bach’s crucial compositional activities in different stages of his career:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{68} Schullenberg, “C. P. E. Bach through the 1740s,” 217.
  \item \textsuperscript{69} Schullenberg, “C. P. E. Bach through the 1740s,” 221.
  \item \textsuperscript{71} Schullenberg, “C. P. E. Bach through the 1740s,” 217.
  \item \textsuperscript{72} Schullenberg, \textit{The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach}, 9.
\end{itemize}
There is evidence of certain concentrations of activity, such as the process of ‘renewing’ earlier works which Bach undertook in the 1740s or the large number of pedagogical and character pieces written for keyboard during the 1750s and 1760s. Also evident is an extremely broad developmental context, featuring the experimental and increasingly bold style which emerges throughout the 1740s, the long ‘plateau’ of ‘refinement’ during the 1750s and 1760s, and the increased emphasis during the later Hamburg years on aphoristic motifs, connected movements, and more radical harmonic adventure, bringing many instrumental works closer to his improvised fantasia ideal.73

Scholars have noted a divergence in style after the 1740s.74 Therefore, the keyboard sonatas and sonatinas from the 1730s and 1740s form a distinctive period which will be the focus of my analysis.

Schulenberg observes that Bach’s complete output is hard to describe, as many works among it were “adaptations, revisions, or arrangements of existing compositions.”75 He adds more detail to Fox’s description of the works of the 1740s:

According to the estate catalogue (NV) issued by Bach’ widow, the years that saw the emergence of Emanuel’s style were also ones in which he revised most of the surviving earlier works, including the first seventeen keyboard sonatas and the first three harpsichord concertos. Less far-reaching revisions of these and later works continued to take place thereafter, but evidently Bach did not feel that these involved a sufficiently great alteration to be described as renewals (Erneuerungen).76

Schulenberg comments that the revisions made during the mid-forties are a “systematic revision” of the earlier works, which contain the insertion of melodic embellishments and sometimes even fresh ideas.77 He suggests that Bach’s use of the term erneuert in his own catalogue, the Nachlass-Verzeichnis of 1790, indicates that for Bach, revisions of musical characteristics even at a surface level, were endowed with “a profound refashioning.”78

Other characteristics of Bach’s mature style identified by Schulenberg are the careful notation of melodic embellishment, as discussed earlier, and formal experimentation founded upon a “fairly

---

74 See for example Günther Wager, quoted in a footnote to Petty, 77.
76 Schulenberg, “C. P. E. Bach through the 1740s,” 218.
77 Schulenberg, The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, 5.
78 Schulenberg, “C. P. E. Bach through the 1740s,” 220-221.
rigid formal design.” The relationship between these two aspects will be explored in my analysis.

Bach’s music has been subject to several attempts at cataloguing. Works discussed in this thesis are labeled according to Alfred Wotquenne thematic catalogue published in 1905. However, in identifying revised versions of earlier works, I have consulted the table published in the Garland Collected Works for Solo Keyboard, which documents the year of composition and the years in which Bach revisited the work, if he did so. This is based upon Bach’s Nachlass-Verzeichnis, which has been described by Schulenberg as the most significant catalogue of the composer’s estate within the older lists. It contains over 300 items for “Clavier Soli” (solo keyboard); over half of these were given the title of “sonata,” and the other items represent a large range of genres developed between the 1730s and 1780s in Germany, including fantasias, fugues, rondos and suites.

In discussing Bach’s revisions, Wade identifies three situations that may result in the alteration of the existing materials: “corrections of occasional mistakes in the writing of a note,” “mechanical revisions of part-writing,” and “substantial changes in a passage for musical reasons.” It is the third category that provides valuable information not only about Bach’s compositional methods, but also about his changing stylistic preferences over time. Wade further points out the unusual frequency of Bach’s revisions. Based on the autograph evidence, she observes that Bach seldom seemed to regard a work as finished, and that his compositional decisions represented a temporary resolution to

82 Schulenberg, The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, 4.
84 Wade, 72.
which he may later return.\textsuperscript{85}

As Schulenberg remarks,

Bach’s failure to publish his remaining early sonatas must have reflected a desire to print only things that represented his best and most up-to-date work. Yet he was evidently keen to prevent the dissemination of these works in early versions, which earned him no profit and could damage his reputation. Hence his zeal in revising them, although even in their renovated versions many would have appealed only to pupils and amateurs.

Schulenberg also points out that the publication of his simpler sonatas from the 1740s was an indication of Bach’s established reputation by this point and his desire to exploit the new commercial opportunities.\textsuperscript{86}

\textsuperscript{85} Wade, 85.
\textsuperscript{86} Schulenberg, \textit{The Music of Carl Philip Emanuel Bach}, 81.
2.2 Felix Salzer’s theory of ornaments and their functions

In *The Classical Style*, Charles Rosen describes an evolution in the relationship between ornamentation and structure through the eighteenth century:

In all the arts, the taste for ornamentation changed radically in the last quarter of the eighteenth century…Most important of all, the function of decoration became the exact contrary of what it had been. In Rococo interiors, the decoration was used to hide the structure, to cover over the joints, to enforce a supreme continuity. Neoclassical decoration, however, always much more sparing, was used to emphasize structure, to articulate it, and to sharpen the spectator’s sense of it. The analogous change in the function of musical ornaments does not need a mystical correspondence of the arts to explain it… To equate the practice of Mozart (and Haydn after 1780) with that of J. S. Bach or even C. P. E. Bach is to ignore one of the most sweeping revolutions of taste in history.87

However, as may be observed from my previous discussion, the trend described by Rosen was already becoming evident in Bach’s keyboard works.

In *The Significance of the Ornaments in Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach’s Keyboard Works*, Salzer offers a detailed analysis of Bach’s use of ornamentation that points to its functional significance. Salzer introduces the ornaments including the short appoggiatura and compound appoggiatura; trills (ascending and descending), short trill and mordent; and the turn, trilled turn and snapped turn respectively. According to different characteristics of the individual ornament, through the analysis of the interaction between those various ornaments and their underlying voice-leading and harmonic structure, they lead to a “fundamental realization” that “far from being in any way arbitrary, Bach’s use of short appoggiaturas shows them to be genuinely important components of the musical content.”88 Thus, for example, Salzer summarises the functions of different ornamentations as having the “function of repeating specific tones [and] repeating the voice leading,” preparation of

88 Salzer, 21.
both “subsequent tones” and “subsequent voice leading” and so forth. Salzer’s approach will
tempests hypotheses of diurnal and nocturnal properties, and so forth. Salzer’s approach will
serve as a partial model for my own analysis.

However, it is necessary first to clarify the different naming of ornaments in Bach’s period in
contrast to current usage. As Petty suggests, compared to some of the terms we are using these days,
Bach’s terms have “broader meanings.” In particular, the term Vorschlage [appoggiatura] includes a
wide range of modern categories of dissonance.90

In the Essay, there is a discussion of the appropriate use of the appoggiatura illustrated with a
musical example (see Figure 4, Bach’s Figure 88 Example b). Through the comparison of two
examples between the notes arriving on a strong beat and weak beat, Bach suggests the appoggiatura
should be accented by playing on the strong beat in order to emphasise the dissonance. In this
example, the notes D, C, and B would each be described in modern terms as an escape tone; however,
Bach uses the term “unaccented appoggiatura”:

This latter dislocation is the origin of the repulsive unaccented appoggiatura, so extraordinarily popular, which is
reserved, unfortunately, for the most legato passages, such as those in Figure 88, Example b. If appoggiaturas
should or must be used in such cases, the asterisked executions are more tolerable. Hence, the remedy for
unaccented appoggiaturas is to shift them ahead to the next accent.91

A similar example also appears in the discussion of the trill (Bach’s Figure 101), which discusses the
inappropriate use of the trill with suffix. Bach labels the “addition to the suffix of a short note” F as
an “unaccented appoggiatura,” “which can be justly included among the worthless unaccented

89 Salzer, 18-21.
90 Petty, 28-29.
91 Bach, Essay, 98.
appoggiaturas.” 92 Similarly, this is what we call now an escape tone.

In addition to this, in Chapter Five, which deals with “Thorough Bass,” in Bach’s Figure 363 Example a, the upper voices (A and D) within the 7 chord are referred to by Bach as “appoggiaturas.” 93 However, since they are prepared, these would be labelled in modern context as suspensions.

In Chapter Four, Bach’s definition of the “irregular passing tone” corresponds to the modern accented passing tone. 94 However, in discussing his Figure 469, Example a, he observes that “Irregular passing tones are to be regarded as appoggiaturas that have been written out and given an exact length.” 95 Note that this comment supports the interpretation of written-out embellishments as ornaments.

92 Bach, Essay, 106-107. The bold characters are my own emphasis.
93 Bach, Essay, 287. The bold characters are my own emphasis.
94 Bach, Essay, 196.
95 Bach, Essay, 425-426. The bold characters are my own emphasis.
Therefore, from the above examples, it can be seen that the way of approaching the embellishment nowadays is different from C. P. E. Bach’s time. Because of their more specific nature, I have adopted the modern terminology for the purposes of this study.

2.2.1 Sonatina in E minor Wq 64/4 (original, 1734; revised, 1744), II.

The Sonatina Wq 64/4 in E minor exists in two versions, and provides a good illustration of Salzer’s theory of the functions of ornamentation in Bach’s works. The later version is clearly a very extensive elaboration and enlargement of the original.

If we compare the opening bar of the earlier version to the opening bars 1 – 3 of the later version (see Figure 5), it is apparent that the written-out appoggiaturas A and F in bar 1 of the earlier version have been altered to the notated appoggiaturas in the later version. Moreover, those notated appoggiaturas continue in descending motion and are extended and developed with a construction built on a chromatic sequence with 7-6 suspensions. Now the original three-part texture is enriched.
to four parts in the later version. It can be noted that if the notated appoggiaturas are inverted from
sixths to thirds, they may be seem as initiating the parallel thirds movement in the lower voices of
the sequence. Thus, in Salzer’s terms, this example displays the appoggiatura’s “function of
preparing subsequent voice leading,”96 where a more profound purpose for the appoggiaturas can be
revealed—the descending parallel thirds of the underlying harmony are anticipated in the upper
voices that “are prepared by means of the ornament.”97

(Figure 5)
If we continue to go through the rest of the movement (see Figure 6), the contrast between bar 10 of the earlier version and bars 8 – 11 of the later version provides a deeper significance for the embellishment. The descending melodic line with notated appoggiatura, D – C – B, in the earlier version has been written out in expanded version at bars 9 – 11 in the later version. Again, this expanded version displays a rich use of harmony, where the D – C – B shape forms the structure of a descending 5ths sequence with sevenths and a suspended ninth. There comes an interesting phenomenon: the descending structure of the sequence is completed by a brief descending figure with notated appoggiatura, A – G – F♯, at bar 11. This figure represents repetition “in shortened form”⁹⁸ of the previous expanded version of the written-out appoggiatura. As Salzer observes for his example, from the Württemberg Sonata No. 1 (1742), “here its use permits the repetition of an underlying linear progression through a third.”⁹⁹ He further comments that “Here the appoggiatura again serves as an agent of diminution, but in a significantly deeper capacity, since it permits the expression of voice-leading events.”¹⁰⁰

---

⁹⁸ Salzer, 18.
⁹⁹ Salzer, 18.
¹⁰⁰ Salzer, 18.
Continuing to examine the second movement of Wq 64/4, bars 12 – 14 of the later version can be seen as a combination of the previous two examples (see Figure 7). Firstly, when compared to their original version bars 13 – 15, it is interesting to observe that the original descent in the bass, B – A – G – F – E – D – C, of the earlier version has been shared between tenor and bass in the later version and forms the basis of a descending sequence (diatonic parallel ⅔ series), with added chromatic passing tones and suspensions. As with the opening bars of this movement (see Figure 5), the notated appoggiaturas F and D followed by their downward resolution anticipate the voice-leading structure of the sequence. The notated short appoggiaturas at bar 14 of the later version present the repetition “in shortened form,” and then extension, of the preceding voice-leading structure, D – C – B. Hence, these two examples reflect two aspects of Salzer’s theory: the “function of preparing subsequent
voice leading” and the “function of repeating the voice leading.”

The above comparison between the two versions demonstrates how Salzer’s theory of the functions of ornaments helps us to understand the relationship between ornamentation and voice-leading. Bach ingeniously transforms the original version into one that is full of harmonic novelty and surprise.

---

101 Salzer, 18.
2.2.2 Sonatina in F major Wq 64/1 (original, 1734; revised, 1744), I.

The first movement of the Sonatina in F major Wq 64/1, in its earlier and later version, provides further insight into Salzer’s theory. If we compare bars 13 – 17 of both versions, the music is identical except bar 13. The additional upper-register A extends the descent to E, as may be observed in the following voice-leading reduction (see Figure 8). As it can be seen, both versions have an interrupted progression at bar 14, where chord vi substitutes for the expected C major chord. The extended descent in the later version increases the momentum towards this interrupted progression and the subsequent descent to tonic.

Furthermore, the two appoggiaturas (G♯ and E) at bar 13 of the later version play an important role in promoting the voice-leading structure. The G♯ emphasises the important A in this passage; the appoggiatura E lends emphasis to 2 and this subsequent descent to tonic in another interrupted progression from bars 13 – 14.
Sonatina in F major Wq 64/1: first movement - early version bars 11-17

C major: 1

(IV) ii° V4 vi

Sonatina in F major Wq 64/1: first movement - later version bars 11-17

It is remarkable that a change to one bar can lead to such a transformation and enrichment of the voice-leading structure.

2.2.3 *Sonata in D minor Wq 65/3* (original, 1732; revised, 1744), II.

The most prominent feature of the second movement of Sonata in D minor Wq 65/3 is the prevalent insertion of the trilled turn compared to its earlier version (compare Figures 9 and 10). Bach in his *Essay* has the following description of the trilled turn: “the turn allies itself with the short trill when its first two notes are alternated with extreme rapidity by means of a snap. The effect of the combined
ornaments can be most easily realized by thinking of a short trill with a suffix. This trilled turn introduces a unique charm and brilliance to the keyboard."\textsuperscript{102} Owing to the two-part nature of this ornament, Salzer notes Bach’s passion for “find[ing] interesting ways of employing the ornament in its double function.”\textsuperscript{103}

\textsuperscript{102} Bach, \textit{Essay}, 121.
\textsuperscript{103} Salzer, 36.

(Figure 9)

(Figure 10)
The added trilled turn above the note B♭ at bar 12 in the later version provides a demonstration of Salzer’s approach (see Figure 11). The trilled turn possesses the double function of “repeating specific tones and preparing subsequent voice leading – repetition and preparation.” It can be observed that the descending second between the appoggiatura C and the note B♭ is repeated in diminution in the short trill; at the same time the suffix A – B♭ anticipates the voice leading on the larger scale in the following bar, where the voice-leading moves from the A within the F major chord to the chordal 7th, B♭, of the dominant 7th then resolves in the subsequent F major chord.

However, regarding to the widespread substitution of the trilled turn in this movement, we must acknowledge the fact that this is a wholesale amendment made by Bach, possibly reflecting a generic preference for the trilled turn to replace the trill. A similar process may be observed in the first movement of the later version of Sonata in A major Wq 65/10 (Figures 12 and 13).

\[104\] My observation is built on Salzer’s investigation of musical example 55 in his article *The Significance of the Ornaments in Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach’s Keyboard Works*, 37. The terms “function of repeating specific tones” and the “function of preparing subsequent voice leading” come from Salzer’s discussion of the short appoggiatura in the same article, page 18.

(Figure 13)
Returning to Wq 65/3, when bar 16 of the later version is compared to the same bar of the earlier version, the added trilled turn above the note E♭ has effect of intensifying the implied cadential 6\(^\text{5}\)\(^\text{4}\).

Salzer observes a similar function for the trill in his discussion of Württemberg Sonata No. 1.\(^{105}\) In Figure 14, the F of the trilled turn is first introduced as an appoggiatura adding weight to the suspension. As Salzer observes for his example, from a performance practice perspective, it is unavoidable for the performer to lend more weight to the first note of the trilled turn, thereby emphasising the harmonic effect.\(^{106}\) Moreover, the trilled turn foreshadows the E-F motion of the top voice at bar 17.

Apart from the insertion of the trilled turn in the later version of this movement, another point where Bach incorporates new material within the later version of this movement is the added turn above the note G at bar 26 (see Figure 15). Firstly, we cannot exclude the possibility that Bach may have

\(^{105}\) Salzer, 22.

\(^{106}\) Salzer, 22.
intended that the performer of the early version may choose to improvise an ornament at this point, nevertheless, the later written-out embellishment testifies to Salzer’s principle of preparing subsequent tones, where the pitches in the semiquaver figure at the beginning of next bar are anticipated by those in the turn.

2.2.4 Sonatina in E minor Wq 64/4 (original, 1734; revised, 1744), I.

This example demonstrates an extension of Salzer’s approach in which ornamentation may be linked to motific elements in the music. The opening of the first movement in the later version of the Sonatina in E minor Wq 64/4 introduces motific elements rather than merely employing the arpeggio pattern of the earlier version (see Figure 16). Firstly, it can be observed that in bar 1 of the later version, an appoggiatura D♯ precedes the E, creating a rising semitone motif. This anticipates the same motif already present in the melody in bar 2. Thus the ascending second motif D♯ – E is introduced twice in the upper voice at bars 1 – 2 of the later version. Further, it is notable that this
rising semitone motif has been added to the later version at bars 43 and 45 in the lower voice (see Figure 18 in comparison to the early version of Figure 17).

Further evidence of motific thinking may be found in the bass in bar 2, where the reiterated A clarifies the motific link to the right hand figure in bar 3 (see Figure 16). This motif reappears in the bass at bars 62 – 65 of the later version (see Figure 18 in comparison to the early version of Figure 17). The additional falling third, C – A, in bar 1 of the later version could be considered to be an abbreviated form of the motif in bar 3.
(Figure 17)

(Figure 18)
In contrast to the previous examples, bar 4 of the later version displays significant alteration to the lower voice (see Figure 19). It can be observed that Bach abandoned the original ascending 3rd melodic figure and adopted a descending scalic figure with the insertion of passing tones in the later version; hence a richer bass support is created. The new combination of the upper and lower voices produces a novel effect, where the passing tone D♮ in the bass followed by the upper-voice D♯ creates a false relation. Immediately after that, the C♯ within the turn in the upper voice is sounded against the C♮ in the bass. Consequently, the false relation heightens the effect of the turn, and in conjunction with the collision between D and D♯, the interaction between the two voices produces multiple clashes. The complexity of the later version leads to a different effect and greater momentum towards the cadence.

Comparing bars 5 – 6 of the later version with the early version, the lower voices are almost the same, apart from some changes of register. However, looking at the upper voice at bar 5 in the later version, based on the original melodic descending 3rd with the appoggiatura, Bach elaborated the original figure by including a chordal skip and passing tones, while the appoggiatura is now written out and has an added trill. Firstly, the insertion of the trill corresponds well to Salzer’s description of one of the trill functions where it “permits the repetition and emphasis of the preceding second”¹⁰⁷ A – G; more significantly, its combination with the bass note B creates the effect of a 7-6 suspension on the scale degrees 3 – 2, and therefore increases the anticipation of the subsequent 2 – 1 (F♯ – E), hence producing more momentum towards to the tonic.

¹⁰⁷ Salzer, 21.
2.2.5 Sonata in A major Wq 65/10 (original, 1738; revised, 1743), I.

In this movement, comparing the opening bar 3 of the later version to the early version, it is obvious that Bach has added a turn above the note D (see Figure 20). The insertion of the ornament here supports Salzer’s notion of the turn’s function being “in part to prepare the voice leading.” In addition, it has the effect of repeating the preceding tones, hence the ornamentation helps to reinforce the voice leading. Again, it must be acknowledged that a performer of the early version...
may have improvised this turn, nevertheless, its effect remains the same.

In bar 6 of the revised version, Bach interpolates a compound appoggiatura before the note E (see Figure 21). In his Essay, Bach has the following descriptions about the compound appoggiatura:

“Melodies grow in attractiveness through the use of this ornament, which serves to connect notes
and, to a degree, fill them out.” To begin with, it can be observed that, rather than simply repeating the same note, the compound appoggiatura helps to articulate the second E. Furthermore, as indicated in Figure 21, the insertion of the compound appoggiatura intensifies Bach’s apparent concern with exploring the D♯ - F♯ - E figure in a variety of ways within a single bar. This approach is also evident in the later version of the second movement of Sonata in B flat major Wq 65/9 as discussed in Chapter 4 (see Figure 34).


(Figure 21)
2.2.6 *Sonata in G major* Wq 65/12 (original, 1740; revision date unknown), I.

Here, it is noteworthy that the two trills above the note F in bar 24 of the early version are replaced by ascending trills in the later version; along with the reprise (bar 74), this is the only place in the movement where trills are converted to ascending trills. A third ascending trill is inserted in bar 23.

The replacement of the trill with the ascending trill can be analysed from two aspects. Firstly, the prefix contained in the ascending trill increases the level of dissonance and hence builds momentum towards the cadence. Further, the pitches contained in the ascending trill (E – F♯ − G) prepare the voice-leading descent, 4 − 3 − 2, that ultimately reaches tonic in bar 26. The repetition of the ascending trill helps to heighten both aspects of its effect here.
When comparing bars 66 – 67 of the later version to the early version, the consecutive added compound appoggiaturas at bar 67 recall a similar compositional device to that used in bars 12 – 14 in the later version of the second movement of Sonatina in E minor Wq 64/4 (see Figure 7), where the appoggiaturas function to repeat and extend the scalar figure of the previous bar.

![Figure 23](image-url)

The examples discussed above support Salzer’s ideas about the various functions of ornamentation in C. P. E. Bach’s keyboard works. Some of these functions can be perceived at the first glance, while some of them require deeper analysis of the voice-leading structure. However, whatever the level or depth, Salzer highlights the importance of interpreting the musical context in order to gain
insight into “the true artistic value of ornaments.”\textsuperscript{110} A substantial part of the changes made in the later versions of these sonatas and sonatinas relate to ornamentation. The interpolation of a new ornament or replacement of the original ornament in the later version points to the deliberate nature of Bach’s use of ornamentation, which goes beyond merely creating an animating effect. However, there are other aspects to the understanding of the musical context, which will be explored in the following chapters.

\textsuperscript{110} Salzer, 39.
Chapter 3: “Rational deception” in Bach’s keyboard sonatas

3.1 The opening of the Sonata in B minor H. 245/W. 55, 3, I.

In the 1950s, Karl Geiringer commented on the “exquisite sense of humour” which characterises Bach’s work. In response to Geiringer’s use of the term, “exquisite,” Susan Wollenberg points out that this word “provides a significant pointer, suggesting a sense of that attention to precise detail which was essential to Bach’s compositional thought. His musical humour often depends for its effect on a single exquisite detail, cleverly manipulated.” Such “precise detail” may include these compositional techniques indentified by Fox: “the use of an unexpected harmony (elision of function, sudden change of mode, abrupt modulation, etc.), which is compounded by melodic, rhythmic, or textural shock.”

Later, Fox refers to the term “Verwunderung” which, in eighteenth-century aesthetics, describes “the wonderment or surprise created by the unexpected.” This “not only arouses attention but also clarifies the emotional content of a piece through what [Alexander Gottlieb] Baumgarten termed ‘elucidation by the contrary.’” While Fox acknowledges that this concept became a catalyst for much debate, she explains Baumgarten’s view that nonconstancy intensifies the interest and emotional affect of a piece, “thus novelty is absolutely essential if one wants to obtain aesthetic

---

112 Wollenberg, 295-296.
115 Fox, “Melodic Nonconstancy,” 126.
According to Fox, C. P. E. Bach “utilized defeat of expectation to arouse the listener’s attentiveness.”\(^\text{117}\) Wollenberg comments that the effect is to render the audience confounded, thus Bach’s music (Wollenberg emphasises especially that for solo keyboard and the orchestral symphonies) stipulates thoughtful and careful listening. Further, she credits Fox’s observation that the listener’s attentiveness is maintained not by a seamless flow of ideas but by employing “unexpected or disruptive procedures.”\(^\text{118}\)

Drawing on Schenker’s analysis, Petty refers to “concealment” in Bach’s music.\(^\text{119}\) In Schenker’s words:

“Bach insists on the most precise order even in the diminution of a free fantasy, but conceals this order under the appearance of disorder purely for the sake of the fantasy; this constitutes the inimitable of his art.”\(^\text{120}\)

In attempting a general characterisation of Bach’s musical style, Schulenberg draws upon the concept of “mannerism.” He points out that Maria Rika Maniate’s investigation of “mannerism” in sixteenth-century music highlights the employment of “\textit{maniera},” which involves “technical devices or conceit meant to elicit surprise or admiration while being expressive or witty or both.” Schulenberg also refers to Willi Apel’s portrayal of the late fourteenth-century \textit{ars subtilior}, in which characteristics of mannerism exist in extensive embellishment on the surface, which disguises the structure of a work.\(^\text{121}\)

\(^{116}\) Fox, “Melodic Nonconstancy,” 127.
\(^{117}\) Fox, “Melodic Nonconstancy,” 128.
\(^{118}\) Wollenberg, 296-297.
\(^{119}\) Petty, 58.
\(^{121}\) Schulenberg, \textit{The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach}, 12.
To sum up, whether it be Fox’s “defeat of expectation,” Schulenberg’s “mannerism” or Petty’s “concealment,” the common thread here is Bach’s concept of “rational deception.” One important manifestation of this lies in the use of deceptive harmonic progressions. As Bach observes, “those who are capable will do well when they depart from a too natural use of harmony to introduce an occasional deception.”

Bach’s use of the word “natural” in the *Essay* is explored extensively by Petty. From a harmonic aspect, it suggests that the music proceeds in accordance with the “basic properties of the diatonic system,” hence satisfying “the listener’s expectations.” In order to achieve a certain effect, a composer might introduce techniques that distort this natural order, but eventually that order must be restored. “Ultimately, the listener must somehow be able to sense the natural relationships operating under the surface – the play between the natural and the artificial.” As Bach himself observes,

> It is one of the beauties of improvisation to feign modulation to a new key through a formal cadence and then move off in another direction. This and other rational deceptions make a fantasia attractive; but they must not be excessively used, or natural relationships will become hopelessly buried beneath them.

The first movement of Sonata in B minor H. 245/W. 55, 3 (1774) is an ideal example in which to explore the concept of “expectational defeat” since Charles Rosen’s observations about its “non-tonic opening” have been further discussed by Wollenberg. Wollenberg demonstrates her own findings in this sonata that the “non-tonic opening” offers “little tonal stability.” Referring to “reductio ad absurdum”, she describes the traditional opening as containing an “upbeat scramble” of

---

124 Petty, 64.
125 Petty, 64.
“three introductory notes” of the tonic triad (see Figure 24). This is followed by a dominant-tonic progression in D major, leading Wollenberg to suggest that the opening triplet has been “calculated with ironic intent.”

A leading note A♯, may be expected after the opening B minor triad in order to establish the tonic. However, Bach unexpectedly uses an A♮, which leads down to F♯. Moreover, the trill-turn above the passing note, G, reinforces through repetition the unexpected direction of the voice-leading and its associated harmony.

Tom Beghin offers his version of one of Johann Nikolaus Forkel’s models for a rhetorical interpretation of music, as follows: “to start from a wrong statement, disprove it, and replace it with one’s own, correct version.” That model is demonstrated in the opening bars of this sonata.

The G♯ in bar 1 should lead to the leading note A♯ and then to the tonic. However, the line again makes a turn towards A♮, emphasised by the insertion of an appoggiatura B. In comparison to this, in bar 2, the G♯ does progress to A♯ and the attainment of the tonic in bar 3 is marked by an appoggiatura C♯. Therefore, the same type of ornament is presented in different ways: one highlights the unexpected direction of the line; the second delivers the expected outcome. This passage offers support for Wollenberg’s observation that “C. P. E. Bach was perhaps one of the first composers to endow the opening of an instrumental movement with more than a purely annunciatory significance.”

129 Wollenberg, 306.
130 Beghin, 159.
131 Wollenberg, 305.
Sonata in B minor H. 245/W. 55, 3 - Bars 1-4

Allegretto


(Figure 24)
3.2 Sonata in A major H. 29/W. 48, 6, I.

In discussing Bach’s methods of deception, Fox summarises two situations that appear in his works:

In some instances the music proceeds so variably and unpredictably that Bach avoids creating expectations; in other works he deliberately establishes an expectation only to defeat it soon thereafter, achieving nonconstancy when the expectation of regularity is skillfully denied fulfillment.132

While the previous example, from the opening of Sonata in B minor H. 245/W. 55, 3, aptly illustrates Fox’s first category, the first movement of Sonata in A major, H. 29/W. 48, 6 (1742) demonstrates Bach’s deception “at a work’s inception and his methods of demanding continued attention throughout.”133 In order to contrast Bach’s musical construction with the conventional musical design, Wollenberg presents two examples: Bach’s opening measures 1 – 5 and a “hypothetical” version (see Figure 25).

At the beginning of Example a, the note D in the melody lacks harmonic support and we are unable to determine whether this note is a chord tone or an appoggiatura. It is not until the sounding of an A major chord on the second quaver that this question is resolved. However, Fox points out that instead of maintaining any sense of unpredictability, Bach responds “in such an extreme form” with “conventional materials (scales, arpeggios)” from bar 3 onwards,134 creating what Wollenberg describes as a “compensatory gesture” – “understatement followed by overstatement.”135 Elsewhere, she refers to Bach’s “ploy”, “to omit some crucial factor at the expected moment and then to insert it at the ‘wrong’ moment as if in (somewhat mocking) compensation for its original omission.”136

---

133 Fox, “Stylistic Anomalies,” 117.
134 Wollenberg, 313. “From bar 3 onwards” takes into account Wollenberg’s observation of what happens in bars 6 – 14, where “there might appear to be some difficulty in departing from the tonic key.”
135 Wollenberg, 300.
136 Wollenberg, 299.
rushing scalic figure at bar 3 and the remaining bars emphasise the tonic A which should have been sounded in the lower voice under the appoggiatura at the start of bar. Bach’s subversive compositional design is described by Wollenberg as “mocking” the musical conventions of the time.\textsuperscript{137}

\textsuperscript{137} Wollenberg, 313.

\textbf{Sonata in A major, H. 29/W. 48, 6}

\textit{a} measures 1-5

\textit{b} 'Hypothetical' version

\textbf{Allegro}
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3.3 Summary

These two sonatas and the analyses by Wollenberg and Fox serve to demonstrate the concepts of “understatement followed by overstatement” and “defeat of expectation” that will form a part of the rhetorical understanding of Bach’s music which will be discussed in Chapter 5. My additional observations are intended to demonstrate the role of ornamentation and its contribution to the creation of these effects.
Chapter 4: The role of embellishment in two of Bach’s keyboard compositions: comparison of early and later versions

4.1 Sonata in B flat H. 18/W. 65, 9, embellishment and transformation in the later version

Schulenberg observes that the slow movement of the Sonata in B flat H. 18/W. 65, 9 offers a particularly clear case for the examination of ornamentation in comparing original and revised versions.\(^{138}\) Indeed, in the Critical Notes to the Collected Works, Darrell Berg notes that “Revision, in this sonata, consists of embellishment, particularly in the middle movement.”\(^{139}\) The two versions of this sonata are separated by a period of six years (1737/1743), and come from a larger set of sonatas which Bach reworked. Through the analysis of both the original and later versions, I will investigate the interplay between the underlying harmonic structure and alterations to the surface level. Because the changes are all related, I will need to refer to changes other than ornamentation where those alterations affect harmony and voice-leading structure.

The opening bars of this movement show clearly the extensive addition of melodic embellishments in the later version. In particular, the later version displays abundant use of appoggiaturas and suspensions.\(^{140}\) Bach describes appoggiaturas as follows:

> Appoggiaturas are among the most essential embellishments. They enhance harmony as well as melody. They heighten the attractiveness of the latter by joining notes smoothly together…they prolong others by occasionally repeating a preceding tone, and musical experience attests to the agreeableness of well-contrived repetitions. Appoggiaturas modify chords which would be too simple without them. All syncopations and dissonances can be

\(^{138}\) Schulenberg, “C. P. E. Bach through the 1740s,” 220-221.


\(^{140}\) As discussed on page 29, it is acknowledged here that Bach would have classified the suspensions as appoggiaturas. Also, to reiterate, both the notated and written-out appoggiatura are included in the discussions here.
traced back to them. What would harmony be without these elements?  

Schenker reinforces Bach’s view, referring to the harmonic and melodic functions of the appoggiatura. He also notes that its “effects and characteristics” comparable to those of a suspension.

Compared to the early version, in the later version of the Sonata in B flat, much greater emphasis is given to the third degree in the melody at the beginning. The alto voice adds a 9-8 suspension to support the 7-6 in the melody (see Figure 26).

Within the same bar, the compound appoggiatura (A and C) written “in large notation” has been created on the third beat in the later version; compared to that, the melodic shape B♭ – A – B♭ is decorated by the short appoggiatura C in the early version. Although the quaver A is sounded before

---

141 Bach, Essay, 87.
142 Schenker, 54.
143 It should be noted that the reading of the semiquavers in the first bar may be erroneous, as the original manuscript is misaligned. See Bach, Collected Works for Solo Keyboard, Vol. 3, 214 for the original score.
144 Bach’s term for written-out embellishments, see for example, Essay, 87.
the short appoggiatura C, the A within the compound appoggiatura in the later version has been
given more weight. As shown in the reduction, it anticipates the eventual goal of the phrase.

Compared to the early version, the cadence is embellished with a decorated suspension,\textsuperscript{145} which
gives more emphasis to the C. Using Salzer’s terminology, it demonstrates ornamentation’s
“function of repeating voice-leading;” the C – B\textsubscript{♭} – A descent occurs twice in the phrase.

In bar 2 of the new version (see Figure 28), the interpolation of material presents a new
countermelody against the original melodic structure, as indicated in the reduction beneath the score.
Notably this is highlighted by the use of appoggiaturas, which are approached by tritone leaps
between the two strands of counterpoint. These embellishments function to further reinforce the
disruption of expectation.

\textsuperscript{145} In the \textit{Essay}, 97, Bach observes that “descending appoggiaturas written in large notation may be decorated by another
appoggiatura, long or short, when they repeat the preceding tone.”
Within the interpolation of new materials in bar 2, the inversions between the lower appoggiatura \( A^\# - G \) and the upper appoggiatura \( F^\# - G \) makes the note \( G \) sound more significant; following that, the \( G_b \) in bar 3 (enharmonic equivalent of the \( F^\# \) in bar 2) with the preceding \( F \) forms a sequential pattern after \( F^\# - G \) in bar 2, and this \( G_b \) is emphasised three times within the same bar. Compared to this later version, the \( G_b \) in the same bar of the earlier version is also approached from the preceding note \( F \), but is not motivically connected to bar 2 (see Figure 29).
Instead of resolving the V to the expected tonic major chord, Bach switches to the minor mode (see Figure 30). In the early version, the diminished 3 chord in bar 3 occurs within the subdominant chord, which sounds quite ambiguous. The whole bar is then repeated. However, in the later version, the diminished 3 chord is made unambiguous with the insertion of a C. In the diminished 3 chord, the G♭ becomes the 7th, whereas in the early version, it is merely the third of chord iv. In the later version, as a dissonance, it must resolve down to F. Bar 4 has the same harmony but introduces an arpeggio figuration, which culminates on G♭⁵, then this G♭ has been given more weight through the use of suspension. It is interesting to observe that the appoggiaturas E♭ and C in bar 3 have been written in large notation in bar 4, perhaps emphasising the affective quality of the descending minor 6th.
The contrast between versions becomes quite obvious at bar 6 (see Figure 31). In the early version, there is a cadence to simple bare octave on the tonic, whereas in the later version, the tonic chord has been expanded with neighbour notes and arpeggio figuration. This treatment of the tonic chord in bar 6 balances the previous minor section by replacing the G♭s and D♭s with their major-mode equivalents.

The octave Fs in the early version allow for the easy return to F minor in bar 7. By comparison, in the later version, bar 7 continues with the major mode until the A♭ appears at the top of an arpeggio. This juxtaposition makes the arrival of the A♭ truly startling.
A prominent revision of this later version appears at bar 10, where the second half of the bar has been crossed out, along with bar 11, and re-written after the ending of the movement.
In the early version, the opening figure, B♭ – C – D♭ is used in both bars.

The initial draft of the later version reveals Bach’s intention of reusing the same material, however, in the re-draft, bars 10 and 11 are changed: the B♭ – C – D♭ figure appears for the first time in bar 12 (see Figure 34).¹⁴⁶

¹⁴⁶ Due to inaccuracies in rhythm in the original manuscript of the later version, in the continuation of bar 10 at the end of the movement, I have rectified the rhythmic errors; see Bach, *Collected Works for Solo Keyboard*, Vol. 3, 220 for the original score.
The alteration of the materials motivates us to seek an explanation for Bach’s change of intention. It is obvious that bars 10 and 11 of the re-written version demonstrate rich use of embellishments. If we make a comparison between these two different versions, in the early version, B♭ minor arrives abruptly in bar 10 after the cadential 6. Thus the transition from major to minor is completed within one bar. Compared to the early version, the D♭ is not present in bar 10 of the later version, however, it occurs at bar 11 in the compound appoggiatura figure at the same time as the D♭ in the bass; hence, the simultaneous sounding of the same note in both upper and lower voices intensifies the effect of D♭. The use of the compound appoggiatura at bar 11 has a “preparatory function,”147 in Salzer’s terms, or a function of “preparing subsequent tones.”148 Instead of repeating the same figure in two consecutive bars, as seen in the earlier version, in the later version Bach prepares the B♭ – C – D♭ figure in bar 11, where it appears in minute reiterations, firstly in a compound appoggiatura, and then in a figure involving an appoggiatura followed by an accented passing note. Thus, an interesting connection to the figure initially presented in bar 12 is made earlier in a more subtle fashion, highlighting Bach’s desire to explore this figure in more varied ways, before presenting it as a thematic element with the turn above the B♭.

Bach’s evident change of mind near the end of the movement reflects E. Eugene Helm’s evaluation of Bach’s approach to thematic material. He states, “Emanuel Bach was not averse to repetition, especially if it was varied; but within a single melody he typically avoided repetition or anything else that might be easily remembered.” Using the term “non-tunes”, he suggests that Bach “will do anything to ensure that nobody is going to go around humming his melodies.”149 Aside from this,
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147 Salzer, 21.
148 Salzer, 21.
the clear evidence of strikethroughs on the score testifies to Wade’s opinion that Bach rarely considered a work accomplished, and the compositional decisions that he makes are treated as provisional.\textsuperscript{150} Thus, a study of the manuscript gives us valuable insight into Bach’s motivation.

Bach’s later version of the slow movement of the Sonata in B flat H. 18/W. 65, 9 demonstrates what Fox describes as “the ever-changing, capricious, and kaleidoscopic musical surface”\textsuperscript{151} of the work, and this description also fits with Fox’s principle of “nonconstancy.” She indicates that the essence of Bach’s nonconstancy is its changeability, especially in relation to melodic construction, while a solid underlying harmonic support is indispensable for providing large-scale coherency.\textsuperscript{152} Thus, the above analyses support Salzer’s summary of the non-arbitrary functions of Bach’s ornamentation, which has been a partial model for the analyses conducted in my research. The analyses of features such as the countermelody presented in the opening of the later version of this work, testifies to the importance of Bach’s ornamentation as a significant constituent of his musical material through the interaction with underlying structures, establishing the profound importance of ornamentation, going well beyond decoration.\textsuperscript{153}

\textsuperscript{150} See pages 25-26.
\textsuperscript{151} Fox, “Stylistic Anomalies,” 115.
\textsuperscript{152} Fox, “Melodic Nonconstancy,” 7-8.
\textsuperscript{153} The first and third movements of this sonata were examined, however it was found that embellishment does not play an important role in the changes made in the later version.
4.2 *Sonatina in C minor Wq 64/6, I.*

The two versions of the Sonatina in C minor Wq 64/6 are separated by a period of 10 years (1734/1744). Unlike the Sonata in B flat H. 18/W. 65, 9, most of the materials in the early version of the first movement of this sonatina have been reused in the later version, and the embellishment does not contribute significantly to the alteration of the materials. However, the opening of the later version is worth noting, where the figure with a notated appoggiatura at bar 4 appears twice more but with the appoggiatura in written-out form. Note however that in the initial statement of this figure (bars 1 – 2), the F is consonant.

If we continue to observe the rest of the movement, this motive recurs in the top voice at bars 25 – 30, repeated on the second beat of every bar (see Figure 36). Again, the first note of the figure is alternately consonant and dissonant. The link to the opening is thus made much clearer in the later version. The descending tetrachord figure also appears twice in the bass, at bars 30 – 34, in crotchets.
Perhaps avoiding the repetitive nature of the early version (see Figure 37), Bach adds a tenor in parallel thirds to the first statement of the motive (Figure 36). Thus, the emphasis given to this motive in the opening of the later version builds coherency by linking it to this later passage, and highlights Bach's zeal for exploring the same motive in varied ways.

(Figure 36)
Please note that the clef used in right hand of the early version is a Soprano C-Clef. However, bars 25-34 of the early version are exactly the same pitch as the late version. What I would like to compare within these bars is the bass.


(Figure 37)
Chapter 5: Rhetoric in eighteenth-century instrumental music

5.1 Brief historical background

Referring to the distinctive characteristics of Haydn’s music, such as “irregularities of rhythm and phrase construction,” “blurrings of sectional boundaries” and “denials of closure,” James Webster observes that in the Eighteenth Century, this “temporal dynamic” was a vital element of musical understanding, and that musical structure itself was understood to have a rhetorical foundation. In regards to this, Dietrich Bartel argues for the use of rhetorical terms to explain form, whereby one would for example state that a recapitulation functions as a summary of all the arguments, rather than a revival of themes in the tonic key. This view is supported by reference to theorists such as Johann Mattheson and Johann Nikolaus Forkel. As Bartel explains,

The German musician’s primary point of departure was an existing musical expression or form which was to be analyzed to identify its components, making it available for both pedagogical and artistic purposes. Both musica poética and rhetoric aspired to an emphatic and affective form of expression through the artful application of their respective techniques. In addition, both disciplines approached their respective subjects objectively and analytically…With common didactic methods, expressive purposes, and related positions in the Lateinschule curriculum, the “rhetorization” of musica poética was an inevitability.

The term musica poética was initially adopted by Adrianus Petit Coclico in 1552, and gradually came into more prominent use amongst German theorists. Nicolaus Listenius used the term to define a musical genre, then in 1563, Gallus Dressler extended the definition to the level of a discipline of study. At the beginning of the Seventeenth Century, Joachim Burmeister introduced

155 Webster, 172.
156 Webster, 173.
157 Bartel, 60.
158 Bartel, 58.
159 Bartel, 20.
160 Bartel, 19-20.
a systematic approach through the identification of musical-rhetorical figures. Bartel points out that the gradual gaining in significance of linguistic and rhetorical concepts combined with the development of Renaissance and Lutheran concern with science, theology and art to create a distinctively German *Musica Poetica*. However,

By the early eighteenth century, *musica poetica*’s emphasis on text expression was superseded by the call to portray and arouse the affections, gradually giving way to the emerging Enlightenment mandate to express an individual’s sentiments.

The whole statement applies well to C. P. E. Bach’s instrumental music, which is directed towards experiencing and conveying emotion:

A musician cannot move others unless he too is moved. He must of necessity feel all of the affects that he hopes to arouse in his audience, for the revealing of his own humor will stimulate a like humor in the listener. In languishing, sad passages, the performer must languish and grow sad. Thus will the expression of the piece be more clearly perceived by the audience.

As reflected in the views of Mattheson, Scheibe and Forkel, Bartel suggests that the direct expression of affects had replaced the focus on a text and had therefore become achievable in the context of instrumental music.

Johann Joachim Quantz makes a vivid analogy between musical interpretation and oratory: “Musical execution may be compared with the delivery of an orator [having] the same aim…namely to make themselves masters of the hearts of their listeners.”

---

161 Bartel, 20.
162 Bartel, 27.
163 Bartel, 24-25.
165 Bartel, 24.
Petty refers to Bach’s “‘songful’ way of writing” to describe instrumental music that stirs both performer and listener. This expression is drawn from a previously quoted statement in Bach’s autobiography:

My chief effort, especially in recent years, has been directed towards both playing and composing as songfully as possible for the clavier, notwithstanding its lack of sustaining power… It seems to me that music primarily must touch the heart, and the clavierist never can accomplish that through mere bluster, drumming, and arpeggiating, at least not in my opinion.167

Bach’s words help to confirm Bartel’s assertion of a growing belief in instrumental music’s capacity to arouse the emotions. Petty remarks,

The possible connections between music and language were a major concern for many of Bach’s friends and colleagues. Many doubted the ability of instrumental music to have meaning, but so suggestive were C. P. E. Bach’s musical “ideas” and the affects they expressed, that some of his colleagues began to see in his music something close to an autonomous instrumental art form.168

According to Bartel, the generation prior to C. P. E. Bach observed a “Baroque concept of the affections and the musical–rhetorical structures,” whereby, “as nature could be tamed, so too could the human temperaments and passions be controlled through orderly and craftfully fashioned artistic devices.”169 By contrast, C. P. E. Bach’s music may convey disorder of the human mind, inconsistency and abruptly changing emotion:

While still accepting a theological relevance of music theory, the mathematical explanation of music became subservient to the empirical realm of natural experience. This reorientation placed a subjective and individualistic slant on musical interpretation, consequently preparing the way for the eighteenth-century Empfindsamkeit aesthetic. Objectivity gave way to subjectivity, mathematics to nature, science to expression, and the Baroque to the Enlightenment.170

The remainder of this section is devoted to exploring rhetorical figures that may be found to have

168 Petty, 23.
169 Bartel, 21.
170 Bartel, 26-27.
musical parallels, and which will inform the subsequent analysis. The word rhetoric originates from the Greek term for a person who gives an oration.\textsuperscript{171} Rhetoric is therefore concerned not only with the structure or form of the speech, but also its delivery. As Martin Luther helped to integrate the concept of rhetoric into music,\textsuperscript{172} during the Renaissance, the “speculative concept of musica”\textsuperscript{173} gave way to the fine art of musical composition and a rhetorical understanding of music. As Peter Roise points out, “music and rhetoric share a basic situation; there is always a maker of music, a hearer of music, and the music – much like the speaker, the audience and the speech.”\textsuperscript{174}

With respect to the discussion of how rhetoric becomes increasingly involved in the musical design, Bartel points out that,

The composer was to use any artistic means necessary to convince his listeners. The use of rhetorical devices and structures in music was one of these methods. Both its structuring steps and divisions as well as the expressive devices used in rhetoric were adopted by the Lutheran musicians in order to make them better “preachers.” Specifically the musical – rhetorical figures became not simply unconventional or decorative musical phenomena, but rather musical devices which were developed to lend the composition a greater measure of exegetical capacity.\textsuperscript{175}

Bartel’s statement stimulates a recollection of Fox’s discussion of Bach’s nonconstancy, where she points out that one of Bach’s compositional idiosyncrasies was his ability to stimulate interest, provoke the listener’s participation and maintain sustained attention throughout a work.\textsuperscript{176} Schulenberg observes that Bach’s music is depicted as “invoking the ‘musical picturesque’ or

\textsuperscript{172} Bartel, 9.
\textsuperscript{173} Bartel, 12.
\textsuperscript{175} Bartel, 8-9.
\textsuperscript{176} Fox, “Stylistic Anomalies,” 117.
involving a high level of ‘drama’ or ‘agitation’.”¹⁷⁷ In discussing Bach’s melodic style, Fox draws upon Leonard Ratner’s statement that “classic melody is a central gathering point for elements of expression and rhetoric.”¹⁷⁸ Schulenberg emphasises Donald Tovey’s findings that Haydn had been significantly influenced by the rhetorical aspect of Bach’s music, adding that “Bach’s development of a sophisticated and subtle rhetoric was a natural product of the collision between a son of J.S. Bach and the popular galant style.”¹⁷⁹ Peter A. Hoyt has observed that Elaine Sisman’s discussion of classical rhetoric supports the impression that even in the late eighteenth century, composers “were influenced by a general intellectual climate that was saturated with rhetorical concepts.”¹⁸⁰

It is possible to identify clear connections between rhetorical theory and musical composition. As the expression of personal sentiment overtook the notion of divine inspiration, theoretical interest grew in using rhetorical concepts to explain the creative procedure in music. Beghin points out that “a good text is still largely ineffective without a good delivery, and a speaker really must make his audience attentive, well disposed, and receptive.”¹⁸¹

Good delivery, then, is nothing more and nothing less than a proper fulfillment of oratory’s previous stages: good inventio (inventing ideas), good dispositio (ordering them), good elocutio (clothing them in proper words), good memoria (memorization).¹⁸²

Bartel provides a comprehensive and systematic description of the traditional rhetorical construction within a composition, containing five steps: “inventio, dispositio, elocutio, memoria, and actio or pronunciatio.”¹⁸³ These steps are defined as follows:

---
¹⁷⁹ Schulenberg, The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, 95.
¹⁸¹ Goldberg, 59.
¹⁸² Beghin, 132.
¹⁸³ Bartel, 66.
While *inventio* concerns itself with determining the subject and gathering pertinent information, *dispositio* focuses on logically arranging the material. The third step, *elocutio*, translates the various ideas and thoughts into words and sentences, adding any necessary devices which would give the argument greater emphasis. The last two steps deal with memorization and delivery.184

Of the five rhetorical steps, the first three are emphasised in German theory, which lends priority to “orderly and eloquent construction rather than on dramatic delivery.”185

Discussing *elocutio*, Bartel identifies its four components: “correct syntax (*puritas, latinitas*), clarity (*perspicuitas*), figurative language (*ornatus*), and suitability of form to content (*aptum, decorum*)”186. In regard to “figurative language (*ornatus*),” Bartel explains the difference between tropes and figures, where tropes can be defined as “metaphoric expressions,” while figures are understood as departures from conventional syntax.187

‘Figure’ comes from the Latin term *figura* which in turn derives from *fingere*, meaning “to form or shape.” Bartel notes that it acquired a more specific meaning as “the image of the original shape or form.” While Marcus Tullius Cicero adopted the term *figura* in his discussions of rhetoric, Fabius Quintilian used it to refer to “the embellishing devices.”188

Bartel observes that Johann Christoph Gottsched’s “concept of the rhetorical figures rests entirely on their capacity to express the affections.”189 He quotes Gottsched’s statement that “one could even say, they are the language of the passions,”190 and notes their potential for use in two distinct ways:

184 Bartel, 66.
185 Bartel, 67.
186 Bartel, 67.
187 Bartel, 67.
188 Bartel, 68-69.
189 Bartel, 72.
190 Quoted in Bartel, 72. Bartel’s translation.
Like facial expressions or the work of a painter, they could be used to portray the reigning affection; and like the combative endeavors of the fencer, they could arouse various affections in the listener [...] Gottsched maintained that “the entire power of an oration is rooted in the figures, for they possess a certain fire, and through their magic throw a spark into the heart of the reader or listener, and similarly set them aflame.”

The figure’s original purpose was to make an oration more lively and appealing, and hence it was valued for its novel artistic effect. Bartel points out that the musical figure through its distinctive qualities “becomes an expression of both the image (imago) of the text and the source (forma) of the intended affection.” It is interesting to note that there are a handful of scholars who differentiate between “melodic figures” and “the figures of rhetoric,” but Friedrich Wilhelm Marpurg makes it clear that the figure is referred to the affectational function of a motive or melodic idea and not the musical object itself.

Thus, according to Bartel’s examination, the stimulation of the emotional affect had been historically connected with rhetoric, particularly the musical figure, but only in the late Baroque was this elevated to become the figures’ main role. Thus musical-rhetorical figures are not merely the servant of the text whose leading role of emotional interpretation has been given way; now the rhetorical figures are used independently to express the affections. The principles of rhetoric and affections eventually became an essential part of musical-rhetorical figures and were seen as “the very language of the affections.” Based upon Luther’s ideas, Bartel evokes an image of music as “a rhetorical sermon in sound,” and it was in Germany that this concept was most thoroughly

---

191 Quoted in Bartel, 72. Again, Bartel’s translation of Gottsched.
192 Bartel, 69.
194 Bartel, 72–73.
195 Bartel, 23.
197 Bartel, 75.
As Petty observes, as with figures of speech, musical figures arouse the emotions by moving beyond “ordinary language.”

He cites Arnold Schering’s reference to the “speaking principle” (redendes Prinzip) in C. P. E. Bach’s music, which “determined both of the following: an immediate relationship to rhetoric as such; and a possible linking of instrumental music (in itself devoid of concepts) to the world of ideas.”

Petty also points to Bach’s assessment of the first volume of Allgemeine Geschichte der Musik by his friend, Johann Nikolaus Forkel:

On the whole, Doctor Forkel regards the music of all the peoples discussed in this volume (even that of the Greeks is not entirely excepted) more as folk music and more as a very inadequate expression of the feelings contained in recited or sung poems than as true art in our sense of the term. Without harmony, which was not known to any ancient people, it was not possible for this music to create effects out of its own resources; rather, precisely due to the lack of its own coherent expressions, this music had to conform so closely to poetry, dance, and so forth, that we find it almost exclusively in the company of these other art forms. Thus the much-acclaimed effects of ancient music in no way lie in the inner properties of the music; rather, in all reasonable likelihood, they were either for explanation of fables or attributable to their cooperation with poetry and other external matters, Newer music… creates similar effects entirely out of its own resources.

Bach reveals a belief in the capacity for music, like language, to express ideas and feelings. At the same time, Bach’s emphasis upon harmony is notable. Without it, “ancient music” was subordinate to other art forms. Hence, complete self-sufficiency was dependant upon the arrival of a “newer music.”

To sum up, the role of rhetoric in musical composition became more explicit during the Seventeenth
Century, stemming from the Baroque general concept of affection, where emotional states were categorised according to a system of defined affects. Musical rhetorical figures evolved from an initial ornamental role to become “primary agents for presenting and arousing the affections.” In parallel with this, came acknowledgement of the structural role of rhetorical principles. The terms used for rhetorical construction, *inventio*, *dispositio*, and *elocutio*, were first brought into the theory of musical composition by Athanasius Kircher, thus paving the way for a more precise connection between music and rhetoric, and its more complete integration in the treatises of Mattheson. After Mattheson, text was not necessary as an intermediary between music and rhetoric. Joachim Burmeister is credited with “opening up a new world of analytical possibilities” by applying rhetorical understanding to existing music, thus providing a foundation for eighteenth-century composers.

---

202 Bartel, 76.
203 Bartel, 30.
204 Bartel, 83.
205 Bartel, 76.
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207 Bartel, 83.
5.2 Ornamentation and rhetoric in Bach’s keyboard sonatas

Charles Burney gives us a definition of dissonance from an eighteenth-century perspective:

*What is Dissonance?* It is the want of that agreeable unison between two or more sounds, which constitutes consonance: in musical composition it is occasioned by the suspension or anticipation of some sound before, or after, it becomes a concord. It is the *Dolce piccante* of Music, and operates on the ear as a poignant sauce on the palate: it is a zest, without which the auditory sense would be as much closed as the appetite, if it had nothing to feed on but sweets.\(^{208}\)

Furthermore, Bach himself comments about the use of dissonance that “the emotions are more stirred by dissonance than consonance.”\(^{209}\)

As demonstrated in the previous chapter, there is an important interdependence in C. P. E. Bach’s music between surface diminutions and underlying harmonic structure. Moreover, Petty notes Bach’s view that melodic diminutions also play a role in conveying the “ideas” of the composition, referring significantly to “untimely variations” that “are contrary to the construction, the affect, and the inner relationship of ideas.”\(^{210}\) Therefore, an examination in rhetorical terms of these “ideas” and their associated embellishments will help us to gain a wider understanding of Bach’s compositional thought. In this regard, excerpts have been drawn from the Sonata in B minor H. 245/W. 55, 3, Sonata in A major, H. 29/W. 48, 6, Sonata in D minor Wq 65/3, Sonata in G major Wq 65/12, Sonata in B flat H. 18/W. 65, 9 and Sonata in D minor Wq 65/3. As I have mentioned in Chapter 1, Schulenberg identifies Bach’s keyboard works from the 1740s as representing “the perfection of Bach’s unique expressive language,”\(^{211}\) and all but one of the following examples comes from this


\(^{211}\) See page 23.
5.2.1 Sonata in B minor H. 245/W. 55, 3 (1774), I.

As discussed earlier, the beginning of this sonata has a non-tonic opening. A leading note, A♯, is expected to follow after the note B, but is unexpectedly replaced by the note A♮ (see Figure 38). However, listeners are brought to further confusion by the subsequent reinforcement of the embellishing trill-turn above the note G that leads down to the D major chord. Thus, the quaver rest under the note A becomes quite significant. This expressive silence underlines the ambiguity of the A♮ compared with the following dominant – tonic progression.

Since the embellishing trilled turn at bar 1 helps to contradict the B minor tonality, bars 1 – 2 can be considered to represent an instance of the rhetorical figure dubitatio. Bartel points out that reference to this figure as a musical device can only be found in musical treatises of the late Baroque, associated with increased interest in highlighting “natural affective expression and the associated psychological examination of music’s expressiveness.” It can be defined as “an intentionally ambiguous rhythmic or harmonic progression,” “a musical ‘doubting’ [that] can be caused by ambivalence or unclarity in either harmony or rhythm.”

Therefore, it can be observed that after the D major chord at bar 1, the listener’s expectation is further interrupted by the pervasive use of the ascending leaps in the following bar, and the constant

---

212 See pages 59-63.
213 For another example of dubitatio in an opening theme, see my discussion of the second movement of the Sonata in B flat H. 18/W. 65, 9 (Figure 28, pages 69-70).
214 Bartel, 243.
change of rhythm at bars 1 – 2 helps to reinforce this uncertainty. The uncertainty is finally resolved with the note A♯ at the end of bar 2, harmonised with a dominant chord, leading towards the tonic, B minor, at the beginning of bar 3. The adding dynamic mark f above the G♯ emphatically announces this moment of clarification. However, the next phrase begins immediately in D major, and the movement continues with frequent modulations. Finally, at bar 37 B minor is properly affirmed and stabilised; Bach holds back this moment almost until the end. Thus it can be perceived that in fact the dubitatio is suffused across the whole movement. Even at bars 33 – 35, where the extended cadential 6 4 expresses the certainty of attaining B minor, this goal is thrown into doubt by the sudden insertion of viio7, and the expected 5 3 chord on the dominant is never achieved.

Sonata in B minor H. 245/W. 55, 3 - Bars 1-4

Allegretto
The constant springing up of new ideas in new key areas helps to reinforce the sense of destabilisation in this movement. Schenker comments that the pleasure stimulated by the new material makes us less aware of the modulation itself. “The harmonic drive is made subservient to the musical idea, and new ideas, new motives, are invented to attract our sensibilities.” Thus the modulation becomes a component of the new idea, rather than being “merely a mechanical transition.”

Moreover, through the study of the autograph, it is also interesting to observe that Bach adds ‘f’ for almost every appearance of a new melody in a new key, either at the beginning of a new phrase or at a cadence point. Moreover, this is always closely preceded by a ‘p’ dynamic marking for the material in the old key. Rosen remarks of the modulation to F♯ minor in bars 14 – 15, that it “has several surprises, the most conspicuous being the sudden turn to G major, emphasised by the forte and the startlingly heavy chord.” This concern with dynamic contrast recalls Bach’s own indication in the Essay that “an exceptional turn of a melody which is designed to create a violent affect must be played loudly.” Along with the careful deployment of embellishments, Schenker praises Bach’s judgment in relation to dynamic markings, which are “notated with such care that one could not wish for any more or better indications, even judging by our present standards.”

The breaking of harmonic convention in the opening of this sonata reflects Petty’s reference to Bach’s “rhetorical desire to use non-standard progressions.” Also, the rhetorical design of this movement perfectly supports Petty’s discussion of Bach’s method of “concealment,” whereby no
hint is given to the listener of the eventual resolution in B minor. Thus, once the purpose is disclosed at the last minute, the effect is startling. Since the concealment permeates the whole movement, its integration with the use of the rhetorical figure of *dubitatio* creates a profound outcome. Petty cites Hellmut Federhofer in this regard:

> A particular spice lies in the deliberate misleading of listener by composer. But it is esthetically productive only if the false cue is set right, so that the listener has a sense not of being *mislead*, but rather, in the end, of being securely led.

In addition to this, in her discussion of “Non-Tunes” in initial phrases, Fox comments on Bach’s “defeat of expectation” in the opening and identifies the non-tonic opening as one of Bach’s idiosyncrasies:

> In many movements of Bach’s sonatas, defeat of expectation in the opening phrase is accomplished through the use of a nonrepetitive and unstable melody. Bach frequently establishes the expectation of stability and regularity by opening a piece with a forceful motive that is rhythmically and harmonically straightforward. However, this expectation is usually not fulfilled since he seldom repeats the motive within the opening phrase (and sometimes not even in the several subsequent phrases), continually turning instead to new ideas.

As demonstrated in the opening of this sonata, embellishments can play a role in creating this “nonrepetitive and unstable” quality. This uncertainty continues throughout the movement until the arrival of the final stabilisation on the tonic key near the end.

When we consider this movement as a whole, the non-tonic introduction may be understood to conceal a basis for the overall structure. This accords with Schenker’s discussion of the opening tonic of Bach’s Fantasia in D major, Wq. 117/14, H. 160:

---

222 Petty, 60-61.
223 Petty, 61.
224 Fox, “Melodic Nonconstancy,” 128.
The beauty of the realization thus lies in the “adherence” to a smaller arpeggiation-motive within the large arpeggiation, and in the concealment of this connection by a run which pretends to be wandering aimlessly but nevertheless achieves a specific goal.225

Petty emphasises that “the diminution conceals the structure as it unfolds,”226 an observation which could also be applied to the first movement of this B minor sonata. The harmony of the opening bars offers a clue to the subsequent course of the music. The broad harmonic progression, i – III – iv – V anticipates the succession of key areas in the movement (see Figure 38). The exception is the tonicisation of G major in bars 6 – 7, serving as a stepping stone towards E minor. Thus, it can be noted that, as with Schenker’s discussions of Bach’s D major Fantasy, uncertainty exists on the surface at the opening, however the underlying coherency is revealed in the end.

5.2.2 Sonata in A major, H. 29/W. 48, 6 (1742), I.

In Chapter 3, the opening of the first movement of this sonata was presented as an example of Susan Wollenberg’s concept of “understatement followed by overstatement.”227 This passage offers a good example of the use in music of the rhetorical figure hyperbole, which is defined as “a manner of speech exaggerating the truth, whether for the sake of magnifying or minifying something.”228 This juxtaposition between the obscure tonic opening and the subsequent “extreme form” of the tonic presents a sharp contrast.

225 Rink, 7. Quoted in Petty, 60.
226 Petty, 60.
227 See pages 64-65.
228 Rhetorica ad Herennium, quoted in Beghin, 137.
5.2.3 *Sonata in G major Wq 65/12* (original, 1740; revision date unknown), I.

This movement demonstrates the operation of *hyperbole* in a more complex way. If we concentrate on bars 5 – 6 of the early version (see Figure 39),\(^\text{229}\) it can be observed that the melodic material of these two bars reappears in the reprise at bars 61 – 62, now with the addition of a rapid escape-tone figure. We may wonder why this figure is modified in the reprise? Is this a simple case of embellishment for the sake of variation, or is there a deeper explanation for the choice of embellishments made here?

![Figure 39](image)

A potential answer lies in an examination of the later version. It is interesting to note that at bar 6 (see Figure 40), Bach adds a compound appoggiatura which seems merely to have the function of articulating the second F in a repeated pair. However, at bar 62 of the later version, the compound

\(^\text{229}\) A complete score of the movement is available in Bach, *Collected Works for Solo Keyboard, Vol. 3*, 242-245.
appoggiatura is presented together with the escape-tone embellishment that was added in the early version. Thus, the simple shape of the embellishment used in the opening now dominates this material and the effect of hyperbole is generated. In answer to the question raised earlier, the later version supplies an explanation for the added escape-tone embellishment in the reprise.

\[
\text{Wq 65/12 later version bars 5-6}
\]

\[
\text{Wq 65/12 later version bars 61-62 (reprise)}
\]

(Figure 40)

5.2.4 *Sonata in D minor Wq 65/3* (original, 1732; revised, 1744), II.

Two versions of this sonata exist, the revised version being published 12 years after its original composition (1732/1744). In the second movement, when bar 26 of the later version is compared to its original version (see Figures 41 and 43), everything else is identical except the added turn above
the note G. This reinforces the neighbour-note F♯ which occurs in bar 27, intensifying the expectation of a resolution to the dominant of G minor. Instead, we arrive at D minor in bar 28. This direction towards D minor begins in bar 17 (see Figure 42), where it occurs as chord vi in an interrupted progression in F major, with F♯ on top. Even with the arrival of D minor at bar 28, 3 is in the soprano, and if we continue to investigate the following bars 28 – 30, the consecutive appearances of the voice leading 3 − 2 or 2 − 3 in the top voice reveal Bach’s refusal to settle on D minor, as it never receives a clear cadential confirmation with 3 − 2 − 1 voice-leading structure. It is only when we get to bar 33, where the top voice eventually arrives on D (1), however, the E♭ of the previous bar announces a modulation to G minor. Therefore, on the basis of the examination of the tonal events on a larger scale, the goal of G minor, hinted at in bars 26 – 27, is achieved despite the long-range anticipation of D minor which is generated in the preceding bars. The turn in bar 26 thus heightens the sense of dubitatio surrounding the tonal direction here.
5.2.5 Sonata in B flat H. 18/W. 65, 9 (original, 1737; revised, 1743), II.

In Chapter 4, a detailed discussion of the slow movement of the Sonata in B flat H. 18/W. 65, 9 was given; here, the rhetorical aspect will be examined in detail, again through comparison between the two versions and examination of the notated embellishments.

As discussed earlier, the $G_b$ in bar 3 of the early version is the third of chord iv; however, the absence of $B_b$ and the insertion of the note $C$ within the lower voice in the later version of the same bar makes the $G_b$ become the 7th of a diminished 4th chord. Thus, if we compare bars 1 – 2 and bars 3 – 4 of the later version (see Figure 44), the major/minor contrast is made more obvious than in the

---

230 See pages 71-72.
early version, especially with the occurrence of the tritone between the C and G♭. Rachel Wade mentions possible links between Georg Friedrich Lingke’s discussion of the use of the augmented sixth and C. P. E. Bach’s Keyboard Concerto in B flat major Wq 25, H 429. Wade notes that Lingke discussed the chords according to “the emotion each created in the listener,” an approach which may equally be applied to the use of a diminished 7th chord here, with its heightened dissonance.

The abrupt major/minor contrast in this passage corresponds well to the rhetorical figure of antithesis, which “present[s] contrasting or even opposing perspectives,” and which Bartel defines for music as an “expression of opposing affections, harmonies, or thematic material.” This juxtaposition “may occur successively or simultaneously” in both vocal and instrumental music. Although present in the early version, this opposition is greatly intensified in the later version.

231 Wade, 82.
232 Bartel, 55.
233 Bartel, 197.
234 Bartel, 197.
After this first exhibition of *antithesis*, a similar process of intensification may be found in bars 6 – 7 of the later version. As observed before, following the expansion of the tonic chord at bar 6, bar 7 continues with the major mode until the A♭ appears at the top of an arpeggio (see Figure 31); this time, the *antithesis* arrives more suddenly, and the false relation created by the A♭ comes as a complete surprise. The tension is maintained through a tonicisation of chord ii until a cadential 4 is reached in bar 9 (see Figure 45).
Wq 65/9 (early version)

F Major:   Bb major:

Bb Major: V6 3

Wq 65/9 (later version)

F Major: I    I  

Bb major: \((i_{6} V_{3}) i^{6}\)

\((i_{6} iv V_{9} vii^{0}) i^{9} i^{8}\)

\(V_{4/3} \)
The major/minor contrast keeps reappearing through the remainder of the movement, as evident in the comparison between bars 9 – 10 and bars 11 – 12 in the later version (see Figure 46). The transition from major to minor is accomplished within one bar (bars 10 – 11) in the earlier version after a dominant chord. The appearance of a D♭ in the bass at bar 10 assists with the transition by foreshadowing the arrival of the tonic minor in the following bar. However, the later version lacks this anticipatory D♭, and it occurs without warning on the first beat of bar 11 with intense effect, as it is sounded almost simultaneously both in the compound appoggiatura of the upper voice and in the bass. As discussed in Chapter 4, the later version displays a rich use of embellishments in bar 11, which contributes to the major/minor contrast created here.

This antithesis is finally resolved at bar 13 of the later version where an explicit indication of a G♮ in bass leads to the major closure of the movement. It is worth mentioning that this indication is missing from the earlier version. If the notation is accurate, and there may be some doubt about that, this would maintain the major/minor conflict until the end of the bar. In any case, the obvious reversal in the later version, where G♮ replaces G♭, both highlights and resolves the major/minor opposition.

---

235 See pages 73-76.
As it can be seen in the above analysis, the use of rhetorical figure *antithesis* permeates the whole movement. Schulenberg quotes Philip Barford, who emphasises Bach’s Romantic characteristics:
…the use of thematic contrast which sometimes rises to the level of dramatic antithesis, but more often to a fragmentary style not unified by an overall rhythmic flow; a vein of ‘sentimental rhetoric’ (Tovey), often tedious, but sometimes achieving great depths of romantic feeling.236

Charles Burney refers briefly to contrast in Bach’s music in his *General History*. He appraises Bach as being possibly the first composer who “observed the law of contrast, as a principle,” even to the extent that prior to Bach’s time, the occurrences of contrast could be considered “accidental.”237

The second movement of Wq 65/9 exemplifies Bach’s use of antithesis in a systematic and coherent manner. In relation to a different sonata, Wq 62/19, he comments that a rhetorical understanding “involve[s] not the association of single musical motives with particular rhetorical devices, but rather the similar structures and rhythms of musical and verbal expression.”238 My analysis above supports Wade’s observation that Bach’s revisions are not merely of local importance; rather, the elaborative process usually happens at “an important point in the structure of the whole movement.”239 Further, Wade points out the association between the “small-scale revisions” and “large-scale changes”240 of the materials in Bach’s work. Although Wade’s discussion concerns Bach’s concertos, it is equally applicable to his keyboard sonatas. She finds that any small alterations to a few bars will “trigger a chain-reaction of other revisions,” which may even spread throughout the movement.241 As I have shown, embellishment is one means by which the music is renewed, and rhetoric offers valuable insight towards an understanding of Bach’s elaborative process. As Schulenberg comments,

The virtuosity and rhetoric of *opera seria*, like the formal conventions of the aria and concerto, are increasingly put to unconventional use or placed in unconventional contexts in Bach’s keyboard works of the 1740s. Yet
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239 Wade, 78.
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perhaps his most important discovery was that the simple, rational sonata form employed in countless blander works by his contemporaries could be a stage for rhetoric, wit, and drama extending deep beneath the musical surface.²⁴²

However, it is important to bear in mind Schulenberg’s observation that the sonatas of the 1740s have a “fairly rigid formal design.”²⁴³ Petty specifically points out that sonata form serves as the basis for the realisation of a variety of surface compositional devices.²⁴⁴ In fact, as Schulenberg comments, Bach’s achievement “was to incorporate such [nonconstant] music into sonatas and other compositions that usually employed more homogeneous writing, and to do so repeatedly.”²⁴⁵ This contrasts with Ethan Haimo’s analysis of the symphonies of Haydn, in which his “unity principle”²⁴⁶ is described as “entirely dependent on clearly apprehended surface relationships. An even late in the movement that has no clearly recognizable surface motivic or thematic connection to earlier events would violate this principle.”²⁴⁷

5.2.6 Sonata in D minor Wq 65/3 (original, 1732; revised, 1744), I.

The two different versions of the first movement of Sonata in D minor Wq 65/3 do not present so many differences as in some previous examples, and the proportions of both versions are almost the same. However, there are still some interesting alterations to be noted by comparing the two versions.

²⁴² Schulenberg, “C. P. E. Bach through the 1740s,” 231.
²⁴³ Schulenberg, “C. P. E. Bach through the 1740s,” 218.
²⁴⁴ Petty, viii.
²⁴⁷ Haimo, 5. Quoted in Hoyt, 268.
Bars 8 – 9 of both versions are built on an ascending 5-6 sequence, however, appoggiaturas are added to the later version replacing the consonances on beats 1 and 3 (see Figure 47). This is a reversal of the consonance – dissonance pattern prevalent in such places as bars 5 – 7.

Looking at bars 5 – 7 of the earlier version, it can be seen that the notes F (bar 5), E (bar 6) and D (bar 7) are all preceded by anticipations. In the later version however, despite the retention of the anticipations, the downbeat F, E and D have been scratched out and replaced by the semiquaver rests.
A similar procedure has been employed in bars 32 – 33 of the later version (see Figure 48). In the earlier version, notes G and A which resolve their respective chromatic neighbour notes, are sounded on the beat; however, in the later version, Bach inserts semiquaver rests, thus displacing the resolution notes.\footnote{Although there is no chromatic neighbour note to the G on the downbeat of bar 33, Bach uses the same rhythm at that point.} The expectation of a resolution is heightened by the delay, exemplifying the
rhetorical figure *suspensio*, which is defined by Beghin as “a holding in suspense of a certain outcome.” Again, if we observe facsimiles of the autographs of both versions, we can perceive that the insertions of those semiquaver rests in the later version were last-minute decisions, made obvious by the narrow distance between the notes F and G, G and A and evidence of scratching out. Wade emphasises the value of such clues in attempting to interpret the compositional process:

Highly important in the discussion of Phillip Emanuel Bach’s compositional process is an awareness of his erasures, which are visible on direct examination of the paper but not on film or in facsimiles. Since the erasures do not always entirely remove the original version and sometimes allow it to be reconstructed under ultraviolet light, the exact location of erasures may play as big a role in deciphering the successive stages of decision-making as the layout and appearance of the musical symbols.

---

249 Beghin, 137.
250 Wade, 68. See also page 97 for further discussion of the existence of multiple versions.

(Figure 48)
5.3 The contribution of metre and rhythm to rhetorical expression

Although I have referred incidentally to rhythm in the above analyses, there are aspects of this that warrant more detailed consideration here, especially in relation to its capacity to reinforce affect.

Bartel points out the conjunction between rhythm and affection:

Rhythm, meter, and tempo were also examined and explained according to their affective properties, for these too are numerical expressions...Although the importance of rhythmic variety in a composition was emphasized in the Renaissance, the reason for its importance lay in the desire to delight (oblectatio) the listener with a varied but balanced composition. As in the other areas of Baroque compositional theory, the emphasis on rhythmic varietas shifted to a desire to portray and arouse the affections.251

Fox observes that,

Bach alters the pace of a composition in two main ways: either through an actual change of tempo designation, or through a sudden shift from faster to slower subdivisions of the beat, which produces contrasting rates of notated rhythmic activity.252

She notes similarities between this concept and Bach’s discussion of rubato in performance.253 Bach writes,

This brings us to the tempo rubato. Its indication is simply the presence of more or fewer notes than are contained in the normal division of the bar. A whole bar, part of one, or several bars may be, so to speak, distorted in this manner. The most difficult but most important task is to give all notes of the same value exactly the same duration...Slow notes and caressing or sad melodies are the best, and dissonant chords are better than consonant ones. Proper execution of this tempo demands great critical faculties and a high order of sensibility... for without a fitting sensitivity, no amount of pains will succeed in contriving a correct rubato. As soon as the upper part begins slavishly to follow the bar, the essence of the rubato is lost, for then all other parts must be played in time.254

251 Bartel, 46-47.
252 Fox, “Melodic Nonconstancy,” 166.
254 Bach, Essay, 161.
Fox refers to Darrell Berg’s descriptions of “convulsive accelerations” and “abrupt decelerations”\textsuperscript{255} in Bach’s music. She describes Bach’s use of “rhythm as an attention-maintaining device by prolonging action through elaborated or unelaborated fermatas, by suspending action through silencing rests, or by changing the rhythmic pace with formal tempo designations or the notation of varying levels of rhythmic activity.”\textsuperscript{256} She sees these elements as being “integral to Bach’s entire output.”\textsuperscript{257} Schulenberg goes so far as to suggest that in certain works, the rhythmic content “becomes an end in itself – the chief attraction of the music.”\textsuperscript{258}

It is possible to observe the role played by rhythm in some of the passages analysed in this chapter. In the Sonata in B minor H. 245/W. 55, 3, the syncopation and unpredictability of the rhythm in bars 1 – 2 help to enhance the harmonic tension and intensify the affect of ambiguity (see Figure 38).

Referring to the Sonata in A major, H. 29/W. 48, 6, the sudden rhythmic shift from a slower division of the beat to a swift ascending scalic figure with its demisemiquavers at bar 3 results in an intense contrast with the previous steady quavers, hence strengthening the effect of “overstatement” (see Figure 25). This device of changing the pace corresponds to Fox’s description of “the use of contrasting levels of rhythmic activity,” in which the meter is disrupted “by the sudden juxtaposition of faster note values and smaller ones or vice versa.”\textsuperscript{259} Lastly, the substituted semiquaver rests in the later version of the Sonata in D minor Wq 65/3 reflect Bach’s concern with the use of rhythm to reinforce the affection of the music (see Figure 48). Fox describes the effect of silence which is

\textsuperscript{256} Fox, “Stylistic Anomalies,” 122.
\textsuperscript{257} Fox, “Stylistic Anomalies,” 122.
\textsuperscript{258} Schulenberg, The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, 95.
\textsuperscript{259} Fox, “Melodic Nonconstancy,” 172.
created by different values of rests as “dramatic.” She points out that “whether they consist ‘only of the momentary omission of a previously established pulse’ or a long period of rest, [they] heighten attentiveness and effectively provide rhythmic nonconstancy.” Schenker suggests that Bach intentionally offers the rest with the “specific purpose of engaging the cooperation of the listener by increasing his expectation.”

In these last two examples, the disrupted rhythm is associated with accented dissonance. Thus, Bach’s combined employment of various surface elaborations, realized through the use of rhetorical figures, give rise to his “eloquently intensified” musical expression. Just as Schulenberg suggests, “with Bach the irregular rhythm and harmony characteristic of recitative became a normal element of writing in more deliberately ‘composed’ genres. This gave sonatas and other compositions a ‘speaking’ quality, making them a metaphorical form of musical rhetoric.” Fox cites Johann Abraham Peter Schulz regarding this aspect:

A large number, of easy and hard keyboard [i.e., clavichord] sonatas by our Hamburg [Emanuel] Bach show how character and expression can be brought to the sonata. The majority of these are so communicative [“sprechend”] that one believes [himself] to be perceiving not tones but a distinct speech, which sets and keeps in motion our imagination and feelings. Unquestionably, to create such sonatas requires much genius [and] knowledge, and an especially adaptable and alert sensibility.

262 Schenker, 41.
263 Bartel, 71.
5.4 Conclusion

In summary, affection permeates every corner of Bach’s music. The expression of those affections relies on various employments of rhetorical figures, such as *dubitatio*, *hyperbaton*, *antithesis* and *hyperbole* that testify to Bartel’s account of the rhetorical figure’s gradual achievement of an independent role in instrumental music of arousing the affections, and becoming a significant tool for the composer’s personal expression. In this chapter, I revisited examples from the Sonata in B minor H. 245/ W. 55, 3, Sonata in B flat H. 18/W. 65, 9 and the Sonata in A major H. 29 in order to examine the role of ornamentation in reinforcing Bach’s musical humour – “non-tonic opening,” “defeat of expectation,” or “understatement followed by overstatement.” However, the involvement of ornamentation with the broader rhetorical design has also been considered; the use of a rhetorical figure and its affective outcome may run through the whole movement, as observed for the Sonata in B minor H. 245/ W. 55, 3 and Sonata in B flat H. 18/W. 65, 9. These reflect well Fox’s description of Bach’s “attention-maintaining”\(^{266}\) compositional devices. Rhythm supplements the expression of affection, for example, the alteration of pace including the abrupt shift of rhythmic division, the use of tempo rubato and also the adoption of dramatic rests. The collaboration between rhythm and ornamentation further reinforces the expression of the affect.

\(^{266}\) Fox, “Stylistic Anomalies,” 122.
Chapter 6: *Sonata in E flat H. 16/W. 65, 7* – the large-scale view of two movements

The Sonata in E flat H. 16/W. 65, 7 displays a massive insertion of new material in the later version compared to the original. In the first movement, the added material creates in effect a re-working of the entire movement. Thus, a detailed examination in this chapter will contribute to an understanding of the rhetorical design and, where appropriate, the contribution made by ornamentation.

This sonata was composed in 1736 and then revised in 1744. Schulenberg describes “extensive interpolations of material, changing the formal proportions if not the fundamental design, [which] occurred in the first two movements of the sonata.”\(^{267}\)

Prompted by this observation, I have investigated all three movements of this sonata. The first movement offers considerably more significant alterations than the second, and is presented in detail here. In addition, I explore some aspects of the third movement.

6.1 The first movement of the Sonata in E flat H. 16/W. 65, 7

On a broad scale, three obvious compositional phenomena can be identified in the later version: the use of the trill to reinforce the cadential \(^{6}\); the intensive use of dissonance within the altered material and frequent occurrences of unsupported appoggiaturas. The heightened presentation of a succession of rhetorical figures throughout the movement will also be discussed.

\(^{267}\) Schulenberg, “C. P. E. Bach through the 1740s,” 221.
As referred to in Chapter 2, Salzer identifies different functions of various embellishments according to their relationship to the underlying voice-leading structure. He comments extensively on Bach’s use of trills to embellish 6\(^4\) chords, which has “a significance that permits us to assign the trill a harmonic function.”\(^{268}\)

Comparing the two versions of this movement (see Figure 49), it can be seen that the quaver B\(_\flat\) at bar 15 of the earlier version has been replaced by the note D at bar 17 in the later version, then the turn above the quaver C is replaced with a trill. Both versions imply the use of a cadential 6\(^4\), but the descending trill at bar 17 of the revised version functions, to use Salzer’s description of a different example, “simply to repeat the six-four chord […] The first eighth-note produces the initial six-four chord; the trill’s first note, which has the character of a suspension, repeats it.”\(^{269}\) The changes in the revised version serve to avoid the irregular treatment of the 4th in the 6\(^4\), and create a consistent use of the melodic pattern of a descending third as indicated in bars 15 and 17. The same change is made at bars 77 and 81 of the later version, which correspond to bars 57 and 61 of the original (see Figure 50).

\(^{268}\) Salzer, 22.

\(^{269}\) Salzer, 22.
Intensive use of dissonance can be found at bars 10 – 14 of revised version in contrast to bars 10 – 12 of the earlier version. In this passage, Bach doubles the length of the E♭ and B♭ chords in the
later version, allowing for more extensive melodic activity (see Figure 51). Firstly, the note C in
the upper voice at bar 10 of the later version creates an accented passing note against the quaver D in
the bass. It can be observed that bars 11 – 12 of earlier version presents a parallel \( \frac{6}{3} \) series with a
simple and largely consonant melody and single-note accompaniment; however, bars 11 – 14 of the
later version presents the same sequence but with frequent accented passing notes and neighbour
notes in the melody. The dissonance is emphasised by the use of repeated thirds in the left hand.
Figure 51 identifies some instances of the transformation.

This passage also demonstrates the introduction of unsupported appoggiaturas in the later version.
These become prevalent throughout the movement (see Figure 52), however, they do not appear at
all in the earlier version.
Wollenberg describes how the unaccompanied appoggiatura “thwarts expectations and allows the knowing listener – the Kenner – the satisfaction of recognizing and savouring the implications of the moment.”\textsuperscript{270}

Beghin cites Quantz’s comment that,

It is much more advantageous for a musician always to keep some of his skill in reserve, so that he can give his listeners more than one surprise, than to display all his skill at once, so that we have nothing more to hear from him.\textsuperscript{271}

Beghin compares the “performer-composer” to an orator, and treats “the sonata as a larger rhetorical
narrative, equivalent perhaps to one oration.”272 He expresses the opinion that “we can only recapture [the composer’s] ‘true performance’ [Quantz’s expression] if we recognize, understand, and internalize his rhetorical approach to the invention, disposition, and elocution of his pieces.”273 Therefore, apart from the obvious modifications we can observe in the later version, it is important to consider how the interpolation of new materials affects the rhetorical design.

As shown in Figure 53, Bach enlarges the development in the later version by substituting 14 new bars (bars 37 – 50) for an original 6 bars (bars 35 – 40). This new section starts with a sequence in G minor which includes the frequent use of unsupported appoggiaturas. The goal of the sequence is unclear until the cadential 6/4 arrives at bars 43 – 46. However, the following chromatic sequence with 7-6 suspensions starting from bar 47 brings the listener to further confusion until the cadential 6/4 arrives again at bars 51 – 52. To adapt Beghin’s description of a passage from a Haydn sonata, “in these moments of doubt (dubitatio), our orator pretends to know no better than to confirm the key of [G minor].”274 Thus, the dubitatio of the opening bars becomes suspensio where the second sequence delays the arrival of the tonic. This finally occurs with a clear cadence in bars 51 – 52.

272 Beghin, 159.
273 Beghin, 158.
274 Beghin, 159.
Wq 65/7 (later version)  Bars 34-52

34

\( B^b \text{ major: } I^6 \quad V^6 \quad 7 \quad I^4 \quad 3 \quad G \text{ minor: } (vi) \)

Descending 5th sequence

39

---

\( i \quad iv \quad V \quad 7 \)

43

---

46

---

Chromatic \( \frac{5}{7} \) series with 7-6 suspensions

49

---

(Figure 53)
In the earlier version, the $E_b$ tonic chord of the recapitulation arrives directly after a cadence to $G$ minor; in contrast, however, in the later version Bach interpolates some new materials (bars 52 – 56) providing a transition to $E_b$ major for the recapitulation (see Figure 54). In this case, it is the earlier version which demonstrates the figure *aversio*, where listeners are expecting some continuation around $G$ minor. However, the composer suddenly sounds the tonic of the home key, $E_b$ major, announcing the arrival of the recapitulation. In Beghin’s words, “by one sweeping gesture […] he forcefully turns away from the self-created doubtful matter at hand and claims renewed attention for his original statement, again in [$E_b$ major].”

The use of rhetorical figure *aversio* recalls Bach’s technique of “rational deception,” as discussed in detail in Chapter 3. Bach describes this device in the “Improvisation” chapter of the *Essay*:

> It is one of the beauties of improvisation to feign modulation to a new key through a formal cadence and then move off in another direction.\(^\text{276}\)

However, he cautions against excessive use of such “rational deceptions,” which will distort the “natural relationships” within the work and render it unrecognisable.\(^\text{277}\) This may help to explain Bach’s interpolation of a transition to $E_b$ major before the recapitulation in the later version.

---

\(^{275}\) Beghin, 159.


As demonstrated in Figure 55, in the recapitulation, in the earlier version, there are secondary dominant chords enhancing the cadential 6 of tonic E♭ major (bars 47 – 49 and bars 58 – 59); whereas in the later version, the added materials at bars 68 – 70 actually establishes a new temporary tonic of B♭ major before switching back to the home key of E♭ major.

In the later version, the new materials at bars 52 – 56 sound unusual, as the tonic is reached before the recapitulation begins, where further development on the dominant chord might have been expected. This helps to explain the later additional material in bars 68 – 70 tonicising B♭ major,
which could be seen as compensating for the previous surprisingly brief statement of the dominant of E♭ major. Then the resulting effect is an example of *hyperbaton*, which is to produce the “affective expression through a dramatic relocation of words, notes, or phrases.”

This compositional device is described by Wollenberg as the “trick of bringing in what would be expected in one context, in another quite incongruous context (the ‘right’ thing in the ‘wrong’ place).” Moreover, it reflects Wollenberg’s characterisation of Bach’s ploy of “omit[ting] some crucial factor at the expected moment and then insert[ing] it at the ‘wrong’ moment as if in (somewhat mocking) compensation for its original omission.” Later in the same passage, she refers to the phenomenon of “understatement followed by overstatement.”

---

278 Bartel, 301. Here, Bartel refers to the writings of Johann Adolf Scheibe.

279 Wollenberg, 299-301. Wollenberg makes these observations in relation to two different works, the Sonatina in G major H. 8/W. 64, 2 and the Sonata in B flat Major H. 25/W. 48, 2. See also Petty’s discussion of Schenker’s *Umweg* in a Haydn sonata (Petty, 67).
Begin observes that Johann Nikolaus Forkel’s analysis of Bach’s Sonata in F Minor, Wq. 57/6 “treats the sonata as a cycle of several movements with one overall rhetorical message.”

Forkel identifies two common orderings of emotion delivered by sonata form:

The first order is the one in which a pleasant main emotion \([\text{eine angenehme Hauptempfindung}]\) dominates and is maintained during a whole piece through all possible appropriate and supporting, pleasant side-emotions. The second is the one in which an unpleasant main emotion \([\text{eine unangenehme Hauptempfindung}]\) is suppressed, soothed, and little by little turned into a pleasant one.

---

280 Beghin, 158.
281 Beghin, 158. A third possibility is identified, but dismissed as impractical. See also Bellamy Hosler, Changing Aesthetic Views of Instrumental Music in 18th-Century Germany (Ann Arbor, Michigan: UMI Research Press, 1981), 147, regarding Sulzer’s use of
Forkel’s models allow us to view the succession of affects on the large scale. Therefore, when we review the whole movement of this sonata, a series of rhetorical figures are presented – *dubitatio*, *suspensio*, *aversio* and *hyperbaton* – which clearly disseminate an “overall rhetorical message”: Forkel’s second order, “unpleasant” to “pleasant.” That is, the “unpleasant” compositional ploys eventually give way to the “pleasant.”

This may be understood to correlate with Mattheson’s definition of the broad rhetorical structuring procedure, as discussed by Bartel:

> [Within the *dispositio,*] *confirmatio* and *confutatio*, can be considered as contrasting processes with the same ultimate purpose: to strengthen the proposition by either confirming the argument or by refuting or resolving any objections to it. While the *confirmatio* employs varied and artful repetitions to reinforce the *propositio*, the *confutatio* makes use of suspensions, chromaticism, or contrasting passages which, when properly resolved, strengthen the original theme.\(^\text{282}\)
6.2 The third movement of the *Sonata in E flat H. 16/W. 65, 7*

I have already discussed the first movement of the Sonata in E flat H. 16/W. 65, 7, based on Schulenberg’s observation of interpolated material. However, Schulenberg does not mention anything about the third movement, the later version of which presents some interesting addition of new materials.

As indicated in Figure 56, the opening of the earlier version (bars 1 – 2) presents a simple figure with triadic foundation that is accompanied by a repeated E♭ in the bass. This figure is developed in bars 4 – 5 where it now consists of wide and dissonance leaps. The repeated bass E♭ is also elaborated in bars 4 – 5, contributing to the sense of magnification of the opening idea. It is noteworthy that the semiquaver figure introduced in the melody in bar 6 appears again in bar 9.

The later version begins with a similar presentation of bars 1 – 2 and the elaboration of the melody in bars 5 – 6. However, a new accompanying figure, with semiquavers, suddenly appears in the bass in bar 5. This figure could be seen as a derivation from the semiquaver figure in bar 6 of the early version.

Compared to the simple reuse of the figure at bar 9 in the early version, this motif from its first appearance in the bass at bar 5 of the later version further appears as imitation between the upper and lower voices at bar 6, and again at bar 9 in the upper voice, and finally in a dramatically extended version at the beginning of the development (bars 11 – 12). Thus, in the later version the process of elaboration is much more extensive, arguably based on a figure from the earlier version. The early
version mostly adheres to the texture of the opening, but in the later version it is transformed. In
the opening of the development, with its wide scope and extensive use of accented passing notes,
elaboration reaches the point of exaggeration, recalling the definition of hyperbole, exaggeration “for
the sake of magnifying or minifying something.”283

283 Rhetorica ad Herennium, quoted in Beghin, 137.
Vivace

Wq 65/7 (early version)

Wq 65/7 (later version) Vivace

(Figure 56)

In the above discussion, I have frequently noted parallels with Beghin’s analysis of the first movement of Haydn’s Sonata in E Major, Hob. XVI: 22 and Sonata in G Major, Hob. XVI: 40. The rhetorical design of these sonatas by Haydn, especially the Sonata in E Major, involves the use of the same rhetorical figures as I have identified for Bach’s process of revision. This lends support to Donald Tovey’s finding that Haydn had been significantly influenced by Bach.²⁸⁴
6.3 Summary

Bartel explains Athanasius Kircher’s commentary upon the evolvement of rhetoric as “shifting the emphasis […] from an elaborative to an expressive concept,” a concept which is reflected in Bach’s music. His prominent use of deceptive techniques in the compositional design of the first movement of the sonata discussed above anticipates Petty’s observation in relation to Haydn that “ideas of concealment and deception suggest deeper connections to rhetoric than the more traditional connections” and “begin to station the composer in relation to an audience of intelligent listeners.”

Petty emphasises that when the “surface diminutions” are sublimated into the rhetorical design, they are infused with a new significance in conveying meaning:

We should therefore add to the notion that the diminutions unfolded against a background of the thoroughbass the idea that diminutions unfolded against a cultural background in which figures carried affective connotations that listeners recognized. This is of course a commonplace – the Figurenlehre. But it is worth reiterating anyway, for it reaffirms the inward qualities of Bach’s music, and it shows the composer’s intense engagement with the listener.

This has been well testified in the later version of the third movement of this sonata, where the treatment of the musical figures and motifs of the earlier version goes beyond mere variation. Their involvement in the rhetorical design works at a deeper level of expression.

Wollenberg observes that “‘breaches of order’ clearly need a ‘framework of order’ to be effective.” Hence, Bach’s “musical jokes” are dependant upon the presence of a familiar underlying form. So if we look back to the compositional procedure of the first movement of this sonata, in the later

---

285 Bartel, 24.
286 Petty, 64.
287 See page 9.
288 Petty, 26.
289 Wollenberg, 302.
version, a series rhetorical figures, *dubitatio, suspensio, aversio* and *hyperbaton*, challenge and ultimately affirm the sonata structure. The later version of the third movement reflects the similar principle, where the extensive use of new materials actually contributes to a sense of motivic coherence. It is worthwhile here to recall Rosen’s comments about Bach’s “treatment of the striking and memorable motif,” which “was crucial for the history of the sonata forms.”290

---

Chapter 7: An integrated view of rhetoric and ornament in Bach’s keyboard works

In Chapter 2, I compared the two versions of the second movement of the Sonatina in E minor Wq 64/4 focusing upon Salzer’s analysis of the functions of ornamentation. Here, in the light of the discussions contained in Chapter 5 and 6, I will explore this movement more extensively.

At first glance, the second movement of the later version looks like a complete reworking of the original; even the tempo marking is different, where the original Largo becomes Adagio non molto in the later version. The proportions are also dissimilar, where the twenty-seven bars of the original are compressed to fifteen in the later version. Moreover, the key of the later version, G major, is the relative major of the original, E minor. However, as I have demonstrated in Chapter 2, the later version draws upon and develops motifs found in the original. In this chapter, I will propose that the revisions are linked to the employment of the rhetorical figures dubitatio and suspensio.

In the later version (see Figure 57), after the first striking of the tonic chord at the opening, the notated appoggiaturas help to initiate the downward motion of the chromatic sequence that follows, bringing suspensio, “a holding in suspense of a certain outcome,” namely a clear establishment of the tonic. This is eventually provided in bars 4 – 5 with an imperfect cadence, but even here there are references to G minor that foreshadow the harmonic events to come.

291 Please refer to Bach, Collected Works for Solo Keyboard, Vol. 3, 156-157 and 163 for complete score of both versions.
292 Beghin, 137.
The development which follows involves tonicisations of C major and C minor, then the approach to the reprise is based on the tonic minor. Instead of resolving this uncertainty, the reprise (bar 12) repeats the opening sequence, thus maintaining a sense of suspensio and illustrating Fox’s concept of “expectational defeat.”

Beghin refers to Quintilian’s observation that “dubitatio offers a particular faith in truth, when we pretend to be searching where to begin, where to end.” Therefore, it can be observed that the effect of dubitatio permeates the whole movement up until the last two bars where G major is finally unchallenged.

Sequences clearly make up a large proportion of this movement, and contribute substantially to its rhetorical design. Furthermore, as I have demonstrated in Chapter 2, there is a close relationship between the ornamentation and the voice-leading structure of the opening sequence.

---

293 Fox, “Melodic Nonconstancy,” 136.
294 Quintilian 9.2.19, translated by Beghin, 147.
295 See pages 30-34.
In regard to Bach’s use of embellishment in sequences, Schulenberg notes Bach’s tendency to embellish sequential material at each repetition.\textsuperscript{296} However, referring to an excerpt from the second movement of the Sonata in B flat H. 32 W. 49/4, Schulenberg also states that “the melodic embellishment and subsequent rhythmic ambiguity of the passage hardly mask Bach’s routine reliance on sequence in this and in similar bridges.”\textsuperscript{297} The descending 5ths sequence at bars 8 – 10 of the present example offers some qualification of this statement.

At bar 10, Bach transfers to the alto the bass figure that would follow as a continuation of the sequential pattern. However, in the expected semiquaver descent, Bach inserts an $F_{\#}$ and a subsequent change of direction. The bass immediately follows the same shape, $A_{\flat} - G - F_{\#}$, reflecting Salzer’s concept of anticipation. This figure emphasises the $V^{\frac{6}{5}}$, and the pivotal function of the $A_{\flat}$ chord as a Neapolitan Sixth chord in relation to the new goal of G minor.

It is apparent here that Bach’s variation near the end of the sequence is not for the purpose of “masking,” but for intensifying the approach to the new key. At the same time, this passage provides another demonstration of the relation between surface figuration and the underlying harmony.

Hence, the comparison between the two versions reveals the degree of transformation in the later version, where the basic three-part texture of the original becomes suffused with more elaborate counterpoint and explorative harmony. The modifications, including expansion of the original motives, the insertion of notated appoggiaturas, and extended use of sequence, create a sense of

\textsuperscript{296} Schulenberg, \textit{The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach}, 63.
\textsuperscript{297} Schulenberg, \textit{The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach}, 63.
uncertainty and hold the listener in a state of disorientation.

Schulenberg suggests that “as a general expression for the ornamentation or alteration of existing material, ‘variation’ is a useful term for the technique used to provide Bach’s sonata movements with varied reprises […] But in a more specific sense [it] can be understood as part of the process of producing an original work.”298 Later, he observes that variation may occur “as part of the compositional process, as when a piece exists in more than one version.”299 This is supported by Fox, who notes that movements that have been reworked or have varied reprises offer the clearest examples of Bach’s procedure of “transforming a melody.”300 The resulting “feeling of spontaneous variation” helps to create a sense of freshness and unpredictability.301

In relation to performance, Bach emphasises the importance of applying ornamentation which is consistent with the affect of the composition.302 William J. Mitchell amplifies this comment by quoting from another Bach source:

Performers want to vary every detail without stopping to ask whether such variation is permitted by their ability and the construction of the piece. […] Often these untimely variations are contrary to the construction, the affect, and the inner relationship of the ideas – an unpleasant matter for many composers.303

This advice to performers may also serve as a guide to Bach’s use of ornamentation.

Schulenberg refers to Johann Adolf Scheibe’s view that “[An embellished musical expression] is in
fact a new and pleasing variation of a short melodic idea in order to make the latter more
impressive, or even more sublime, without departing from the harmony.”

Scheibe’s monition points to the interrelationship between surface variation and underlying harmony.
Bach also warns that “not everything should be varied, for if it is the reprise will become a new
piece.”

Petty refers to Bach’s “concern for shaping the parts in relation to the whole.” In discussing
“elaborate variations,” Bach asserts that, in order to preserve the affect, “it is of first importance
always to make certain that the lineaments of a piece […] remain unobscured.” Petty emphasises
the concept of “lineaments,” referring to “a sense of linear continuity” that reflects “a concern for
wholeness.”

Bach’s commitment to “the lineaments of a piece” is demonstrated in the sonatas analysed in this
thesis. In the second movement of the Sonata in B flat H. 18/W. 65, 9, for example, the interaction
between the ornamentation and voice-leading identified in Chapter 4 feeds into the rhetorical design
as discussed in Chapter 5. The rhetorical figure of antithesis, which is intensified by changes made
to the figuration in the later version, runs through the whole movement until the major/minor conflict
is finally resolved at the end of the movement. In the revised version of the second movement of
the Sonatina in E minor Wq 64/4, the sequences, which are anticipated by the embellishments in the

---

304 Johann Adolph Scheibe, Der Critische Musicus (Hamburg: Beneke, 1738), accessed April 15, 2016,
https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_KVpDAAAAcAAJ. Quoted in Schulenberg, The Instrumental Music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach,
305 Bach, Essay, 165.
306 Petty, 19.
308 Petty, 18.
309 See Chapter 4, pages 67-77 and Chapter 5, pages 101-109.
opening bars help to generate *dubitatio*. Again, this rhetorical figure permeates the whole movement until the home key is finally confirmed in the last two bars.\(^{310}\) By contrast, in the later version of the first movement of the Sonata in E flat H. 16/W. 65, 7, there is a succession of rhetorical figures – *dubitatio*, *suspensio*, *aversio* and *hyperbaton* – that render a broader progression in the piece from “unpleasant” to “pleasant.”\(^{311}\) My discussion has demonstrated the role of ornamentation in helping to generate this rhetorical structure. Therefore, it can be seen that my analysis lends strong support to the motion of “lineament” as an important aspect of Bach’s style, in which, as Petty observes, Bach “insisted that individual moments in a piece have some connection to the whole.”\(^{312}\) Bach’s use of “rational deception” may create a superficial sense of disorder, however, Schenker identifies a “synthesis of ideas” that creates a deeper unity.\(^{313}\)

---

\(^{310}\) See Chapter 2, pages 30-34 and Chapter 7, pages 139-142.
\(^{311}\) See pages 119-132.
\(^{312}\) Petty, 20.
Conclusion

Bach’s enthusiasm for innovation is well reflected in his extensive revision of earlier works, including the evidence of crossed-out passages and erasure even on the autograph sources of the revised versions. Fox cites Johann Georg Sulzer in identifying a perfectionist element in this process: “This predilection for change contributes very much to the gradual perfection of man. For it sustains and augments his activity and causes a daily increase in his ideas.”314 Focusing on the concertos, Rachel Wade explores Bach’s motivation for his revisions, finding that “the alterations were anything but mechanical, [...] and they afford a rare glimpse of a mid-century composer exercising artistic choice.”315

Ornamentation plays a significant role in Bach’s revisions of works from the 1740s. Reviewing examples drawn from various sonatas and sonatinas, no matter what perspective is used as a starting point – Salzer’s classification of voice-leading functions, Fox’s concern with nonconstancy, Wollenberg’s interpretation of Bach’s “musical jokes,” or Beghin’s analysis based on rhetorical principles – they all contribute to our understanding of the choices which Bach makes. The insertion of new ornamentation, or replacement of the original, demonstrates Bach’s precise treatment of every detail. These changes are not arbitrary, and what may seem like superficial alterations have been shown to be closely related to the deeper voice-leading structure, or to subsequent tonal events. In some instances, observation of the autograph score has also helped us to trace Bach’s thought process in making the revisions. Moreover, by considering the affective functions of the ornaments

314 Hosler, Changing Aesthetic Views, 149. Quoted in Fox, “Melodic Nonconstancy,” 266.
315 Wade, 83.
we gain an understanding of a possible larger rhetorical design. In some cases, where the same type of ornament (for example, appoggiatura) is used in different ways in different works, I have demonstrated that these multifarious occurrences are each related to their specific context. This supports my view that, in the works examined, embellishment is not purely about decoration but provides insights into other aspects of the music. As I have demonstrated in this thesis, while rhetoric offers many insights, it needs to be considered along with other compositional techniques. As Hoyt points out in relation to Haydn and Mozart, “rhetoric does not provide a paradigm that can, by itself, offer a significant account of [their] characteristic procedures.”

Before we study a composer’s work, either as researcher or performer, it is important for us to possess certain knowledge in order not to misinterpret the composer’s intentions. Bach explicitly points out that “the performer must possess a knowledge of thorough bass” in order successfully to employ embellishment. This admonition extends to composers. Analysis of Bach’s reasons for writing out embellishments, especially in revised versions, reveals his concerns about the possible disruption of the affection of a piece.

Nowadays we possess abundant sources on 18th-century performance practice, but these are not always take into account. Evan Streater has pointed to the importance of Bach’s Essay to later composers. He found that many modern performers “interpret works from the Classical era without having digested a single word from the pedagogical writings of C. P. E. Bach, Mozart, Quantz,

316 Hoyt, 281.
317 Bach, Essay, 82.
318 Bach, Essay, 343.
319 Bach, Essay, 80.
Clementi, or Türk.  This may be the result of a conscious decision to ignore them, in some cases because they are considered “old-fashioned.” Observing the problems existing in contemporary interpretation of 18th-century music, he emphasises the importance of “a well-informed approach.”

My analysis has demonstrated that in order to explore Bach’s motivation for revising works by varying the materials, including the interpolation of a new ornament or replacing the original ornament, we should first understand the larger context of the composition, including the voice-leading structure and rhetorical considerations. Ornamentation participates in the musical structure at a level which significantly exceeds its decorative value.

320 Streater, 36.
321 Streater, 36.
322 Streater, 43.
Appendix 1: *Examples 5 and 6* from Felix Salzer, “The Significance of the Ornaments in Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach’s Keyboard Works.”

**Example 5**

![Example 5](image1)

**Example 6**

![Example 6](image2)
Bibliography

&isAdvanced=false.


Bach, C. P. E. Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen. Kassel and New York: Bärenreiter,
1994.


Bartel, Dietrich. Musica Poetica: Musical – Rhetorical Figures in German Baroque Music. Lincoln:
University of Nebraska Press, 1997.

Beghin, Tom. “‘Delivery, Delivery, Delivery!’ Crowning the Rhetorical Process of Haydn’s
Keyboard Sonata.” In Haydn and the Performance of Rhetoric, edited by Tom Beghin and

69-138.

Berg, Darrell M. “C. P. E. Bach’s ‘Variations’ and ‘Embellishments’ for His Keyboard Sonatas.”


http://find.galegroup.com.ezproxy1.library.usyd.edu.au/ecco/infomark.do?&source=gale&prodId=ECCO&userGroupName=usyd&tabID=T001&docId=CB130022591&type=multipage&contentSet=ECCOArticles&version=1.0&docLevel=FASCIMILE.


https://archive.org/details/bub_gb_KVpDAAAAcAAJ.


Discography


Scores

