

Volume 1

The late keyboard rondos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach:  
Issues of genre, form, and voice leading

By

Karen G. Mandelbaum

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Music in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,  
The City University of New York

2008

UMI Number: 3311205

Copyright 2008 by  
Mandelbaum, Karen G.

All rights reserved

#### INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI<sup>®</sup>

---

UMI Microform 3311205  
Copyright 2008 by ProQuest LLC  
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against  
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

---

ProQuest LLC  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

© 2008

Karen G. Mandelbaum

All Rights Reserved

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the  
Graduate Faculty in Music in satisfaction of the  
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

	<u>Joseph Straus</u>
<u>4/8/08</u>	<u>Chair of Examining Committee</u>
Date	
	<u>David Olan</u>
<u>4/8/08</u>	<u>Executive Officer</u>
Date	

William Rothstein

L. Poundie Burstein

Mark Anson-Cartwright

David Gagné

Wayne C. Petty  
Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

## Abstract

The late keyboard rondos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach:

Issues of genre, form, and voice leading

By

Karen G. Mandelbaum

Advisor: Professor William Rothstein

This dissertation presents the first comprehensive study of the late keyboard rondos of Carl Philippe Emanuel Bach. He published these works during the 1770s and 1780s in volumes ii through vi of his six collections of keyboard works *für Kenner und Liebhaber*.

This study rejects the notion—shared both by many of Bach’s contemporaries and by recent scholarship—that Bach’s late rondos have refrains that return in keys other than the tonic. Instead, a case is made through a variety of means, including theme, phrase rhythm, harmony, and voice leading as co-determinants of formal structure, that only tonic iterations of the refrain theme are true refrains. Considerations of phrase function and sentence structure help determine the function of thematic material and its relevance as a formal marker. This perspective also demonstrates how a change in phrase function can alter the function of repetitions of thematic material. As a result, transposed thematic repetitions can be understood within changing contexts.

Bach developed a variety of formal designs associated with either the rondo or sonata-rondo genres. This results from a complex interaction between a rondo’s surface features and deep-level voice-leading motions. This interaction emanates from the

modification of surface divisions that enable the creation of long-range harmonic and linear relationships.

The concepts of unity and diversity in musical expression were important issues to Bach's contemporaries and his late rondos seem to be a practical result of this philosophy. Since their publication, writers have been commenting on the disunities on their surfaces. These disunities are real, demanding the listener's attention. At the same time, many of Bach's techniques provided unity on a variety of levels from the foreground to the deepest levels of middleground.

## Acknowledgments

There are many teachers along the way who have inspired me, but most of all I owe my thanks to my advisor, William Rothstein. Not only did he inspire me, but he challenged me to dig deeper, always emphasizing clarity and scholarship. He was generous with his support, great knowledge, and patience. I shall always feel privileged to have had the opportunity to work with him.

I owe many thanks to Carl Schachter who introduced me to the keyboard rondos of C.P.E. Bach several years ago during a private study I was fortunate to have had with him. I was immediately fascinated by the formal and phrase-rhythmic issues presented by these works.

Over the course of my education, I have had many wonderful teachers who have given so much to me. In addition to my years of Schenker and theory studies with Carl Schachter, I was also privileged to study with Ernst Oster, Saul Novack, and Charles Burkhart. I learned much about the history of music theory from Joel Lester, and much about reading sub-texts from Leo Treitler. I also owe many thanks to George Stauffer who read through my early work and was always helpful and supportive. My love and memories of my piano studies with two great teachers, Marie Powers and Nadia Reisenberg, always remain with me. They taught me to be a musician.

I am very grateful to all the members of my dissertation committee. I offer many thanks to Joe Straus for his criticisms and suggestions. I am very appreciative of his help in the final process of submission. He made it smooth and painless. I was very fortunate to have Poundie Burstein and Mark Anson-Cartwright as my readers. They encouraged me, questioned me, and offered valuable suggestions. I owe many thanks to David

Gagné for his expertise and his confidence. To Wayne Petty, I feel deep appreciation and offer many thanks. I was very inspired by his dissertation on C. P. E. Bach and greatly benefited by his hard work and intelligence. I thank him for participating on my committee and for allowing me to reproduce two examples from his dissertation. I also owe many thanks to Allan Atlas and David Olan for the allowance of time.

My husband and sons have been incredibly supportive from beginning to end. I can't imagine having a more loving and caring family. They are my heroes. I will always remain indebted to my parents whose love of music brought profound richness and fulfillment to my life.

## Table of Contents

### Volume I

Abstract.....	iv
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Table of Contents: Volume I.....	viii
Table of Contents: Volume II.....	x
List of Figures.....	xvii
Concordance.....	xviii
Chapter 1. Eighteenth- and twentieth-century perceptions of the late rondos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach .....	1
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background.....	2
1.2 Conflict in the perception of C. P. E. Bach's rondo form.....	3
1.3 The perception of Bach's rondos in the eighteenth century .....	4
1. Eighteenth-century descriptions of rondeau form.....	4
2. Eighteenth-century descriptions of Bach's late rondos .....	6
3. Forkel's concept of the rondo and his theory of period structure .....	8
4. Kirnberger: One theorist, two concepts of period structure.....	17
5. Kollmann's synthesis of Kirnberger's theories; phrase rhythm related to poetry .....	19
1.4 The perception of Bach's rondos in the twentieth century .....	24
1. Introduction.....	24
2. Kollmann's influence on twentieth-century perceptions on Bach's rondos.....	25
3. Fantasy and improvisation as a basis of twentieth-century analyses of Bach's rondos.....	27
4. Bach's concept of fantasy and its influence on his late rondos .....	33
5. Structural and functional conflicts in the analysis of Bach's rondos.....	35
6. A non-traditional perspective: Evaluating the structural meaning of individual refrains .....	46
1.5 Summary .....	48
Chapter 2. Formal principles of the eighteenth-century keyboard rondeau: Developing a context for the rondos of C. P. E. Bach .....	49
2.0 Introduction.....	49
2.1 Heinrich Christoph Koch: A late-eighteenth-century consideration of rondo in relation to a theory of compositional structure .....	50
2.2 The rondo in eighteenth-century practice: Couperin and the art of structural invention .....	59
2.3 Summary .....	70

Chapter 3. Exploring the formal structures of C. P. E. Bach's early rondos and pseudo-rondos .....	72
3.0 Introduction.....	72
3.1 Refrain and ritornello: A late-eighteenth-century perspective.....	73
3.2 Rondo or pseudo-rondo? Thematic reference as a formal marker in Bach's early sonata movements and character pieces .....	76
1. Middle movements with repetitions of the opening material in the tonic and in at least one other key.....	76
2. Middle movements with repetition of the opening material in the tonic key.....	85
3. The role of thematic repetition in middle movements.....	88
4. Transposition of opening material in a finale .....	88
5. Bach's character pieces of the 1750s.....	90
6. Thematic reference is not design-specific.....	93
3.3 The expansion of a <i>Fortspinnung</i> type: Bach's sections reflect a union of tonal, rhythmic, and melodic elements.....	94
1. Introduction.....	94
2. Sentence structures in the Andante of H. 30/ii: Tension and thematic restatement as phrase-specific functions.....	100
3.4 Summary .....	105
Chapter 4. Exploring the formal structures of C. P. E. Bach's late rondos: The outer form .....	108
4.0 Introduction.....	108
4.1 Opening refrains: Models of antecedent-consequent construction.....	113
4.2 The first couplet: Conformance to a basic rhythmic paradigm.....	115
4.3 Expanding the first couplet: Suffix construction after the PAC .....	118
4.4 The opening refrain and first couplet: Bach's sonata exposition as a model of intrathematic and interthematic functions.....	120
4.5 The opening refrain and first couplet: Further considerations of phrase function .....	123
1. In relation to the opening sections of the Classical rondo .....	123
2. Refrain and first couplet: Opening section of a Classical sonata-rondo.....	127
3. Refrain and couplet: Summary .....	130
4.6 The grouping of refrains and interior couplets into larger sections.....	131
1. Rondo in E Major, H. 265: An analysis.....	133
2. Rondo in F Major, H. 266: An analysis.....	144
3. Rondo in C Major, H. 260: An analysis.....	152
4.7 Summary .....	159
Chapter 5. Exploring the interaction of outer and inner form in C. P. E. Bach's late rondos .....	161

5.1	Introduction.....	161
5.2	An analysis of the Rondo in Bb Major, H. 267 .....	163
	1. Introduction.....	163
	2. Part I (mm. 1–155): An analysis of the harmonic and linear structure of the exposition and development .....	165
	3. Part II (mm. 156–237): An analysis of the harmonic and linear structure of the recapitulation .....	169
	4. Summary of the Rondo in Bb Major, H. 267.....	171
5.3	An analysis of the Rondo in E Major, H. 274.....	172
	1. Introduction.....	172
	2. An analysis of the harmonic and linear structure in the context of refrains and couplets.....	172
	3. Voice-leading, harmonic structure, and thematic plan: The formation of a five-part rondo .....	176
	4. Summary of the analysis of the rondo in E Major, H. 274 .....	178
5.4	An analysis of the Rondo in G Major, H. 268 .....	179
	1. Introduction.....	179
	2. The development: Conflicts in outer and inner form.....	180
	3. Recapitulation .....	188
	4. Modal mixture as a unifying element in the deep middleground structure .....	189
	5. Summary of the analysis of the Rondo in G Major, H. 268 .....	191
5.5	Chapter Summary .....	193
Chapter 6. New perspectives on the late rondos of C. P. E. Bach: A summary.....		195
6.0	Introduction.....	195
6.1	The late rondos: An evaluation of their historical context in the eighteenth and twentieth centuries.....	195
6.2	The late rondos: Genre and form .....	197
6.3	Tension on the surface and within .....	200
6.4	Conclusion .....	203
Reference list .....		204

## Table of Contents

### Volume II

Chapter 1. Eighteenth- and twentieth-century perspectives on the late rondos of C. P. E. Bach.....	212
Example 1.1 C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in G Major, H. 523/iii.....	212

Example 1.2	Augustus Frederic Christopher Kollmann, Symphony for the Pianoforte, a Violin and a Violoncello, op. 7/i, mm. 1–10.....	213
Example 1.3	From Augustus Frederic Christopher Kollmann, <i>An essay on musical harmony; according to the nature of the science &amp; the principles of the greatest musical authors . . .</i>	
	a. Example 332b .....	214
	b. Example 333, 5-bar period.....	214
Example 1.4	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268, mm. 1–111 .....	215
Example 1.5	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in C Minor, H. 283, mm. 55–109 .....	219
Chapter 2.	Formal principles of the eighteenth-century keyboard rondeau: Developing a context for the rondos of C. P. E. Bach.....	221
Example 2.1	François Couperin, <i>Pièces de Claveçin</i> , opening refrains	
	a. <i>La Princesse de Sens</i> .....	221
	b. <i>Le Gazoüillement</i> .....	221
	c. <i>Les Rozeaux</i> .....	222
	d. <i>La Favorite</i> .....	222
Example 2.2	François Couperin, <i>Pièces de Claveçin</i>	
	a. <i>Les Amusmens</i> .....	223
	b. <i>Les Bergeries</i> .....	225
Example 2.3	François Couperin, <i>Allégrèsse des Vainqueurs</i> , <i>Seconde Partie de la Triomphante</i> .....	227
Example 2.4	François Couperin, <i>Allégrèsse des Vainquers</i> .....	229
Example 2.5	François Couperin, <i>Les Amusemens</i> , 2 <sup>ème</sup> Rondeau .....	231
Example 2.6	François Couperin, <i>Les Bergeries</i> .....	233
Example 2.7	François Couperin, <i>Les Bergeries</i> , couplet 3, mm. 29–34, rhythmic reduction .....	236
Example 2.8	Jean-Philippe Rameau, <i>Musette en Rondeau</i> .....	237
Example 2.9	Jean-Philippe Rameau, <i>Les Tricotets</i> .....	238
Example 2.10	Jean-Philippe Rameau, <i>Gigue en Rondeau</i> .....	240

Example 2.11	Johann Christian Bach, Sonata in E Major, op. 5, no. 5/iii: mm. 1-57 .....	241
Chapter 3. Exploring the formal structures of C. P. E. Bach's early rondos and pseudo-rondos .....		243
Example 3.1	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in C Major, H. 28/ii .....	243
Example 3.2	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in C Major, H. 28/ii a. mm. 61-68 .....	245
	b. mm. 69-76 .....	245
Example 3.3	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in C Major, H. 28/ii, mm. 92-97 .....	246
Example 3.4	François Couperin, <i>Les Amusemens</i> .....	247
Example 3.5	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata No. 1 in A Minor, H. 30/ii .....	249
Example 3.6	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata No. 1 in A Minor, H. 30/ii a. mm. 1-8 .....	251
	b. mm. 33-52 .....	251
	c. mm. 33-52, middleground.....	251
Example 3.7	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in B Minor, H. 36/ii a. mm. 1-6 .....	252
	b. mm. 20-26 .....	252
Example 3.8	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in B Minor, H. 32.5/ii .....	253
Example 3.9	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in B Minor, H. 32.5/ii a. m. 1 .....	255
	b. mm. 20-23 .....	255
Example 3.10	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in G Minor, H. 47/ii a. mm. 1-4.....	256
	b. mm. 44-55.....	256
Example 3.11	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in G Major, H. 56/iii .....	257
Example 3.12	C. P. E. Bach, <i>La Buchholtz</i> , H. 93 .....	259
Example 3.13	C. P. E. Bach, <i>La Buchholtz</i> , H. 93 a. mm. 1-8 and 8-17.....	260
	b. Refrain antecedents, mm. 1-4 and 16-27 .....	261
	c. Chromaticized voice exchange, mm. 21-27 .....	261

Example 3.14	C. P. E. Bach, <i>La Louise</i> , H. 114 .....	262
Example 3.15	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata No. 1 in A Minor, H. 30/i, Wayne Petty's phrase analysis of the exposition .....	264
Example 3.16	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in G Minor, H. 68/i .....	266
Example 3.17	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in G Minor, H. 68/i, closing phrase, mm. 17–28 .....	267
Example 3.18	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata No. 1 in A Minor, H. 30/ii .....	268
Example 3.19	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata No. 1 in A Minor, H. 30/ii	
	a. Closing phrase reduced to eight measures, mm. 9–18 .....	270
	b. Opening phrase, mm. 1–8 .....	270
	c. Closing phrase, mm. 9–18 .....	270
	d. Second period closing phrase, mm. 53–69 .....	271
	e. First period opening phrase, mm. 1–8; and second period closing phrase, mm. 53–69 .....	271
	f. Middleground voice-leading reduction, mm. 1–8 and 53–69 .....	272
Chapter 4. Exploring the formal structures of C. P. E. Bach's late rondos: The outer form .....		273
Example 4.1	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in D, H. 261 .....	273
Examples 4.2	C. P. E. Bach, opening refrains	
	a. Rondo in Bb, H. 267 .....	274
	b. Rondo in D Minor, H. 290 .....	274
Example 4.3	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 271 .....	275
Example 4.4	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in D Minor	
	a. Opening refrain and couplet .....	276
	b. Couplet 1, mm. 12–21 .....	277
	c. Hypothetical basic phrase .....	277
Example 4.5	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 274 .....	278
Example 4.6	C. P. E. Bach, modulations following couplet 1	
	a. Rondo in Eb, H. 288 .....	279
	b. Rondo in Bb, H. 267 .....	281
Example 4.7	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in A, H. 276 .....	282

Example 4.8	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in D Minor, H.208/i, Wayne Petty's annotated score of the exposition .....	283
Example 4.9	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in F, H. 266 .....	284
Example 4.10	Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Sonata in C, K. 545/iii .....	286
Example 4.11	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in Bb, H. 267 .....	287
Example 4.12	From Koch, <i>Introductory essay on composition</i> a. Example 388 .....	289
	b. Example 390 .....	289
Example 4.13	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 265 .....	290
Example 4.14	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 265 a. mm. 24–28 .....	298
	b. mm. 24–27, reduction .....	298
	c. Figure 473 from C. P. E. Bach, <i>Essay on the true art of playing keyboard instruments</i> , and mm. 24–27 .....	298
	d. mm. 31–32, reduction .....	298
	e. mm. 34–37 .....	299
	f. mm. 42–47, reduction .....	299
	g. Suffix, mm. 54–57 .....	299
Example 4.15	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in F, H. 266 .....	300
Example 4.16	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in F, H. 266, P <sup>ff</sup> antecedent and Rotation 1 TR as prototypes for Rotation 3 TR (expanded) .....	306
Example 4.17	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in C, H. 260 .....	307
Example 4.18	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in C, H. 260 a. mm. 24–33, RT .....	315
	b. Hypothetical version of m. 106 .....	316
Chapter 5. Exploring the synthesis of outer and inner form in C. P. E. Bach's late rondos .....		317
Example 5.1	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in Bb, H. 267 .....	317
Example 5.2	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in Bb, H. 267 a. Deep-middleground voice-leading reduction, mm. 1–138 .....	323
	b. Reduction of opening of refrain theme, mm. 1–2 .....	323
	c. Reduction of opening of TR, mm. 20–32 .....	324
	d. Reduction of new theme, mm. 60–67 .....	324

	e. Reduction of mm. 213–237.....	325
	f. Dominant prolongation, mm. 233–237.....	325
	g. Comparison of mm. 119–138 and 213–226.....	326
Example 5.3	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 274.....	327
Example 5.4	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 274, comparison of mm. 1–16 and mm. 50–83 .....	331
Example 5.5	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 274	
	a. Deep-middleground voice-leading reduction .....	332
	b. Chromaticized voice exchange and resulting motivic repetitions, mm. 83–123 .....	332
	c. Reduction of mm. 83–119 with interpolation.....	332
Example 5.6	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G Major, H. 268.....	333
Example 5.7	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268, lead-in and its reduction, mm. 54–56 .....	340
Example 5.8	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268	
	a. Hypothetical version of mm. 51–69.....	341
	b. Reduction of mm. 51–69.....	341
	c. Reduction of mm. 69–73.....	341
Example 5.9	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268, middleground voice-leading reductions	
	a. mm. 1–89 .....	342
	b. Deeper middleground, mm. 1–89 .....	342
	c. mm. 1–144 .....	342
	d. Original version, mm. 1–89 .....	343
	e. Transposed version, mm. 115–144 .....	343
	f. Hypothetical version .....	343
Example 5.10	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268	
	a. Deep-middleground voice-leading reduction with ellipsis, mm. 89–122 .....	344
	b. Reduction of mm. 115–132.....	344
	c. Reduction, from VI <sup>#</sup> to V, mm. 89–144.....	344
Example 5.11	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268, comparison of mm. 17–20 and mm. 167–172 .....	345
Example 5.12	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268	
	a. RT, mm. 25–31 .....	346
	b. Reduction of RT, mm. 24–28 .....	347

c. Middleground voice-leading reduction, mm. 24-30 .....	347
d. Deep-middleground voice-leading reduction, mm. 1-144 .....	348
e. Deeper-middleground voice-leading reduction, mm. 1-144.....	348
Appendix A. Three graphic analyses.....	340
1. The Rondo in Bb, H. 267.....	349
2. The Rondo in E, H. 274.....	359
3. The Rondo in G, H. 268.....	364

## List of figures

3.1	Origins of transposed phrases in period 3 of the Sonata in C Major, H. 28/ii .....	83
4.1	Configurations of opening refrains .....	114
4.2	Rondo in E Major, H. 265, couplet 3: Interthematic functions.....	137
4.3	Rondo in E Major, H. 265: A sonata-rondo.....	141
4.4	Rondo in F Major, H. 266: A rotational analysis.....	146
4.5	Rondo in C Major, H. 260: Intrathematic and interthematic functions .....	154
5.1	Rondo in Bb Major, H. 267: Key-scheme analysis of refrain-theme repetitions.....	164
5.2	Rondo in Bb Major, H. 267: A sonata-rondo.....	170
5.3	Rondo in E Major, H. 274: An outline of its outer form .....	177
5.4	Rondo in G Major, H. 268: An outline of its outer form .....	180
5.5	Comparison of mm. 68–91 and mm. 123–146 .....	186

<b>Concordance</b>		
<b>Rondo</b>	<b>Helm #</b>	<b>Wotquenne #</b>
C Major	260	56/1
D Major	261	56/3
A Minor	262	56/5
E Major	265	57/1
F Major	266	57/5
Bb Major	267	58/5
G Major	268	59/2
G Major	271	57/3
E Major	274	58/3
A Major	276	58/1
C Minor	283	59/4
Eb Major	288	61/1
D Minor	290	61/4
<b>Sonata</b>		
Sonata in C Major	28	48/5
Sonata No. 1 in A Minor	30	49/1
Sonata in B Minor	32.5	65/13
Sonata in B Minor	36	49/6
Sonata in G Minor	68	65/27
Sonata in G Minor	47	65/17
Sonata in G Major	56	65/22

<b>Sonata</b>	<b>Helm #</b>	<b>Wotquenne #</b>
Sonata in D Minor	208	57/4
Sonata in G Major	523	90/2
<b>Character piece</b>		
<i>La Buchholtz</i>	93	117/24
<i>La Louise</i>	114	117/36

## Chapter 1

### Eighteenth- and twentieth-century perspectives on the late rondos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach

#### 1.0 Introduction

This dissertation is a study of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach's keyboard rondos that he published during the 1770s and 1780s in volumes ii through vi of his six collections of keyboard works *für Kenner und Liebhaber* (for the connoisseur and the amateur). Discussions of these works that occur in both the eighteenth and twentieth centuries often refer to transposed iterations of the opening refrain theme as actual refrains.<sup>1</sup> It is my belief that true rondo refrains occur only in the tonic. I consider transposed versions of the refrain theme to belong to intervening sections frequently referred to as couplets. I adhere, therefore, to the traditional notion that a rondo is a composition in which the opening theme repeats in the tonic at various intervals with interceding sections. In addition, as my analyses will indicate, I shall demonstrate that Bach creates a dialogue between surface features of refrain and couplet that organize its outer form and middleground voice-leading and harmonic features that organize its inner form. I shall explain how these features occasionally conflict resulting in tension on a variety of levels on and beneath the surface.

I begin with a discussion of the issues that have influenced the analysis of these rondos in both the eighteenth and twentieth centuries and shall demonstrate the influence of the earlier writers on those writing a century later. Chapters 2 and 3 place the rondos

---

<sup>1</sup> I use the term "refrain" throughout this dissertation to refer to the opening section of a rondo that encompasses a theme in the tonic key that closes with a PAC (perfect authentic cadence) as well as each tonic iteration of this section that occurs thereafter. As noted by Troschke (2004, 6), the term refrain was popularized by A. B. Marx in the nineteenth century. In the manner of the French *clavecinistes*, I use the term "couplet" to refer to musical material that intervenes between refrains.

in a context that reflects their relationship to previous tradition and contemporary practice. Chapter 3 also establishes that thematic return, a characteristic frequently relied on in the analysis of these works, is not necessarily an indicator of formal division. Chapter 4 presents analyses that consider how phrases function within traditional patterns of refrain and couplet and illustrates how many of these rondos mediate between rondo and sonata form. Chapter 5 explores the relationship between a rondo's surface organization and long-term relationships that become apparent in the underlying voice-leading structure. The result, I hope, will be a deeper appreciation of these remarkable pieces.

### 1.1 Background

The *Kenner und Liebhaber rondos* were the first independent keyboard rondos Bach composed since his early rondeaux with French titles of the 1750s. His interest in composing independent rondos seems to have been instigated by popular demand for works in this genre. As Bach wrote in a letter to his friend Alexander Reinagle in the latter part of 1785:

The fancy for the Rondos is just as great here as in London, and for that reason I have inserted them to further my sales. I know from experience that very many people buy my collections only because of the Rondos (Bach 1994, 1130-1131; Clark 1997, 241).

Many writers who discussed Bach's late rondos in both the eighteenth and twentieth centuries base their explorations of these works on a concept of rondo form as an additive structure, defined solely by thematic repetition and the resulting arrangement of keys. Some identify aspects of sonata, ritornello, or song form and describe the influence of the concerto, capriccio, and fantasy in their composition. Discussions often turn to the influences upon Bach's rondo style, rather than the development of a coherent

approach to their analysis. It is my intention to investigate C. P. E. Bach's rondos from perspectives that have received less attention from scholars. I will consider aspects of phrase rhythm, period structure, theme, harmony, and form, as well as various levels of structural connection that transcend superficial elements of design.

### 1.2 Conflict in the perception of C. P. E. Bach's rondo form

Discussions of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach's rondos of the 1770s and '80s appeared in print during the last quarter of the eighteenth century and again during the twentieth century with the rebirth of interest in Bach's music and theoretical writings.<sup>2</sup> Regardless of the time, a central focus of these discussions has been the unusual recurrences of the rondo refrain in varying keys. Writers in both centuries have offered various and sometimes conflicting explanations for this deviation from traditional rondo form. Indeed, conflict begins to surface within the decade after the initial publication of Bach's rondos.

The root of this conflict resides in conflicting definitions of a rondo's divisions, which have traditionally been classified into two types, refrain and couplet. Bach does not comment in his writings on these divisions. As a result, the analyst's perception of these works depends on whether transpositions of the refrain theme are regarded as refrains or not. Because our understanding of rondo form has been greatly influenced by writers of the eighteenth century, it is first necessary to consider their descriptions of this form. I will then discuss comments by contemporaries of Bach that are specific to his late rondos. This study leads to a discussion of various eighteenth-century definitions of the term "period" and to an inquiry into the influence of period structure on the

---

<sup>2</sup> Cole 1970 summarizes some of the writings on these works. I will discuss other writings as well.

perception of Bach's rondos by those eighteenth-century writers who commented upon them.

Although the writings of Heinrich Christoph Koch are important to this discussion, I will postpone my consideration of his work to chapter 2. I do this in order to present a more detailed study of Koch's theory of composition in relation to period structure and the rondo (Koch 1782–93/1969; 1983 and Koch 1802/1985). Since similar issues regarding the parameters of refrain and couplet arise in the discussions of Bach's rondos during the twentieth century, I will devote the second half of this chapter to an investigation of those writers whose analyses have been most influential in the past century.

### 1.3 The perception of Bach's rondos in the eighteenth century

#### 1. Eighteenth-century descriptions of rondeau form<sup>3</sup>

Johann Gottfried Walther defines the term *rondeau* in the following way (Walther 1732, 531–32):

*Rondeau* signifies a circle; derives from *round* and is a melody set in  $\frac{3}{4}$  or even meter; its first section [*Satz*] is so arranged that it can make a cadence. The other *reprises* [*Reprisen*], of which there are three or four, must be composed so as to fit well with the first section.<sup>4</sup>

He continues with a brief discussion of the possibility of various numbers of measures in the first section, preferring the length of eight measures. He advises that the musical content must be pleasurable enough to withstand five or six repetitions and concludes by stating that the first section, the *rondeau*, is the reprise that is repeated. Walther reveals

<sup>3</sup> I use the spelling "rondeau" in reference to works that are in—or refer to—the French tradition.

<sup>4</sup> The translation is from Ratner 1980, 249. "Rondeau bedeutet einen Creis oder Circul: kommt her von rond. rund, und ist eine im  $\frac{3}{4}$  oder auch im egalen Tact geseßte Melodie: deren erster Satz so eingerichtet ist, daß er den Schluß machen kan. Die andern reprises, deren bisweilen 3 bis 4 zu finden, müssen sich allemahl so verhalten, daß der erste Satz auf jede wohl passe."

important qualities fundamental to the opening section, the rondeau refrain: it closes harmonically with a cadence (equivalent to our perfect authentic cadence or PAC), has an even number of measures, and repeats throughout the piece. Walther, however, says little about the sections he calls “other reprises” (more often referred to by the French term *couplet* or the German *Zwischensatz*), except to say that they must fit satisfactorily with the repetitions of the first section.

Walther makes a brief reference to the relationship of the musical rondeau to the poetic form of the same name. Johann Mattheson emphasizes the poetic reference:

A Rondeau which has either an even or an uneven meter, and is in music what is indicated by similarly-named rhyme-species in poetry. The 136<sup>th</sup> Psalm is in its way nothing other than a rondeau. (Mattheson 230; Harriss 1981, 461).<sup>5</sup>

Other eighteenth-century writers take similar approaches. Prior to Walther, Sebastien de Brossard mentions the rondeau in his discussion of the minuet en rondeau.<sup>6</sup> Because his interest is in the minuet, he says very little about the rondeau except to state that the first reprise of the *minuetto* normally concludes on the dominant [*Dominante*] in major or the mediant [*Mediante*] in minor, but on the tonic [*Finalie*] if it is a rondeau. This description recognizes the importance of closure in the tonic of the opening section, but says nothing about repetition of this section after the second reprise. James Grassineau describes the rondeau in general terms as any piece that concludes with a repetition, indicated by the letters *DC*, of the first strain.<sup>7</sup> Jean-Jacques Rousseau, affirming Walther’s definition, specifies the repetition of the first reprise after every other reprise and emphasizes that the modulation of each reprise must be constructed in such a

---

<sup>5</sup> Other writings that emphasize the connection to poetry include Forkel 1778 (281–82), Sulzer 1792–99 (the article “Rondeau,” written by J. P. Kirnberger and J. A. P. Schulz), and Koch 1802 (the article “Rondeau”).

<sup>6</sup> Brossard 1707, 60.

<sup>7</sup> Grassineau 1740, 205.

way that the end of each section prepares for the one to follow.<sup>8</sup> Kirnberger and Schulz, referring to poetry, are also concerned with the natural connection between parts of the rondeau that together comprise a “strophe.” These authors echo Rousseau’s concern that connections between each reprise be as smooth as possible.<sup>9</sup>

## 2. Eighteenth-century descriptions of Bach’s late rondos

In 1778 Johann Nikolaus Forkel published a review of Bach’s *Claviersonaten, mit einer Violin und einem Violoncell zur Begleitung* (1775-76).<sup>10</sup> Half of the essay is devoted to a discussion of the final movement of one sonata, the rondo, *Grazioso e poco allegro*, from the Sonata in G Major, H. 523. With his commentary, Forkel offers a theory that outlines the qualities he expects in a good rondo. Since he illustrates these qualities with specific reference to a Bach rondo, his description aids our understanding of his approach in defining the various sections.

His first two precepts concern the main theme (*Hauptgedanke*). Employing a literary analogy, Forkel explains that the main theme must have an “inner worth” that can withstand frequent repetition and must possess certain appropriate qualities, such as pleasantness and simplicity (282-284). For the purpose of variety, it must be composed in a way that allows it to be broken down and altered (284). A third precept, found in no other author, pertains to the couplets (*Zwischensätze*). Forkel states that the couplets must spring from the main theme, and, in fact, the best couplets are those that paraphrase it. His explanation of paraphrase includes several possibilities: the use of parts of the

---

<sup>8</sup> Rousseau 1768, 428. The term “modulation” here is used in the eighteenth-century sense, indicating any progression of melody or harmony, either within a single key or changing keys. See Lester 1992, 2.

<sup>9</sup> Sulzer 1792–99, article “Rondeau.” See note 5.

<sup>10</sup> Forkel 1778–9, 2:275–300. Forkel here reviews two collections of sonatas. The discussion of the rondo from H. 523 appears on pp. 281–94. It should be noted that Forkel is writing about this Bach rondo specifically, since Bach’s independent rondos for keyboard were published after this review.

main theme (*Hauptgedanke*), or secondary ideas (*Nebengedanken*) that have some connection to it; variations of the main theme; and transpositions of the main theme into related or, when appropriate, distant keys. Forkel follows his discussion of paraphrase by professing interest in a unified work that is perceived as a whole and not as a series of individual parts. He then underscores this idea by advising that modulations (*Zwischenmodulationen*) to transpositions of the main theme be as smooth as possible and that subsidiary ideas be well connected to and supportive of it (286). Throughout his commentary, Forkel cites various musical examples that elucidate his ideas on both melodic and harmonic unity; he concludes his discussion with what he refers to as a short analysis of Bach's rondo (289).

In 1789 Daniel Gottlob Türk offered a different perspective on Bach's rondo form. In his definition of the rondo, Türk states: "After every intervening section (couplet), of which a rondo often has two, three, and more, the principal theme is repeated. That this is not always in the main key but often takes place in various related keys has been shown by E. Bach in his rondos" (Türk 1789, 398; Haggh 1982, 391). Türk perceives Bach's transposed thematic statements as restatements of the main theme, the refrain, not as couplets.

Ten years later, Augustus F. C. Kollmann described a rondo as follows:

Of five or more short sections, are in general those pieces called *Rondos*. In these the first section begins and ends in the principal key; the second section begins either in the same key and modulates to the fifth, or begins in the fifth at once and ends with the leading chord of the principal key; the third section is nothing else but a repetition of the first; the fourth section begins and ends in another related key; and the fifth, is a repetition of the first again. (Kollmann 1799, 4)

Two pages later, Kollmann amends his description to include two types of rondos. The first type, the one he describes above, he calls *proper* because "the first section always

returns in the principal key.” The second type he calls *improper* because the “subject or first section also appears in keys to which a digression may be made” (Kollmann, 6). Kollmann then offers an analysis of the same rondo analyzed by Forkel, from Bach’s Sonata in G Major, H. 523. Kollmann indicates his analysis on the score of this movement and includes it as part of his treatise. From both his description and his analysis, it appears his interest is solely in explaining how the modulation of Bach’s rondo is a unified progression.<sup>11</sup> For Kollmann and Türk, the structure or content of the couplets requires no additional explanation. In opposition to Forkel, Türk and Kollmann accept that rondo refrains can return in keys other than the main key.

As stated above, Kollmann discusses the harmonic scheme of the various sections, while Türk, with less detail, allows a number of intervening *Zwischensätze* or couplets. The lack of attention to the actual construction of the couplets, other than the requirement of continuity, seems to be emblematic of eighteenth-century discussions of the rondeau/rondo. Forkel’s discussion is unusual in its comprehensive discussion of the couplet.

### 3. Forkel’s concept of the rondo and his theory of period structure

In order to sort out these diverging views of what may or may not be a rondo refrain or couplet, it is necessary to understand the basis of this conflict. Forkel’s interest in period structure is an important component of his concept of the foundation of musical composition. As the following discussion illustrates, Forkel’s notion of period structure seems to influence the manner in which he perceives the formation of a rondo refrain and a rondo couplet. I shall demonstrate, his rondo theory suggests that transpositions of the rondo refrain conclude secondary sections and, therefore, participate in the formulation of

---

<sup>11</sup> Kollmann, 6: “...I have added to it an explanation of the course of its modulation.”

a couplet as well as a period. I will also show that the views of Türk and Kollmann contrast those of Forkel because of differing concepts of period structure.

Forkel's interpretation of the transposed refrain as part of the couplet may at first seem counterintuitive, but it is supported by his rhetorical conception of music, which he elucidates in two publications, *Ueber die Theorie der Musik*<sup>12</sup> and the *Introduction (Einleitung)* to his *Allgemeine Geschichte der Musik*.<sup>13</sup> Forkel relies on rhetoric to provide a language for and, consequently, a means of understanding certain aspects of both texted and instrumental music. He explains that form and meaning arise from two aspects of rhetoric: logic and rhythm. Logic concerns the relationships that occur within the period. These include the well-planned use of the main theme, the *Hauptgedanke*, to insure the unity of melodic material; this distribution of material is categorized as the ordering of musical ideas (*Die Anordnung musikalischer Gedanken*).<sup>14</sup> It also concerns voice leading and harmonic modulation, both of which affect the construction of phrases and their connections to each other. Rhythm is concerned with external aspects of the phrase as well as of the unity of surface rhythm. However, logic and rhythm together govern the lengths of phrases and their proportional relationships to one another (Forkel 1778, 42-43).

---

<sup>12</sup> Forkel 1777, especially 20–22. See Mark Evan Bonds' discussion of Forkel in Bonds 1991, 120–26.

<sup>13</sup> Forkel 1788, i:39–43. In this introduction Forkel explains in detail the rhetorical basis for his understanding of six aspects of music: period structure, styles, genres, the ordering of musical ideas, the performance or declamation of musical compositions, and musical criticism. Forkel's discussion of period structure occurs in a section of the Introduction entitled "Periodologie." Forkel's application of rhetorical principles to the structural aspects of music is noted in Ottenberg 1987, 130.

<sup>14</sup> Forkel 1788, i:39, 67. Regarding the influence of Mattheson's rhetorical theory on the development of Forkel's concept, see Bonds 1991, 122–23 and Fishman 1997, 48-50. Fishman compares Forkel's concepts with Mattheson's and discusses the significance of Forkel's expansion of Mattheson's principles. Fishman also cites the work of Karl-Heinz Göttert, who considers Forkel's system to be a basis for understanding music and not a basis for composition.

Forkel's period is divided into phrases (*Sätze*) and subdivisions of phrases (*Theile*). He considers these divisions of musical material to be important constructs of grammar and speech. As he states in the *Introduction*:

There is already a word, **periodology**, that is used here for the theory [*Lehre*] of period structure. The period consists of individual musical phrases [*Sätze*] of which there can be more or fewer depending on whether the phrases [*Sätze*] are long or short, or depending on their inner design. These phrases from which periods are constructed belong essentially to musical grammar, and we already know that they must be considered **rhythmically** and **logically**, that is, according to their external form and internal meaning. So it is also with the period that is formed from them... Thus, a musical period is a phrase [*Satz*] in which different smaller phrases [*Sätze*] are united with each other so that they stand both according to their meaning as well as to their form in a certain agreement or mutual relationship and represent fully a certain sense.<sup>15</sup>

Forkel continues by connecting the need for a variety of longer and shorter musical periods to the need for such variety in speech. "For also here, each phrase [*Satz*] can be expanded to form a period; consequently, there are as many kinds of periods as there are possible expansions of single phrases." For fear of creating *Sätze* that are too long, Forkel relies on an old rule of rhetoric, the length of a breath.<sup>16</sup> Unfortunately, he does not illustrate this discussion with musical examples.

---

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 39-40; the translation is adapted from Doris Powers 1995, 107-8. I have made some alterations to the second and fifth sentences of Powers' translation. "Das Wort **Periodologie** giebt es schon, daß hier von der Lehre des Periodenbaues die Rede sey. Die Periode besteht aus einzelnen musikalischen Sätzen, deren sie bisweilen mehr, bisweilen weniger in sich enthalten kann, je nachdem die Sätze lang oder kurz, oder sonst ihrer innern Einrichtung nach beschaffen sind. Diese Sätze, woraus die Perioden zusammengesetzt werden, gehören eigentlich in die musikalische Grammatik, und wir wissen schon, daß sie **rhythmisch** und **logisch**, das heißt, nach ihrer äußern Form und innern Bedeutung betrachtet werden müssen. Eben so die Periode, die aus ihnen gebildet wird... Eine musikalische Periode ist also ein Satz, in welchem verschiedene kleinere Sätze mit einander vereinigt werden, so daß sie sowol ihrer Bedeutung als Form nach in einer gewissen Uebereinstimmung oder gegenseitigen Beziehung stehen, und einen gewissen Sinn vollständig bezeichnen."

<sup>16</sup> Forkel 1788, 40; Powers 1995, 108. "Denn auch hier kann jeder Satz an sich selbst schon so erweitert werden, daß er eine Periode abgeben kann; folglich giebt es so vielerley Arten der Perioden, als Erweiterungen einzelner Sätze möglich sind." The analogy of a phrase to a breath is a time-honored one, but interesting here because of the context of Forkel's discussion of phrase expansion. Kirnberger suggests four measures as the usual length of a phrase, thirty-two measures as the maximum length of a period (Kirnberger 1776, 2:141; Eng. 407). William Rothstein, citing Roger Sessions, also makes use of the idea of a breath in relation to the dynamics of a phrase (Rothstein 1989, 3-4, 13, 42-43).

Forkel emphasizes four qualities that are fundamental to the construction of a period: precision, clarity, intelligibility, and the easy connection of phrases. These qualities aid the listener in his perception of a period's structure. If a period is too long, the listener will become confused. Without clarity the meanings of phrases will be obscured and the listener will be distracted or become tired.<sup>17</sup>

Precision here is the best aid; without it, disorder, lack of clarity and, in general, all errors arise that hinder easy understanding of a composition and, consequently, its good effect.<sup>18</sup>

Following this statement, Forkel advises that the same rules of logic and rhythm that govern the relationship of phrases within a period also govern the relationships of periods within larger compositions.

Forkel concludes his section *Periodologie* with a perspective on compositional form that summarizes the important value he assigns to the periodic divisions of music as a necessity for its comprehension and enjoyment:

Especially in the more elaborate pieces, this rhythmical and logical relationship of the periods of a composition is not always noted because sometimes several periods are linked to each other through connections in such a way that only the more proficient listener can differentiate between them. It is still necessary to look at them in great detail, because this relationship alone determines the easy intelligibility of the compositions in their entirety.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> Forkel 1788, 41, 43. Walther expresses similar concerns that a listener could become frustrated if the length of a phrase were too long (Walther 1732, 532).

<sup>18</sup> Forkel 1788, 41; Powers 1995, 110. "Präcision ist hier das beste Hülfsmittel, so wie aus dem Mangel derselben, Verworrenheit, Undeutlichkeit, und überhaupt alle Fehler entspringen, die die leichte Faßlichkeit eines Tonstücks, folglich auch dessen gute Wirkung hindern."

<sup>19</sup> Forkel 1788, 43; the translation is my own. "Ob nun gleich dieses rhythmische und logische Verhältniß der Perioden eines Tonstücks, hauptsächlich in den ausführlichern, nicht immer, und nicht von jedermann bemerkt wird, weil bisweilen mehrere Perioden durch Verbindungen so an einander gekettet werden, daß sie nur der geübtere Zuhörer zu unterscheiden weiß, so ist doch die genaueste Beobachtung desselben durchaus nothwendig, weil blos allein von demselben die leichte Verständlichkeit der Tonstücke in ihrem ganzen Umfange abhängt."

In the *Introduction*, Forkel does not discuss phrase endings or cadences.<sup>20</sup> His one musical example does, however, illustrate a complete period. The purpose of the example is to emphasize the proportional nature of phrase rhythm that governs the relationships of phrases within the period. His example of a period closes with a perfect authentic cadence (PAC) and can be described as follows: a four-measure antecedent, consisting of two two-measure groups, is followed by a similar consequent with two two-measure groups. Forkel uses the theme from Bach's G-major Rondo, H. 271, as an example of this relationship.<sup>21</sup> His example illustrates an error in proportion made by contracting the final two measures of Bach's rondo theme into one measure, subsequently creating measure groupings of 2 + 2 followed by 2 + 1. He then offers Bach's final two measures as a correction.<sup>22</sup>

In evaluating Forkel's analysis of the finale of Bach's Sonata, H. 523, in relation to the comments of Türk and Kollmann, it is important to consider the two aspects of his theory that concern him most: the ordering of musical ideas and period structure. These concepts are important because a writer who considers periodicity as defined by Forkel as a fundamental basis of musical composition may distinguish formal structures like refrains and couplets as independent periods. At the same time, their independence is limited by the necessity (according to Forkel) of a close relationship of their musical ideas. These two concepts are, therefore, theoretically co-dependent. Forkel recognizes that each section of a rondo is a period, but these periods share musical material. The following, brief description of the phrase-rhythmic structure of the first twenty-eight

---

<sup>20</sup> Forkel includes the harmonic cadence within a lesson on harmony in the section on musical grammar in Forkel 1777, 18–19.

<sup>21</sup> Forkel uses the same rondo for an example in Forkel 1788, 40 (§76).

<sup>22</sup> Bonds (1991, 123) notes that the few examples of periods offered by Forkel are in the antecedent-consequent form typical of the late eighteenth century.

measures of Bach's rondo will show how, for Forkel, unity of ideas is enhanced by his concept of "periodology."

As shown in ex. 1.1, the opening double period (Periods 1 and 2), which includes two statements of the antecedent-consequent rondo theme, ends with a PAC (perfect authentic cadence) in m. 16.<sup>23</sup> Each phrase is four measures in length. The next phrase, which initiates Period 3 and is also four measures, begins in m. 17 in the tonic and moves to an HC (half cadence) in the dominant with the third (the leading tone) on top (m. 20). The next four-measure phrase (mm. 21–24) is a transposition to the dominant of the antecedent phrase of the refrain; this also ends with an HC in the dominant, but with the fifth on top. It is followed by the concluding cadential phrase (mm. 25–28), the four-measure phrase previously heard as the refrain's consequent, also in the dominant, ending with a PAC.

Both Kollmann and, presumably, Türk consider mm. 17-20 as a couplet and the transposed phrases that follow as a refrain. As we will see shortly, Forkel's concern with period structure permits a different interpretation, one that allows him to consider the couplet to include not only the first phrase with the half cadence, but the transposed refrain as well. Since the four-measure phrase identified by Kollmann as the couplet initiates a harmonic motion that remains incomplete at its end with an HC, it is dependent on the transposed consequent for resolution—the concluding PAC. Although the antecedent of the transposed refrain participates in the phrase rhythm of Period 3, it is not that period's initial phrase. All three phrases, therefore, act together to create a division that is both a rhythmic and a formal unit—a period and a couplet.

---

<sup>23</sup> The term "double period" is here used to mean two periods that group together, not a single period of four phrases in a 2 + 2 arrangement. The latter meaning is often encountered in writings on musical form.

Forkel actually describes these three phrases in his analysis. He states that after the main theme (*Hauptgedanke*, literally “main idea”) is completed in the main key (the end of the double period), “a secondary section [*Nebensatz*] enters, one which leads the harmony from the main key to D major and closes in this key with the first repetition of the main theme in this key.”<sup>24</sup> Forkel thus indicates that the transposed repetition of the main theme is the concluding part of the secondary section, not a section in its own right. His statement illustrates his notion that transposed repetitions of the refrain may be included within the couplets, reinforcing a concept of period structure that coincides with formal structures.

Unfortunately, Forkel’s lack of consistency in his use of terms discourages any general conclusion. In his initial discussion of the sections of a rondo, Forkel uses the terms “main section” (*Hauptsatz*) and “couplet” (*Zwischensatz*) to designate formal units. As he begins to explain examples of modulations connecting transpositions of the refrain to its tonic statements, he frequently uses different terms: “main theme” (*Hauptgedanke*), “secondary idea” (*Nebengedanke*), and “secondary section” (*Nebensatz*).<sup>25</sup> It is unclear whether “secondary section” is synonymous with “couplet.”

As Forkel’s analysis progresses, the identity of his earlier sections erodes further:

In the first case, where the main theme [*Hauptgedanke*] was transposed to Bb major, the harmony, on the other hand, leads back again after the end of the main

---

<sup>24</sup> Forkel 1778–79, 2:287. “Die Haupttonart ist G dur. So wie nun der Hauptgedanke in dieser Tonart einmal vorgetragen und vollkommen geendigt ist, tritt ein Nebensatz ein, welcher die Harmonie aus der Haupttonart, ins D dur führt, und mit der ersten Wiederholung des Hauptgedankens in dieser Tonart schliesst.”

<sup>25</sup> Since there is no requirement that a *Nebengedanke* be heard more than once, the translation “secondary theme” seems inappropriate. On the other hand, “main theme” seems an accurate translation of *Hauptgedanke*, which refers to the recurring theme of the rondo.

section [*Hauptsatz*] to G minor with the aid of a secondary section [*Nebensatz*], and modulates to the main key (*Haupttonart*) in the following way.<sup>26</sup>

Here, Forkel places the Bb-major transposition of the main theme in a main section, not in a couplet. Again, he describes a secondary section that carries a modulation. This time his modulation connects a main section in Bb major to the main key (G major) where, as his analysis indicates, the next main section arrives with a repetition of the main theme. The secondary section that he describes resembles the transitional modulation (*Zwischenmodulation*) described in his general description of the rondo:

Concerning the transposition into related or distant keys, it also must be noted that one must proceed cautiously in order to make the transitional modulations [*Zwischenmodulationen*] as smooth as possible, and also through this careful process to assist in assuring that the main idea [*Hauptgedanke*] is not severed from its necessary connection with the subsidiary ideas [*Nebengedanken*], but rather, on the contrary, that it be all the more supported and always become increasingly more confirmed.<sup>27</sup>

Forkel does not relate the term “transitional modulation” (*Zwischenmodulation*) to the periodic structures of main section (*Hauptsatz*) and couplet (*Zwischensatz*), but, as in the previous example, to main theme (*Hauptgedanke*) and secondary idea (*Nebengedanke*). The question arises whether a transitional modulation is a phrase that functions outside the parameters of main section and couplet, or is it, in fact, the Kollmann-Türk couplet. If we reconsider the modulating first phrase of Period 3 of the Bach rondo (discussed above), we must ask whether Forkel considers it to be *both* the

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 2:289. “Beym ersten Fall, wo der Hauptgedanke ins B dur versetzt wurde, wird die Harmonie nach Endigung des Hauptsatzes wiederum ins G moll vermittelt eines Nebensatzes zurückgeführt, und auf folgende Weise in die Haupttonart hinein modulirt.”

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 2:286: “Bey den Versetzungen in verwandte oder entfernte Tonarten, muß noch angemerkt werden, daß man sehr vorsichtig dabey verfahren müsse, um die Zwischenmodulationen so sanft wie möglich zu machen, und auch dadurch beyzutragen, daß der Hauptgedanke nicht aus der nothwendigen Verbindung mit den Nebengedanken gerissen, sondern vielmehr dadurch nur unterstützt und immer bestätigter werde.”

couplet and the opening phrase of a period that contains a main section.<sup>28</sup> Or, as suggested earlier, are the terms “main theme” and “secondary idea” unrelated to “main section” and “secondary section” where Period 3 is concerned?

Perhaps Forkel’s concept of period structure was in its early phase when he offered his rondo theory and analysis of Bach’s rondo; the *Introduction* to his *Allgemeine Geschichte*, his most comprehensive discussion of this issue, appeared ten years after his article on the rondo. It is also possible that the inconsistency in his delineation of musical material results from the increasing irregularity of phrase rhythm as Bach’s rondo progresses. A short period consisting of a group of four-measure phrases, such as follows the opening double period, does not recur after subsequent repetitions of the refrain. One must conclude, then, that although Forkel discusses phrase rhythm and refers to this perspective with a specific vocabulary in his rondo theory, his analysis ultimately fails to support an understanding of the complete rondo based on period structure.

Although Forkel’s theories challenge the traditional analysis of Bach’s rondos, very few writers subsequently pursued his notion that transpositions of the refrain theme may occur in the couplets. Forkel’s consideration of period structure as a fundamental organizing principle of instrumental music in the last half of the eighteenth century, however, was a concept shared by others. In order to recognize the usefulness of period structure for understanding the divisions of refrain and couplet in Bach’s rondos, it will be necessary to investigate the developing concept of period structure in the writings of other eighteenth-century theorists.

---

<sup>28</sup> Galand (1990, 87) states that “Forkel merely distinguishes between any repetition of the *Hauptthema*, and the transitional *Nebengedanken* which connect these tonally varied statements”.

#### 4. Kirnberger: One theorist, two concepts of period structure

Although discussion of period structure during the eighteenth century dates back to Johann Mattheson's *Kern melodischer Wissenschaft* of 1737,<sup>29</sup> the definition of a period varies throughout the century from writer to writer—even, occasionally, within the writings of a single author.<sup>30</sup> Of the three main issues that writers in the second half of the eighteenth century emphasize in their writings on the division of music into sections and periods—length, proportion, and closure—the requirements of closure seem to be the most variable. Differences in the requirements of period closure are important because they influence a writer's notion of how music divides into sections. In the decade before Forkel's publication of his *Allgemeine Geschichte*, with its section on *Periodologie*, Johann Philipp Kirnberger, whose work influenced many subsequent theorists, also wrote about his concept of period structure in the two volumes of his magnum opus, *Die Kunst des reinen Satzes in der Musik*. Kirnberger's discussion occurs first in Vol. 1 (1771) and then again in Vol. 2, Part 1 (1776). What quickly becomes apparent to the reader of Vol. 2 is Kirnberger's own reevaluation of period closure since Vol. 1. In the 1771 publication, Kirnberger first distinguishes between “main sections” (*Haupttheile*), which must end with a perfect cadence, and divisions of these sections, called “periods” (*Perioden*), which may close with a half or deceptive cadence (Kirnberger 1771–79/1988, 1:96; Beach 1982, 114). Two pages later, however, he states the following:

---

<sup>29</sup> Mattheson incorporated this work into Part 2 of his larger and more comprehensive work, *Der vollkommene Capellmeister* (Mattheson 1739). For a discussion of Mattheson's influence on Joseph Riepel, see Reed-Knouse 1983, 26. Bonds 1991 (73–74) also discusses Mattheson's writings on period structure.

<sup>30</sup> Koch states in 1787 (Baker 1983, 4, n. 7): “But the insufficient definition of the nature of phrases makes the teaching of musical period structure more difficult with regard to the punctuation sequence of sections and the rhythm.” Ratner also discusses confusion in terminology where periodicity is concerned (Ratner 1980, 34–35). According to Bonds 1991, 74: “No single theorist is particularly succinct in presenting these various elements of periodicity, and the problem of terminology further confuses the issue.” Justin London also discusses the different understandings and uses of phrase-related terminology by eighteenth-century theorists (London 1990).

These are the three main types of cadences, the first [perfect] of which produces complete repose and thus can be used to conclude main sections of a composition. The other two types [half-cadence and deceptive cadence] do not produce complete repose, yet can also be used to conclude main sections; they are also suitable for dividing such sections into periods. (Kirnberger 1771–79/1988, 1:98; Beach 1982, 116)

Kirnberger then presents the possibility of weakening these cadences by employing chord inversions and, consequently, ensuring an increase in the variety of cadential endings.

These different endings produce different degrees of rest, ranging from strong to weak at the end of a “main section” or “period” (Kirnberger 1771–79/1988, 1:98–100; Beach 1982, 116–17). It is clear that Kirnberger in 1771 does not necessarily consider periods to conclude with complete repose, and, in fact, allows a variety of degrees of closure.

What becomes confusing, however, is his criterion for the proper cadential closure of main sections. If, as he first stated, “A [main] section [*Haupttheil*] of a composition always ends with such a perfect cadence,” how can a main section end with a half or a deceptive cadence?<sup>31</sup>

In Vol. 2, part 1, published five years later, Kirnberger’s description of period closure changes. In discussing how the ear groups successive pitches into units that eventually arrive at a point of rest, he writes:

This break or rest point can be achieved either by a complete cadence [*völlige Cadenz*] or simply by a melodic close with a restful harmony, without a close in the bass. In the first case, we have a complete musical statement [*Satz*] that is equivalent to a full sentence in speech, after which a period is placed. But in the other case, we have a phrase [*Satz*] that is indeed comprehensible, yet after which another or several more phrases are expected to complete the meaning of the period. The musical statement [*Satz*] that is complete and ends with a formal cadence [*förmlichen Schluß*] we will call a *section* [*Abschnitt*] or *period* [*Periode*]; but the incomplete one that ends only with a melodic break or a

---

<sup>31</sup> Kirnberger 1771–79/1988,1:96; Beach 1982, 114. In this sentence, the translators use “principal” section instead of “main” section for Kirnberger’s term *Haupttheil*. For the purpose of consistency, I have substituted “main.”

satisfying harmony we will call a *phrase* [*Einschnitt*] or a *rhythmic unit* [*Rhythmus*].<sup>32</sup>

At this point, it becomes apparent that Kirnberger has not simply altered his qualifications for closure, but has refined his distinction between a phrase (*Einschnitt* or *Satz*), a period (*Period* or *Abschnitt*), and a main section (*Haupttheil*). Kirnberger's "period" of Vol. 1 metamorphoses into his "phrase" of Vol. 2.

##### 5. Kollmann's synthesis of Kirnberger's theories; phrase rhythm related to poetry

Kollmann discusses period structure in *An Essay on Musical Harmony* three years prior to his analysis of C. P. E. Bach's G-Major Rondo in *An Essay on Practical Musical Composition* (1799).<sup>33</sup> This volume, first published in 1796 (another printing occurred in 1817), was influenced by Kirnberger's *Kunst des reinen Satzes*. Aspects of Kirnberger's harmonic theories appear, as do certain aspects of his writings on meter and rhythm.<sup>34</sup> Like Kirnberger, Kollmann offers his discussion of harmony before his discourse on the rhythmic aspects of music. He presents the same form of perfect cadence as preferred: the bass moves down a fifth from the dominant to the tonic; the top voice moves up from the leading tone (scale-step  $\hat{7}$ ) to the tonic (scale-step  $\hat{8}$ ).<sup>35</sup> He also refers to Kirnberger's

---

<sup>32</sup> Ibid., 2:138; Beach 1982, 404–5. In the notes to his translation of Türk's *School of Clavier Playing*, Haggh (1982, 507–8) cites Kirnberger's definitions of rhetorical terms in his article *Einschnitt* in Johann Georg Sulzer's *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste*: "In this work we will call the principal components of a melody, which begin with a new tone and close with a complete cadence, periods or *Abschnitte*. The *smaller portions* of which several together constitute a period and of which each one in common is called a *Rhythmus*, we will designate as *Einschnitte*, the *smallest* members, however, which are caused by short points of rest within *Einschnitte*, we will call caesuras" (Sulzer 1771–74/1967–70, 2:35).

<sup>33</sup> *An Essay on Musical Harmony*, Kollmann 1796/1817. Since I have had access to the 1817 edition only, my references are to that version.

<sup>34</sup> Imogene Horsley states in her introduction to Kollmann 1799 (p. vi) that Kollmann adopted Kirnberger's harmonic theories. Kollmann includes modified versions of Kirnberger's Tables 4.1 and 4.2 of simple and compound meters (Kollmann 1817, 156, 159; Kirnberger 1771–79/1988, 117, 132; (Beach 1982, 385, 399).

<sup>35</sup> Kirnberger 1771–79, 1:94 (Beach 1982, 112); Kollmann 1817, 119.

rejection of the French added-sixth chord (first posited by Rameau) as an essential dissonance.<sup>36</sup>

Although Kollmann offers and acknowledges many of Kirnberger's ideas and several of his examples, differences seem to arise in Kollmann's discussion of rhythm and music. Kollmann builds his theory of musical phrase rhythm, the governing principle that determines the divisions of music, on the model of poetic meter and versification. He begins his chapter XII, "Of Rhythm," as follows: "By *Rhythm*, I understand that *periodical order* in a composition, which is equal to what is called *number* in prose, or *metre* in poetry" (Kollmann 1817, 159).<sup>37</sup> He continues:

But still simple Rhythm is not sufficient to express those regular *changes* which are required in a regular variety, if it shall become expressive of *particular passions*, in a certain character; as it still proceeds in one uniform strain, without regard to the number of measures in that progression. The said regular changes therefore must be produced by *compound rhythm*, which is the connecting of two, three, four, or more measures, into a *rhythmical period*. (Kollmann 1817, 161)<sup>38</sup>

Although aspects of Kollmann's discussion are similar to Kirnberger's in *Die Kunst des reinen Satzes*, Kollmann's discussion of "compound rhythm" seems to be based on the Kirnberger/Schulz article *Rhythmus* in Sulzer's *Allgemeine Theorie*, where "compound rhythm" is discussed in similar terms (Sulzer 1771–74/1967–70, 4:95-96).<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> Kirnberger 1771–79, 1:97 (Beach 1982, 115); Kollmann 1817, 123.

<sup>37</sup> Kirnberger (1771–79/1988, 2:137; Beach 1982, 404) offers a literary connection between the rhythm of a musical work and the versification of a lyric poem: "Individual phrases represent the lines, and larger sections of several phrases are musical strophes." Writing in Sulzer (1771–74/1967–70) Kirnberger analogizes the lines of a poem to musical *Einschnitte* (Sulzer, 1771–74/1967–70, 2:35-37). See Haggh's *Notes* in Türk's *School of Clavier Playing*, 1982, p. 508.

<sup>38</sup> In his discussion of simple and compound measure, Kollmann declares "simple measure has but one principal accent" and "in compound measure, every bar has two principal accents, a chief one on the first and an inferior on the second half of the measure" (1817, 158).

<sup>39</sup> Kollmann includes modified versions of Kirnberger's Tables 4.1 and 4.2 (Kollmann 1817, 156, 159; Kirnberger 1771–79/1988, 2:117, 132; Beach 385, 399).

Kollmann compares the rhythmic aspect of his periods to verse. A musical period, like a verse, “can be divided into two, three or four *strains*, besides its division into measures.” After establishing this poetic basis for the divisions in a musical composition, the grammatical aspect of closure is used to distinguish strains from periods:

The difference between a *period* and a mere *strain*, is their cadence. The former ought to end with a more conclusive cadence than the latter; but a perfect *final* cadence in its complete form, should only be made at the conclusion of those periods, which end a section, and an *imperfect*, or *interrupted*, or *inverted perfect cadence*, are sufficient for the conclusion of those periods which do not end a section. (Kollmann 1817, 164)

Kollmann’s concept of cadential closure reiterates Kirnberger’s concepts in Vol. 1 of *Kunst*. Like early Kirnberger, the variety of endings that Kollmann allows to bring closure to a period can be explained by his application of the term “period” to a phrase exhibiting only weak closure. Kollmann, in fact, includes an example of a period and its subdivision into two strains in his *Essay on Musical Harmony* (Kollmann 1817). After explaining how the first two measures of J. S. Bach’s Prelude in F Minor from Book Two of *The Well-Tempered Clavier* qualify as a strain, he designates the first four measures of the Prelude, which conclude with an HC, as a period (165).

In 1789 Kollmann published a *Symphony for the Pianoforte, a Violin, and a Violoncello, with analytical explanations of the Subjects and Imitations, the Counterpoint Inversions, and the Rhythmical order it contains, Opus VII*.<sup>40</sup> In his analysis, Kollmann indicates periods on the score by entering the measure number at the end of each period. Imogene Horsley comments that some of Kollmann’s periods actually end with the

---

<sup>40</sup> Imogene Horsley discusses this work and reprints the score of the first movement and part of the second with Kollmann’s analysis as part of her Introduction to Kollmann 1799 (viii–xxx).

cadence in the following measure (Kollmann 1799, ix). However, consideration of one such period suggests a different explanation for Kollmann's period indications.

Example 1.2 provides the opening theme of Kollmann's *Symphony*. It begins with a theme that appears to be five measures long. Measure 4 consists of a progression from subdominant to dominant, with the resolution to the tonic on the first beat of m. 5. Although the first beat of m. 5 through a process of phrase overlap is also the first beat of a new phrase, Kollmann indicates the end of the phrase at the end of m. 4.<sup>41</sup> Kollmann's concept of the four-measure rhythmical period does not rely on cadential closure but on what he calls "compound rhythm." He parses a musical phrase as he would parse a poetic verse. Kollmann's reliance on "simple regularity as the foundation of rhythmical order" (1817, 169) affirms a rhythmical order based on the concept of symmetry—the recurrence of "verses" (periods) of equal length.

One might read into this concept a pattern of alternating strong and weak measures, although neither Kirnberger nor Kollmann does this explicitly. Türk, however, does posit such an alternation when phrase rhythms are duple and symmetrical (Türk 1789, 335-338; Hagg 1982, 325-27). Türk's interpretation, which set the stage for nineteenth-century theories of hypermeter, will be followed here. In ex. 1.2, m. 4, the end of Kollmann's rhythmical period, is weak, and m. 5, the beginning of a new period, is strong. The syntactical unit, however, cannot be said to end until the authentic cadence in m. 5. One might analyze this as a four-measure phrase (mm. 2-5) preceded by a one-measure prefix, yielding an expanded phrase of five measures, but Kollmann does not do so.

---

<sup>41</sup> See the discussion of phrase overlap in Rothstein 1989, 48.

Another opportunity exists to consider Kollmann's perspective on period structure. In *An Essay on Musical Harmony* he offers two examples of periods that require some kind of alteration upon conclusion. They are reproduced here in ex. 1.3. As Kollmann explains, the period in the first example (ex. 1.3a) actually ends on the first beat of the third bar. In order to complete the rhythmic period with "good effect," it was necessary "to fill the two last bars up with the echo of the second and third bar" (1817, 169). Example 1.3b presents a different solution. Kollmann states "it is a period apparently consisting of five bars; but it ends with the half cadence at the end of the fourth bar...and the fifth bar only is added like the beginning of a new period, to complete the conclusion without filling the time of that period up with rests or notes" (Kollmann 1817, 170). This example reveals that "period" to Kollmann is a purely rhythmic unit, even a metrical one, not a syntactic unit requiring closure; it is consistent with his reading of four-measure periods in his *Symphony*.

Kollmann's view that musical divisions are based on metrical units diverges from the rhetorically based perspective of Forkel and from Kirnberger's later (1776) conception of the period. In these perspectives, musical divisions rely on a convergence of rhythm, harmony, and melody.

As I indicated earlier, Kollmann's interest in Bach's rondos extends only to their harmonic organization. He wishes to demonstrate harmonic unity, and to show that Bach's transposed refrains deviate from the typical ("proper") rondo form. He shows no interest in explaining the melodic content of couplets or analyzing their phrase rhythm. Writing at the very end of the last decade of the eighteenth century, Kollmann offers examples of Bach's rondos and sonatas even though Bach, who died in 1788, was no

longer stylistically contemporary, and the vogue for rondos had begun to pass. Although Kollmann's descriptions of forms in his treatise on composition are widely regarded as contemporary, the divergence of his perspective on rhythm and form from those of other theorists of the time (Kirnberger 1771–79/1988, Koch 1782–93/1969, and Türk 1789) mark his viewpoint as somewhat out of date, based as it is on Kirnberger's writings of the early 1770s.<sup>42</sup>

#### 1.4 The perception of the Bach rondos in the twentieth century

##### 1. Introduction

With an increased interest in the music and writings of C. P. E. Bach in the twentieth century, musicologists began, once again, to examine his late rondos. As I will illustrate, some writers were influenced by Kollmann's categorization of rondos as either *proper* or *improper*. Rondos were proper if refrains occurred only in the tonic key; they were improper if refrains occurred in other keys as well. Other writers theorized a different explanation for the occurrence of non-tonic refrains, citing the influence of the fantasy. To further complicate matters, writers employed differing terms for the sections of the rondos or, frequently, the same terms but with different meanings. It is my intention to evaluate the main body of twentieth-century scholarship in order to make a case for a different view of these works. I shall demonstrate that refrains in Bach's rondos return only in the tonic and that non-tonic returns fall within the couplets.

---

<sup>42</sup> One of Kollmann's sources, Sulzer's *Allgemeine Theorie*, was first published in 1771–74. See also Bonds 1991, 34.

## 2. Kollmann's influence on twentieth-century perspectives on Bach's rondos

During the past century, many scholars who studied Bach's rondos considered the repetitions of the rondo theme in keys other than the main key as refrains, not couplets.<sup>43</sup> Although this perspective prevailed before the publication in 1970 of Malcolm Cole's article "Rondos, Proper and Improper," Cole's application of Kollmann's terminology soon became an inextricable element of the reception history of C. P. E. Bach's rondos (Cole 1970). Although Cole refers in great detail to Forkel's description of the rondo, which includes non-tonic statements of the rondo theme within the couplets, Cole gives more credence to Kollmann's perspective than to Forkel's.

Cole's reliance on Kollmann can most likely be explained by the influence of traditional descriptions of the rondo, which define the form by the repetitions of a tonally closed refrain—the melodic content of which will be referred to as the "rondo theme"—interspersed with couplets that have an unspecified phrase-rhythmic structure. As previously discussed, the sole requirement of couplet organization for most eighteenth-century writers is its unifying relationship (however defined) with surrounding refrains. Since Bach's repetitions of the rondo theme are tonally closed and interspersed with other material, as illustrated by both Forkel and Kollmann, Bach's rondos seem to fit those aspects of the traditional rondo paradigm. Türk and Kollmann's acknowledgement that

---

<sup>43</sup> Very few writers have dissented. In an analysis of C. P. E. Bach's Rondo in G Major, H. 283, Leonard Ratner includes only tonic statements of the rondo refrain in his 'A' sections. Non-tonic statements are included within his episodes, or 'B' and 'C' sections. See Ratner 1980, 252. In his article "Rondeau – Rondo" in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Ulrich Leisinger comments that the common assumption is that Bach used refrains in keys other than the main key in his rondos as noted by Kollmann, but that Forkel considered the possibility that the main theme can also serve as the basis for an episode. In this case, Leisinger states, the theme does not function as a refrain.

Bach's refrains sometimes occur in keys other than the tonic grants Cole's perspective historical legitimacy.

Although Cole quotes Forkel extensively, he never considers Forkel's concept of period structure or its function as the fundamental organizing principle of musical form.<sup>44</sup> Because of this omission, Cole's terminology must be considered carefully. In a problematic translation of Forkel's statement in his discussion of transposition (see n. 23), Cole renders Forkel's term *Hauptgedanke* as "main thought" the first time and "main section" the second. Here is Cole's translation:

When the main thought has been performed once in this key and finished completely, a secondary section enters, one which leads the harmony from the main key to D major and closes in this key with the first restatement of the *main section* [emphasis added].<sup>45</sup>

Forkel's use of the words "Wiederholung des Hauptgedankens" would suggest, however, that he meant "and closes in this key with the first repetition of the main thought." The substitution of "main section" for "main thought" indicates a formal structure that perhaps Forkel did not intend. In this passage, at least, Forkel seems to use *Gedanke* to indicate a melodic idea and *Satz* to indicate a syntactical unit that embodies a certain completeness, regardless of the melodic material used. Cole effaces this distinction. His translation reinforces the notion that each time the rondo theme appears, it arrives as an independent section, a refrain. No consideration of the relations of phrases that precede rondo-theme repetitions, as discussed earlier, is included in Cole's assessment of sectional structure.

---

<sup>44</sup> Ottenberg 1987 endorses Forkel's understanding of period structure as the basis of musical form. Thirty years earlier, with theories such as Forkel's in mind, Leonard Ratner wrote (1956, 439): "Yet eighteenth-century theories of phrase and period structure, that is, of the elements that deal with movement and formal principles, have not received as much attention as have harmony, performance practice, and other aspects of the music of the time."

<sup>45</sup> Cole 1970, 390. See my n. 24 for the original German.

### 3. Fantasy and improvisation as a basis of twentieth-century analyses of Bach's rondos

For twentieth-century scholars, the eighteenth-century fantasy offered another way of explaining the recurrence of the refrain in a variety of keys in Bach's late rondos. Cole explains the frequent occurrences of the rondo theme in keys other than the tonic as a result of Bach's "constant exploration of the fantasy or improvisatory principle in works other than fantasies" and cites the work of Sir Henry Hadow, Suzanne Clercx, Rudolf von Tobel, Heinrich Schenker, and Hans Engel to support this premise.<sup>46</sup> He also refers to the criticism of Bach's contemporary Carl Friedrich Cramer, who employed fantasy as the basis of the literary programs he devised for each of the three rondos of *Kenner und Liebhaber*, vol. IV. In particular, Cole emphasizes Cramer's analogy of the free cadenza at the conclusion of the Rondo in Bb Major, H. 267, to the "flight of the gods."<sup>47</sup>

Cole (2001, 21:651) specifies various aspects of Bach's rondos as elements of fantasy: "virtuoso figuration, dynamic juxtapositions, abrupt alternation of the lyric and the rhapsodic, and changes of metre and tempo within a composition."<sup>48</sup> Cole's description of Bach's rondo couplets (Cole refers to them as "episodes") reflects this perspective:

---

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., 389. More recent writers who subscribe to this theory include Matthew Head, who sees the fantasy as influencing not only Bach's couplets but his refrains as well. He concludes that there is a blurring of the distinction between these traditional divisions of rondo form (Head 1995, 189–222). See also Galand 1995, 36; Poos 1993, 139; and Hausler 1987, 13 and 16. David Schulenberg writes (1984, 148): "By contrast with the typical concerto movement, the key structure articulated by the statements of the rondo theme is so elaborate that [Charles] Rosen rightly describes the form as 'an improvised fantasy on one theme that wanders through several keys, with striking effects.'"

<sup>47</sup> Cole 1969, 437, n. 29; 1970, 391. Cramer discusses the Bach rondos in Cramer 1783–87, 1:1241–50. The analogy to the "flight of the gods" appears on pp. 1249–50.

<sup>48</sup> Ottenberg (1987, 78) describes the following improvisational aspects of the fantasy: "extended rhapsodic passages, instrumental recitatives, an imaginative arrangement of surprise effects, [and] *adagio* insertions... Thematic ideas which avoid all rhythmic and metrical regularity also indicate a close relation to the fantasia."

Episode material is often non-thematic, consisting of arpeggiated figuration, sequential passages and chains of chords that serve to prepare refrain statements in related keys. Bach often developed aspects of a refrain theme. Episodes tend to be lengthy and of open design rather than in the closed binary and ternary substructures used by his contemporaries (such as J. C. Bach). (Cole 2001, 21:651)

Cole's episodes resemble transitional phrases that connect various statements of the rondo refrain. This perspective emphasizes a dichotomy between the closed period structure of the thematic statement and the open structure of the non-thematic figuration of the couplet. Many writers concur with this approach.<sup>49</sup>

As Cole notes (1970, 389), Heinrich Schenker acknowledged improvisation as the structural basis of Bach's rondos thirty-five years earlier:

With the progressive development of the art of prolongation, and particularly the art of improvisation, it became possible for C. P. E. Bach, for example, to vary the key of the A section in his rondos so that not only the keys of the contrasting sections but also those of the A<sub>2</sub> and A<sub>3</sub> differed from the main tonality. (Schenker 1935/1956, 214; Oster 1979, 142)

Schenker continues:

Later composers, more concerned with the organic coherence of the whole, tended to base their rondos on the three-part song form and hence maintained the A section in the main tonality. Only within a larger passing motion did they occasionally allow an A section to appear in a different (illusory) key. This liberty creates the effect of a developmental section, but such a passage, strictly speaking, belongs to a particular contrasting section, to a C or D.

Schenker's portrayal of Bach's rondo form at first seems enigmatic. He bases his understanding of its structure on a traditional paradigm modified by a modern compositional technique: the rondos have both "A" sections and contrasting sections ("B," "C," etc.) typical of sectionalized rondo form, yet their form is also the result of

---

<sup>49</sup> Schulenberg (1984, 153) describes the return of the "periodic simplicity of the rondo theme" after its abandonment in the "chaotic second episode." Hausler (1987, 13 and 16) contrasts the period structure of the refrain sections with the free-fantasy aspects of the episodes. In an analysis of Bach's Rondo in A Minor, H. 262, Poos (1993, 135–42) writes at length on the digressive aspect of Bach's episodes and the ultimate destruction of the psychological sense of period architecture.

“the progressive development” of “the art of improvisation.” Schenker does not elucidate how the recurrence of “A” sections in keys other than the main key results from Bach’s art of improvisation. He continues, instead, to define Bach’s rondos by contrasting their structures with examples of rondos by Mozart and Beethoven. In opposition to the works of these later composers, Schenker rejects the possibility of organic coherence and song form as the basis of Bach’s rondos.<sup>50</sup> Instead he asserts that the rondos are the result of an improvisational act, leading us to believe that they exist outside the paradigms of traditional form.<sup>51</sup>

A context for these remarks, however, may be found in Schenker’s earlier writings. In *A Contribution to the Study of Ornamentation*, first published in 1904 and revised in 1908 as a companion to his edition of selected works from Bach’s *Kenner und Liebhaber* collections, Schenker devotes a section of his discussion to “Form in the Works of C. P. E. Bach.”<sup>52</sup> Schenker remarks (1908, 10-11; Siegel 1976, 27) that Bach does not rely on any “schematic formula, whether in regard to form, idea, or harmony....Instead, everything—at its inception as well as during its successive development—exists by grace of an improvisatory imagination.” According to Schenker,

---

<sup>50</sup> Galand (1990, 88–93) challenges Schenker’s view with an analysis of Bach’s rondo from the Sonata, H. 523, the Forkel-Kollmann rondo. Galand demonstrates that this rondo is structured as a combination of two song forms that are generated by the middleground techniques of interruption and neighboring motion. Later, however, in a discussion of Mozart’s Rondo, K. 485, Galand states (1990, 109): “Bach’s elaborate fusion of fantasy, expanded-binary, and rondo procedures bears little resemblance to K. 485. It does, however, bear comparison to the Austrian capriccio tradition, which involves a similar amalgamation of these genres.” (See also Galand 1995, 36).

<sup>51</sup> John Rink notes (1993, 10) “that Schenker derived his notion of improvisation largely, if not entirely, from C. P. E. Bach, in other words, from an eighteenth-century tradition rooted in thoroughbass practice.” In opposition to Schenker, Bonds’ approach to form is based on thematic elaboration. In his discussion of eighteenth-century formal concepts, Bonds states in reference to the fantasia and capriccio: “for within the realm of instrumental music these are the only genres that can legitimately claim to be wholly unrelated to any kind of stereotypical pattern.” Bonds considers all other forms to be based on “the manipulation and development of a single theme or a limited number of related ideas.” Bonds, therefore, would consider Bach’s rondos as a creation of thematic elaboration, not free fantasy. See pp. 114-118.

<sup>52</sup> Schenker 1908, 10-14; Siegel 1976, 27-33. Wayne Petty (1995, 54-57) includes a discussion of Schenker’s *Study of Ornamentation*.

Bach's wealth of ideas is the form-giving substance of his technique: "it is this richness alone that bestows on his ideas the gift of sounding spontaneous—eternally improvised" (1908, 14; Siegel 1976, 33).

Yet Schenker makes clear that Bach employs three organizing principles in the development of his ideas: tonality, rhythm, and dynamics. These elements foster a technique that creates relationships by group formation (*Gruppenbildung*). Tonality, for example, can unify a series of events into a single group while the individual parts retain their own character. In a defense of Bach's misunderstood form, Schenker proclaims (1908, 14; 1976, 33) that modulation, for C. P. E. Bach as well as Haydn, Mozart, and Beethoven, "is a vehicle for ideas rather than a mechanical harmonic device." Later in the same essay (1908, 20; 1976, 43), Schenker remarks on the only rondo included in his publication, Bach's Rondo in G Major, H. 268: "this is an unsurpassed example of a rondo, which displays the most sublime variation technique." In particular, Schenker admires the variety and diversity that occur between tonic and transposed repetitions of the theme, but he emphasizes (1908, 20; 1976, 44) that "in order to understand the design [*Disposition*] of the piece it is important to observe the progressive lowering of the tonality from G major... to F major... to E major."<sup>53</sup>

These remarks help to shed light on Schenker's comments on Bach's rondos in *Free Composition*. The structure of the G-major Rondo is based upon the harmonic descent of the theme from the tonic through two, but not all, of its transpositions on its way to the dominant, D. These transpositions, to F major and E major, are important to the rondo's deep middleground voice-leading structure even though they tonicize triads

---

<sup>53</sup> The word "plan" might be a more appropriate translation of *Disposition*. I offer my own analysis of this rondo in chap. 5.

that do not occur in the key of G major. They exemplify Bach's imaginative, not mechanical, approach to modulation. For Schenker, the middleground descent, not the traditional divisions of tonic refrains and intervening, modulating couplets, seems to account for the formal structure of this rondo.

Nearer in time to Schenker's comments in *Free Composition* is his essay "The Art of Improvisation," published in 1925 in Vol. I of *The Masterwork in Music* (Schenker 1925, 11-40; Kramer 1994, 2-19). Here Schenker incorporates much of Bach's chapter "Improvisation; The Free Fantasia," the concluding chapter of Part Two in Bach's *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments* (Bach 1753-62/[1994], 325-341, 1\*; Mitchell 1949, 430-445). Schenker offers Bach's chapter as the basis for his discussion of diminution, a compositional process fundamental to Schenker's concepts of *Ursatz* (fundamental structure) and *Auskomponierung* (the composing-out or prolongation of the *Ursatz*). Bach explains the basic skills a performer must possess in order to improvise a fantasy and what musical elements a performer should employ to create such a piece. Bach's emphasis (1753-62/[1994], 333; Mitchell 1949, 436) on "circuitous ways of modulating" encourages the creation of a bass line that traverses a series of closely and distantly related keys. As Schenker demonstrates, Bach's circuitous modulations can be conceptualized as a series of diminutions applied to an underlying voice-leading structure.

Although Schenker describes Bach's art of diminution in the fantasy, he does not mention Bach's rondos in this essay. He does mention Bach's rondos, however, in the section on diminution in *Free Composition*. In §252, "Figurations and small notation,"

Schenker discusses the occurrence of statement and repetition as a multi-leveled event.

He then states:

In the strictest sense, variations as an art form belong here. They may be called Variations, Doubles, Agréments, Partita (Chorale Variations); or they may be disguised as Chaconne, Passacaglia, or Rondo (C. P. E. Bach)...In each case, statement and variant exhibit relatedness and coherence even at the foreground level. It must always be borne in mind, however, that the middleground and background present the ultimate, decisive relationships. (1935/1956, 151; Oster 1979, 97)

Although many years have passed since Schenker's remarks on the G-major Rondo in *A Contribution to the Study of Ornamentation*, he continues to perceive Bach's rondos as variations.<sup>54</sup>

Schenker ultimately dismisses the terminology of traditional *Formenlehre*:

Thus, I reject those definitions of song form which take the motive as their starting point and emphasize manipulation of the motive by means of repetition, variation, extension, fragmentation, or dissolution. I also reject those explanations which are based upon phrases, phrase-groups, periods, double periods, themes, antecedents, and consequents. My theory replaces all of these with specific concepts of form which, from the outset, are based upon the content of the whole and of the individual parts; that is, the differences in prolongations lead to differences in form. (1935/1956, 202; Oster 1979, 131)

His comments on rondo form, however, seem inescapably bound to the old sectional view. In his later writings on Bach's rondos, he makes no reference to an underlying structural plan facilitated by certain variations of the theme as he did in his early discussion of the G-major Rondo. In *Free Composition* Bach's rondos simply have A sections that are varied by diminutions and modulations and B, C, or D sections that also present material in keys other than the tonic.

---

<sup>54</sup> Chrzanowski (1911, 22) preceded Schenker in connecting the rondos of the German composers to a loose variation form. He traces this influence to rondeaux of Couperin and Rameau. Schulenberg (1984, 144) also considers certain works of Bach's, including the Rondo in E Major, H. 274, to resemble "a set of variations on a given type and ordering of material set down by the initial period."

#### 4. Bach's concept of fantasy and its influence on his late rondos

Associations between fantasy, improvisation, and rondo stem partly from C. P. E. Bach's own writings. Bach's first discussion of the fantasy occurs in §15 of Chapter Three, Part One, of his *Essay*, first published in 1753 (1753–62/[1994], 123-124; Mitchell 1949, 153–54). As mentioned above, a more detailed discussion occurs in the final chapter of Part Two. Although Bach initially makes no reference to his rondos in these sections, various aspects of the fantasy style that he describes can be detected in his rondos as well. Bach characterizes fantasy by contrasts inherent in certain musical elements—meter, harmony, texture, and sonority—and the frequent movement from one affect to another.<sup>55</sup> Metrical variety is achieved by frequent changes of tempo and meter (also seen in accompanied recitative) and by the elimination of bar lines (1753–62/[1994], 124; Mitchell 1949, 153). Harmonic variety is achieved by the use of scales and various alterations of them in the bass, a variety of figured-bass signatures, modulation to remote keys, and the frequent use of diminished chords, chromaticism, and enharmony. Textural variety results from differing types of figuration. Varying articulations, registers, and dynamics produce variety in coloration (1753–62/[1994], 325-341; Mitchell 1949, 430–42). Bach's attribution of these elements to the fantasy style confirms their recognition by Cole, Ottenberg, and other twentieth-century writers as important features of these rondos.

It may be that Bach recognized a connection between certain elements of the fantasy and works composed in other genres. Before his death Bach sent his publisher,

---

<sup>55</sup> For Bach, variety is a necessity of expression: “At least it can be seen in accompanied recitatives that tempo and meter must be frequently changed in order to rouse and still the rapidly alternating affects” (1753–62/[1994], 124; Mitchell 1949, 153).

Engelhardt Schwickert, several emendations to be included in a new edition of Part Two of his *Essay*. (New editions of Parts One and Two appeared in 1787 and 1797 respectively.) One of these additions was to be inserted as §12 in his chapter on the free fantasy.<sup>56</sup> In this added paragraph, Bach includes examples from works that are not fantasies; three examples are from the C-major Rondo, H. 260, and four are from his choral work *Heilig*, H. 778. Some writers have suggested that Bach consciously links the rondo and fantasy genres by including examples from a rondo in his chapter on the fantasy (Head 1995, 220). This notion seems unequivocal since the added paragraph, advising the use of aids “to give special expression to such altogether usual modulations,” is to be inserted following Section 11, the culmination of detailed instruction on harmonic progressions and modulations. These aids include “*fermate*, rests, the alternation of high and low register, of loud and soft, of various tempos and note values, and a diversity of voices and instruments, among other things” (Bach 1753–62/[1994], 16\*-17\*; Kramer 1985, 552). He then adds: “And if one judiciously applies enharmonic artifice, what a wealth of continually new, pleasing, and striking modulations offers itself” (Bach 1753–62/[1994], 17\*; Kramer 1985, 552). Since Bach links the performance of fantasies and improvisations with these same elements, either in the text or examples of the first edition of his *Essay*, and since the second edition adds examples from a rondo and a choral work in the chapter on improvisation and the free fantasy, it is difficult to dismiss the implication that elements of fantasy and improvisation somehow influenced his works in other genres.

---

<sup>56</sup> Richard Kramer (1985) discusses this added paragraph in great detail. He speculates that it may have been written much earlier, between 1778 and 1780.

### 5. Structural and functional conflicts in the analysis of Bach's rondos

The use of inconsistent terminology, recognized by writers in the eighteenth century, continues to be problematic in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries as well. In analyses of Bach's rondos, writers apply a variety of terms to describe the divisions of a rondo's form. For most writers the basic parts are defined by repetitions of the rondo theme and the sections that intervene between these repetitions. Rondo theme, refrain, and ritornello are the terms most often used to indicate the opening theme, which is repeated throughout the rondo. Couplet, episode, modulating phrase, connecting phrase, bridge, transition, and retransition are terms used to describe the intervening material.

Period, another term of division, is frequently used to describe rondo themes in much the same way that Forkel used it in the *Introduction* to his *Allgemeine Geschichte der Musik* (Forkel 1788). Schulenberg (1984, 148) states that the themes of Bach's rondos "maintain a simple periodicity." In his discussions of Bach's works, he frequently employs the adjectival form "periodic." Schulenberg defines a "periodic phrase" as a Classical structure that contrasts with the Baroque sequence, adding: "the periodic phrase, which, though by no means always a simplistic structure of four-plus-four measures or the like, is based on the principle of balanced, more or less symmetrical statements of antecedent and consequent" (Schulenberg 1984, 62).<sup>57</sup> In his analysis of Bach's Rondo in G Major, H. 268, Schulenberg detects periodicity far beyond the

---

<sup>57</sup> See also Schulenberg 1984, 8. Hausler (1987, 25) notes that the rondo theme of the Rondo in C Minor, H. 283, is asymmetrical (4+5). That Hausler finds the asymmetry remarkable implies that symmetry in a rondo theme is the norm.

opening refrain; he considers periodic structures, containing both rondo theme statements and intervening material, to continue through the fourth statement of the rondo theme.<sup>58</sup>

Schulenberg's use of the adjective "periodic" in preference to the noun "period" seems to derive from his interest in dividing the rondo into alternating "periodic" and "non-periodic" sections.<sup>59</sup> At first, with a reference to Kollmann's improper rondos, he offers a generalized description of them as "works based not on several alternating themes but on a single principal theme stated in various keys, interspersed with free modulating passages" (Schulenberg 1984, 148). He then mentions a similarity between their design and that of Bach's concertos. Schulenberg quickly acknowledges, however, that varying types of phrase structures, not just "free modulating passages," actually occur between thematic statements in both genres. For this reason, he employs the categories of "episode," "bridge," "sequential repetition," and "retransition" instead of the traditional term "couplet."

Bridges are defined (148) as "relatively short, periodic passages which modulate or otherwise pass directly from one thematic statement to the next." They are the passages that intervene between the first four thematic statements of H. 268, creating the periodic rhythm mentioned above. However, Schulenberg avoids the term "phrase," preferring the more neutral term "passage." In addition, as his analysis progresses, it

---

<sup>58</sup> Schulenberg 1984, 149. I offer an analysis of this rondo in chap. 5. Witold Chrzanowski (1911, 40), writing of the finale movement, a rondo, of Bach's Sonata in B Minor, H. 245 (1772), detects periodicity beyond the rondo theme that presages Bach's late rondos. He describes a pair of "two-part periods" that comprise the rondo's opening section. The first two-part period is the first refrain; the second includes the first couplet plus the second refrain. Chrzanowski notes the tendency of couplets in the rondeaux of Couperin to form a two-part period.

<sup>59</sup> After his acknowledgement of the periodic phrasing through the fourth thematic statement, Schulenberg continues (149): "Following this passage the piece enters into a more expansive, non-periodic type of rhythmic organization with the first episode."

becomes increasingly unclear why the term “periodic” is used to describe such diverse passages.

Example 1.4 is a partial score of the Rondo in G, H. 268. Schulenberg’s first bridge passage consists of mm. 17–20. It is a single phrase of four measures that concludes with an HC in the dominant; it is followed by a statement of the rondo theme’s consequent phrase, also in the dominant (mm. 21-24). Although the melody of the four-measure passage, mm. 17-20, has been altered to accommodate a modulation to the dominant, its structure closely resembles that of the refrain antecedent. Like the antecedent, its opening two measures are sequential, although the motion is inverted (upward instead of downward); the following two measures provide the cadential formula with the motion to scale step  $\hat{2}$  supported by dominant harmony. Because it is succeeded by a transposition of the consequent phrase, the two phrases form a period similar to that of the opening refrain. The first phrase of this period with its pseudo-antecedent character would be the phrase that Türk and Kollmann, as well as many writers of the twentieth century, refer to as the first couplet. It is similar in construction to the first phrase of the period that follows the opening double period of the finale from Bach’s Sonata H. 523 (ex. 1.1), the rondo analyzed by Forkel and Kollmann.

The second bridge, mm. 25–31, also ends on an HC, but its periodic syntax is skewed by the three-measure, recitative-like extension, including a final Adagio measure containing six quarter-note beats (thus potentially counting as two measures). However, in his Table 7-1, a summary of this rondo’s form, Schulenberg labels this eight-measure passage (as he considers it) without acknowledging that the half cadence actually arrives in the fourth measure. In his table he groups this “eight-measure” passage with the

following eight-measure refrain, which has the distinct 4 + 4 antecedent-consequent phrase structure. Although the second bridge might better be regarded as a single four-measure phrase with an extension (including a change of tempo!), both interpretations recognize a periodic structure (three four-measure phrases) that concludes with a PAC in m. 39.<sup>60</sup>

Schulenberg's third bridge, mm. 40–47, is in some respects still more problematic.<sup>61</sup> This bridge differs from the first two because it does not lead directly to a restatement of the theme following the arrival of an HC. In addition, it is not clear that m. 47 is the end of a phrase—the term used (unusually) by Schulenberg in reference to this passage—because it concludes on a dissonant harmony, a dominant seventh. According to Schulenberg, this bridge leads to another eight-measure passage that he calls “sequential repetition of theme,” mm. 48–55.

Although these two passages each receive a label from Schulenberg, the specific function of the second passage is difficult to define precisely. These sixteen measures together share a voice-leading motion: C# (bass, m. 43) becomes an upper neighbor to B (m. 50; I have indicated both pitches on the score). Yet Schulenberg, who acknowledges a harmonic relationship (albeit a different one), only considers the first eight measures to be a bridge. But to what is it a bridge? Harmonic *terra firma* is lacking even as the refrain returns in m. 56. Schulenberg himself remarks on the peculiarity of the lead-in in mm. 53–54. The motion back to the tonic with the entrance of the refrain is unconvincing; the refrain sneaks in *pianissimo*, without benefit of dominant

---

<sup>60</sup> I discuss extended phrases in chaps. 3 and 4.

<sup>61</sup> Because Schulenberg counts the six beats of m. 31 as two measures and I do not, his measure numbers following m. 31 are always greater by 1 than mine. My m. 40, therefore, is his m. 41. For the remainder of this discussion, I will tacitly translate his measure numbers into mine.

preparation.<sup>62</sup> Schulenberg groups mm. 40–55 with the subsequent twelve-measure refrain in his table. Yet the “periodic” nature of mm. 40–47 rests only on the caesuras in mm. 43 and 47, not on a clear sense of goal-directed motion. Kirnberger might have recognized periods here in 1771, but he would not have done so in 1776. The sense in which this passage is “periodic” remains questionable.

Similar issues arise in Schulenberg’s discussions of episodes. In opposition to periodic bridges, Schulenberg defines episodes as non-periodic structures that tend to be longer and more complex than bridges and “may include rapid passage-work and any number of modulations to distantly related keys” (Schulenberg 1984, 148–49). Schulenberg considers the first episode to encompass mm. 68–91. In his Table 7-1, significantly, he does not recognize any subdivision of musical material in this 25-measure section. But if we examine the episode, we find that it can be subdivided into at least two sections. The first passage, ten measures long, concludes with an HC in m. 77 and exhibits features that might be described as periodic. The second is more improvisatory, consisting of many sequential repetitions, including some of the theme’s head-motive. Taken together, these two sections move harmonically from G major at the end of m. 67 (the end of the previous section) to the dominant of A minor in mm. 89–91. This motion down a minor third, from G to E, is the mirror image of the harmonic motion facilitated by the third bridge, which moved harmonically from the G major at the end of m. 39 up a major third to B minor in m. 54. In this way, the two passages of Schulenberg’s first episode resemble the two passages of his third bridge and “sequential repetition of theme.”

---

<sup>62</sup> I discuss this entrance of the tonic refrain in detail in chapter 5.

Like the latter two phrases, the two phrases of Schulenberg's first episode present a modulating harmonic structure. The phrases of the episode are metrically freer, with longer expansions than the bridge, but neither the bridge nor the episode is a period according to the definition that I prefer, that of Kirnberger 1776, Forkel, and—as we shall see in the next chapter—Koch. The third bridge plus “sequential repetition” total sixteen measures, compared to the 25 measures of the first episode. The first number is divisible by 4, and that division is clearly reflected in the music. The second number is divisible by 5, and that division is not reflected in the music, even though the section's main subdivision falls in the tenth measure. The subdivisions in one passage are thus, in some sense, more regular than those in the other. But is the difference between their harmonic and rhythmic structures sufficient to merit different formal designations, implying different formal functions? In the same sense, consideration must be given to whether there should be a distinction between voice leading that occurs in figuration (which may be sequential) or in sequential motivic development. In the chapters that follow I will consider aspects of length, figuration, and period structure and their relationship to voice-leading events in order to determine the indicators of formal divisions.

Rudolf Hausler (1987) uses the terms refrain and ritornello interchangeably as his article progresses. He calls the intervening sections episodes and acknowledges Forkel's theory that often they contain paraphrases of the theme. As a result, Hausler develops two categories of episodes: the paraphrase type, containing variations of the rondo theme; and the contrasting type, which presents new material. Like Türk and Kollmann, he considers the repetitions of the rondo theme in different keys to be rondo refrains. He does not distinguish incomplete thematic statements from those that are complete other

than to note in a particular situation that, for example, only the *Vordersatz* (antecedent) is given.

Because he relies on the influence of the free fantasy and the toccata on Bach's passagework, Hausler's interpretation of sectional divisions (episode vs. ritornello) does not rely on phrase structure. As a result, firm criteria in the distinction between refrains and couplets are sometimes lacking. This problem becomes apparent in his analysis of Bach's Rondo in C Minor, H. 283 (Hausler 1987, 26–27). Hausler designates mm. 77–86, shown in ex. 1.5, as Ritornello 4, a refrain that begins on the tonic but concludes without a cadence at the end of the third sequence of thematic material in the middle of a modulatory passage. According to Hausler, these measures are followed by Episode 4, mm. 87–95.<sup>63</sup>

Episode 4 consists of three measures of sequential motivic development, four measures of sequential figuration, and two final measures leading to an HC. According to Hausler, it is followed in m. 96 by Refrain 5, the final refrain of the rondo. I would argue, however, that Refrain 4 does not end in m. 86, but actually concludes at the end of the rondo in m. 109. That is, mm. 77–95 are not a refrain and episode, but an expanded refrain antecedent in the tonic key, with the expansion encompassing mm. 80–93. As I have indicated on the example, the opening beat of m. 94 resumes the harmony of m. 79, and m. 95 provides the expected tonic HC. The consequent then begins in m. 96 and it, too, is expanded. It concludes in m. 108, the rondo's penultimate measure. Hausler considered Ritornello 4 as the only refrain in the rondo that modulates, since all the

---

<sup>63</sup> In his ex. 11, Hausler incorrectly numbers the second part of m. 93 as m. 94. This error occurs because of the break in the middle of the measure from one system to another. His measure numbers in the rest of the rondo, therefore, are one ahead of mine.

others occur in the tonic key. As my analysis indicates, however, all the refrains in this rondo are tonic refrains.

In his 1911 dissertation, Witold Chrzanowski acknowledges difficulty in dividing Bach's rondos into refrains and couplets (terms he considers historically appropriate) because the refrains arrive in various keys and because they are not always repeated in their entirety (Chrzanowski 1911, 39). As an example of these difficulties he cites the final movement of the Sonata in B-flat Major, H. 151, composed in 1760, eighteen years before the first of the *Kenner und Liebhaber* rondos. Although Bach does not use the title "Rondo" for this sonata movement (nor does he in the final movement of H. 523 of Forkel and Kollmann fame), it has a rondo theme in an 8 + 8 antecedent-consequent format that never repeats in its entirety again. For the remainder of the movement, we hear only repetitions of its consequent phrase. With the exception of the final consequent refrain, which is naturally in the tonic, each one occurs in a different key. Each occurrence is preceded by an eight-measure phrase that ends on an HC, much like the antecedent, and similar in structure to the initial phrases of the periods that follow the opening rondo theme statements previously described in H. 523 and 268. (See exs. 1.1 and 1.4.) The incomplete refrains to which Chrzanowski refers are those statements that include only the consequent phrase. He considers the eight-measure phrases that precede these refrains to be the couplets. However, Chrzanowski recognizes that this couplet phrase forms a period with the repetition of the consequent phrase of the theme. He subsequently proposes a larger context for the opening phrases of rondo movements, one that entails the expansion of the opening refrain into a larger section (*Satz*): "A regularly constructed two-part period is followed by another one which functions as the answer or

supplement to the first.”<sup>64</sup> This large section includes the opening refrain as the first period, and the first couplet and following refrain as the second period. Here he cites as an example the finale of the Piano Sonata in B Minor, H. 245 of 1772, from *Kenner und Liebhaber* I. In this movement, the refrain of the second period is transposed and again consists only of the consequent. One might detect the influence of the poetic rondeau, in which the refrain is used to *begin* the first stanza, but to *end* subsequent stanzas.

Chrzanowski’s discussion of the couplet and following refrain as a period is important because it subverts the usual emphasis on divisions between refrain and couplet. Instead it acknowledges a larger context for the relationships of refrains and couplets.<sup>65</sup> In his discussion of the Rondo in A Major, H. 276 of 1782, from *Kenner und Liebhaber* IV, Chrzanowski proposes grouping the opening phrases into a larger section. In this rondo, the refrain that follows the first couplet is again a transposed consequent phrase. He points out that because the transposed refrain in the dominant is followed by a double bar, the opening section can be characterized as a separate part, possibly having “the same importance as the exposition in the sonata form” (Chrzanowski (1911, 43). However, this double bar—a frequent addition for notational reasons in modern editions—does not appear in the first edition published by Bach.<sup>66</sup>

Chrzanowski presents us with another interesting perspective, albeit one that he ultimately rejects. In discussing the rondo movement of Forkel’s famous analysis, he first proposes counting as refrains only those that occur in the tonic key—an idea later

---

<sup>64</sup> Chrzanowski 1911, 40: “An die regelmäßig gebaute zweigliedrige Periode knüpft eine andere an, die die Funktion einer Antwort oder Ergänzung der ersten spielt.”

<sup>65</sup> In his discussion of the French rondeau, Chrzanowski (1911, 22) acknowledges the influence of particular *rondeaux* of Couperin on the later development of refrain groups. He reiterates the connection to C. P. E. Bach on p. 40.

<sup>66</sup> Berg 1985.

proposed by Heinrich Schenker for the analyses of certain rondos by Mozart and Beethoven (Schenker 1935/1956, 214; Oster 1979, 142).<sup>67</sup> Since there are three tonic refrains, one occurring at the beginning, a second approximately in the middle, and a third at the end (mm. 1, 59, and 101), two couplets would result. He relates these two couplets to those of the French rondeau form, in which the first couplet passes through closely related keys and the second couplet through those more distant. But Chrzanowski rejects this possibility in favor of counting all the transposed refrains as equal to those in the tonic because they occur in their entirety and are equipped with a complete close. He then summarizes that the rondo has six couplets, which, he warns, can easily be mistaken for linking or modulating parts, and refers to Forkel's idea that couplets may paraphrase parts of the theme to justify his interpretation (Chrzanowski 1911, 41).

Chrzanowski's ideas, however, are contradictory. The fifth (beginning in m. 77) and sixth (beginning in m. 93) statements of the theme are actually incomplete because their consequents lack cadential closure.<sup>68</sup> In addition, he fails to account for those rondo refrains he described earlier that are incomplete because they lack the original antecedent phrase but express closure with a perfect authentic cadence. Ultimately, as impressive as his study is, we remain confused by his delineation of refrain and couplet.

Other writers in addition to Chrzanowski and Berg perceive aspects of sonata form in Bach's late rondos. Suzanne Clercx (1935, 160–65) refers to Chrzanowski's comparison of the opening phrase groupings to a sonata exposition. Clercx proceeds by comparing a Bach theme to a Baroque *Fortspinnungstypus*. She then analogizes this

---

<sup>67</sup> As discussed above, Schenker proposed the occurrence of non-tonic thematic statements within "B" or "C" sections in the works of composers after C. P. E. Bach. See p. 28.

<sup>68</sup> Joel Galand (1990, 92) refers to these two incomplete statements as "improper" statements of the theme, but considers the rondo's voice-leading structure to reflect the combination of two song-forms.

three-part structure to Chrzanowski's refrain group. Ultimately, she connects this tripartite arrangement to the overall design of a sonata-form movement. Citing Chrzanowski, she posits that Bach's independent rondos in *Kenner und Liebhaber* exhibit the three large subdivisions of sonata form. Poos (1993, 120-21) draws comparisons between the late rondos and the sonata-rondo. He bases his analysis on the sonata-rondo scheme presented by Anton Reicha in his *Traité de haute composition musicale* of 1826.

In addition to applying the formal concepts of rondo, song form, fantasia, and sonata to the analysis of Bach's rondos, many writers in the twentieth century find similarities between Bach's rondos and works in ritornello form. Chrzanowski claims a "striking similarity" between Bach's pieces with transposed refrains and Vivaldi's concerto principle (Chrzanowski 1911, 40). Darrell Berg speaks for many scholars:

Although the majority of movements of the sonatas have some sort of binary design, a number have a structure that is an amalgam of binary, rondo, and ritornello forms; it was by combining elements of these forms that Bach eventually developed the modulating rondo (Berg 1985, xiii).<sup>69</sup>

Berg cites Bach's "dependence upon old-fashioned methods in his application of ritornello procedure to the rondo" and refers to the second movements of two early Berlin sonatas as "early examples of a formal anomaly cultivated, and probably invented, by Emanuel Bach—the modulating rondo. Here ritornello procedure is in operation, for in each movement the rondo appears at least once in a key other than the tonic" (Berg 1975, 203–4; 1988, 9). But Berg's criteria for identifying a ritornello or the repetition of a theme are unclear.<sup>70</sup> Her statement that "each of these movements is interspersed with recurrences of opening material," and that this opening material "often leads without

---

<sup>69</sup> By "modulating rondo" Berg refers to repetitions of the rondo theme in different keys.

<sup>70</sup> Laurence Dreyfus (1996, 60) states: "What many commentators tend to slight is that [J.S.] Bach's concerto ritornellos are, nearly without exception, tonally closed." Dreyfus' fascinating study of Bach's ritornellos was a catalyst for my thoughts about period structure in C.P.E. Bach's rondos.

close to episodes,” fail to differentiate the repetition of a closed theme (ritornello or refrain) from repetition of a fragment or incipit. If the repetition of an opening theme is altered so that its harmonic and rhythmic functions change, can thematic recurrence alone explain its formal function? Is the statement of an isolated head-motive a ritornello? Many of Berg’s examples of earlier C. P. E. Bach works, which she uses to illustrate connections to Bach’s late rondos, are important because the earlier and late works share certain characteristics, but they raise questions about differing functions of repetition and the connection of repetition to structure. Some of these works will be considered in chapter 3.

6. A non-traditional perspective: Evaluating the structural meaning of individual refrains

Schachter (1987) proposes that not all returns of the theme in a rondeau have the same meaning. These different meanings result from a structure in which key relationships are a function of large-scale bass motions that ultimately take precedence over the usual, sectionalized parade of keys. His perspective, emanating from his study of J. S. Bach’s “Gavotte en Rondeau,” the third movement of the Partita No. 3 in E Major, BWV 1006, for solo violin, challenges traditional concepts of rondo form.

Schachter begins his analysis by acknowledging the tonal scheme delineated by the usual autonomous divisions of thematic statement and couplet. He finds the lack of harmonic direction projected by these divisions to contradict his perception of the Gavotte’s strong forward motion. He proposes (1987, 11) that a “larger harmonic structure” and “more inclusive groupings” may function here.

The question of meaning arises as a result of Schachter’s analysis, which indicates that Bach treats various returns of the theme in different ways. The second couplet, for

example, concludes with a transposed variant of the rondeau theme, an idea that apparently was not invented by his son, Emanuel. Schachter considers this statement to be part of the couplet, a thematic return but not a ritornello, the term he uses to describe the repetition of the opening section. He also demonstrates how Bach connects the third return of the theme (which is actually the fourth ritornello) to the end of the preceding couplet, couplet 3, by beginning the return with a tonic  $\frac{6}{3}$ , prolonging the couplet's supertonic harmony through the opening measures of the return. Schachter then proposes that the bass of couplet 3 connects to a bass tone in couplet 4. The intervening tonic ritornello, the one that begins with the  $\frac{6}{3}$ , becomes secondary to the longer-range progression of the bass. Schachter considers this bass motion "the primary unifying force that welds ritornelli and couplets into a cohesive whole" (Schachter, 22). He delineates two large groupings that underlie the structure of the movement. Both groups consist of five sections of ritornello and couplet, with the final ritornello of the first group doubling as the first ritornello of the second.

Schachter's view, then, is not based on the traditional assumption that all returns of the rondo theme have the same meaning. This idea is most emphasized by his analysis of the rondeau's middleground structure, which indicates important harmonic and voice-leading relationships that operate beneath surface. According to Schachter, these relationships affect the essence of individual repetitions of the rondeau theme. His summary challenges the theorist to pursue different perspectives of rondo form:

If my reading of the *Gavotte* is correct, it would suggest some minor revisions in the way we think about rondo procedure in general. We might consider, for example, that the recurrent theme, like the *rentrement* in a poetic rondeau, can take on new meanings when it appears in new contexts. The juncture of episode and ritornello is particularly sensitive, and the beginning of a new ritornello may have quite a different effect from that of earlier statements...(Schachter 1987, 24).

### 1.5 Summary

There are tangible connections between eighteenth- and twentieth-century perceptions of Bach's late rondos. Although Forkel suggested that non-tonic repetitions of the refrain theme resided within the couplet, Kollmann's contrary interpretation—reflected by his terminology of proper and improper rondos—became the dominant view in their reception history. I believe that Kollmann's perspective derived from a notion of form more concerned with harmonic progression and theme than with the period as defined by Forkel and Kirnberger.

Kollmann's description of Bach's rondos was rarely challenged during the twentieth century. Like Kollmann, most scholars analyzed these works by thematic repetition and harmonic progression. Formal content, therefore, was formulated by these parameters, often omitting reference to phrase-rhythmic organization. Frequently, terms like phrase and period are mentioned, but, their meanings are not defined and their usage is unclear.

Many important issues are raised by the analyses I have addressed. These include the relationship of Bach's late rondos to the French rondeau, his early character pieces and sonata movements, ritornello form, sonata form, song form, the capriccio, and the fantasy. The diversity of these perspectives provides a context and a point of departure for my investigation of them.

## Chapter 2

### Formal principles of the eighteenth-century keyboard rondeau: Developing a context for the rondos of C. P. E. Bach

#### 2.0 Introduction

References to Bach's late rondos in the critical literature discussed in chapter 1 frequently state or imply that these works are unique and are not representative of the genre. The purpose of this chapter is to begin to develop a context for these works to determine whether or not this is true. This process will begin with an examination of the writings on composition and form by the late eighteenth-century theorist, Heinrich Christoph Koch. Koch's discussion of form is important because it offers a perspective on divisions of musical material based on a variety of musical elements that are not necessarily related to thematic repetition. Because I find his concept of form based on sectional divisions pertinent to understanding the divisions of musical material that occur in rondo form, I borrow his concepts and apply them to earlier rondeaux that emanate from the tradition of the French *clavecinistes*. I shall demonstrate that composers working in this tradition did not rely on one specific model, but were flexible in the development of relationships within and between sections. These relationships reflected contemporary concerns that emphasized an amalgamation of both the divisions and the unities inherent in musical structures.

I include a lengthy discussion of Koch's rondo theory not only to compare his theory with Bach's practice, but because he presents ideas that are often contrary to those of other writers. For example, Koch's distinction of rondo refrains from ritornellos

becomes an important issue in the twentieth century when many writers ascribe the terms rondo refrain or ritornello to particular themes.

An inquiry into the practices of eighteenth-century composers of the French rondeau, particularly François Couperin and Jean-Philippe Rameau, is important in establishing their influence on Bach's rondos. Making comparisons between Bach's rondos and those of the French *clavecinistes*, particularly François Couperin, can be easily justified, since J. S. Bach included Couperin's rondeau *Les Bergeries* (II, 6) in his *Clavierbüchlein vor Anna Magdalena Bach* of 1725. It can be assumed, therefore, that C.P.E. Bach was familiar with at least this work of Couperin. A second connection between Couperin and C. P. E. Bach is implied by the twenty-four character pieces, some with titles identical to those of Couperin, composed by Bach during the 1750s.<sup>1</sup> I present this part of my study after my discussion of Koch's theory of composition because my approach, like Koch's, is based on period structure.

## 2.1 Heinrich Christoph Koch: A late-eighteenth-century consideration of rondo in relation to a theory of compositional structure

In their discussions of rondo, not all writers in the later part of the eighteenth century mention the rondos of C. P. E. Bach. In his *Musikalisches Kunstmagazin* Johann Friedrich Reichardt, in apparent reference to Forkel's rondo theory, discusses aspects of unity and diversity between the rondo theme and the couplets and, in addition, stresses a preference for folk-like rondo melodies (Reichardt 1782–91/1969, 1:168–69). Reichardt

---

<sup>1</sup> For a very informative article about these works, see Berg 1988. She states (1988, 5): "But, in fact, one need not look back beyond the *pièce de caractère* of François Couperin and his contemporaries for Bach's models." As Berg points out, Bach's and Couperin's character pieces are considered to belong to the same genre in the article "Mahlerey" in Sulzer's *Allgemeine Theorie* (Sulzer 1771–74/1967–70, 3:356–7). This provides further acknowledgement that C. P. E. Bach's contemporaries recognized Couperin's influence on his work. Chrzanowski 1911 (21–25) also discusses the influence of Couperin's *rondeaux* on those of C. P. E. Bach, providing numerous examples.

expresses a wariness toward the mediocrity of most rondos and is subsequently responded to by Cramer, who urges Reichardt to consider the exceptional quality and taste of Bach's rondos.<sup>2</sup>

Heinrich Christoph Koch also discusses the popular rondo genre, but from a different perspective. Koch's most detailed discussion occurs in his *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*, a work published in three volumes between 1782 and 1793.<sup>3</sup>

A briefer but interesting discussion appears in his *Musikalisches Lexikon* of 1802.

Koch's work is distinctive in its detailed effort to define various genres by the divisions of musical material into sections that combine to form certain structures.<sup>4</sup> Unlike most other writers of the eighteenth century, Koch relies on period structure as the fundamental organizing principle of composition. These ideas are the basis of section 3 of vol. 2, published in 1787, and section 4 of vol. 3, published in 1793, both included within part 2, *The Mechanical Rules of Melody: The Way in Which Melody Is Connected with Respect to the Mechanical Rules*.<sup>5</sup>

Koch's process of explaining his compositional theory is extremely deliberate, necessitating a step-by-step approach from aspects of phrase structure to the eventual distinction of various genres, including that of the rondo. He begins by describing the melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic elements that characterize a basic phrase, emphasizing

---

<sup>2</sup> Translations and discussions of Reichardt and Cramer appear in Cole 1970, 433-35.

<sup>3</sup> I will refer to both the original German text and its English translation by Nancy Kovaleff Baker. The translation, which includes the latter part of vol. 2 (1787) and all of vol. 3 (1793) will be cited as Baker 1983.

<sup>4</sup> See Lester 1992, 273-99. Lester states (285): "Riepel too had made melody his centerpiece. But Koch, by first expounding his notion of harmonically conceived melody, constructs a far more compelling perspective."

<sup>5</sup> Unlike Kirnberger, whose ideas about period structure influenced other writers, especially Kollmann (see chap. 1), Koch's writings on period structure received little recognition since his *Essay* was not widely distributed. See Baker 1976, 36; Koch 1983, xxi.

the three elements discussed earlier—length, proportion, and closure (Koch considers length and proportion together):

If we consider the various sections in musical works, which compose their periods, then two main characteristics are found through which they distinguish themselves as divisions of the whole. The first is the type of their endings, or that which characterizes the resting points in the material aspect of the art. The second is the length of these sections, together with a certain proportion or relation between them which can be found in the number of their measures once they are reduced to their essential components. (Koch 1782–93/1969, 2:343; 1983, 1–2)

These various sections are classified by the degree of closure of their endings.

Those that require other material to follow Koch calls *phrases*; those that end a complete thought with a characteristic cadence formula he calls *closing phrases*. Because of his focus on the melodic aspect of musical material in these chapters, Koch does not illustrate a harmonic cadence in his examples. However, he does not ignore the harmonic implications of his melodic material. He refers the reader to vol. 1, section 179 for an explanation of the requirements of a formal cadence that properly closes a period, and provides numerous examples of voice-leading possibilities that might precede its arrival. Koch's closing cadence formula requires a resolution to scale-step  $\hat{1}$  in the melody and the progression of a root-position dominant to a root-position tonic in the bass.<sup>6</sup> We recognize this cadence today as a perfect authentic cadence (PAC). Only this cadence at the end of a phrase can close a period, and only this cadence in the main key can conclude a composition. All other phrase endings lack either a resolution to scale-step  $\hat{1}$

---

<sup>6</sup> See Koch 1782–93/1969, 1:240–244; 1983, 38–39. This passage includes a discussion of how a melodic line functions melodically and rhythmically in a cadential passage. In the course of the *Essay* Koch refers to closing cadences using a variety of terms, including *vollkommene Cadenz* or *förmliche Cadenz* (1782–93/1969, 2:253–254;3:232), used in connection with main periods and the second and third periods of a rondo; the simple *Cadenz*, used frequently (e.g., 2:419); and *Cadenz des Tonschlusses* (1:240–244).

in the melody line, a dominant-tonic cadence in the bass, or both. Consequently, these phrase endings, as well as the endings of closing phrases that conclude in keys other than the main key, invite further melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic activity.

The concept of a hierarchical relationship of endings between an incise (*Einschnitt*),<sup>7</sup> phrase (*Satz*), period (*Periode*), or large section (*Hauptperiode*) is fundamental to Koch's understanding of how music divides to make it comprehensible to the listener. On a more profound level, however, he reveals how these various endings—along with other aspects of phrases, namely their length and proportion—interact with a basic harmonic scheme to create musical forms.

For Koch, music requires a balance between unity and diversity—unity of musical material vs. its division into separate, sometimes contrasting sections (Koch 3:54-56; 1983, 84–85). Section 3 of vol. 2 is chiefly concerned with the division of musical material into different types of phrases. Section 4 of vol. 3 explains how these phrases connect to form periods and short compositions. Koch then demonstrates how the melodic phrases of these short compositions can be extended, eventually forming larger periods. These larger periods connect to form larger sections (Koch often refers to these as “main periods”) and, ultimately, larger compositions. The different arrangements of sections within compositions help to distinguish different genres, both vocal and instrumental.

It is in his discussion of the aria that Koch describes the rondo. Undoubtedly, Koch considered his description of the vocal rondo sufficient for the understanding of

---

<sup>7</sup> The term *Einschnitt* has been translated by Nancy Baker as *incise*. As she indicates (1983, xxiii), Koch uses the term to indicate both the end of a phrase segment (its ending formula) and the segment itself. An incise is normally 1–2 measures in length.

instrumental rondos. At the beginning of his discussion he acknowledges the difference between a vocal rondo and others, stating that in an aria the “rondo theme is first presented by the instruments as a ritornello” (3:249; 1983, 172). In his later comments on possible forms for the andante movement of a symphony he states (3:313; 1983, 202): “The second form which the andante of the symphony takes is the rondo. Nothing else important remains to be said of this here, because it already has been described above in connection with the aria.” Koch later restates this position in his discussion of the sonata. Although he is clearly aware that the instrumental rondo was being used in many popular instrumental genres and was, in fact, at its height of popularity, Koch prefers to associate the rondo with a literary model, the poetic rondeau.<sup>8</sup> Koch affirms this connection in his *Musikalisches Lexikon* (Koch 1802/1985, 1271): “a rondo is actually a small poem which has thirteen verses, which have only two rhymes and are divided into three strophes, and in which the beginning is repeated in its individual and particular sense after the fifth, eighth, and thirteenth verse.”<sup>9</sup> This perspective explains why Koch chose a vocal rondo for his model. It may also partially explain why Koch frequently refers with great admiration to various compositions by C. P. E. Bach but never refers to Bach’s instrumental rondos.

We can formulate a description of Koch’s instrumental rondo by omitting the ritornellos from his vocal rondo. Accordingly, the rondo theme is the first period, the

---

<sup>8</sup> The popularity of the rondo is addressed in Cole 1969. Matthew Head proposes (Head 1995b) that Koch chose an aria sung by a woman with advice for young brides because of Koch’s “association of the rondo with woman and femininity.” The text of Koch’s example, from Georg Benda’s Singspiel, “Walder,” is particularly egregious in this respect.

<sup>9</sup> “Rondo, (Rondeau) ist eigentlich ein kleines Gedicht, welches aus 13 Versen bestehet, welche nur zwey Reime haben, in drey Strophen abgetheilt sind, und bey welchem der Anfang nach dem fünften, achten und dreyzehnten Verse besonders und einzeln, jedoch jedesmal in einem besondern Sinne wiederholt werden muß.”

first couplet is the second period, the second couplet is the third period, etc. In most other genres Koch considers periods to be main periods, but in the rondo “its different periods or episodes have no such similarity of melodic sections in common as do the periods of other compositions; for its every period has a special combination of specific melodic sections.”<sup>10</sup> He continues by explaining that the rondo theme consists of only one complete melodic section “which is presented first as a V-phrase (*Quintabsatz*), but in its immediate repetition is transformed into a closing phrase of the main key” (Koch, 3:249; 1983, 172).<sup>11</sup> The returns of the rondo theme always occur in the main key and are considered as returns of the first period, not new periods.<sup>12</sup> He prefers that the intervening text be a complete sentence; this might be taken to imply cadential closure for each couplet (a PAC had already been required for the refrain). In addition, he suggests that the first couplet move to the fifth and the second couplet begin and conclude in some other related key before returning to the refrain in the main key.

Much can be learned about Koch’s understanding of the rondo by what he omits from his discussion. Koch’s description of the rondo excludes an important aspect of composition that Koch describes as the basis of other genres—a plan (*Anlage*) of the piece. This plan consists of “the main ideas of the composition already connected with one another, which present themselves together to the composer as a complete whole,

---

<sup>10</sup> Koch defines a main period (3:231\*[footnote]; 1983, 166, n. 43) as “the connection of several phrases, of which the last closes with a formal cadence either in the main key or in one closely related to it.” As Koch proceeds, however, it becomes clear that only the final main period of a composition closes in the main key.

<sup>11</sup> Baker (1983, 36, n. 24) uses V-phrase for Koch’s term *Quintabsatz* that refers to a caesura on a V chord and I-phrase for his term *Grundabsatz* that refers to a caesura on a I chord.

<sup>12</sup> Keyboard rondos were sometimes published with the refrain printed only once, with instructions that it be repeated after each of the couplets.

along with its main harmonic features” (Koch, 2:53; 1983, 170, n. 47). The plan is the first part of the creative process.<sup>13</sup>

Koch refers to this plan as the basis of the symphony, sonata, concerto, and two of the three types of aria he describes.<sup>14</sup> In these two types of aria, Koch claims the plan of the piece is revealed in the first main period, which follows the opening ritornello. According to Koch, however, his second type of aria, the rondo, has no main periods—no similarities of melodic sections—and thus, it seems, no revelation of a plan. In other aria types and genres, Koch discusses the fragmentation and working out of the theme (a single theme) that provides the musical material for extended rhythmic and harmonic motion. This process would be fundamental to the two other aspects of his rhetorical concept of composition, realization and elaboration. As mentioned above, however, Koch considers the rondo theme to have only one melodic section—omitting any possibility of extending the period through a sustained motion forward.

In a later discussion of periods, Koch reveals another important distinction between a vocal rondo and compositions, including other types of aria, that are composed of main periods:

The difference between the form of an initial ritornello and the following first main period of the composition is principally that it closes in the main key, and not in the most closely related key as does the period. (3:421; 1983, 244)

---

<sup>13</sup> Koch (2:52-53) borrows Sulzer’s terms from *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste*. The plan of a piece is followed by two other stages of the compositional process, realization and elaboration. The process as a whole is adapted from the discipline of rhetoric. See Koch 1983, 170, n. 47.

<sup>14</sup> Koch reiterates his description of the plan of the piece in his discussion of the first section of the Allegro of the symphony (3:304-305; 1983, 199): “The first of these [sections] consists only of a single main period and contains the plan of the symphony; that is, the main melodic phrases are presented in their original order and afterwards a few of them are fragmented.” Koch again refers to this plan in his discussion of the concerto (3:333; 1983, 210).

The first main periods of Koch's various genres all contain modulations to related keys. However, the first period that follows the opening ritornello in the vocal rondo, unlike his other aria types, closes in the main key; no motion to a related key occurs until the following period. As a result, a rondo is not defined by opening periods that modulate, but by periods that contrast each other. His concept of rondo seems inextricably tied to his perception of it as a poetic, and hence primarily vocal, genre.

As previously discussed in chapter 1, many twentieth-century writers have suggested that Bach's rondos share compositional similarities to eighteenth-century concerto form. But Koch's understanding of period structure in the concerto, based on those of C. P. E. Bach, is in direct opposition to his understanding of period structure in the rondo.<sup>15</sup> To start with, according to Koch's plan, the opening ritornello, whether of a concerto or other genre, is conceived after the initial solo section.<sup>16</sup> The first solo section reveals the plan of the piece, and Koch designates it as the first main period. The ritornello cadences in the main key, after which the first main period modulates to the dominant. Koch considers the three solo periods of a concerto movement to possess the same plan of melodic sections as the three periods of a symphonic first movement.<sup>17</sup> These three periods are based on a particular harmonic plan in which the first two periods modulate and the third period most often begins and ends in the main key.

---

<sup>15</sup> Koch refers to C. P. E. Bach's concerto form as his model (3:337; 1983, 211).

<sup>16</sup> In the concerto, Koch considers ritornellos to be subsidiary periods. Only solo sections are main periods. "The first allegro of the concerto contains three main periods performed by the soloist, which are enclosed by four subsidiary periods (*Nebenperioden*) performed by the orchestra as ritornellos" (3:333; 1983, 210).

<sup>17</sup> "Nothing remains to be noted in connection with the three main periods of the solo part, for they have the same external arrangement and the same course of modulation as the three main periods in the first Allegro of the symphony" (3:336; 1983, 211).

This description of a concerto, then, conflicts with that of the rondo—a piece with no main periods, in which the opening theme (the rondo theme) is composed of a single melodic section stated twice, forming a non-modulating first period that is conceived before the second period, and whose melodic sections have nothing in common with those of the symphony, concerto, or sonata. Koch makes no analogy between the non-modulating opening subsidiary period, the ritornello, of a concerto and the non-modulating opening first period of a rondo, the refrain, even though both can be characterized by closure in the main key and repetition of thematic material. On the contrary, the opening ritornello in a concerto is seen as analogous to the opening ritornello in a vocal rondo. The rondo genre, therefore, is distinct from all others that he describes.

Koch's concept of musical form is not based on thematic repetition, development, or contrast. Although all three of these aspects are present and fundamental to his concept of unity of musical material, formal divisions are based on a combination of melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic events that occur at varying levels of time. Divisions of musical material into melodic sections often share a common structure regardless of differences in style of thematic construction and development between various genres. Koch's perspective is important not only because he perceives these relationships in the works of his contemporaries in the second half of the eighteenth century, but also because he constructs a system to explain them. Although Koch considers the rondo to exist outside of the paradigm he has constructed to explain the important works of this period—he clearly seems to regard it as a lesser genre—his ideas are valuable in understanding the larger, more complex rondos of C. P. E. Bach, which often do reveal a

similar plan to that described by Koch for other genres. His ideas, therefore, should be considered in a discussion of formal aspects of late-eighteenth-century compositions.<sup>18</sup>

## 2.2 The rondo in eighteenth-century practice: Couperin and the art of structural invention

Although Bach's rondos do not prove to be models for Koch's rondo, it is important to note that they share a basic characteristic of rondos in general, the frequent repetition of an opening theme that conforms to Koch's definition of a period: a section that concludes with a root-position V–I cadence in the bass and a top-voice motion to scale-step  $\hat{1}$ . Although rondos composed during the eighteenth century share this characteristic, many do not conform to Koch's model as outlined above. Contrary to Cole's statement, referred to in chapter 1, that the open design of Bach's rondo couplets sets them apart from those of his contemporaries (J. C. Bach, for one), many of Bach's contemporaries and predecessors composed couplets that are tonally open. Not all of the rondos that appear as examples in Reichardt's *Musikalisches Kunstmagazin*, for instance, have couplets that end with a complete cadence.<sup>19</sup> In fact, in the final movement, a rondo, from Johann Christian Bach's Sonata in E Major, op. 5, no. 5, the second couplet, which begins with a minor-mode version of the rondo theme, closes with a ten-measure phrase that moves to an HC. Importantly, close examination of the rondo oeuvre of François Couperin, a composer whose works were known to both J. S. and C. P. E. Bach, reveals a great variety of structures. As I shall demonstrate in my discussion of formal divisions in Bach's rondos in chapters 3 and 4, occasionally, the rondos of Bach and

---

<sup>18</sup> William Rothstein (1989, ix) acknowledges Koch's *Essay* as a major influence on his work.

<sup>19</sup> See Rameau's *Gavotte en Rondeau* in Reichardt 1782, 1:141; also the rondo by Alessio Prati in 1791, 2:24–26.

Couperin share particular approaches to thematic repetition as well as to the construction of refrains and couplets.

Couperin published four books of pieces for the harpsichord in 1713, 1717, 1722, and 1730. Of the 226 pieces, nearly one-fifth are rondeaux. Couperin differentiates the structures of his rondeaux by varying certain characteristics of their themes and couplets. If we first consider the structure of Couperin's rondeau themes, we find numerous models. *La Princesse de Sens*, ex. 2.1a, consists of two four-measure phrases in antecedent-consequent formation, with an antecedent that concludes on scale-step  $\hat{2}$  with the dominant beneath and a consequent that concludes with a PAC. *La Gazoüillement*, ex. 2.1b, presents a four-measure fore-phrase that concludes on the tonic with scale-step  $\hat{3}$  in the top voice, followed by a four-measure after-phrase that concludes with a PAC. I use Rothstein's terms *fore-phrase* and *after-phrase* here to indicate two phrases that form a period but differ from antecedent-consequent construction by the omission of melodic and/or harmonic parallelism or a half cadence at the conclusion of the first phrase (Rothstein 1989, 18). In a more unusual manner, the opening theme of *Les Rozeaux*, ex. 2.1c, consists of two phrases, each ending with an HC—a rare example of a rondo with a theme that is tonally open. Upon its repetition after the first couplet, however, Couperin recomposes the second phrase to close with a PAC, returning each subsequent time in this altered form. Couperin also uses ostinato forms like the *Passacaille* and the lament bass of *La Favorite*, ex. 2.1d. Their four-measure themes each conclude with a PAC and are extended in length to eight measures by repetition.

Other rondeaux have themes that behave in a less orthodox manner. In his introduction to Couperin's *Pièces de Claveçin*, the editor, Kenneth Gilbert, states that

three rondeaux—*Les Bergeries*, the first rondeau of *Les Amusemens*, and *Allégresse des Vainqueurs*, the second part of *La Triomphante*—have binary themes, but that only the second part of the theme returns after the first couplet. If we consult the first edition of these works (1713-22/[1988?]-1990), both the first rondeau of *Les Amusemens* and *Les Bergeries* include the term “Reprise” at the beginning of the second half of the binary theme.<sup>20</sup> As we see in exs. 2.2a and b, the instructions at the end of the first couplet indicate that the performer is to play only the reprise, the second part, of the rondeau theme. In *Les Amusemens* Couperin writes out the repeated material, omitting signs of return (*renvois dal segno*). In both pieces the first couplet seems to function as a substitute for the first part of the theme. For example, in *Les Amusemens* both the four-measure first phrase of the theme, which repeats, and the four-measure couplet phrase, which also repeats, conclude with an imperfect authentic cadence (IAC) with scale-step  $\hat{3}$  in the top voice. Similarly, in *Les Bergeries*, the four-measure, repeated antecedent phrase of the refrain and the four-measure, repeated phrase of the couplet both conclude with an HC. In these two examples, Couperin omits the repetition of the first part of the binary refrain after the first couplet; in both cases, the first couplet behaves harmonically and rhythmically (i.e., in terms of phrase length) much like the first phrase of the refrain, and can therefore substitute for it.

The first edition of *Allégresse des Vainqueurs*, ex. 2.3, presents a different situation. In this rondeau, Couperin does not place the term *Reprise* at the beginning of the second part of the theme. In addition, he does not indicate the repetition of either part

---

<sup>20</sup> See Couperin 1713–30/1973, a facsimile edition. Because there are no known autographs of these works, the first edition is presumably the best source available.

of the theme at the conclusion of each couplet. Unlike the Gilbert edition (Couperin 1972), shown in ex. 2.4, and Brahms-Chrysander edition (Couperin [1888?]/1988) of this piece, which notate double bar-lines at the conclusion of each refrain (see ex. 2.4, mm. 16 and 36), the original edition indicates that Couperin marked the beginning of each couplet with the legends *1<sup>er</sup> Couplet*, etc. By writing out each refrain instead of indicating “Reprise” or “Rondeau,” Couperin avoids calling attention to its entrance. This omission is important because, as we shall see, the boundary between couplet 1 and refrain 2 is ambiguous. As a result, until we understand where refrain 2 actually begins, we cannot assess whether Gilbert’s idea that the first part of the refrain does not return is correct.

If my concept of phrase substitution based on phrase cadence and phrase length applies, I first must compare the closure of the binary theme’s first phrase in m. 4, labeled phrase “a” in ex. 2.4, with that of the first couplet phrase in m. 20. It is immediately clear that their closures are not alike. Although both phrases share certain characteristics—a length of four measures; a rising, stepwise melodic line followed by a pair of falling thirds—the couplet phrase concludes with an authentic cadence in the dominant, A major, contradicting the contrapuntal cadence (a cadence that leads to a root-position tonic by step in the bass) in m. 4 that results from the tonic prolongation in the opening four measures of the refrain theme. The couplet phrase, then, does not function as a substitute for the first phrase of the refrain theme. I will return to the A-major cadence shortly.

Because substitution does not occur here, as it did in the previous two rondeaux, it seems necessary to consider the ramifications of this fact. Since Couperin does not indicate where refrain 2 begins, it must first be determined whether the A-major cadence in m. 24 actually concludes the couplet, or if the succeeding phrase, mm. 25–28, is also

part of the couplet. (I can only assume that Gilbert considered this phrase as part of the couplet.)

As I listen to this phrase, beginning with its initial upbeat in m. 24, my first impression is that I am about to hear a third iteration of the couplet phrase, because the opening pitches are identical to those on the upbeats to mm. 17 and 21. However, the lower voices quickly assume a different pattern, and a gradual sense of familiarity with an earlier musical idea becomes apparent. In a subtle manner, Couperin has reintroduced the musical material of the refrain. Beginning with the upbeat in m. 24, the top voice consists of an expansion of the last two measures of phrase “a” (from the upbeat to m. 3 through the downbeat of m. 4). Both phrases outline the scale degrees  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{5}$  followed by a descent of  $\hat{5}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  and, importantly, a conclusion on scale-step  $\hat{3}$  over a tonic bass. At the same time, Couperin employs the bass line of phrase “b”—a stepwise line descending from D to F#, followed by a V–I cadence. This phrase is, in essence, a hybrid of “a” and “b”: Couperin combines the incomplete closure of “a” (ending on scale-step  $\hat{3}$  in the melody) with the bass of cadence “b” (an authentic cadence).

The similarity of closure to the first part of the refrain theme, “a,” contributes to the recognition of this phrase as a substitute for phrase “a” of the theme. It is true that the cadence in m. 4 is not, like that in m. 28, an imperfect authentic cadence (IAC) in the sense defined by, for example, William Caplin.<sup>21</sup> Probably Couperin avoided the V–I leap in m. 4 to create contrast with the leaping bass line of mm. 1–2, much as he contrasts the conjunct bass of mm. 25–26 with the cadential leap into m. 28. What matters is that

---

<sup>21</sup> See Caplin 2004, 70. Caplin requires an authentic cadence to present a dominant in root position prior to the arrival of the tonic. For this same reason, Caplin would not recognize the closure of m. 4 as cadential.

the cadences in mm. 4 and 28 are of comparable strength, and that they support other similarities between their respective phrases.

Couperin follows m. 28 with two iterations of phrase “b.” Once again, using similarities of length and cadential closure, Couperin substitutes one phrase for another: mm. 25–28 act as a substitute for phrase “a” of the theme; in effect, they belong to the refrain and not to the couplet. Gilbert’s claim that only the second part of the rondo theme returns after the first couplet is, therefore, not quite accurate.

Couperin’s rondeaux present a variety of phrase structures within their couplets.<sup>22</sup> Some utilize the type of couplet described by Koch, consisting of a single period that concludes with a PAC. Others have two phrases, each of which concludes with a PAC, forming two short periods.<sup>23</sup> In opposition to the Koch model, however, many couplets close with HCs, contrapuntal cadences, or IACs.<sup>24</sup> Often an interior phrase of a couplet concludes with a PAC in a key related to the tonic or the dominant, while the arrival of the dominant is postponed to a tonic-key HC at the end of the couplet’s final phrase.<sup>25</sup> The first couplet of the second rondeau of *Les Amusemens*, seen in ex. 2.5, has two phrases. The first closes with a PAC in III, the second with an HC on V of the main key. The third couplet of *Les Bergeries*, the Couperin rondeau that appears in the *Clavierbüchlein vor Anna Magdalena Bach*, has a similar structure.

---

<sup>22</sup> This fact may have influenced Koch’s statement that in the rondo the various periods have no similarity of melodic sections.

<sup>23</sup> See the fourth couplet of *L’Enchanteresse* or the second couplet of the first rondeau of *Les Amusemens*.

<sup>24</sup> See the sixth couplet of *Passacaille*; the first couplet of *La Tendre Fanchon*; the first and third couplets of *Le Gazouïlliment*.

<sup>25</sup> The first phrase of the fourth couplet of *La Favorite* concludes with a PAC on III of the dominant. It is followed by a four-measure phrase that concludes with an HC on the dominant. See also the second couplet of *La Bandoline*.

The third couplet of *Les Bergeries*, Ex. 2.6 consists of two six-measure phrases, m. 28 to m. 34 and m. 34 to m. 40. The first phrase, grouped 2+4, can be heard as an expanded 2+2, a familiar grouping that originates with the opening phrase of the rondeau theme and recurs in the second couplet. As illustrated in ex. 2.7, the first two measures contain a third-progression in the top voice with leaping passing tone D4 in the bass. These motions connect a first-inversion G-minor triad to its root position. The four measures that follow contain a two-measure expansion that prolongs G minor and a two-measure modulation to D minor, concluding with a PAC (with Picardy third) in the latter key. The second phrase (mm. 35-40), a mirror image in terms of grouping (4+2), employs a series of descending fifths to return to Bb major, the main key of the rondeau, ending with an HC.<sup>26</sup> The final half-measure of this couplet has the same bass line as the final half-measure of the first ending of the refrain's antecedent (m. 4). Not only does the occurrence of this bass line emphasize the arrival of the home dominant, prompting the return of the theme; it also invokes a connection between the couplet and the antecedent phrase of the refrain, requiring a similar response to that elicited by the actual antecedent.

Couperin uses various rhythmic, harmonic, and melodic devices in creating complex structures by suppressing certain distinctions between refrains and couplets. *Allégresse des Vainqueurs*, ex. 2.4, illustrates some of these techniques. As already discussed, the first couplet of this rondeau, mm. 16-24, consists of two iterations of a four-measure phrase that concludes with an IAC. The second couplet, mm. 36–52, is formed quite differently. It begins with two four-measure phrases, the second a transposition of the first, ending with HCs in B minor and D major respectively. Since D

---

<sup>26</sup> These six measures cannot so readily be heard as an expanded 2+2.

major is the main key of this rondeau, we have arrived on the home dominant. What follows in mm. 44–48 is a transposition to the dominant of phrase “b” of the refrain, ending with a PAC. The final phrase, mm. 48–52, is in some ways the most interesting: it synthesizes all of the phrases heard in this couplet, beginning with another transposition of the second half of m. 36 to m. 38 but ending with a variant of mm. 47–48. The couplet as a whole reproduces certain aspects of the refrain: it contains four phrases, grouped into pairs by some kind of repetition; and it ends with a version of phrase “b.”<sup>27</sup>

This evaluation of Couperin’s couplets reveals that their constructions have ramifications beyond the context of the couplets themselves. As can be seen in the examples from *Les Amusemens*, *Allégresse des Vainquers*, and *Les Bergeries*, the absence of closure at the end of a couplet, often emphasized by similarity to the end of the refrain’s antecedent phrase, creates an ambiguity between the divisions of refrain and couplet. Without complete cadential closure, the couplet, seeking harmonic and melodic resolution, joins with the following refrain to form a larger period, thus contradicting a strict separation of couplet and refrain. Furthermore, in view of the use of transposition in a work such as *Allégresse des Vainquers*, Couperin’s couplets sometimes imitate refrains, although they generally remain distinguishable from them.

For Couperin’s rondeaux, we may conclude that the best formal model is often not the nineteenth-century model popularized by A. B. Marx, adopted (perhaps too readily) by Schenker, and enshrined in textbooks to this day. In this model, refrains and couplets remain strictly separate, and the rondo is understood as a chain of ternary (ABA)

---

<sup>27</sup> Couperin also employs transposition of the rondo theme in couplets in less subtle ways: in his rondeau *Les Bagatelles* the first couplet is a note-for-note transposition of the entire eight-measure theme.

forms. The proper model, both analytically and historically, is the poetic rondeau with which Couperin would have been familiar. In the poetic rondeau, the return of the refrain is smoothly integrated into the structure of the stanza, generally without a period intervening (a period being the linguistic equivalent of a PAC).<sup>28</sup> Koch, while referring to the poetic rondeau, emphasizes the separation of refrain and couplet; thus, his position on this issue is equivocal and perhaps historically transitional.

Other aspects of Couperin's rondeaux are important to note. Couperin occasionally varies interior refrains by adding additional phrases.<sup>29</sup> These additional phrases, however, are simply varied repetitions of the antecedent-consequent phrases already stated. Couplet construction is flexible. As mentioned earlier, the number of phrases and the number of measures within them vary considerably. As the rondeaux progress, couplets often grow in length. In *La Favorite*, for example, the first couplet is eight measures. Subsequent couplets become progressively longer, with the fifth and last couplet attaining a length of sixteen measures.

Other composers of the eighteenth century also offered a variety of rondo models, using techniques similar to those of Couperin. Jean-Philippe Rameau published numerous rondeaux in his *Pièces de Claveçin* of 1724 and *Nouvelles Suites de Pièces de Claveçin* of 1728. Rameau often concludes couplets without strong cadential closure. In his *Musette en Rondeau*, the first and third couplets conclude with HCs. They are illustrated in exs. 2.8a and b and are indicated as 1<sup>re</sup> Reprise and 3<sup>me</sup> Reprise. The second

---

<sup>28</sup> See Carl Schachter's remark on this technique of *rentrement* in chap. 1, p. 47.

<sup>29</sup> See the third refrain of *Allégresse des Vainqueurs*, beginning at m. 53.

couplet (not shown), true to the musette style, continues the tonic pedal of the refrain and, consequently, avoids cadential closure altogether.

In Rameau's rondeau *Les Tricotets*, ex. 2.9, couplet 1 is formed in a manner similar to the refrain. It consists of two eight-measure phrases, of which the opening fore-phrase closes with an HC and the after-phrase with a PAC. As with Couperin's rondeau *Allégresse des Vainqueurs* (ex. 2.4), the couplet concludes with a transposition of the consequent phrase of the refrain. The second and final couplet, mm. 49–72, begins with a transposition of mm. 17–21, the opening of couplet 1. It then departs from its model by introducing a *Fortspinnung* passage that concludes in m. 64 with a PAC in the relative minor.<sup>30</sup> It is followed by an eight-measure phrase that concludes with an HC in the tonic to prepare the return of the refrain.

Rameau includes transpositions of refrain phrases in other rondeaux as well. The first couplet of *Gigue en Rondeau* concludes with a transposed (and varied) repetition of the refrain's consequent phrase in mm. 19–22. Transpositions of refrain phrases also occur in two couplets of his rondeau *La Villageoise*. The transposition that occurs in the second couplet contains a four-measure expansion.

The second couplet of the rondo from J. C. Bach's Sonata in E Major, op. 5, no. 5, bears some resemblance to the second couplet of Rameau's *Les Tricotets*, in that a complete period (ending with a PAC) is followed by a phrase ending with a tonic-key HC. Bach's rondo is presented in ex. 2.10. Couplet 2, mm. 39–56, begins with a period in the tonic minor that shares the antecedent-consequent structure of the refrain. This period is followed by a ten-measure phrase, mm. 47–56, ending (as noted above) with an

---

<sup>30</sup> This is actually a *Fortspinnung*-type sentence, a structure I will discuss in chap. 4.

HC in preparation of the tonic refrain that follows. As in several of Couperin's rondeaux, the closing measure of Bach's couplet, m. 56, recalls the closing measure of the antecedent phrase, m. 4.

C. P. E. Bach had other models to draw on as well. J. S. Bach concludes the second couplet of the Rondeau in Partita No. 2 in C minor, BWV 826, with an HC (m. 31). As discussed in chapter 1, he transposed the rondeau theme in the "Gavotte en Rondeau," the third movement of his Partita No. 3 in E Major, BWV 1006. C. P. E. Bach's godfather, Georg Philipp Telemann, also composed rondeaux that include transposed repetitions of the rondeau theme.<sup>31</sup>

Elaine Sisman has pointed out that repetition of a theme in distant keys is "one important strand of the capriccio-fantasia tradition in the later eighteenth century" (Sisman 1993, 183). Sisman is referring to Haydn, not C. P. E. Bach, but Joel Galand (1990, 109) explicitly places C. P. E. Bach's rondos within an Austrian capriccio tradition. It is difficult to know, however, how familiar C. P. E. Bach could have been with this tradition. Although Haydn's famous Capriccio in G Major, "Acht Sauschneider müssen seyn," was composed in 1765, it was not published until 1788, ten years after the publication of Bach's first rondos in *Kenner und Liebhaber* II. The capricci of Joseph Anton Steffan, which are in many ways dissimilar to the Bach rondos but do often employ the repetition of periodic statements of the theme, were published posthumously in 1797, well after the death of C. P. E. Bach. There were, however, non-Austrian

---

<sup>31</sup> Jeanne Swack considers many of Telemann's rondeaux to reflect a consolidation of rondeau form with that of a concerted solo—a work for solo instrument in concerto-ritornello form. See Swack 1988, 164; 1993, 381 (n. 23). Darrell Berg's similar perspective was discussed in chap. 1.

antecedents. For example, Handel's *Capriccio in F Major*, HWV 481, published in 1732, employs transposed repetition of a periodic theme.

### 2.3 Summary

The foregoing evaluation of eighteenth-century rondos makes it clear that no single rondo model existed for eighteenth-century composers. As evidenced in various rondeaux by Couperin and Rameau, the divisions of musical material into rondeaux (refrains) and couplets are often not as clearly defined as the models of later theorists might suggest. When couplets do not conclude with complete closure, the resulting phrase-rhythmic structure urges the music forward in its quest for this goal, softening the boundaries of couplet and refrain much as poets did in their rondeaux. Combined with thematic references to the refrain within the couplets, this blurring of boundaries creates manifold interrelationships between refrain and couplet that belie Koch's description of the rondo and render unwarranted his subtle denigration of the genre.

Especially significant is the reference to the ends of antecedent phrases by phrases that provide harmonic transitions to tonic refrains. Not only do these phrases emphasize a sense of harmonic, melodic, and rhythmic instability, but they stimulate the same expectation of completion that a listener experiences at the end of an actual antecedent phrase. These phrases, then, seem to group with the phrases that follow, yet the divisions dictated by nineteenth- and twentieth-century theorists exclude their participation in the following refrain. Despite Koch's description of the rondo itself, his general theory of period structure offers a different and, I believe, superior perspective on the divisions of musical material in many rondos and rondeaux. As will be seen in the following

chapters, Koch's ideas are fundamental to my understanding of the divisions of musical material in the late rondos of C. P. E. Bach.

### Chapter 3

Exploring the formal structures of C. P. E. Bach's early rondos and pseudo-rondos

#### 3.0 Introduction

In this chapter, I will investigate Bach's use of thematic reference and repetition through a study of his early rondos and pseudo-rondos. I shall demonstrate that many of these works do not conform to refrain procedures intrinsic to the rondo genre. Rather than representing refrains or ritornellos, as some have suggested, repetitions or references to opening thematic material are often incomplete or altered. These alterations frequently reflect a change in formal function and not that of a true return. My analyses will help determine which of these early works have divisions of material influenced by rondo or ritornello procedures and establish the relation of these works to his late independent rondos.

I begin my study with a group of pieces that emanate from an article on Bach's character pieces by Darrell Berg in which she compares various movements of C. P. E. Bach's keyboard sonatas of the 1740s to the character pieces with French titles that he composed in the middle 1750s.<sup>1</sup> Her comparison is based on her premise that Bach develops "rondo forms" by employing aspects of both ritornello and rondo in certain movements of these sonatas and then applies these techniques to particular character pieces (Berg 1988, 9).<sup>2</sup> Although Bach does not associate the term "rondo" with any of the early pieces Berg identifies as rondos, she states:

But, the fact that Bach designated his Hamburg compositions [*für Kenner und Liebhaber*] with modulating refrains as 'rondos' indicates that he also perceived

---

<sup>1</sup> Berg (1988, 6, n. 14) offers titles of various character pieces by Couperin and Dandrieu later used by C. P. E. Bach.

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that Bach designates only one of his character pieces, *La Gleim*, H. 89, of 1755 as a *Rondeau*. In contrast to the movements offered by Berg, it adheres to the usual French *rondeau* form.

in them a relation to the *rondeau*. It seems likely that he had a similar perception of the character pieces written in 1754–7, years during which he was adapting the forms of French character pieces to his own purpose. (Berg 1988, 13-16)

Berg later concludes:

In them [the twenty-four miniatures of 1754–7], he examined the rondo principle purposefully and combined it with several other formal methods, preparing the way for the great expansive rondos of the ‘*Kenner und Liebhaber*’ collections. (Berg 1988, 32)<sup>3</sup>

According to Berg, the early works lay the foundation for the compositional structures of his late independent rondos, composed in Hamburg in the 1770s and 80s.

I begin section 3.1 with a consideration of terminology used by Bach’s contemporaries as a basis for understanding the divisions of material into sections. Section 3.2 consists of analyses of sonata movements and character pieces by C. P. E. Bach that are offered by Berg as rondos or as rondos influenced by “the ritornello principle” (Berg 1988, 9). I rely on Koch’s theory of the relationship of phrase and period as a basis for investigating the function of thematic returns and references in these works.<sup>4</sup> Section 3.3 considers the concept of the expanded *Fortspinnung*-type sentence, discussed in great detail by Wayne Petty in his dissertation on the sonatas of C. P. E. Bach (Petty 1995).<sup>5</sup> I believe his work provides a valuable approach to certain aspects of the formal structures of these works.

### 3.1 Refrain and ritornello: A late-eighteenth-century perspective

Berg identifies three different manifestations of ritornello and rondo form in sonata movements from the 1740s: slow middle movements that have recurrences of opening material in the tonic and in at least one other key; slow middle movements that

<sup>3</sup> Berg (1988, 7) previously stated: “Within the group of character pieces, on the other hand, Bach rapidly developed a variety of rondo conformations.”

<sup>4</sup> Contrasting perspectives on the function of thematic content are explored in Petty 1995, chapter 4.

<sup>5</sup> A summary of some of the concepts presented in this dissertation appears in Petty 1999b.

have recurrences of opening material in the tonic key only; and Allegro finale movements in binary form that have a transposition of opening material in the dominant in the second phrase of the second section.<sup>6</sup> After a consideration of relevant terminology, examples of these various types will be examined.

Berg's only explanation of the terms "refrain" and "ritornello" occurs in her discussion of Bach's character piece *L'Aly Rupalich* (Berg 1988, 8–12). At first, her distinction between these terms is a function of key: thematic material that recurs in the tonic is a refrain; thematic material that recurs in a key other than the tonic is a ritornello. Berg then comments that in addition to the appearance of thematic material in keys other than the tonic, it is also the asymmetry of the thematic segments that she associates with a ritornello. Key, however, ultimately seems to be the primary determinant as she concludes: "some of this material, moreover, is as clearly profiled in related keys as it is in the tonic, and there is nothing that prevents it from being construed as a refrain except the convention that prescribes the tonic for all refrains" (Berg 1988, 8).

Conventions of refrain and ritornello closure, however, are not considered. Berg remarks: "these refrains are not neatly distinguished from *couplets* as in most French *rondeaux*" (Berg 1988, 8); ritornellos often lack closure, leading "without close to episodes" (Berg 1988, 9).<sup>7</sup> As I noted in chapter 1, writers in the eighteenth century always defined a rondeau refrain by the closure of its ending.<sup>8</sup> A refrain, therefore, that cannot be distinguished by its closure from the couplet that follows would lack the most

---

<sup>6</sup> Berg (1988, 9, n. 20) lists examples of the first type: H. 28, H. 30, H. 33, H. 37, and H. 46; n. 21 lists examples of the second type: H. 32.5, H. 36, H. 47, and H. 53.

<sup>7</sup> Earlier in this paragraph, Berg refers to a couplet as "episode (*couplet*)."

<sup>8</sup> The concept of the refrain as a closed period is discussed at length in chapter 1.

fundamental characteristic of a refrain. Reasonable evidence, then, would be needed to support this claim.

Similarly, the issue of closure is important to the recognition of a ritornello. Heinrich Christoph Koch considered complete closure with a perfect authentic cadence (PAC) to be a requirement of a ritornello. Koch states in his discussion of the opening ritornello of an aria that the opening “ritornello always closes with a formal cadence” (Koch 1983, 170).<sup>9</sup> Later, he requires this same closure of other ritornellos as well: “Afterwards it [the second ritornello] presents one or two melodic sections of the principal period and uses the same closing phrase in this key with which the first ritornello had ended in the main key” (248). Kirnberger includes a brief discussion of ritornellos in *The Art of Strict Musical Composition*. Here, because his chief concern is the interruption of harmonic motion by closure in the main key anywhere prior to the conclusion of the composition, he only writes of opening ritornellos and laments the common practice as unnatural:

In concerti and arias, the tutti and ritornelli normally close in the main key and are thus complete independent pieces, since the ear is already completely satisfied after such a close and perceives nothing at all that arouses the expectation of a new succession of notes.<sup>10</sup>

Historically, then, by the late eighteenth century, both rondo refrains and at least opening and closing ritornellos were considered to be periods that conclude with PACs.

Questions arise, therefore, whether rondo and ritornello are the basic formal principles governing all of the works that Berg describes as rondo forms.

---

<sup>9</sup> As explained in chapter 2, p. 52, Koch’s “formal cadence” is equivalent to a PAC.

<sup>10</sup> Kirnberger 1771–79, 2:139 (Beach, 406). As discussed in chapter 1, 18–19, Kirnberger also considered a PAC necessary for complete closure.

Koch's approach, which forms large sections through the grouping of phrases and periods, offers a rigorous method of examining the formal structures of these works. It should be remembered, however, that Koch's understanding of compositional structure is based on the classification of works within particular genres. As previously discussed in chapter 2, Koch describes a vocal rondo and subsequently refers back to this genre when he notes that rondos may occur in instrumental works as well. Koch allows for the possibility of an instrumental rondo in either the second or third movement of a sonata, symphony, or concerto. An instrumental rondo that occurs in one of these movements, therefore, must presumably exhibit the same structural plan as the vocal one.

In his discussion of sonata movements that are not in rondo or variation form, Koch always stipulates a two-part structure, a two-reprise form, in which the first reprise consists of one main period and the second reprise usually two.<sup>11</sup> His *Essay* lacks any reference to second or third movements of sonatas that are not in rondo, variation, or two-reprise form. The formal structures he discusses in each genre, then, seem limited to a general understanding for the student and do not encompass all possibilities of formal construction. Nevertheless, Koch's basic concepts of phrase and period structure can be applied to formal structures included in his *Introductory Essay on Composition*.

### 3.2 Rondo or pseudo-rondo? Thematic reference as a formal marker in Bach's early sonata movements and character pieces

#### 1. Middle movements with repetitions of the opening material in the tonic and in at least one other key

According to Berg, Bach's early and late rondos were influenced by techniques he applied to certain sonata movements composed during the 1740s. In these movements

---

<sup>11</sup> Koch (3:312; 1983, 201) states that if an Andante movement is to be short, the second reprise has only one period.

Bach combined characteristics of the “ritornello principle” with rondo form. The A-minor Andante of the Sonata in C Major, H. 28, shown in ex. 3.1, is an example of a middle movement with repetitions of the opening material in the tonic and in at least one other key. It begins with an eight-measure thematic idea that ends with an HC. Throughout the movement, this phrase occurs two additional times in the tonic and once in a modified transposition. Because the Andante has opening thematic material that repeats once in a key other than the tonic, Berg refers to all of the repetitions as ritornellos. I assume, therefore, that she regards the intervening phrases as episodes.

Tonal closure with a PAC—a requirement for an opening ritornello according to Kirnberger and Koch—does not occur in this movement, however, until m. 46. When the PAC finally does occur, it is not in the tonic, but in the closely related mediant key. As Koch explains (3:421; 1983, 244):

The difference between the form of an initial ritornello and the following first main period of the composition is principally that it closes in the main key, and not in the most closely related key as does the period.<sup>12</sup>

According to Koch, then, the opening forty-six measures would form a first main period and not a ritornello and episode, as they seem to do for Berg. Bach further extends this period by adding a phrase, mm. 47–52, that concludes with the same cadence as the preceding period. Koch considered this type of post-cadential phrase an “*appendix*, which further clarifies the phrase” (Koch 2:435; 1983, 45).<sup>13</sup> If we continue our analysis of this movement, we discover that it consists of three main periods, each beginning with a tonic statement of the opening eight-measure theme.

---

<sup>12</sup> Here, Koch’s discussion of the ritornello is in reference to “ritornellos which are connected with the aria, the chorus, and the concerto.” He does not mention the possibility of ritornellos occurring in other genres.

<sup>13</sup> *Appendix* is Baker’s translation for Koch’s term *Anhang*.

The forty-measure second main period proceeds to modulate to the subdominant after its opening thematic statement. Its final phrase (mm. 77–92) is a recomposed and transposed version of the movement's opening eight-measure theme; this time, however, instead of concluding with an HC, the theme concludes with a subdominant PAC. In retrospect, then, we hear a close relationship between the opening and closing phrases of this period. The opening phrase may be heard as an antecedent phrase in the tonic, while the closing phrase becomes a subdominant transposition of a previously withheld consequent. In fact, following the restatement of the theme at the beginning of this section, m. 61 suggests that a consequent phrase is beginning. However, an alteration in the second measure of this phrase deflects its course, and it proves not to be a closing phrase.

Since the transposed phrase in the subdominant (m. 77ff.) is the only repetition of the opening material in a key other than the tonic, it must be this “thematic return” in the subdominant to which Berg refers. Berg seems to understand the opening and closing phrases of this period as separate sections that function equally as ritornellos, while the intervening phrases combine to form a couplet. This perspective does not acknowledge the interrelation of all these phrases as members of a single period. In addition, it does not consider the difference in function between the tonally open construction of the opening theme and the full closure of the subdominant return.

The second period consists, in fact, of a network of phrases that are both distinct and yet profoundly connected. The opening and closing phrases contrast by the nature of their different structures—the tonally open first phrase and the tonally closed final phrase. At the same time, the parallelism of their melodic structures, an attribute of

antecedent-consequent construction, also ensures their connectedness. The phrases that occur in between these two facilitate the modulation and present similarly conflicting qualities. The second phrase, again eight measures (mm. 61–68), quickly turns away from its pose as a consequent both melodically and harmonically, moving to a cadence in the submediant. The arrival of this cadence on the second beat of a  $\frac{3}{8}$  measure—insufficient closure for a main period according to Koch—challenges our interpretation of events: a sense of completion is contradicted by the weak-beat placement of the PAC.<sup>14</sup> If, after hearing this phrase, we are fooled into perceiving the end of the period, the brevity of the four-measure phrase that follows (mm. 69–72), with a similar cadence on the same weak beat, offers a correction. Not only are these cadences weakened by rhythmic displacement, but, as can be seen in exs. 3.2a and b, they result from inner-voice motions emphasized by the temporary omission of the structural top voices in mm. 68 and 72 respectively. A series of reachings-over extends from Bb–A (mm. 65–68) through C–Bb (69–70) to Eb–D (71–72) and to D–C# (73–76), ending with an HC in D minor, the subdominant. Thus the two weak-beat PACs are, in a deeper sense, IACs on their way to a deeper-level half cadence, which in turn prepares the closing phrase.

These second and third phrases of the second main period, then, seem on the surface to be self-contained, yet they are actually part of a larger phrase group in which each phrase participates in the motion to the new key, the subdominant. Bach extends the closing phrase by substituting a deceptive cadence (DC) for a PAC at the beginning of its eighth measure (m. 84). Final closure with the subdominant PAC occurs in m. 92. Bach,

---

<sup>14</sup> See Koch 2:310-11 and Rothstein (forthcoming). According to Rothstein, C.P.E. Bach uses a hierarchic system of cadential closure in his earlier works in which strong-beat cadences conclude main periods and weak-beat cadences close divisions of lesser import.

however, further extends this period with the addition of an appendix that moves to a tonic-key half cadence (m. 97). Koch states that it is not necessary for an appendix to close on the same triad as the closing phrase that precedes it. That is, a phrase that closes with a PAC in the tonic may be followed by an appendix that closes on an HC; a phrase that closes in the dominant may be followed by an appendix that closes in a related key (Koch 3:197; 1983, 151).<sup>15</sup> Although Koch makes the following remarks in reference to first-movement form in a symphony or sonata, we see a similar situation arise at the end of the second main period in this middle movement:

Usually a short passage is connected with this second main period of the symphony, which consists of a segment of a main melodic idea drawn out in a sequential way. By this means the modulation is carried back to the main key, in which the last main period begins. (Koch 3:309; 1983, 200)

Two paragraphs later, Koch refers to this “short passage” as an appendix:

In this case too the period usually acquires the appendix mentioned before, which modulates back to the main key for the beginning of the last period. (Koch 3:310; 1983, 201)

This appendix, herein referred to by Rothstein’s term cadence-altering suffix, functions as a retransition between the final cadence of the second main period, which commonly closes not in the dominant but in a closely related key, and the tonic that begins the third main period. Examples 3.3a and b demonstrate how the six-measure appendix that follows the second main period of H. 28/ii mitigates the effect of the subdominant PAC before the resumption of the tonic. The diminished chord and accompanying fermata that arrive in its second measure (m. 93) contradict the repose of

---

<sup>15</sup> Koch (2:443-444; 1983, 49–50) explains how a phrase may be extended by an appendix that closes with an HC. Rothstein (1989, 94–97) offers the term “cadence-altering suffix” to describe this type of suffix and discusses Koch’s explanation in great detail.

the PAC while the four measures that follow first prolong IV before concluding with dominant harmony in m. 97.

Koch's detailed consideration of differing types of appendices offers insight into their function in relation to other phrases. He repeatedly refers to an important rhythmic aspect of the appendix from early on in his *Essay*:

The multiplication of ending formulas resulting from the addition of an appendix to a phrase is disregarded when linking several complete ideas into a period. The phrase extended by this means retains, with respect to the rhythmic relations of phrases, exactly the value which it would have had without such an appendix. (Koch 2:440; 1983, 47)

Koch then reiterates his concept that an appendix does not alter the phrase-rhythmic content of the period:

Such an appendix, which consists of a segment of an even number of measures, is never taken into account from the standpoint of the rhythmic relations of melodic sections; the phrase is considered just as if this appendix were not present. (Koch 3:199; 1983, 151)<sup>16</sup>

Koch, then, would have heard Bach's retransition phrase as extraneous to the rhythmic structure of the period. The notion that some musical material is "extra" is a concept he discusses in great detail from the beginning of Part 2, Section 3, of his *Essay*.<sup>17</sup> Here Koch describes how particular measures of a phrase extend the phrase internally or externally. Since these measures can be eliminated without affecting the viability of the phrase's structure, they exist outside the construct of the *basic phrase*.<sup>18</sup> Koch's discussion of the appendix is consistent with his concept of a hierarchic system of phrase construction in which not all measures or phrases participate equally in the

---

<sup>16</sup> Koch then demonstrates that a segment with an uneven number of measures may also be used as an appendix.

<sup>17</sup> See the discussion of Koch's concepts in Rothstein 1989, 94–97.

<sup>18</sup> Koch states (2:348; 1983, 3): "A phrase may contain only as much as is absolutely necessary for it to be understood and felt as an independent section of the whole; such a phrase I shall call a *basic phrase* [*enger Satz*]. See also Koch 2:440; 1983, 47. See Rothstein 1989, 64–67 for a summary of eighteenth-century theorists' understanding of the basic phrase and various possibilities for expansion.

rhythmic structure of a composition. In this sense, a phrase that serves as an appendix does not affect the formal structure of the phrase, main period, or section to which it is appended.

The appendix phrase that follows the second main period of H. 28/ii is very different in function from the concluding phrase of a tonally open couplet by Couperin. In ex. 3.4 Couperin offers two evenly proportioned phrases in the first couplet of *Les Amusemens*. The first phrase concludes with a PAC in the mediant; the second phrase concludes with an HC in the tonic. The second phrase is similar in melodic content to the first phrase, which is similar in melodic content to the refrain melody. The equality of the relationship of the two couplet phrases is such that they could easily appear before the refrain in the reverse order and make as much musical sense.

Bach's six-measure appendix phrase, however, seems to function as a revision to the closing PAC of a substantial section of forty measures. When the subdominant PAC finally arrives in m. 92, after having been delayed by a deceptive cadence, we experience a sense of finality, brief though it is. (That Bach allows the D-minor harmony to sound for only one eighth note suggests that we should not take too much pleasure in having reached our goal.) The alteration of the cadence by the appendix does not affect the formal structure of the movement: the appendix does not conclude a section or offer a new beginning. As Koch's theory prescribes, the PAC still concludes the previous main period and the tonic restatement of the opening theme begins the third and final main period in m. 98 after the HC.

The third main period, thirty-five measures in length, confirms the tonic key. Bach lengthens the statement of the opening theme by extending the HC in its eighth

measure (m. 105) with a lengthy appendix on the dominant. As can be seen in figure 3.1, this appendix and all of the other phrases in period 3 are transposed phrases from periods 1 and 2.<sup>19</sup> In period 3, as in period 1, the opening antecedent-like phrase is not answered by a closing consequent phrase. However, Bach does conclude the movement with a tonic transposition of the final four measures of period 2, measures that we earlier identified as the conclusion of a delayed and transposed consequent.

Figure 3.1 Origins of transposed phrases in period 3 of the Sonata in C Major, H. 28/ii

<u>Period 3</u>	<u>Period 2</u>	<u>Period 1</u>
mm. 98–105		mm. 1–8
mm. 105–114		mm. 21–30
mm. 115–123		mm. 31–39
mm. 124–132	mm. 84–92	

Let us summarize a few aspects of this piece. First, Bach organizes it into three periods. Second, he exploits the antecedent-consequent relation, albeit never at the musical surface. In period 2 Bach offers a possible antecedent, hints at a consequent that fails to materialize, and finally (after a series of digressions) presents a transposed consequent as a closing phrase. In addition, the appendix to period 2 recalls the end of period's "antecedent" phrase. As we consider the complex variety of phrase endings and phrase groupings, therefore, the three-period structure of this piece becomes apparent. Relying solely on thematic reference as a marker of formal divisions or debating the endings of open ritornellos and the beginnings of episodes proves to be less informative.

Similar structures occur in Berg's other examples of middle movements in which opening material returns in non-tonic keys. The Andante of the Württemberg Sonata No.

---

<sup>19</sup> Petty (1999) discusses C. P. E. Bach's frequent use of transposition in sonata-form movements.

1 in A Minor, H. 30/ii, has two main periods. The opening theme of eight measures, seen in ex. 3.5, ends with an HC. However, at the beginning of the second period (m. 21), only the first two measures of this theme are heard. Bach modulates sequentially away from the tonic in ten additional measures, ending the twelve-measure phrase with an HC in the submediant, F# minor. The period's second phrase then begins in this key with a transposition of the theme's opening five measures. Again, it seems to be this partial thematic return that Berg refers to as a ritornello.

As can be seen in a comparison of ex. 3.6a with exs. 3.6b and c, Bach alters the voice leading and harmonic structure of the transposition beginning in its sixth measure (m. 38) to facilitate another sequential modulation. This time, the modulation leads back to the tonic half cadence of the opening theme, employing the same half-cadential motive that ends the first-period suffix (compare mm. 18–20 and 50–52 in ex. 3.5). The HC prepares for the closing phrase of the movement.

The voice-leading analysis of ex. 3.6c reveals a more profound relationship, however, between the opening theme and the second phrase of period 2: a motivic parallelism of the ascending third A–B–C# emerges between mm. 1–4 and mm. 36–42.<sup>20</sup> In addition, mm. 42–52 of ex. 3.6c reveal an expansion of mm. 6–8. As can be seen in a comparison of this example with ex. 3.6a, the motion of C#5 to F#5 is filled in by ascending stepwise motion from m. 6 to m.7, but F#5 is reached via a descending third in mm. 42–44. The stepwise descent back to C#5 unfolds over four beats in mm. 7 and 8, where it is divided between two registers and part of it occurs in an inner voice (compare

---

<sup>20</sup> Burkhart (1978) offers numerous examples of “motivic parallelism.” Rothgeb (1983) discusses examples of motivic expansion and contraction that occur in a variety of contexts, in particular sonata movements by C. P. E. Bach. Petty (1995, 139–43) considers Rothgeb's analyses as an important precedent in the study of Bach's compositional style and as a foundation for further investigation.

ex. 3.5). The same descent progresses far more slowly in mm. 44–50, occupying twenty-one beats. Yet in spite of the middleground similarities, mm. 33–52 function as a modulating phrase within the period; more precisely, this is the second of three large phrases within the movement's second (and last) period. Although the thematic incipit is used repeatedly to mark the beginnings of phrases and periods, to speak of ritornellos or refrains here does not seem particularly helpful.<sup>21</sup>

## 2. Middle movements with repetition of the opening material in the tonic key

Other issues arise when we consider Berg's assessment of particular thematic returns that signify a relationship to refrains. These are the recurrences of tonic-only material found in her second category of slow middle movements. The opening theme of one of Berg's examples, the Adagio of the Sonata in B Minor, H. 36, seen in ex. 3.7a, is a six-measure phrase that concludes with an imperfect authentic cadence (IAC) in the tonic.<sup>22</sup> The second reference to this theme, seen in ex. 3.7 b, moves away from the tonic and cadences in the subdominant. According to Berg (1998, 9):

In these movements, Bach has repeated portions of the opening material with the same freedom and irregularity as in the group of ritornello movements described above. This material does not modulate, however, as in the ritornello forms, but always appears in the tonic as in a conventional rondo.

Although it is true that the opening two measures of this phrase quote the opening theme of the movement, they are part of a modulating phrase that does not share other similarities with the return of the tonic refrain of a conventional rondo.

Berg also cites the D-major Molto Adagio movement from the Sonata in B Minor, H. 32.5, shown in ex. 3.8, as an example of a middle movement that has repetitions of the

<sup>21</sup> For a thorough discussion of similar phenomena in the music of J. S. Bach, see Lester 2001, which I discuss in the last part of section 3.2. I consider another perspective on H. 30/ii in section 3.3.

<sup>22</sup> Koch (2:394; 1983, 25) would have considered D5 the caesura tone in top voice and the notes that follow an overhang (*Ueberhang*).

opening material in the tonic key. But in this movement the opening material is reinterpreted with each subsequent entrance; in its second appearance, the theme is merely referred to, not actually repeated as a refrain. Although it might appear that the theme returns after the PAC in B minor at the end of the first period (m. 11), less than two beats of music actually recur. As early as the first measure (m. 12), Bach begins a process of modulating away from D major by altering C# to C $\natural$ . This change stimulates a reinterpretation of D major as the dominant seventh of G major, on which the music cadences in m. 14 (the intervening m. 13 is a transposition of m. 12 to A major). The opening of the second period, therefore, refers thematically to the opening theme in the tonic, but its melodic treatment is developmental, and its harmonic structure has been reinterpreted.

The third entrance of the theme (m. 21) also differs from the opening thematic statement. As illustrated by reductions of the beginnings of both statements in exs. 3.9a and b, the upbeat to m. 21 enters not in the tonic as in the theme's initial statement but as a continuation of the harmony of E minor, the key of the preceding two measures. The altered upbeat then leads into the first full measure of the theme as it was stated in m. 1, but both its counterpoint and harmonic context have changed. Instead of repeating the original motion of  $\hat{5}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}$  in the top voice above a neighboring motion D-C#-D in the bass, scale-step 4, G4, is prolonged over the bass E, first as the third of II, then as the diminished fifth of V $\frac{6}{4}$ , before it resolves to F#4 as before. Only then does A4 enter, and it is by no means certain that A4 re-establishes the *Kopftön*,  $\hat{5}$  (its tonic support seems subordinate to a larger motion from II to V). This final reference to the opening theme, therefore, does not begin with a repetition of the beginning of the movement, nor does it

begin a new period. It is difficult in these circumstances to speak of ritornellos or refrains.

Along with the middle movements of H. 36 and H. 32.5, Berg also cites the G-major Adagio from the Sonata in G Minor, H. 47, as an example of an early sonata movement with tonic refrains. Like H. 28/ii, H. 47/ii can be divided into three periods, each beginning with a thematic statement that remains within the tonic key. Unlike H. 28/ii, however, only the first two statements are the same. As shown in ex. 3.10a, the opening theme concludes after four measures with a PAC in the tonic, on a weak beat of the  $\frac{3}{4}$  meter. Again, as in H. 28/ii and H. 32.5 (mm. 6 and 14), this weak-beat cadence does not function as a closing cadence. Rather, it establishes the tonic key within a longer opening phrase that prepares the first modulation.<sup>23</sup> Period 1 cadences in the mediant, B minor; period 2 cadences in the subdominant, C major.

Period 3 begins with a recomposed version of the opening theme, shown in ex. 3.10b. Rather than conclude this penultimate phrase with a weak-beat PAC as in m. 4, Bach offers an HC in m. 47. A sequential passage follows, leading to the final cadential progression and a strong-beat PAC in m. 54. Bach's revision of the opening theme indicates the importance he placed on the arrival of the dominant before final closure. In addition, with the arrival of the final PAC on the strong beat, he distinguishes the import of cadences that occur on weak beats from those that conclude main periods; the latter fall on strong beats exclusively.

---

<sup>23</sup> The following section of this chapter will delve more deeply into the function of opening and closing phrases.

### 3. The role of thematic repetition in middle movements

With regard to the treatment of thematic materials, few categorical distinctions can be drawn among the middle movements of H. 28, 30, 32.5, 36, and 47. Although Berg classifies the recurrence of themes as either tonic or non-tonic returns, we frequently find that, whatever their classification, modulation away from their opening keys results in profound alterations to their melodic, harmonic, and rhythmic structures. In the case of H. 28, a non-tonic return acts as the closing phrase of a period.<sup>24</sup>

### 4. Transposition of opening material in a finale

Berg's third category of early sonata movements that display features of both ritornello and rondo forms comprises an Allegro finale in binary form in which there is a transposed statement of the opening theme in the second phrase of the second reprise. Berg offers the Allegro of the Sonata in G Major, H. 56 (1748), seen in ex. 3.11. This movement is very different from the middle movements just discussed. The first of its two reprises consists of a single period with a rondo-like theme: two phrases of eight measures each, in antecedent-consequent relation, without modulation.

The second reprise begins in m. 17 and contains two periods. The first of these periods also begins with an eight-measure phrase, but it moves to an HC in the dominant (m. 24). It is followed by a second phrase (mm. 25–32) that is a transposition to the dominant of the eight-measure consequent phrase from the first reprise.<sup>25</sup> Following the dominant-key PAC at the end of the transposed consequent, Bach extends this period with an appendix (mm. 33–44). Like the appendix described in H. 28, this one functions

---

<sup>24</sup> In this dissertation, my use of the term “period” is in Koch’s sense, a main period.

<sup>25</sup> See chap. 1, 42–43, for a discussion of Witold Chrzanowski’s description of this phrase structure.

as a retransition, leading to a tonic-key half cadence. Unlike H. 28, this retransition needs merely to de-tonicize the dominant, since the preceding PAC was in that key.

We can offer the following observations about this curious movement. Bach uses a two-reprise form that encompasses three periods to develop a simple rondo structure. The first period is the opening rondo refrain. The third period is the closing refrain. The material in between, the second period, with its two phrases in the dominant (including the transposed consequent phrase), is the couplet. This conclusion differs from Berg's characterization of the lone transposed phrase as a rondo refrain.

Other structural aspects of H. 56/iii are important to recognize. Two of these are particularly significant because they recur in Bach's late rondos. First, because of the nature of a two-reprise form, the opening theme is repeated. Although Bach's late rondos are not in two-reprise form, the immediate repetition of the opening theme at the beginning of the rondo is a frequent occurrence. (This is also true in many rondos by other composers.) Second, the couplet in H. 56/iii, the first period of the second reprise, consists of two phrases—a dominant-key phrase that substitutes for the refrain's antecedent phrase, followed by the refrain's consequent transposed to D major. In his late rondos, Bach frequently follows the opening refrain with two phrases in the dominant, with the same design of antecedent-substitute and transposed consequent. Although it was a technique employed by Couperin in *Allégresse des Vainqueurs*<sup>26</sup> and by Rameau in two rondeaux, *La Villageoise* and *Gigue en Rondeau*,<sup>27</sup> its occurrence becomes more frequent in Bach's rondos. Furthermore, in H. 56/iii, because the closing refrain is part of the second reprise, it repeats not as an independent section but with the

---

<sup>26</sup> Chapter 2, 66.

<sup>27</sup> See chap. 2, 68.

couplet. This allows the listener the benefit of hearing a repetition of the couplet and final refrain. In summary, although the thematic return in the dominant key is not a refrain, this two-reprise movement is a rondo.

##### 5. Bach's character pieces of the 1750s

As I have noted, Berg draws a connection between the early sonata movements just examined and Bach's character pieces of the 1750s, which are clearly influenced by the rondeaux of the French *clavecinistes*. Berg comments that *L'Aly Rupalich*, H. 95 (1755), is Bach's "first character piece in which refrain sections alternate more than once with episodes (*couplets*)," and notes too that the refrains "are not neatly distinguished from *couplets* as in most French *rondeaux*" (Berg 1988, 8). In fact, although we hear numerous transpositions of the thematic incipit, cadential closure does not occur anywhere in *L'Aly Rupalich* until the final PAC in m. 176. Even the codetta that follows this PAC avoids closure, leaving the listener with expectations unfulfilled. Again, as previously indicated by examples from Bach's early sonata movements (e.g., the concluding phrase of period 2 in H. 28/ii), the return of a thematic incipit does not necessarily indicate the beginning of a formal division.<sup>28</sup>

Perhaps, as in the sonata movements, there is an alternate way of understanding how and when Bach's thematic returns affect formal structure. In her discussion of Bach's character pieces, Berg offers *La Buchholtz*, H. 93, seen here in ex. 3.12, as another example of a rondeau influenced by these early sonata movements.<sup>29</sup> Berg correctly compares this piece to the finale of H. 56.

---

<sup>28</sup> Schulenberg (1994, 218–19) also refers to *L'Aly Rupalich* as an early simple rondo whose episodes lack the long modulating passages of figuration found in Bach's later rondos.

<sup>29</sup> As noted earlier, Bach does not include the term *Rondeau* in the titles of the character pieces discussed here.

Both H. 56 and *La Buchholtz* are divided into two reprises, each with a similar pattern of phrases. The first reprise of *La Buchholtz* is a single period consisting of the antecedent and consequent phrases of the theme. Each phrase is four measures in length. The first period of the second reprise (mm. 9–16) begins in the mediant key with a four-measure phrase that concludes with an HC. It is followed by a four-measure phrase in the mediant that begins with a reference to the opening theme and concludes with a PAC. As can be seen in ex. 3.13a, the couplet is not a transposition of the foreground of the refrain, but there is a transpositional relation in the middleground.

The second period of the second reprise (mm. 17–37) is an expanded statement of the refrain in the tonic. Bach uses augmentation, repetition, and a five-measure chromatic voice exchange to transform the original four-measure antecedent into one of eleven measures. Ex. 3.13b compares the rhythmic structures of the antecedent phrases of the opening and closing refrains; ex. 3.13c illustrates the chromaticized voice exchange.

Although Berg seems to consider mm. 9–12 to be a couplet and mm. 13–16 to be a transposed refrain, an alternative analysis similar to that of H. 56/iii can be offered. In this analysis, the entire first period of the second reprise, including the transposed reference to the consequent (mm. 9–16), functions as the first couplet; the next and last period functions as the tonic refrain. This perspective has two advantages. First, it coincides with the divisions created by the principal cadences—the periods as Koch would define them. Thus it avoids dividing a single period, the first period of the second reprise, into two opposing functions, couplet and refrain. Second, it avoids the occurrence of two contiguous refrains, the first transposed and the second in the tonic.

As we know, the inclusion of transposed versions of the refrain within couplets was an established technique in the French rondeau tradition, a tradition to which Bach refers by using French titles for this and other character pieces of the mid-1750s.

The formal structure of *La Buchholtz* is not an anomaly. Other character pieces composed by Bach during these years are similar in structure to the three-period, two-reprise forms of the rondeaux H. 56/iii and *La Buchholtz*. *La Complaisante*, H. 109; *L'Auguste*, H. 122; *La Xenophon*, H. 123; *L'Ernestine*, H. 124—all begin with a non-modulating parallel period as first reprise. The first period of the second reprise always modulates away from the tonic. Its first phrase encompasses the same number of measures as the antecedent phrase of the first reprise, and like that phrase it ends with an HC. This “substitute antecedent” is followed by a transposed version of the consequent. The second period of the second reprise repeats the tonic refrain.<sup>30</sup>

Like Couperin, however, Bach relied on a variety of organizing principles in the composition of character pieces within the rondeau genre. *Les Lameurs tendres*, H. 110, relies on a binary scheme like those discussed above, but although Bach refers to the opening theme in the second phrase of the second reprise, he does not transpose it. In *La Louise*, H. 114, Bach abandons the two-reprise form, adding a second couplet and a double final refrain—although he omits the repetition of the initial refrain.

Both *Les Lameurs tendres* and *La Louise* include appendices similar in function to those in H. 28/ii and H. 56/iii. In *Les Lameurs tendres* Bach adds an appendix to the closing phrase of the first period of the second reprise. As in H. 28/ii, the appendix functions as a retransition, leading from a subdominant PAC to the home dominant in preparation for the return of the tonic refrain. In *La Louise* (ex. 3.14), Bach adds an

---

<sup>30</sup> The final period of *L'Auguste* consists of the consequent phrase of the theme only.

appendix to the conclusion of the second couplet and a coda to the conclusion of the final refrain. The appendix follows a dominant-key transposition of the refrain's consequent phrase, much like the retransition in H. 56/iii. Again, the function of the appendix is to destabilize the dominant in preparation for the return of the tonic.

#### 6. Thematic reference is not design-specific

As I have previously stated, to understand Bach's late rondos we need first to understand the formal structures of earlier works, both sonata movements and rondeaux, that in some ways resemble them.<sup>31</sup> Some of these sonata movements are characterized by a three-part sectional form that is not related to rondo or ritornello forms. Joel Lester notes that in the works of J. S. Bach three-section forms are common across the spectrum of genres.<sup>32</sup> Lester defines these sections as "portions of a movement that begin with a thematic presentation parallel to the beginning of a movement and end with a clear-cut cadence" (Lester 2001, 53). As Lester demonstrates in an analysis of the C-major Invention, BWV 772, three divisions occur; each section presents material from the opening theme followed by a modulation to a related key. Contrary to the harmonic scheme of C. P. E. Bach's early sonata movements, where each section begins in the tonic, each section of the Invention continues the key that ended the previous section; the first section moves from I to V, the second from V to VI, and the third from VI to I. Lester's perspective is important to consider for two reasons. First, it recognizes J. S. Bach's frequent structural division of movements into three sections, each beginning with a clear reference to the opening theme, and each ending with a conclusive cadence.

---

<sup>31</sup> I use the term *rondeau* in reference to his early independent character pieces that have French titles, but use the term *rondo* in reference to sonata movements because that is the preferred term in German usage at that time.

<sup>32</sup> Lester 2001. Both Berg (1975, 115–16) and Schulenberg (1984, 99–100) comment on C.P.E. Bach's frequent reliance on a tripartite division of material.

Secondly, as Wayne Petty demonstrates in great detail, not only did young C. P. E. Bach study his father's works, he employed some of them as models for his own.<sup>33</sup>

The finale of H. 56 and many of the character pieces of the 1750s are best understood within the context of a two-reprise form with three periods, one in the first reprise and two in the second. According to Leonard Ratner, the standard French rondeau form in the early eighteenth century “resembled a two-reprise form in which Reprise I ended in the tonic. After the X section Reprise I could be repeated verbatim, making an A B A melodic form, identical to that of a small rondeau with a *da capo* sign at the end of the couplet to indicate the repetition of the refrain.”<sup>34</sup> Although Ratner was not alluding to Bach's rondeaux, his statement establishes a Baroque context for these works.

### 3.3 The expansion of a *Fortspinnung* type: Bach's sections reflect a union of tonal, rhythmic, and melodic elements

#### 1. Introduction

In previous analyses I have demonstrated how Koch's theory of the relationship of phrase and period can reveal important information about the function of thematic return and reference in Bach's early works. This information helps in distinguishing true rondos from pseudo-rondos. Wayne Petty's work on Bach's sonatas provides another valuable approach, one that, like Koch's, can be applied to the late rondos as well.

Petty's study of Bach's sonata movements is focused on the tonal, melodic, and phrase-rhythmic aspects of each section. He credits an extensive number of writers; a

---

<sup>33</sup> Petty (1995, 163–64) discusses C. P. E. Bach's Sonata in D Minor, H. 5/I and its model, J. S. Bach's D-minor Prelude from Book I of the *Well-Tempered Clavier* (98–106 and 161–62), as well as C. P. E. Bach's Sonata in B-flat Major, H. 2/I and its model, J. S. Bach's F-major Invention, BWV 779, (163–65). Petty (164) also refers to other writers (particularly Günther Wagner) who discuss the younger Bach's use of his father's works as models.

<sup>34</sup> Ratner 1980, 249. Ratner (209) identifies “X” as “the approach to the final close in the tonic.”

brief synopsis of their work follows (Petty 1995, 148–60). From Koch he understands that the first reprise of a sonata has one “main period” while the second reprise has two. He incorporates the terms exposition, development, and recapitulation in his references to these three periods. Petty follows Koch in dividing a period into phrases that conclude with a variety of phrase endings depending on their harmonic, melodic, and rhythmic functions within the period. In addition, he embraces Koch’s concept of phrase expansion.<sup>35</sup> He applies Wilhelm Fischer’s concept of the *Fortspinnung* type (*Fortspinnungstypus*) to describe certain relationships between the various phrases within the exposition. However, Petty reinterprets Fischer’s *Fortspinnung* type to include a phrase-rhythmic perspective, a value that Fischer’s melodically based approach does not encompass. As Petty concludes:

Phrase rhythm and formal function can then help account for the order of motivic transformations and for changes in melodic design in ways that Fischer’s long strings of motive labels do not capture.<sup>36</sup>

Petty adopts William Rothstein’s concept of phrase: “a phrase should be understood as, among other things, a directed motion in time from one tonal entity to another; these entities may be harmonies, melodic tones (in any voice or voices), or some combination of the two” (Rothstein 1989, 5). From the work of Erwin Ratz he perceives two types of sentence formations, loose-knit and tight-knit. He relies on the work of William Caplin to explain how sentence structures are ordered by formal function.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> See Koch 2:424-453 and 153-230; 1983, 41–54 and 129–165. For an in-depth discussion of Koch’s concept of phrase expansion see Rothstein 1989, 64–101.

<sup>36</sup> Petty 1995, 160. In n. 23 Petty acknowledges that Laurence Dreyfus and William Caplin also emphasize the importance of harmonic and cadential structure. Petty (167–68) also discusses the work of David Schulenberg (1984) on the subdivisions of the opening main period and Wolfgang Horn (1988) on punctuations within the exposition.

<sup>37</sup> See Caplin 1998. In his introduction, Caplin (1998, 3) credits the writings of Arnold Schoenberg, particularly *Fundamentals of Musical Composition*, and the work of Ratz (Schoenberg’s student) as “sources of inspiration” for his own work. Petty refers to Caplin 1998 as a book-in-progress and relies on Caplin’s previous publications.

Janet Schmalfeldt's analytic approach builds on the work of Caplin to integrate a middleground harmonic-contrapuntal structure that mediates between Schenker's concept of form and traditional formal theory (Schmalfeldt 1991).

In his analysis of the construction of an early Bach sonata exposition, Petty designates a function for each phrase of a period: *opening phrase*, *transitional phrase*, *closing phrase*, and *post-cadential phrase* (Petty 1995, 162). He substitutes the first three terms for Fischer's *Vordersatz*, *Fortspinnung* and *Epilog*. From early in his composing career, Petty notes, C. P. E. Bach concludes the opening phrase of a period with a cadence, articulating it from the *Fortspinnung* phrase that follows.<sup>38</sup> Owing to the use of cadential articulations at the ends of opening and closing phrases—transitional phrases sometimes cadence and sometimes do not—Bach's phrases become distinct entities within the period.

The terms *opening phrase*, *transitional phrase*, and *closing phrase* express these distinctions better than Fischer's better-known terms. In particular, Petty favors the term *transitional phrase* over *Fortspinnung*. According to Petty, "all C. P. E. Bach sonatas have such a modulating passage, but not all such passages display the usual features of the *Fortspinnung* segment of a *Fortspinnung* type" (Petty 1995, 169). Example 3.15 reproduces Petty's phrase analysis of the first-movement exposition in the Sonata H. 30 (composed 1742-43).<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Petty (1995, 162) offers H. 5 as a particularly good example of C. P. E. Bach's phrase development, since this movement is modeled on J. S. Bach's D-minor Prelude from Book I of the *Well-Tempered Clavier*, which does not have an HC (or any other cadence) after the opening phrase (*Vordersatz*).

<sup>39</sup> Petty 1995. This appears as example 5.6 in vol. 2, pp. 51-52.

Petty views the expansion of the closing phrase as an important element that distinguishes it from the shorter cadential close of a Baroque period. In emphasizing the independent nature of Bach's closing phrases, Petty cites that of Bach's Sonata in A Minor, H. 30 ("Württemberg" no. 1), which repeats the entire opening phrase of the exposition in varied form in the dominant minor (Petty 1995, 173). Here, the repetition of thematic material provides Bach with a closing phrase that offers the same depth of phrase expansion offered by the expanded opening phrase. Petty theorizes a correspondence between the *Fortspinnung* type and the Classical sonata exposition in movements in which the expanded closing phrase contains a transposition of the theme of the opening phrase. He explains "that music in a new key, something like a 'second theme,' may develop by expanding the *Fortspinnung* type from within, rather than by adding music from without" (Petty 1995, 165).<sup>40</sup>

Sometimes the closing phrase of a period is supported by an *expanded cadential progression* (ECP). Caplin identifies four harmonic functions within an ECP: initial tonic (usually in first inversion), pre-dominant, dominant, and final tonic (Caplin 1998, 109–111). Petty recognizes that Bach often further expands the cadential progression (Petty 1995, 187–88 and 211–14). In the closing phrase (mm. 17–28) of the first movement of Bach's Sonata in G Minor, H. 68 (1752), shown in ex. 3.16, Bach expands the closing phrase from a basic phrase of eight measures to twelve by means of a deceptive cadence. As ex. 3.17 illustrates, Bach first prolongs I<sup>6</sup> in Bb, through motion to an upper neighbor in the top voice while the tenor ascends to Bb3, in sixths with the alto. Having arrived through motion to an inner voice, this Bb does not mark the arrival of the tonic close in Bb; rather, it prolongs the initial I<sup>6</sup> in Bb major. Following this

---

<sup>40</sup> Fischer 1915 also claims that the Classical sonata exposition derives from the *Fortspinnung* type.

prolongation, Bach continues the cadential progression in m. 23 to II<sup>6</sup> and V. The final resolution of the cadence is postponed, however, by a deceptive cadence that begins a four-measure expansion (notated on the score with brackets). Following the arrival of VI, Bach repeats the approach to the cadence, beginning with V<sup>6</sup>.

Often the final tonic of a closing phrase is prolonged by a post-cadential phrase or suffix.<sup>41</sup> It is in the suffix to the exposition of the first “Prussian” sonata (Sonata in F Major, H. 24) that Petty cites another example of thematic repetition. This time, however, only the opening motive of the theme is presented. Because of its occurrence as a suffix to the final cadence of the period, Petty remarks on its resemblance to a *ritornello*.

As Petty demonstrates, often each phrase can be subdivided into the same tripartite configuration that shapes the period. These phrases, which resemble small, independent *Fortspinnung* types, can be understood as sentences with formal functions that reflect those described by Caplin.<sup>42</sup> Caplin divides a paradigmatic eight-measure sentence into two segments he calls phrases: a *presentation phrase* and a *continuation phrase*. Presentation phrases do not conclude with a cadence but move directly to the continuation phrase. It is important to note that Caplin’s understanding of the term “phrase” is not the same as the one I shall use here. Because I prefer to define a phrase as a *tonal* motion with beginning, middle, and end, following William Rothstein, I do not consider Caplin’s presentation and continuation as phrases but as phrase segments (Rothstein calls them “subphrases”). That is, an eight-measure sentence is a single

---

<sup>41</sup> Petty 1995, 171. Petty prefers Rothstein’s term, suffix. According to Rothstein (1989, 71), suffixes “extend the basic phrase’s closing harmony.” Koch calls this kind of phrase expansion an *appendix*.

<sup>42</sup> Petty 1995, 176 ff. Caplin’s concepts of phrase, period, and sentence are discussed in the following publications: 1987, 1991, 1994, and 1998. Petty’s discussion of *Fortspinnung* types and sentences may be found in chap. 5 of his dissertation. Petty’s terminology generally follows Caplin’s.

phrase divided into two segments. Jan Miyake offers the term “phase” as a substitute for Caplin’s “phrase” (Miyake 2004, 72); I adopt her term here.

In its paradigmatic form, the *presentation* consists of a two-measure basic idea and its two-measure repetition, which is normally modified in some way. Together, these four measures establish the initial tonic with a tonic-prolonging progression (Petty 1995, 178; Caplin 1998, 10). As I have indicated on the score of ex. 3.16, Bach’s presentation prolongs the tonic with a descent from scale-step  $\hat{5}$  to scale-step  $\hat{3}$  above a neighboring motion in the bass.

According to Caplin, the continuation phrase (or phase, as I prefer) serves the two functions of continuation and cadence. Continuation function requires the destabilization of the harmonic and rhythmic structures of the presentation. Cadential function involves, chiefly, the sounding of a conventional cadential progression in the bass (Caplin 1998, 40–41). These two functions can be difficult to separate in concrete instances, and they are often expressed simultaneously within a four-measure continuation phase. Petty, like Caplin, identifies several characteristics of the continuation: faster harmonic rhythm; faster surface rhythm; sequence; and *fragmentation*. Fragmentation refers to a decrease in the length of melodic units subject to repetition, especially the breaking-down of the two-measure basic idea into shorter units.

Ex. 3.16 offers an analysis, following Petty and Caplin, of the exposition of H. 68/1. The movement begins with an eight-measure sentence; continuation function is expressed through the fragmentation of the two-measure basic idea into one-measure

units (m. 5 and m. 6).<sup>43</sup> The transitional phrase, mm. 9–16, would also be a sentence if its presentation phase (mm. 9–12) expressed a tonic prolongation, but this is where the modulation to Bb major begins. The closing phrase, mm. 17–28, has already been discussed. As we noted earlier, it is built over an expanded cadential progression (ECP), the completion of which is delayed first by a prolongation of its initial Bb harmony, I<sup>6</sup>, then by a deceptive cadence.

2. Sentence structures in the Andante of H. 30/ii: Tension and thematic restatement as phrase-specific functions

As noted earlier in section 3.2, considering thematic restatements in the context of period structure offers a useful perspective in evaluating whether a composition is a rondo. For Darrell Berg the recurrence of opening thematic material, even as little as an incipit, seems to indicate rondo or ritornello form. As Petty shows in his analyses of Bach's sonata expositions, this is not necessarily the case: a transposed repetition of an opening phrase, for example, may occur as a closing phrase, thus expressing the function of ending a period, not initiating a return. Similarly, the transposed quotation of the opening theme at m. 33 of H. 30/ii does not initiate a formal section larger than a phrase; nor does it mark a formal return.<sup>44</sup> The techniques developed by Petty and Caplin are very helpful in understanding how phrases function not only as individual elements, but as parts of larger structures.

By studying the middleground structures of Bach's phrases from a Schenkerian standpoint, relationships of statement and repetition, or antecedent and consequent, that may not be obvious in the foreground become apparent. In exs. 3.18 and 3.19, I present a

---

<sup>43</sup>Petty acknowledges the frequent use of sentences in Bach's sonatas and rondos from the the 1750s onward (Petty 1995, 180–81). See Petty's exs. 5.7, 5.8, fig. 5.7, and the accompanying discussion (178–82).

<sup>44</sup> See pp. 84–85 and exs. 3.5 and 3.6.

multivalent approach to H. 30/ii that adapts the analytic tools of Caplin, Petty, and Schenker. I do this as a preliminary study for my analysis of Bach's phrase structures and their formal implications in his late rondos.

As my analysis of H. 30/ii shows, Bach uses several techniques to forge relationships of the kinds discussed above. One important technique, already mentioned, is a change in function of phrases that repeat or refer to a previously presented theme. A second technique is the transposition of the middleground of a theme while varying its foreground. This technique is familiar from Bach's works with varied reprises (e.g., the *Sonaten mit veränderten Reprisen* of 1760), but changes to the foreground may exceed those found in such works. A third technique exploits the tension of conventional antecedent-consequent relationships, which Bach often employs in concealed forms. In addition, as we know, Bach contrasts basic phrases, usually four or eight measures in length, with expanded phrases, thus creating tensions of another kind.<sup>45</sup> He also relies on the type of suffix described by Koch that may close on a different cadence from the one of its preceding PAC, necessitating a reinterpretation of that cadence. As previously stated, I refer to this type of cadence with Rothstein's term, cadence-altering suffix.

H. 30/ii consists of two periods and, in contrast to Bach's sonata-form movements, is not in two-reprise form. As ex. 3.18 illustrates, the first period consists of two sentences that function as opening and closing phrases respectively. There is no transitional phrase, although the attainment of an apparent half cadence in E major in m.

---

<sup>45</sup> Caplin and Schenker use the term *expansion* differently. For Caplin "expansion involves the internal lengthening of component members of the function over their normative size in tight-knit themes" (1998, 20). Caplin further explains that expansion is similar to the rhythmic technique of *augmentation*. For Schenker, expansion is a metric event that requires a prototype but is not dependent on a phrase-structural paradigm such as the sentence (1979, 124). Rothstein (1989, 64) defines the prototype as the part of the basic phrase that is expanded. Both Petty and I adhere to the Schenker-Rothstein concept of expansion (Petty 1995, 169, n. 36).

16 (the eighth measure of the closing phrase) suggests momentarily that we are hearing the end of a transitional phrase. The E-major PAC in mm. 17–18 effectively cancels the half-cadential effect of m. 16; these two measures might be regarded as a cadence-altering suffix. Ex. 3.19a offers another interpretation of how the closing phrase reaches a length of ten measures, suggesting that mm. 9–12 could have been expressed as two measures rather than four. The lack of melodic parallelism between opening and closing phrases means that we are not dealing with an antecedent and consequent as those terms are generally defined.<sup>46</sup> The two phrases do, however, exhibit some characteristics typical of antecedent and consequent functions.

First, although their foregrounds are different, the first segment of each phrase outlines ascending and descending thirds.<sup>47</sup> This is illustrated by the voice-leading reductions of exs. 3.19b and c. In mm. 1–2 the descent in the soprano, C#–B–A, is accompanied in the alto by E–D–C#. In mm. 9–13 of the closing phrase the intervals of the descent are inverted, with E–D–C# in the soprano and C#–B–A in the bass. In addition, the presentation of the opening phrase outlines an ascending third, which is imitated in the inner voices of the closing phrase. The rising-third motive is then reiterated in both phrases. Finally, of course, there is the relation between the two cadences: an HC in the opening phrase, a PAC (in the dominant key) in the closing phrase.

---

<sup>46</sup> Rothstein (1989, 18) and Caplin (1998, 53–55) acknowledge the possibility of an antecedent with modulating consequent, however, they both require the two phrases to exhibit melodic parallelism.

<sup>47</sup> The first segment of phrase 1, mm. 1–4, constitutes what Caplin calls a *compound basic idea* (Caplin 1998, 61), which by itself fulfills the function of presentation. The first segment of phrase 2, mm. 9–12, would be assigned continuation function by Caplin on account of its sequential harmonic progression. Petty, however, permits what he terms *sequential “presentations,”* using quotation marks to indicate that Caplin’s criterion of tonic prolongation is not fulfilled; hence the segment is not a presentation in the strict sense (Petty 1995, 183–84).

The second period is more than twice the length of the first. As can be seen in ex. 3.18, it consists of three long phrases of 12, 20, and 17 measures respectively. In addition to a tripartite structure, it possesses two other attributes that invoke Petty's *Fortspinnung*-type sentence. First, the middle phrase behaves like a transitional phrase as it modulates from F# minor back to A major (ending with an HC) with lengthy sequential passages. Second, each of these phrases can be described by Caplin's term *loose-knit*, a characteristic Petty associates with the *Fortspinnung* type. According to Caplin:

Tight-knit organization is characterized by harmonic-tonal stability, cadential confirmation, unity of melodic-motivic material, efficiency of functional expression, and symmetrical phrase groupings. Loose organization is characterized by harmonic-tonal instability, evasion or omission of cadence, diversity of melodic-motivic material, inefficiency or ambiguity of functional expression, and asymmetrical phrase groupings (arising through extensions, expansions, compressions, and interpolations). (Caplin 1998, 17)

Each phrase, however, maintains certain characteristics of sentence structure. The opening phrase (mm. 21–32) begins in the tonic with the same two measures that began the opening phrase of the first period. But in contrast to the first opening phrase, in which the tonic triad is prolonged throughout the presentation, here the third and fourth measures are altered to tonicize the subdominant. The continuation phase is sequential in design and concludes with an HC in the submediant.

The transitional phrase (mm. 33–52) comes next. It opens in the submediant with a transposition of the original presentation (mm. 1–4). The actual function of this phrase, however, is not at first apparent. Initially, because the phrase follows the F#-minor half cadence and begins with melodic parallelism, we might think we are hearing a consequent. Our perception changes, however, as the continuation progresses into canonic imitation and a long sequential passage, eventually to conclude with another half

cadence. Although this presentation is thematically similar to the presentation of the opening phrase, its placement at the beginning of a transitional phrase alters its function. It acts now as part of a modulating structure, not an opening, tonic-defining one.

The closing phrase of the second period is an expanded sentence. Like the closing phrase of period 1, this closing phrase begins with a sequential “presentation.”<sup>48</sup> The first measure provides the model that is imitated sequentially by the following three measures (Caplin 1998, 11). As illustrated by the rhythmic reduction in ex. 3.19d and the corresponding measures in ex. 3.18, the first expansion occurs during this sequence, whose goal is to move from the tonic minor to the dominant.<sup>49</sup> It results from the additional time required by the outer voices to attain their goals. Instead of moving directly to the closest B by moving up a step in the bass and down a step in the top voice, the bass descends a seventh from A3 to B2, V/V (or II<sup>#</sup>), in m. 56, while the top voice ascends a seventh from C5 in m. 53 to B5 in m. 56; an upward registral shift results in this B appearing as B5 rather than B4. (See the dotted slurs in ex. 3.18.) After the arrival of the dominant in m. 57, the presentation is expanded a second time, now by a cadenza-like interpolation on the dominant (mm. 58–64). The final measure of this expansion repeats the voice leading of m. 57, the measure preceding the expansion.

The repetition of m. 57 in m. 64 is significant on two accounts. First, the recollection of m. 57 emphasizes the expendability of the measures added between mm. 57 and 65 by returning to the point of departure. Secondly, if we eliminate the

---

<sup>48</sup> See n. 45. Petty states: “At the beginning of a closing phrase they [sequential “presentations”] may bind the closing phrase to the preceding transition and build momentum toward the cadence, just as a sequence might do in a continuation phrase” (183).

<sup>49</sup> I have normalized the register of certain pitches in ex. 3.19d to emphasize the similarity to the opening phrase and to aid the audibility of the voice leading.

expansion, we recognize that measures 57 and 65 recall mm. 3–4, as of course do mm. 64–65.

In fact, there is a unique relationship between the closing phrase of the second period and the opening phrase of the first period. In order to demonstrate this relationship, I have reconstructed the closing phrase in its basic form (ex. 3.19e). For purposes of comparison, the opening phrase of the first period is included above it. As the example illustrates with brackets, the motive of the top voice of mm. 3–4, B–C#–D–C#, also occurs in the third and fourth measures of the reconstructed closing phrase (i.e., mm. 57 and 65). This time, however, the motive is rhythmically altered and remains in the middle voice until the end of m. 57, where it regains its upper-voice status. Measure 65 then repeats m. 4 in its entirety. The continuation of the closing phrase proceeds like the continuation of the opening phrase; its cadence, however, is recomposed to bring closure with a PAC.

The unique relationship between the opening and closing phrases of this movement is further evidenced by the middlegrounds of the two phrases (ex. 3.19f). Here their similarity in structure becomes apparent. In effect, the last phrase of the movement represents a delayed, expanded, and concealed consequent to its first phrase.

### 3.4 Summary

According to Berg, Bach experimented with compositional techniques in his early sonata movements that influenced the formal structures of his rondeaux of the 1750s and his independent rondos of the 1770s and 1780s. These techniques resulted from a combination of rondo and ritornello procedures. As my analyses have shown, however, Bach's use of thematic reference and repetition in most of these sonata movements does

not conform to refrain procedures intrinsic to the rondo genre. Rather than representing refrains or ritornellos, repetitions or references to opening thematic material are often altered in a manner that results in a change in formal function.

The importance of recognizing different types of phrase constructions offers insight into how thematic relationships impact formal structures. In H. 30/ii, for example, Bach offers two different types of period construction. The first period consists of two phrases that refer to an antecedent-consequent relationship. The three phrases of the second period together form an expanded *Fortspinnung* type, with each phrase maintaining characteristics of sentence structure. Bach refers to the opening thematic material three times in the second period. Each reference is incomplete and each occurs in a functionally different position within the period—the first at the beginning of the presentation of the opening phrase, the second at the beginning of the presentation of the transitional phrase, and the third beginning with the close of the presentation and then expanded through the continuation phase in the closing phrase. The difference in function of these thematic references, all of which function dependently within the context of other phrases and phrases, as well as their lack of harmonic closure, does not support an analysis of them as rondo refrains.

As we have learned from the preceding analysis of H. 30/ii, an analysis that considers the influence of phrase function, voice leading, and phrase rhythm on formal structure imparts important information about works in a variety of genres. Not only can we use this method to understand the division of material into periods, phrases, and sub-phrases that function contextually within a composition, we can also use it to understand the formal implications of thematic repetition. Such a painstaking method may seem

pointless if we are dealing with a simple rondo in which refrains and couplets are easily distinguished. In C. P. E. Bach's late rondos, however, his manner of employing thematic reference and return is complex, requiring a more nuanced system of structural and phrase analysis to gain a better understanding of their formal structures.

## Chapter 4

Exploring the formal structures of C. P. E. Bach's late rondos: The outer form

### 4.0 Introduction

In this chapter I shall address the concern that seems primary to all those who write about these works: the division of their musical material into refrains and couplets. As I discussed in chapter 1, most writers have claimed to rely on the traditional rondo paradigm in their discussions of Bach's rondos. Although in this paradigm repetitions of the rondo refrain occur only in the tonic key, most authors regard the transposed repetitions of Bach's refrain themes as refrains. The result of this assumption formulates these works as special-case rondos that hover somewhere mysteriously within the rondo genre. I shall demonstrate, however, that true refrains return only in the tonic key and only these refrains effect the formal divisions of these rondos.

The goal of this study is to understand the function of material, whether new or recurring, as rondos progress. In order to accomplish this task, I first investigate how this material is organized. I begin with the most basic sections, which then become part of larger sections. The organization of material in the opening sections is generally clearly laid out. As the rondos proceed, however, the division of material becomes more complex. One aspect of this complexity is the dramatic increase in the length of couplets after couplet 1. I shall illustrate through my analyses that often the couplets are lengthened by expansions and extremely large interpolations.

Frequently, groups of rondos will share particular characteristics while diverging in other respects. Because each rondo is distinct in its conception, I will choose particular examples to explore in detail.

The traditional paradigm of rondo form, which considers only tonic repetitions of the opening section as refrains, has rarely been considered as the basis for analysis of Bach's rondos of the 1770s and 1780s.<sup>1</sup> Questioning the assumption that transpositions of the opening theme invariably function as refrains leads to other questions. The most obvious of these—how do we understand the function of non-tonic thematic statements?—leads to two important areas of investigation. The first considers how couplets are constituted in these works. The second considers whether there is a correlation between the binary oppositions tonic/non-tonic (referring to statements of a refrain theme) and refrain/couplet? These inquiries require a detailed examination of numerous aspects of these rondos, including not only melody, harmony, and phrase rhythm, but occasionally register and dynamics as well.

In considering many of these issues, Rothstein's distinction between outer and inner forms will prove useful. According to Rothstein (1989, 104), outer form considers thematic aspects of a piece and the organization of phrases and periods within it. Inner form organizes a piece into large-scale units of harmony and voice leading, which may conflict with the layout of phrase groupings. In this chapter, I shall consider how phrases function within traditional outer-form patterns of refrain and couplet. I shall also demonstrate that while some of Bach's rondos can be defined solely by these parameters, others mediate between the structures of both rondo and sonata. In chapter 5 I shall reconsider these same features, this time in conjunction with large-scale harmony and voice-leading, in a discussion focusing on inner form.

As in chapter 3, I employ a synthesis of the concepts expressed in the writings of Heinrich Christoph Koch on phrases and their connection in the formation of larger

---

<sup>1</sup> See chap. 1 for a discussion of this perspective.

sections, William Rothstein on musical form as an expression of phrase structure and rhythm, William Caplin on phrase function as a determinant of formal organization, and Wayne Petty on Bach's use of *Fortspinnung*-type sentences.<sup>2</sup> In addition, I refer to the work of Hepokoski and Darcy (2006) and their insights into sonata-rondo forms.

Although Heinrich Schenker was little concerned with outer form, I occasionally employ his analytic techniques to clarify the function of particular passages by better understanding their harmony and voice leading. All of these perspectives share a hierarchic view; that is, events are perceived from a variety of levels that result from the consideration of events within a phrase as well as those that occur over larger spans of time.<sup>3</sup>

Viewing these works from a variety of perspectives requires some clarification of terms. I rely on William Rothstein's concept of phrase expansion based on rhythmic and tonal phenomena and not on formal function.<sup>4</sup> Accordingly, an *expanded phrase* is an elaborated version of a *basic phrase* that has been lengthened by added tones and harmonies.<sup>5</sup> The *prototype* is that portion of the basic phrase that becomes expanded. Both phrases, the basic phrase and the expanded phrase, share the same "structural skeleton," which, in Schenkerian terms, means that they share the same middleground.<sup>6</sup>

This perspective provides a basis for acknowledging the relationship between the

---

<sup>2</sup> The basic sources are Koch 1782-1793 (Baker 1983), Rothstein 1989, Caplin 1998, and Petty 1995.

<sup>3</sup> My discussion of eighteenth-century theorists in chaps. 1 and 2 supports the historical premise for an examination of Bach's work from a hierarchic perspective of phrase development. According to Wolf (1981, 96): "By likening music to language, the eighteenth century implicitly recognized the hierarchical nature of its music, in which any component may consist of two or more smaller units and also contribute to the formation of one or more larger ones."

<sup>4</sup> As Rothstein acknowledges (1989, 65), his ideas were influenced most by the writings of Heinrich Christoph Koch and Heinrich Schenker.

<sup>5</sup> As described by Koch (2: 348-349; 1983, 3), a *basic phrase* "may contain only as much as is absolutely necessary for it to be understood and felt as an independent section of the whole." I discuss Koch's description of a basic phrase and how it can be expanded in chap. 3, p. 80.

<sup>6</sup> Rothstein 1989, 64. Schenker (1979, 124) uses the term *metric prototype* as the basis of the expanded phrase.

middleground of a basic phrase and that of its expanded version. Expansions of a phrase may occur either externally (before or after the basic phrase) or internally (within the basic phrase). Like Rothstein (1989, 70–73), I use the term *suffix* to indicate the extension of the closing harmony of a basic phrase—i.e., an expansion of the closing harmony itself.

I have integrated Caplin's concept of intrathematic and interthematic functions as a basis for understanding many aspects of these works. According to Caplin, *intrathematic functions* are “the functional constituents of individual themes” that “are linked together in a specified order and thus establish a kind of ‘syntax’ of formal organization” (Caplin 1998, 17). Individual themes are formed as sentences, periods, or hybrids of these types. Caplin's approach is based on a phrase-rhythmic model of eight measures. He identifies his intrathematic phrase functions on the division of this eight-measure grouping: a period consists of a four-measure antecedent and four-measure consequent; a sentence consists of a four-measure presentation and a four-measure continuation. As forms proceed, these phrase-rhythmic structures often encounter a variety of loosening techniques that emphasize their *interthematic functions*. Interthematic functions result from the “conventionalized order” of “various themelike units in movements” and result in a “higher-level formal syntax” (Caplin 1998, 17). In a rondo, these functions include refrain and couplet. In a sonata-form exposition, interthematic functions include main theme, transition, and subordinate theme. I will explain these concepts in greater detail as I proceed.

My understanding of the term *period* (already discussed in chapter 2), is based on the same principles as Koch's. According to Koch, a period consists of a grouping of two

or more phrases. Each phrase ends with a resting point, but only the closing phrase concludes with a complete cadence, the type referred to as a PAC.<sup>7</sup> In this sense, a period may or may not exhibit parallel construction.

My interpretation of the terms *antecedent* and *consequent* is occasionally broader than that of Caplin and Rothstein. Melodic parallelism is often omitted in favor of variety. As I previously discussed in chapter 2, Rothstein's terms *fore-phrase* and *after-phrase* is preferred in some instances where neither melodic nor harmonic parallelism occurs, yet the two phrases share a question-answer type of relationship (Rothstein 1989, 18). Finally, I employ Schenker's term *prolongation* to describe a tone or chord that remains active through any of a variety of techniques (Cadwallader and Gagné 1998, 2, 68–73).

Before continuing with discussions of Bach's rondos, it is important to recall Koch's description of the genre. In traditional fashion, Koch's rondo is based on a sectional paradigm with alternations of tonic refrains and couplets that are closely related harmonically to the tonic key. Koch's discussion, however, differs from those of previous writers by the sharp contrast he draws between refrains and couplets. According to Koch, each section differs from the others because "its different periods or episodes [couplets] have no such similarity of melodic sections in common as do the periods of other compositions; for its every period has a special combination of specific melodic sections."<sup>8</sup> As this statement indicates, the composer of a rondo seems at liberty to vary the number of melodic sections within a refrain or couplet. Koch also offers the

---

<sup>7</sup> See chap. 2, p. 52 and Koch 2:344; 1983, 2. As we saw in chap. 1, Forkel and Kirnberger shared a similar understanding of what a period is.

<sup>8</sup> Koch 3:248-249; 1983, 172. Koch considers a melodic section to be a complete phrase. In the text that follows this comment, he discusses how these sections might be realized. I discuss Koch's remarks in greater detail in chap. 2, p. 55.

possibility of a couplet that presents itself as a small rondo, ABA, with three complete melodic sections (Koch 3:260; 1983, 177). Koch thus recognizes considerable freedom in the grouping of phrases within a couplet.

#### 4.1 Opening refrains: Models of antecedent-consequent construction

The opening refrains of most of C. P. E. Bach's rondos begin with some form of the antecedent-consequent period structure that typically defines the eighteenth-century rondo theme. Usually, the opening refrain is repeated a second time, sometimes in varied form. Of the thirteen rondos, eight have eight-measure refrain periods that subdivide into phrases of 4 + 4; two have four-measure periods that subdivide into phrases of 2 + 2; one, the Rondo in C Minor, H. 283, has nine measures that subdivide into two phrases of 4 + 5; and two, the Rondos in E Major and Eb Major, H. 274 and 288 respectively, have sixteen-measure periods that subdivide into two eight-measure phrases. Figure 4.1 illustrates the configuration of the opening refrains in Bach's rondos.

In most of the rondos, the antecedent phrase concludes with an HC with scale-step 2 in the top voice. The consequent begins in the tonic, parallels the opening measures of the antecedent, then alters course in order to conclude with a tonic PAC that includes a stepwise melodic descent (in Schenker's sense) to 1. Ex. 4.1 illustrates the 4 + 4 antecedent-consequent theme of the Rondo in D Major, H. 261, and its varied repetition.

Figure 4.1 Configurations of opening refrains

<u>Length</u>	<u>Subdivision</u>	<u>Rondo</u>
4 measures	2 + 2	E, H. 265; A, H. 276
8 measures	4 + 4	C, H. 260; D, H. 261; A min., H. 262; F, H. 266; Bb, H. 267; G, H. 268; G, H. 271; D min., H. 290
9 measures	4 + 5	C minor, H. 283
16 measures	8 + 8	E, H. 274; Eb, H. 288

Bach occasionally presents an alternative structure for the two phrases of his opening theme. Two of the rondos with eight-measure refrain themes, the Rondos in Bb Major and G Major, H. 267 and 271 respectively, and two of the rondos with four-measure refrain themes, the Rondos in D Major and A Major, H. 265 and 276 respectively, have irregular antecedents that close with an IAC (imperfect authentic cadence) instead of an HC.<sup>9</sup> The refrain themes of the Rondos in E major, H. 274, and Eb major, H. 288, are compound sixteen-measure periods (see example 4.6a for H. 288). They have an eight-measure fore-phrase and an eight-measure after-phrase (Rothstein 1989, 18). Although the consequents of these opening refrains begin with melodic material related to their antecedents, they do not begin with tonic harmony but instead prolong the dominant harmony of the antecedent's HC. The opening measures of the consequents serve the function, in Caplin's terms, of continuation.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Caplin (1998, 57–58) recognizes the IAC as a possible way of ending an antecedent.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 69. Caplin would probably analyze these themes as sixteen-measure sentences.

There are only two deviations from the symmetrical structures examined so far. The opening statement of the refrain in the Rondo in Bb Major, H. 267, illustrated in ex. 4.2a, is followed by a four-measure suffix that destabilizes the perfect authentic cadence arrived at in m. 8 by the top-voice motion to scale-step  $\hat{3}$  in m. 12.<sup>11</sup> This suffix generates a reinterpretation of the second phrase as one that ends with an IAC. As described by Rothstein, cadence-altering suffixes “force the listener to change his evaluation of the cadence—and thus of the middleground—but they do not really alter the *rhythmic* perception of a stable, four-measure unit.”<sup>12</sup> Following this suffix, the second statement of the refrain arrives; this time the PAC closes unequivocally. In the Rondo in D Minor, H. 290, seen in ex. 4.2b, the four-measure antecedent phrase is expanded by a three-measure suffix that prolongs the dominant of the HC. The consequent that follows is a basic phrase of four measures.

#### 4.2 The first couplet: Conformance to a basic rhythmic paradigm

Most of Bach’s opening refrains are succeeded by short couplets that consist of two basic phrases and conclude with a PAC. These first couplets are, in Koch’s sense, periods. Each period includes a modulation to the dominant if the rondo is in a major key, the mediant if in a minor key. The first phrase often modulates away from the tonic, concluding with an HC in the new key. This phrase is then answered by a closing phrase of the same length and, often, this closing phrase is a transposition of the refrain’s consequent phrase.<sup>13</sup> Bach transposes the consequent phrase in this way in the Rondos in

---

<sup>11</sup> I consider the cadences that arrive in mm. 4 and 16 as IACs because the arrival of scale-step  $\hat{1}$  occurs in an inner voice (via an ascent, scale degrees  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{7}-\hat{8}$ ) while scale-step  $\hat{5}$  is prolonged above. The stepwise descent to scale-step 1 that results in a PAC is completed in the top voice in mm. 8 and 20.

<sup>12</sup> Rothstein 1989, 95. I also discuss the cadence-altering suffix in chap. 3, pp. 81–83.

<sup>13</sup> As noted in chap. 1, most writers consider only the first phrase as the couplet; the transposed consequent is regarded as a refrain.

D Major, H. 261, G Major, H. 268, and E Major, H. 274.<sup>14</sup> In the Rondo in E Major, H. 265, and the Rondo in C Minor, H. 283, the closing phrase of the couplet shares thematic material with the consequent but is not a transposition of it.

Most often, the number of measures in each of the two phrases of the first couplet equals the number of measures in each of the two phrases of the refrain: when the opening theme consists of two phrases that are 4 + 4 or 8 + 8, the first couplet's phrases are also 4 + 4 or 8 + 8, respectively. The proportional relationship between the phrases of the couplet and refrain and the use of phrase substitution for the antecedent is reminiscent of some rondeaux by Couperin that I discussed in chapter 2 (pp. 61-63).

There are some rondos that exhibit minor deviations from this paradigm. Ex. 4.3 illustrates the three-phrase construction of the first couplet of the Rondo in G, H. 271. The second phrase has a four-measure grouping of 2 + 2 with the last two measures, mm. 23–24, appearing as a varied repetition of the first two. The repetition continues the perception of four-measure phrases while weakening the feeling of closure at the end of the second phrase. Bach then expands the closing phrase, mm. 25–29, from a basic phrase of four measures to five measures by adding a measure of echo in m. 27. Additional exceptions are the first couplets of the two rondos with themes of 2 + 2, the Rondos in E and A, H. 265 and 276 respectively. These couplets retain the same proportion, but double the number of measures to 4 + 4.

Harmonically, each of these couplets modulates to the dominant if in a major key, the mediant if in a minor key. Because the basic phrases of these couplets generally share the same number of measures and the same cadence scheme as the preceding

---

<sup>14</sup> Bach also includes a transposition of the consequent phrase in the Rondo in C, H. 260. However, as I will discuss later in the chapter, this phrase does not conclude the couplet.

antecedent-consequent period, they also tend to sound like antecedent-consequent constructions but with modulating antecedents, a possibility recognized by Caplin (1998, 51–53). This impression is emphasized by the arrival of a transposed version of the refrain consequent as a closing phrase.<sup>15</sup> Although the two phrases of the couplet often do not express parallel construction, they fulfill all the other criteria of antecedent-consequent structures described by Caplin. Each phrase is tight-knit, often presenting a basic idea and a contrasting idea. The first phrase ends with a weak cadence and the second with a PAC. Because of these relationships, these two phrases are heard as a complete unit that together forms the couplet. This interpretation precludes the division of these phrases into two separate sections, a couplet followed by a refrain.

The opening refrain and couplet of the Rondo in D Major, H. 261, seen in ex. 4.1, illustrate these relationships. The refrain's antecedent-consequent phrase structure of 4 + 4 (mm. 1–8) is followed by its varied repetition (9–16). The first couplet then enters with a modulating antecedent and a transposed consequent (mm. 17–24).

The first couplet of Bach's final rondo, the Rondo in D Minor, H. 290, in ex. 4.4a differs: it has only one phrase that encompasses measures 12 through 21. Its ten-measure length results from the expansion of a four-measure basic phrase. As shown in exs. 4.4b and c, the bass in the first two measures of the phrase ascends by step from the tonic (at the end of the refrain) to the mediant (m. 13). The first expansion prolongs the mediant for an additional two measures. The following two measures, mm. 16–17, begin the cadential motion in the mediant (F major), but the cadence is evaded by a second

---

<sup>15</sup> Caplin (1998, 233) offers a similar example from the rondo movement of Mozart's Piano Sonata in C, K. 545. Caplin always considers the phrase that follows the opening refrain as simultaneously a "transition" and the beginning of the couplet. Although he recognizes the potential of an antecedent-consequent relationship between this transitional phrase and the following phrase, he discounts it because they lack melodic parallelism.

expansion that repeats the approach to the PAC, finally concluding in m. 18. This phrase is then externally expanded by a one-measure, cadence-altering suffix that destabilizes the PAC by concluding with the mediant as  $\hat{3}$  chord, and by a second cadence-altering suffix, this time two measures in length, that reinterprets the bass note of the  $\hat{3}$  chord, A, as the root of a dominant seventh. This couplet, then, is a loose-knit unit that seems to fulfill the basic requirements of Bach's other first couplets in minor-key rondos: transition from the tonic to the mediant; and closure in this new key with a PAC.<sup>16</sup>

Like the couplets of Bach's other rondos but less obviously, the couplet phrase is closely related to the refrain. First, the expansion of the couplet phrase to ten measures provides a balanced proportion with the preceding eleven-measure refrain. Although Bach creates irregular phrase lengths in both the refrain and the couplet, their similarity in length reflects the proportions between opening refrain and first couplet in his other rondos. Second, in addition to this proportional relationship, Bach offers a parallelism between the bass line at the approach to the PAC of the refrain consequent—scale-steps  $\hat{3}-\hat{4}-\hat{5}-\hat{1}$ —and its transposition to the mediant in the couplet (mm. 16–18, again approaching a PAC). The couplet does not present a transposition of the refrain's consequent phrase, but its reference to the consequent is palpable.

#### 4.3 Expanding the first couplet: Suffix construction after the PAC

The Rondo in C Minor, H. 283, is the only rondo whose first-couplet PAC is followed by an immediate repetition of the tonic refrain. Most often, first couplets are extended by at least one suffix, sometimes two, before the tonic refrain arrives.

Frequently, the suffix destabilizes the previous PAC in preparation for the tonic return

---

<sup>16</sup> Loose-knit refers to phrase organization that exhibits harmonic and rhythmic instability (Caplin 1998, 17). See my more detailed description in chap. 3, p. 103.

that follows. As in the Rondo in D Minor, H. 290, Bach employs two cadence-altering suffixes that function as a two-stage retransition for this purpose. Ex. 4.5 illustrates two extremely protracted cadence-altering suffixes that follow the first couplet of the Rondo in E Major, H. 274. Here again, the suffixes (mm. 32–49) function as a two-stage retransition by destabilizing the tonicized dominant, B major, as it resumes its role as an active dominant.<sup>17</sup> The second refrain commences in the tonic immediately following the HC in mm. 48–49.

Three rondos—those in Eb, H. 288, Bb, H. 267, and A, H. 276—present a very different pattern. In these rondos, the apparent conclusion of the first couplet is followed by a modulation to a new key. In the Rondo in Eb, ex. 4.6a, couplet 1 begins in m. 33 and includes a complete statement of the refrain theme in the dominant, Bb major (mm. 48–63). Following the arrival of the PAC in m. 63, Bach adds a twelve-measure suffix that functions as a transition to a new key, Db major, bIII of the dominant or bVII of the tonic. Similarly, in the Rondo in Bb, H. 267, following the dominant-key PAC (m. 35), Bach composes an eight-measure suffix with a further extension of three measures. As shown in ex. 4.6b, instead of returning to the tonic as expected, the suffix moves to the subdominant.<sup>18</sup> The square brackets in mm. 50–52 highlight Bach's use of linkage technique (*Knüpftechnik*).

The Rondo in A, H. 276, presents yet another pattern (see example 4.7). The Rondo in A is one of the two rondos with a four-measure theme. Although these four measures could be regarded as a single phrase, the alternation of a basic idea (mm. 1 and

---

<sup>17</sup> In this case the first suffix, mm. 33–38, leaves the tonicized dominant in root position but places the third on top (m. 38). The second suffix, mm. 39–49, quickly de-tonicizes B; it consists of a two-measure HC in E minor and its expanded repetition.

<sup>18</sup> The Rondo in Bb will be discussed in more detail in chap. 5.

3) with contrasting ideas (mm. 2 and 4) suggests a parallel period. After the opening double refrain, the first couplet begins in m. 9 with a new theme. The couplet consists of two phrases: a modulating fore-phrase, four measures long, ending with an HC in the dominant; and an after-phrase of the same length, ending with a PAC in the same key. The suffix that follows in m. 17, however, is quite unusual: it is the refrain theme, transposed to the dominant. Since the dominant-key PAC has already occurred in m. 16, the arrival of this transposed refrain has no phrase-rhythmic value in Koch's sense; its cadence is simply a repetition of the previous PAC.<sup>19</sup> The transposed refrain theme, therefore, is a suffix—unlike its counterpart in H. 288 (example 4.6a, mm. 48–63), which functions more like the subordinate theme in a sonata exposition.<sup>20</sup>

In ex. 4.7, the entire grouping of suffix phrases between mm. 17 and 25, including the transposed theme, constitutes what Koch calls a subsidiary period, like the ritornello in a concerto movement or aria.<sup>21</sup> A retransition follows in mm. 26–29, preparing for tonic return, which is omitted as it is in the two rondos, H. 267 and 288. As this last example indicates, Bach alters the function of a thematic return by changing its location; if the transposition of one or both phrases of the refrain precede the PAC of the couplet, it functions as couplet material, if it follows a PAC in the same key, it functions as suffix material.

#### 4.4 The opening refrain and first couplet: Bach's sonata exposition as a model of intrathematic and interthematic functions

As I pointed out in chapter 3, Petty describes how Bach alters the function of opening thematic material by transposing it and reformulating it as a closing phrase. He

<sup>19</sup> I discuss the phrase-rhythmic value of a suffix in chap. 3, pp. 81-82.

<sup>20</sup> See below, pp. 128-30.

<sup>21</sup> See my discussion (chap. 2, p. 57) of Koch's concept of the ritornello as a subsidiary period. For Koch's comments see Koch, 3:242-243; 1983, 169–70.

cites the exposition of the first movement of the Sonata in A Minor, H. 30, which dates from the early 1740s.<sup>22</sup> Example 3.15 reproduced Petty's example with his designations of opening, transitional, closing, and post-cadential (suffix) phrases.

In a comparison of the exposition of the Sonata in A Minor, ex. 3.15, with mm. 1–28 of ex. 4.1—the refrain, couplet, and suffix—some differences, but some similarities become apparent. Initially, the most striking difference is the construction of the opening theme. The sonata movement begins with a three-measure theme that prolongs the tonic, but its cadence is only an IAC, and its third measure is a suffix (a varied repetition of m. 2). The rondo theme consists of two four-measure phrases that function as antecedent and consequent. The complete closure expressed by the PAC of the consequent differs from the incomplete closure of the theme of H. 30. Once the opening phase (in H. 30) or period (in H. 261) is finished, however, transitions lead to the dominant key (minor in H. 30, major in H. 261), which is fully established in the closing phrase that follows.<sup>23</sup> In order to distinguish the functions of opening and closing in H. 30, Bach can recompose the transposed version of the opening theme so that it brings complete closure to the exposition. According to Petty, he accomplishes this by expanding the closing version into a “small *Fortspinnung* type in the key of the dominant” that is “modeled on the earlier opening phrase and transitional phrase.” Petty continues:

But now the initial segment of the closing phrase, from the middle of bar 9 to the downbeat of bar 12, repeats the entire opening phrase of the exposition (bars 1–3) in varied form; Bach then condenses the *Fortspinnung* into a tightknit continuation (from the middle of bar 12 to the middle of bar 14), with [a] cadential idea at the end. (Petty 1995, 173)

<sup>22</sup> Chap. 3, p. 97. See also Petty 1995, 173 and ex. 5.6.

<sup>23</sup> As explained in chap. 3, pp. 98–99, I follow Miyake (2004, 72) in using the term “phase” to describe a sentence segment that does not meet Rothstein's definition of a phrase (Rothstein 1989, 7).

Since the consequent phrase in the rondo already possesses closing function, transposing it is all that remains to be done.

Although the opening refrain of a rondo consistently differs in construction from the opening theme of a sonata, the transitions in the rondos—the opening phrases of the first couplets—are similar in construction to the transitional phrases of sonata expositions.<sup>24</sup> For Petty, the transitional phrase is a modulating passage that functions as the continuation within a *Fortspinnung*-type sentence (1995, 169). According to Caplin, the continuation destabilizes the presentation (the sentence's opening phase) by fragmentation, an increased rate of harmonic change and surface rhythmic activity, and (often) sequential harmonic progressions.<sup>25</sup> As Petty's examples indicate, the transitional phrases in the sonatas, like the transitions in the rondos, begin with either stable or unstable harmonies and often conclude with an HC as they modulate to a subsidiary key.

Example 4.8 reproduces Petty's example 5.22, the exposition of Bach's Sonata in D Minor, H. 208, in which the transitional phrase begins with a stable tonic harmony and concludes with an HC in the mediant, F major. Although the transitional phrases in the first couplets of Bach's rondos are often shorter and squarer—that is, more tight-knit—as they substitute for the antecedent phrase of their respective rondo themes, they share the same medial function as modulatory phrases that lead from the home key to a subordinate key. If we refer again to rondos previously discussed, exs. 4.1, 4.3, 4.5, and 4.6 (the Rondos in D, H. 261; G, H. 271; E, H. 274; and Eb, H. 288), or examine others discussed

---

<sup>24</sup> Rothstein (1989, 99–100) remarks that Classical composers often based “non-thematic” passages like transitions in sonata expositions on “underlying duple models.” Duple models are based on phrases with lengths divisible by two, i.e., 2, 4, 6, 8, and 16 measures. The same observation could be applied to the first-couplet transitions in Bach's late rondos, in which duple construction is generally evident on the musical surface.

<sup>25</sup> Caplin 1998, 41.

later in this chapter, we can confirm the similarity in structure of the opening phrases of their couplets to the transitions just cited from the A-minor and D-minor sonatas by Bach.

#### 4.5 The opening refrain and first couplet: Further considerations of phrase function

##### 1. In relation to the opening sections of the Classical rondo

The thematic functions that govern the opening sections of many of Bach's rondos invite comparison to the opening thematic functions of the Classical rondos described by Caplin (1998, 231–33). Example 4.9 presents the opening refrain and first couplet of the Rondo in F Major, H. 266. Bach begins the first couplet with  $II_2^{4h}$  (m. 17), which functions as  $V_2^4$  of V.  $II_2^{4h}$  destabilizes the previous tonic, with which it shares the same bass note, and prepares the HC in the dominant (m. 20). According to Caplin, opening instability and a concluding HC enable a phrase to function as a transition from the tonic conclusion of the first refrain to the dominant key of the subordinate theme, which follows here in m. 21.<sup>26</sup> As Caplin notes that although subordinate-theme complexes most commonly occur within sonata forms, they often occur in rondos; together with the opening refrain a sonata exposition results (1998, 97, 233). He proposes that the first couplet often consists of a *subordinate-theme complex* whose principal function is to establish a subordinate key area. It typically consists of a transition, one or more subordinate themes, closing section, and retransition.<sup>27</sup> (233). In Caplin's conception of the first couplet, therefore, the transition is included within the couplet as part of the subordinate-theme complex.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Caplin 1998, 129–31. See his ex. 9.7, where the transition begins in the tonic on a  $V_2^4$ .

<sup>27</sup> In his discussion of the subordinate-theme complex, p. 233, Caplin allows more flexibility than in a sonata form in the requirements of a transition.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, 125. This consideration of the transition as part of the subordinate-theme complex differs from Caplin's treatment of the transition in the sonata, where it functions interthematically as "a *themelike unit* within the exposition," standing between "the formal functions of main theme and subordinate theme."

According to Caplin's description, a subordinate theme normally closes with a PAC in a subordinate key and exhibits looser intrathematic functions than the principal theme. The couplet offered by Bach in mm. 17–37 is, in fact, more loose-knit than the refrain theme. It begins in loose-knit fashion with a dissonance at the start of the transition; by the middle of its second measure, a process of fragmentation begins. However, like the antecedent of the tight-knit refrain theme, it concludes with an HC in its fourth measure. The transition, mm. 17–20, is followed by the subordinate theme, mm. 21–32. This theme is also loose-knit. It begins with a four-measure continuation phase (mm. 21–24) that consists of the repetition of a half-measure motive; this phase prolongs the new tonic, C major. Following is an eight-measure cadential phase, concluding with an expanded cadential progression (ECP) in C major. (An ECP is already suggested in mm. 24–25, but the bass's stepwise ascent continues beyond the dominant.) At the close of the subordinate theme, Bach refers to the refrain theme by embellishing the PAC with an *appoggiatura* as he does at the close of the refrain. The cadence is then followed by a suffix. Caplin remarks that it is common for the concluding cadence of a subordinate theme to be followed by at least one suffix (122; Caplin uses the term *codetta*). Following the suffix there is a short lead-in to the refrain, which returns in the tonic.

The opening refrains and first couplets of Bach's Rondos in C, D, G, and E (H. 260, 261, 268, and 274 respectively) share a similar construction with the opening refrain and first couplet of the Classical-period rondo as described by Caplin. In these rondos, however, the subordinate theme is not a new theme but a transposition of the refrain theme's consequent phrase. Their opening refrains and first couplets are, in fact, very

similar in construction to the opening refrain and first couplet of the Rondo from Mozart's Piano Sonata in C, K. 545, referred to by Caplin in his discussion of first couplets. In the Mozart rondo, reproduced in my ex. 4.10, the subordinate theme is not an exact transposition of the opening theme, but a variation that combines characteristics of the refrain's antecedent and consequent phrases (Caplin, 232–33). The Rondo in E, H. 274, shown in ex. 4.5, employs a varied version of the consequent only and is most similar to Mozart's rondo.<sup>29</sup>

As in these rondos, the couplet that follows the opening refrain of the Rondo in Eb Major, H. 288 (ex. 4.6a), also begins with a transition. The four-measure phrase, mm. 33–36, leads to an HC in the dominant. This transition is followed by an eleven-measure suffix that extends the dominant and introduces the seventh. Caplin refers to such a dominant extension as “standing on the dominant.”<sup>30</sup> Again, like the Rondo in F Major (ex. 4.9), the transitional phrase leads to a thematic statement in a subordinate key—this time not to a new theme but to a transposition to the dominant of both the antecedent and consequent phrases of the refrain theme (mm. 48–63). As in other rondos discussed in this section, the transposition of the refrain theme functions as part of the subordinate-theme complex that organizes the first couplet.

The first couplet of the Rondo in Bb, H. 267, ex. 4.11, also includes a transposition of the antecedent and consequent phrases of the opening refrain. This couplet begins in an unusually dramatic fashion. The transition, beginning in m. 21, enters abruptly with a fanfare on the major VI chord, G. In its eighth measure, the tonic

---

<sup>29</sup> The Mozart rondo dates from 1788 and the Bach rondo from 1781.

<sup>30</sup> According to Caplin, “When a theme (or a portion thereof) ends with an HC, the final harmony can be prolonged by means of a postcadential standing on the dominant” (1998, 16).

returns as the goal of a contrapuntal cadence.<sup>31</sup> Like the opening of the transition, the arrival of this cadence is also unexpected, since the usual purpose of a transition is to carry the tonic harmony of the main theme to the dominant of the subordinate key. However, in a move that continues the element of surprise, Bach overlaps the cadence in m. 28 with the beginning of a five-measure, cadence-altering suffix (mm. 28–32). The suffix reinterprets the tonic cadence with a 5–6–5 motion that results in the dominant-key HC in m. 32. (See Chapter 5, ex. 5.2c, for a graphic analysis of this passage that indicates the 5-6-5 motion.)<sup>32</sup> The HC prepares, in turn, for the entrance of the subordinate theme in m. 33; this consists of both the antecedent and consequent phrases of the refrain theme, transposed to the dominant.

By applying Caplin's concept of first-couplet structure to all of these examples, it is possible to conclude that Bach employs one of three thematic options in the subordinate-key area of his first couplets: (1) a new theme, as in the Rondo in F, H. 266; (2) a transposition of the refrain's consequent, as in the Rondo in D, H. 261; or (3) a transposition of the antecedent and consequent together, as in the Rondos in Eb, H. 288, and Bb, H. 267.

Clearly, the rondos belonging to the first two categories offer the most interesting comparison with Bach's sonata expositions. This is because the closing phrases of the first couplets of these rondos, like the closing phrases of Bach's sonata expositions, do not combine with other phrases to form parallel periods, as do the closing phrases in category (3). Bach seems to have distinguished his sonata themes from his rondo themes

---

<sup>31</sup> The term "contrapuntal cadence" was defined in chap. 2, p. 63.

<sup>32</sup> Hausler (1987, 22) comments that this phrase, mm. 21–28, is a variation of mm. 9–12. He considers mm. 9–12 the first episode and mm. 21–32 the second.

by avoiding parallel-period construction in the former.<sup>33</sup> Petty's recognition of Bach's sonata expositions as expanded *Fortspinnung*-type sentences may offer an explanation as to why the opening phases of these sonata movements are constructed more like a *Vordersatz* than a parallel period.<sup>34</sup> In at least some of his late rondos, Bach combines the parallel-period construction of his refrain themes with the *Fortspinnung*-type-sentence model of a sonata exposition as the basis for the opening refrain-couplet section (the first refrain plus the first couplet). This hybrid model may explain the consistent occurrence of a transitional phrase at the beginning of the first couplet.<sup>35</sup>

## 2. Refrain and first couplet: Opening section of a Classical sonata-rondo

Koch's description of opening periods of sonata forms may occasionally offer greater understanding of the opening sections of Bach's rondos than his deliberations on rondo form. For example, in his brief discussion of the rondo, Koch does not offer an opening couplet phrase that begins with an unstable harmony like that of m. 17 of the Rondo in F of ex. 4.9. However, similarities of phrase structure exist between some of Koch's examples of the opening main period (*Hauptperiode*) of sonata forms—i.e., sonata expositions—and the opening refrain and couplet of the Rondo in F Major. The opening phrases of Koch's example of the finale from a symphony by Francesco Antonio Rosetti (ex. 388 in Baker, 1983) reproduced here as ex. 4.12a, enables this comparison. Like the opening refrain of the Rondo in F, the Rosetti finale begins with a short parallel period that cadences with a PAC in the tonic. Similarly, like the first couplet of the rondo, the tonic PAC is followed by a modulatory phrase that begins with a dissonant

---

<sup>33</sup> Petty points out that Bach relies on parallel construction only in themes in rondo movements of sonatas and in the late rondos (1995, 155, n. 14).

<sup>34</sup> See chap. 3, pp. 97-99, and Petty, chap. 5.

<sup>35</sup> In the Rondo in D Minor, H. 290, discussed earlier (pp. 117-118), Bach compresses the interthematic functions of a subordinate-theme complex—transition and subordinate theme—into a single phrase.

chord.<sup>36</sup> In the subsequent section of his *Essay*, Koch recognizes that a main period may consist of more than one shorter period. He illustrates this possibility with an example (ex. 390 in Baker, 1983. reproduced here as ex. 4.12b):

An important deviation from the usual form of the first [main] period can occur right at the beginning of the period, when after the I-phrase a cadence is made in the main key, instead of a V-phrase. After this, either a I-phrase is made with its following V-phrase or, with the omission of the I-phrase, a V-phrase is immediately made. Then the period is continued as usual.<sup>37</sup> (Koch 3:377; 1983, 227)

These examples illustrate the difference between a “period” and a “main period,” more clearly perhaps than Koch’s text. The tonic-key PAC in each of Koch’s examples (m. 8 in each case) ends a period, but it does not end the first main period. The first main period includes the subsequent modulating phrase and the entire subordinate theme (not shown). The main difference between these examples and the opening refrain and couplet of the Rondo in F Major is the immediate repetition of the opening short period in the latter. Repeating the opening refrain was a traditional feature of the genre, going back to the French *clavecinistes*.<sup>38</sup>

The similarity of the opening refrain and first couplet to Koch’s model of a sonata exposition leads to the consideration of these rondos as possible sonata-rondos. Recently, several writers have discussed in great depth similarities between a sonata exposition and the opening refrain-couplet section of certain rondos. According to Caplin, an opening

---

<sup>36</sup> As Koch explains (3:375; 1983, 226), “Another deviation from the proper form of the first period is that, instead of a V-phrase in the main key after the I-phrase, a passing modulation is made. This results in a I- or V-phrase in that key to which the melody modulates in passing.”

<sup>37</sup> This harmonic scheme is only one possibility that Koch presents for an opening main period. Koch is wary, however, of opening phrases that end with a PAC, like a closing phrase. It is important to remember that a I-phrase (*Grundabsatz*) and a closing phrase (*Schlussatz*) are not the same thing; in Koch’s terminology, “cadence” (equivalent to our PAC) applies only to a closing phrase. When a sonata exposition begins with an apparent closing phrase, Koch regards the phrase as an introduction, even if it is in the same tempo and meter as the rest of the movement (Koch 3:379; 1983, 228).

<sup>38</sup> Bach repeats the opening refrain in either exact or varied form in eleven of his thirteen late rondos.

refrain, followed by a first couplet consisting of a subordinate-theme complex in the dominant as described above, fulfills the requirements of the exposition of a sonata-rondo (Caplin 1998, 235). As a result, it is often difficult for the listener to distinguish the opening of a rondo from the opening of a sonata movement:

The return of the refrain after couplet 1 is a conventional signal for rondo form, although at first this return can be heard to mark the repetition of a sonata exposition. Thus it is only when the music begins to depart from the plan laid out in the exposition that the listener can confirm an interpretation of rondo form. (Caplin, 237)

Caplin's observation applies whether the subordinate-theme complex introduces a new theme in the subordinate key or if it restates part or all of the refrain theme in that key. In the latter case, the listener may have the impression of hearing a monothematic sonata exposition.<sup>39</sup>

Like Caplin, Hepokoski and Darcy also base an initial distinction between a rondo and a sonata-rondo on the presence of a sonata exposition. A sonata exposition is distinguished by the arrival of a transition between the primary and secondary ideas.<sup>40</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy identify a sonata-rondo as a Type 4 sonata and avoid the terms refrain and couplet. Each time the refrain arrives, it indicates the beginning of a new rotation that includes the couplet that follows. Their terminology, which I often find helpful, describes the exposition of a textbook sonata-rondo as follows: a refrain acting as the "*primary theme or primary idea*" in the tonic (P<sup>rf</sup>); a transition (TR) that leads to a medial caesura (MC); and a "secondary-theme zone (S) in the new key," which includes

---

<sup>39</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy also note that the omission of the repetition of the exposition distinguishes a sonata-rondo, their Type 4, from a "standard 'textbook' sonata, their Type 3 (2006, 344).

<sup>40</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy explain their requirements for a sonata-rondo on pp. 404-405. In their Table 18.1, p. 391, they provide a clear diagram of their distinctions between rondeau, rondo and sonata-rondo. Although they dismiss the possibility of a transition arriving as part of a "simple period" following the opening refrain (404), it is a style particular to the first couplet of Bach's late rondos and possibly rooted in the *Fortspinnung*-type exposition as I discuss previously.

*essential expositional closure* (EEC).<sup>41</sup> Frequently, the EEC is succeeded by a closing zone (C) and/or a retransition (RT) (18, 404). Each time the refrain returns, it begins a new *rotation*. There are typically four rotations in a Type 4 sonata: the first rotation begins the exposition, the second the development, the third, the recapitulation, and the fourth a closing statement of the P<sup>rf</sup> and optional coda (2006, 16-18). Hepokoski and Darcy allow for variations of this paradigm and offer other models as well.

### 3. Refrain and couplet: Summary

As Caplin demonstrates, the functional differentiation of themes and theme-like units determines how phrases group together. In Bach's late rondos, these formal functions are based on two main elements: the tight-knit and loose-knit properties of individual phrases within a predetermined syntax of grouping structure; and a tonal scheme that defines the opening refrain and couplet of all of the rondos. As noted by Caplin, this tonal scheme encompasses a modulation away from the home key to a related subordinate key. Since the opening refrain-couplet sections of Bach's rondos are closely related, in their interthematic functions, to the opening refrain-couplet section of Classical rondos (such as Mozart's Rondo from K. 545) and frequently of sonata expositions as well, I will rely on Caplin's and Hepokoski and Darcy's concepts of main theme and subordinate-theme complex [P<sup>rf</sup> TR ' S RT] as a basis for understanding the organization of these opening sections as a first rotation. Caplin's perspective, which allows the transition to function as the first phrase of the couplet, offers flexibility in understanding the relationships of the opening sections of Bach's rondos to rondo form. However, as the rondo sections progress, Hepokoski and Darcy's concepts of rotation become equally important.

---

<sup>41</sup> Caplin (2004, 98-99) questions Hepokoski and Darcy's concept of what constitutes a medial cadence.

#### 4.6 The grouping of refrains and interior couplets into larger sections

Eleven of Bach's thirteen late rondos have either three or four tonic refrains. Of the remainder, one has five refrains and one has two.<sup>42</sup> Following the opening refrain and first couplet, a variety of possibilities arise for the organization of the rest of the piece. Couplets may or may not close with PACs; they frequently contain multiple periods and multiple references to the refrain theme. In addition, Bach varies the number of tonic refrains and the number of phrases and periods within formal sections (refrains and couplets). For these reasons, it is necessary to define basic principles that operate regardless of the length of sections or the number of refrains. As in my analyses of Bach's opening refrain-couplet sections, Caplin's theory of intrathematic and interthematic functions offers a basis for understanding how phrases group together to form larger sections—refrains and couplets. I shall summarize his concepts since they may not be familiar to many readers.

According to Caplin, while the opening couplet often consists of a subordinate-theme complex, the second couplet may contain an *interior theme*. This theme differs from that of the first couplet “in its melodic-motivic material, tonal region, and formal plan. At times, the second couplet assumes a development-like organization” (Caplin, 231).

Caplin uses the term *development* in two ways. First, it can refer to a formal unit that “stands between an exposition and a recapitulation” in a sonata, sonata-rondo, or concerto. Second, it refers to a formal function. Caplin writes:

---

<sup>42</sup> H. 265 has five; H. 260, 261, 262, 266, 268, and 283 have four; H. 267, 271, 274, 276, and 290 have three; H. 288 has two. See Concordance for Wotquenne numbers.

As a formal function, a development generates the greatest degree of tonal and phrase-structural instability in the movement and thus motivates a restoration of stability (to be accomplished by the recapitulation). (Caplin, 139)

Caplin also acknowledges that in a five-part rondo, the second couplet may be organized like an actual development section or contain development-like characteristics (Caplin 234). In a rondo, the restoration of stability would occur with the return of the refrain following the second couplet.

Caplin's recognition of formal functions based on a development-like organization within rondo couplets is sometimes helpful in understanding the organization of phrases in Bach's couplets and, on occasion, his interior and concluding refrains as well.<sup>43</sup> For this reason, I will briefly summarize the terms that Caplin employs in his analysis of formal functions in development sections.

Caplin offers the terms *pre-core*, *core*, and *retransition* to describe the three interthematic functions that shape many Classical development sections.<sup>44</sup> Since a retransition usually consists of a standing on the dominant following an HC—in terms of the present study, a suffix—we will focus on Caplin's first two functions. A pre-core is an initiating function, although it is not required. It is usually more tight-knit than the core, often beginning with the material of the main theme either in the dominant or a new key. However, it is generally more loose-knit than the main theme and sometimes is more transition-like because of its looser, modulatory character. A pre-core may be a sentence, a period, or a hybrid, or it may be incomplete, lacking either an initiating, medial, or concluding function. In addition, there may be multiple thematic units within

---

<sup>43</sup> Caplin recognizes that not all development sections are organized in the ways he describes (155). Hepokoski and Darcy (2006, 228-229) are critical of Caplin's approach to development sections. I hope to address their concerns by using a variety of perspectives, including theirs.

<sup>44</sup> Caplin describes pre-cores and cores in great detail throughout his chapter on developments (139–59).

a pre-core, one of which is often incomplete (Caplin, 155). I have adapted Caplin's term *pre-core* in my analyses of Bach's rondos to include phrases that begin with main-theme material in the tonic, as is sometimes the case at the beginning of a couplet.

Caplin describes the core as a unit that "typically projects an emotional quality of instability, restlessness, and dramatic conflict...The core normally brings a marked increase in rhythmic activity projected by conventionalized accompaniment patterns" (Caplin, 142). The core is often characterized by model-sequence technique—with the model lasting from four to eight measures—fragmentation, and a cadential function; normally involving an HC, with which the core ends. This HC is frequently expanded by a standing on the dominant (the retransition). Often, a core is replaced by a *pseudo-core*, which uses sequential harmonies over shorter spans than a core and a more improvisatory style that evokes a fantasia or toccata. Like a core, a pseudo-core normally closes with an HC. I will use Caplin's terms when appropriate and will discuss further details of his ideas as I proceed with my analyses of Bach's rondos.

#### 1. Rondo in E Major, H. 265: An analysis

The Rondo in E Major, H. 265, reproduced in ex. 4.13, has five tonic refrains and four couplets. My analysis will indicate that it is a nine-part rondo with five refrains and four couplets that exhibit phrase-functional characteristics of a sonata-rondo with a double development. In order to establish its formal aspects, it is first important to distinguish the division of material into refrains and couplets. I begin by offering a detailed explanation of the function of each phrase.

The opening refrain and first couplet, Rotation 1, adhere to the sonata-exposition model discussed in the previous section: the refrain and a subordinate-theme complex

indicated according to Hepokoski and Darcy as P<sup>rf</sup> TR' S(EEC) RT. The final component of this complex is a suffix (RT) that destabilizes the dominant EEC. This dominant, now active (as described by Hepokoski and Darcy and indicated as V<sub>A</sub>), prepares for the arrival of Rotation 2 in m. 21.

Rotation 2 consists of the second refrain, a single presentation of the theme, which is followed by a brief modulation that enables Bach to begin couplet 2 in the ♯II region (F major) in m. 27. Bach approaches the new key by reinterpreting the bass E♯, the root of the tonic triad, as the leading tone to ♯II, in a version of the common 5–6 technique; I of E major becomes V<sup>♯</sup> of F. As illustrated in exs. 4.14a and b, the realization of the 5–6 shift involves a stepwise descent in the middle voice, 8–7–6–5–5b, starting from the last beat of m. 24. The arrival of ♯II completes a motion up a half step from the tonic, with parallel tenths in the outer voices. (See ex. 4.14b.)

Bach typically uses an applied dominant in his motion to a new key area. Example 4.14c is a reproduction of Figure 473a from the chapter “Improvisation” in Bach’s *Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard Instruments* (Bach 1753–62/[1994], 330; 1949, 434); I have added a roman-numeral analysis. In this example, Bach uses an applied  $\frac{6}{3}$  chord—which may be regarded, in Schenkerian terms, as an abbreviated 6–5b motion—to move to the dominant. To the right of Bach’s figure I show the analogous motion in H. 265, from I to ♯II. The function of the leading-tone chord V<sup>♯</sup><sub>♭</sub> remains the same in both cases. In fact, as we see in ex. 4.14b, Bach’s goal of F♯ is made easy by the ready availability of its leading tone, E.

In “Improvisation,” Bach encourages the performer to “modulate to remoter keys.” He continues: “It suffices if the leading tone (*semitonium modi*) of the various

keys lies in the bass or some other part, for this tone is the pivot and token of all natural modulation” (Bach, 330; 1949, 434). Bach, however, warns that leading tones are inadequate to attain conclusive harmonic goals. Rather, the goals of leading tones are passing:

When it is desired to reach distant keys conclusively instead of simply passing through them, it is not sufficient merely to reach for the leading tone in the belief that once it is found the goal will have been attained and that further ends may then be sought immediately. The ear, in order not to be disagreeably startled, must be prepared for the new key by means of intermediate harmonic progressions. (Bach, 333; 1949, 436)

Bach, then, would probably have considered the motion to ♯II a passing modulation.

Couplet 2 (mm. 27–37) is actually shorter than couplet 1 (mm. 9–20) if the four-measure retransition is included in the latter, but couplet 2 seems more extensive owing to its adventurous tonal and phrase-structural organization. It is organized as a small development section. The couplet begins with a pre-core, a tight-knit theme that is a transposition of the main theme in the new key, F major (♯II). As previously mentioned, pre-cores are relatively tight-knit and often invoke the main theme in a new key. The pre-core is followed by a cadence-altering suffix beginning in m. 31, which leads from the PAC in ♯II to an HC in the minor subdominant (A minor) in m. 32. The harmony of this HC is an E-major triad, which arrives this time not as a tonic but as a dominant (see ex. 4.14d). Again Bach uses the leading tone, this time a diminished seventh chord on D-sharp, to reach the E-major triad.

The subsequent phrase, beginning in m. 33, is a pseudo-core. It begins with an E-major harmony, still a dominant, which resolves to its tonic on the second beat of the measure. In marked contrast to the pre-core phrase, the pseudo-core offers model-sequence figuration. Each model is two beats in length and is more similar to

*Fortspinnung* than the lengthier models that occur in actual cores. As we see in ex. 4.14e, the model presented in m. 34 is restated in invertible counterpoint, rather than in sequence, in m. 35. The model-sequence of m. 36 is fragmented in m. 37 as the pseudo-core approaches its HC, this time a tonic-key HC in preparation for the refrain that follows. Couplet 2, then, is not tonally closed. The HC is followed by the beginning of Rotation 3 in m. 38, and another single statement of the refrain theme.

Couplet 3, mm. 42–77, by far the longest couplet in the rondo, is a multiple-region couplet.<sup>45</sup> That is, it presents three key areas:  $\text{II}^\#$  ( $\text{F}^\#$  major),  $\text{IV VI}$  (C major), and  $\text{IV III}$  (G major). The couplet subdivides into two parts, the first comprising one region and the second comprising two. Each of the two parts is subdivided into two smaller units. Both parts (labeled below as part 1 and part 2) are developmental, presenting transposed thematic material. Part 2 presents a transposition, a major third lower, of the opening refrain and the first couplet with its subordinate-theme complex, thus modulating from C major ( $\text{IV VI}$ ) to its dominant, G major ( $\text{IV III}$ ). The transposition of the subordinate-theme complex raises the question of its possible recapitulatory function. This issue will be addressed following the complete phrase analysis of this rondo.

An analysis of phrase functions in couplet 3 appears in Figure 4.2. Part 1 consists of two thematic units. Unit 1 functions as a transition, beginning in m. 42 in the tonic and concluding in m. 46 with a deceptive cadence. It is an expanded, varied, but incomplete version of the refrain theme, essentially an expansion of mm. 1–2. Because of its expansion, its concluding deceptive cadence, and the brief improvisatory suffix that follows, it is more loose-knit than the main theme.

---

<sup>45</sup> I base the concept of *multiple-region couplet* on Caplin's "double-region couplet." According to Caplin (238), double-region couplets are commonly found as the second couplet of Mozart's rondos. Mozart's two regions are typically VI and IV.

Figure 4.2 Rondo in E Major, H. 265, couplet 3: Interthematic functions

Part 1: Developmental, 42–57; two thematic units

Unit 1: Transition, 42–46; incomplete version of refrain theme in E major. Begins on I and concludes with a deceptive cadence on VI (I:DC), which is reinterpreted as V/II<sup>#</sup> (see below for explanation).

Unit 2: Theme, 47–57; two complete variations of refrain theme in II<sup>#</sup>, plus cadence-altering suffix (II<sup>#</sup> → V/♯VI).

Part 2: Developmental, 58–77; two thematic units

Unit 1: Theme, 58–65; transposition (with varied reprise) of refrain theme in ♯VI.

Unit 2: Subordinate-theme complex, 66–77; transposition of couplet 1, including transition (♯VI → V/♯III) and subordinate theme (in ♯III, ending ♯III:PAC).

Retransition follows—*not* an exact transposition from couplet 1—leading to I:HC.

Owing to the monophonic texture of the suffix, the listener can reinterpret the C#-minor harmony of m. 46 as a dominant even though a dominant is intrinsically major.

With the unaccompanied melody moving from E4 up an octave to E5 and thence to F#5 and G#5, emphasis moves from the minor third to the fifth of the triad. The fermata that follows the arrival of the fifth allows the prior harmony to fade away, while the fifth remains in our memory.<sup>46</sup>

Ex. 4.14f, a middleground graph of mm. 42–47, illustrates the tonal function of C# and reveals that Bach's modulation to F# major (II<sup>#</sup>) closely parallels his earlier modulation to F major (♯II). Here B, the fifth of the tonic harmony, ascends in an inner voice to the C# of the deceptive cadence. This 5–6 contrapuntal motion then continues to another 5 with the arrival of the F# harmony in m. 47. An analogous 5–6 shift was illustrated in the second part of ex. 4.14c. Like most 5–6 shifts, both of these prevent

---

<sup>46</sup> In the published facsimile of the first edition (Berg 1985, 2:334–37), half a line remains blank following the fermata. At the end of the line appear the words *volti subito*, in preparation for the *pianissimo* that follows on the next page (m. 47). A similar situation occurs between mm. 77 and 78.

parallel fifths between the bass and one of the upper voices. In the present case, the outer voices ascend in parallel tenths (E to F# in the bass, G# to A# in the soprano).

The second unit of part 1, mm. 47–57, is also loose-knit. It consists of two variations of the refrain theme transposed to the major supertonic, an unusual key unless used as V of V (as it is not here); the theme also undergoes alterations in meter (from  $\frac{4}{4}$  to  $\frac{12}{8}$ ) and rhythm. The second variation contrasts with the preceding one in its arpeggiated texture, which evokes the improvisatory genres of fantasia or prelude.

After the concluding PAC in II<sup>#</sup>, the second variation is followed by an unusually formed cadence-altering suffix in mm. 55–57. This suffix not only prepares for a dramatic change of key—up a tritone from F# major at the conclusion of part 1, unit 2 to C major at the beginning of part 2, unit 1—but also for changes in meter and texture. Bach modulates by moving from F# to the dominant of C, G. As illustrated in ex. 4.14g, instead of simply ascending a half step, the bass line descends a major seventh, approaching each of the last three pitches (B2, A2, and G2) with their applied dominants, the last two of which are in root position. Bach formulates the opening measure of the suffix, m. 55, by continuing the arpeggiated figuration from the F# cadence at the end of m. 54 through the stepwise descent that leads to the arrival of B in the bass in m. 56. The descent from F# to B alters the function of F# from that of a tonic to a dominant. The arrival of B2 is preceded by rests, allowing another improvisational breath before the bass descent continues in a new dynamic (*piano*), meter ( $\frac{4}{4}$ ), and diminutional pattern. Bach returns suddenly to a *forte* dynamic just as G major arrives. As G becomes a dominant seventh chord, Bach once again evokes the fantasia with the use of *fermate* and the

addition of extra beats to the  $\frac{4}{4}$  measure. The *forte* dominant is followed by a *pianissimo* tonic to begin part 2 of the couplet.

Many of the stylistic elements described above are mentioned by Bach in the paragraph he appended to his chapter on improvisation for a new edition of his *Essay* (published posthumously in 1797). In this paragraph Bach lists specific means that a composer can use to enhance expression:

To give special expression to such altogether usual modulations, one enlists the aid of such means as *fermate*, rests, the alternation of high and low register, of loud and soft, of various tempos and note values, and a diversity of voices and instruments, among other things. (Bach 1753–62/[1994], 17\*; Kramer 1985, 552)

Bach observes that many examples of these techniques occur in his compositions and offers specific examples from his Rondo in C, H. 260.

The second large section, part 2, which also includes two units, begins in m. 58. The first unit opens with the refrain theme in  $\sharp VI$ , slightly varied in its consequent phrase, followed by a varied reprise of the same music (mm. 62–65). Following the transposed double refrain, just when we might expect another cadence-altering suffix to take us to a new key or back to the tonic, Bach offers a restatement, beginning in m. 66, of the entire first couplet with its transitional phrase, subordinate theme, and retransition. (As noted earlier, all but the retransition are exact transpositions of music from couplet 1.) Bach relies on the transitional phrase, mm. 66–69, to initiate a modulation to G major,  $\sharp III$  of the home key, ending with an HC in this new key. The subordinate theme follows in mm. 70–73, concluding with a PAC in G major. In part 2 of the couplet, therefore, Bach offers a transposition of the refrain and the subordinate-theme complex. However, these transpositions do not indicate a recapitulation. Instead they remain

within the realm of a development section, which subsequently concludes with a tonic-key HC through the retransition in mm. 74–77.

Any uncertainty that may arise about the status of this transposed refrain and couplet is quickly resolved because a better candidate for the recapitulation follows immediately. Figure 4.3 summarizes the pattern of refrains and couplets and their formation into larger sections. Like refrains 2 and 3, refrain 4 (mm. 78–81) offers only a single statement of the refrain theme. However, like refrain 1, which initiated a sonata-like exposition, refrain 4 initiates the true recapitulation, which includes couplet 4 and refrain 5. Figure 4.3 offers a rotational analysis of the rondo.

Couplet 4 recapitulates segments of couplets 1 and 2, now in the tonic. The first phrase of couplet 4, mm. 82–85, recapitulates parts of couplet 1, the subordinate-theme complex. These measures are rearranged to form a four-measure transitional phrase in the tonic. The first two measures, 82–83, are based on the first two measures of the subordinate theme, 13–14. Unlike previous statements of this theme, which began with a standing on the dominant, this statement begins on a root-position tonic. The half-measure rests in previous statements are now filled with arpeggiated figuration that may be traced to several passages in preceding couplets.

The second pair of measures, 84–85, replicates exactly the final two measures of the retransition that ended couplet 1 (mm. 19–20). As a result, the first phrase of couplet 4 ends with a tonic-key HC. We might expect the subordinate theme to follow, although it would sound redundant after mm. 82–83; or we might expect to hear another refrain. Neither ensues.

Figure 4.3 Rondo in E Major, H. 265: A sonata-rondo

**Rotation 1: Exposition** (mm. 1-20)

Refrain 1	Couplet 1
P <sup>rf</sup>	TR(MC) S(EEC) RT
I	V:HC V V <sub>A</sub>

**Rotation 2: Development** (mm. 21-37)

Refrain 2	Couplet 2
P <sup>rf</sup>	development → V <sub>A</sub>

**Rotation 3: Development** (mm. 38-77)

Refrain 3	Couplet 3
P <sup>rf</sup>	development → V <sub>A</sub>

**Rotation 4** + **Rotation 5: Recapitulation** (mm. 78-94)

Refrain 4	Couplet 4	Refrain 5
P <sup>rf</sup>	TR (S + RT)' MC extended (cadenza)	P <sup>rf</sup>
I	I:HC V <sub>A</sub>	I

The couplet's second phrase, beginning in m. 86, prolongs the dominant of E major. It consists mostly of a freely transposed restatement of the pseudo-core of couplet 2 (mm. 33–37), the freedom lying largely in changes of transposition level (first a fourth lower, then a sixth lower, then a fourth lower again). Bach reworks the pseudo-core because of its new harmonic context. The conclusion of this phrase, m. 90, is cadenza-like in character. It begins with three of sequential fragmentation, corresponding to the first three beats of m. 37. The ascending sequence is halted just before it would have reached a dominant  $\frac{4}{2}$  on Bb; this chord is rearranged and enharmonically reinterpreted as an augmented sixth chord in E minor (or E major). The augmented sixth resolves to the dominant, which is embellished for an additional eleven beats. This fantasia-like phrase is followed by a fifth and final statement of the tonic refrain.

As this analysis of couplet 4 reveals, Bach's recomposition of the subordinate theme in the tonic results in a *double entendre*. Because the subordinate theme shares motivic material with the refrain theme, its transposition to the tonic refers simultaneously to both themes. However, its phrase-rhythmic design most resembles that of the transitional phrase of the subordinate-theme complex, a four-measure antecedent-like phrase. Instead of fulfilling the expectation of an immediate consequent or after-phrase, a long *Fortspinnung* passage that originated in couplet 2 arrives, prolonging the dominant in the manner of a cadenza. Eventually, the missing consequent does seem to arrive in the form of the four-measure final refrain—providing an element of proportion and balance to the closing section of the rondo.

The final three sections of the rondo—refrain 4, couplet 4, and refrain 5—seem to fulfill the functions of a recapitulation. These functions include the return in the tonic of the opening thematic material in refrain 4, the transposition to the tonic of subordinate-theme material in couplet 4, and the arrival of final tonic closure with a PAC in refrain 5. According to Caplin (1998, 161), “The recapitulation functions to resolve the principal tonal and melodic processes left incomplete in earlier sections and to provide symmetry and balance to the overall form by restating the melodic-motivic material of the exposition.” The return of refrain 4 in m. 78 is the beginning of a welcome tonal and melodic resolution following the very long and tonally distant couplet 3. By itself, however, the four measures of tonic harmony and concluding PAC of refrain 4 do not provide a strong enough or proportionally balanced resolution to the dissonance and length of couplet 3. Refrain 4, couplet 4, and refrain 5 together, however, provide this

balance by emphasizing the tonic-dominant-tonic framework of the rondo's home key and by recapitulating melodic material from earlier sections.

Hepokoski and Darcy are more specific about their expectations for a recapitulation: "A piece or movement should not qualify as a (full-scale) sonata-rondo, or Type 4 sonata, unless its first rotation [first refrain and first couplet] is structured as the exposition of a sonata (P TR' S / C), and a later rotation either recapitulates this expositional pattern (the strong norm) or recomposes the pattern in what may still be reasonably (and flexibly) considered to be recapitulatory space..."(404). Caplin and Hepokoski and Darcy allow for occasional deviations from this paradigm in sonata-rondo form. For example, Hepokoski and Darcy recognize that the arrival of the ESC (essential structural closure) at the location parallel to the arrival of the EEC (essential expositional closure) may be postponed. In the Rondo in E major, the tonic-key PAC, which would correspond to the closing PAC of the subordinate-theme complex in couplet 1 (m. 16), does not arrive in couplet 4. If it did, refrain 5 would constitute a coda or, perhaps more accurately, a closing ritornello. In fact, Essential Structural Closure—to the extent that the concept is pertinent to this very unusual piece—is deferred until the last half of the last beat of the last measure of Bach's rondo.

In summary, the Rondo in E Major, H. 265, is a nine-part rondo with five refrains and four couplets that exhibit the phrase-functional characteristics of a sonata-rondo with a double development.<sup>47</sup> The double development adds an extra refrain and couplet to the length of the rondo. The inclusion of a development section more typical of his sonata movements but in the form of a refrain and couplet adds an element of contrast

---

<sup>47</sup> This analysis is very similar to the scheme of a sonata-rondo offered by Anton Reicha (1826) and referred to by Poos (1993, 120-21) in his analysis of Bach's A-minor Rondo, H. 262.

with the very long, fantasy-like development that follows. As this analysis indicates, Bach seems to experiment with a variety of compositional and formal principles.

## 2. Rondo in F Major, H. 266: An analysis

Bach's Rondo in F Major, H. 266 (example 4.15) has four tonic refrains and three rotations. The final refrain occurs in the coda. The progression of refrains and couplets in these rotations exemplify a complex fusion of sonata and rondo forms. As I will demonstrate, each rotation expresses a unique set of elements that refer either to a rondo, a sonata, or both.

Like the Rondo in E, the opening rotation of the Rondo in F includes a refrain and couplet that constitute a sonata exposition. As I demonstrated in section 4.5, couplet 1 consists of a subordinate-theme complex (TR ' S RT) that begins in m. 17 with a transitional phrase that leads to the dominant, and a subordinate theme that begins in m. 21. The exposition of the Rondo in F differs from that of the Rondo in E because its subordinate theme complex is not based on the refrain theme. Following a four-measure continuation and a lengthy cadential phase that concludes with an expanded cadential progression (ECP), the subordinate theme closes on a weak beat with an EEC on V in m. 32. A retransition overlaps the PAC further destabilizing it by shifting the top voice upward from scale-step 1 to 5 in mm. 33–37. A short lead-in presents the dominant seventh just prior to the arrival of refrain 2 and the beginning of the second rotation in m. 38.

Rotation 2 differs from those described by Hepokoski and Darcy because it does not serve the function of a typical development leading to the expected active dominant. Instead, it concludes in the manner of a second period of a sonata movement as described

by Koch with a PAC on VI. Since Koch referred to Bach's sonata movements as models for his theory, it is no surprise that Bach's development sections frequently concluded with a PAC on VI, followed by a short lead-in that prepares for tonic harmony (Petty 1995, 277). As the following description of the second rotation illustrates, however, the refrain and couplet can also function as an interior group in a rondo.

The rotation begins with a single statement of the refrain theme with an expanded consequent phrase. Unlike the second couplet of the E-major Rondo, which begins with a transposition of the refrain theme in  $\sharp$  II, couplet 2 of the F-major Rondo, mm. 50–70, consists of an interior theme. Interior themes are common to second couplets. They usually take the form of a small ternary or small binary and arrive as a *minore* or in the subdominant or submediant (Caplin, 233). In this rondo, the interior theme is a small binary in the submediant. The couplet begins with an eight-measure phrase that concludes with an HC (m. 57). Next, and last, we hear an expanded eight-measure phrase based on the refrain theme's head motive (the expansion is illustrated by parentheses in ex. 4.15), ending with a PAC in the submediant (m. 70). Following this PAC, the short lead-in, common to his sonata development sections as mentioned above, ushers in Rotation 3.

Figure 4.4 Rondo in F Major, H. 266: A rotational analysis

**Rotation 1: Exposition** (mm. 1-37)

Refrain 1	Couplet 1
P <sup>rf</sup>	TR(MC) S(EEC) + short lead-in
I	V:HC V V <sub>A</sub>

**Rotation 2: Development** (mm.38-70)

Refrain 2	Couplet 2
P <sup>rf</sup>	interior theme (Bach-style development) + short lead-in
I	VI V <sub>A</sub>

**Rotation 3: Development + Recapitulation:** (mm. 71-205)

Refrain 3/Couplet 3 (conflated)			
P <sup>rf</sup> (71-78)	TR...[interpolation]...TR'	S / C	
I	I → V <sub>A</sub>	I	

TR: 79-165 [2-part transition with large interpolation between mm. 85-159]

Part 1: 79–130, I → IV; *Fortspinnung*-type sentence, divided into three phases

1. Opening, 79–85: expanded basic idea of antecedent
2. Transitional, 86–123: uses model-sequence, fragmentation, interpolation; overlaps closing phase
3. Closing, 123–30: transposition of refrain theme to IV (ends IV:PAC)

Part 2: 131–165, IV → V

1. Opening, 131–38: IV → V/IV; expanded antecedent transposed to IV
2. Transition-like unit, 139–65: begins as consequent transposed to IV; interpolation with model-sequence, the Eb3 of m. 88 recomposed as E♭3 in m. 159; ends I:HC (MC) in m. 165 with a transposition to the tonic of TR from Rotation 1

(Interruption)

S / C: 166–205, I

1. S: 166–78: transposition of S to tonic; ends I: PAC (ESC); one-measure suffix follows
2. C: 179–205: prolongs I; transposition of passagework from transitional phase of part 1; overlaps beginning of P<sup>rf</sup> of Rotation 4

**Rotation 4: Coda** (mm. 205–24)

Refrain 4	
P <sup>rf</sup> (205–12)	varied reprise, expanded (mm. 213–24)
I	I

Rotation 3 in the Rondo in F, like Rotation 3 in the Rondo in E, is extremely long. It begins in m.71 and concludes in m. 205 with the simultaneous arrival of Rotation 4. Figure 4.4 presents a phrase and rotational analysis of the rondo.

Rotation 3 begins with a complete statement of the refrain, P<sup>rf</sup>. A second repetition, however, is not completed before the third couplet begins. The conflation of refrain and couplet results in the reinterpretation of the second iteration of the refrain theme as the beginning of a long TR. TR consists of two large periods that subdivide the transition into two parts. Part 1, mm. 79–130, begins in the tonic and closes with a PAC in the subdominant. It also subdivides, this time into three phases: opening, transitional, and closing. Because both the opening and transitional phases lack cadential closure, it resembles a *Fortspinnung*-type sentence.<sup>48</sup>

The opening phase, mm. 79–85, is based on the refrain antecedent, but the antecedent's HC is not reached. It begins in the tonic with the first two measures of the refrain theme. At the end of the second measure, however, the arrival of D5—the goal of the top voice in that measure—is replaced by an arpeggiated interpolation. The missing D finally appears in m. 85, an octave below its expected register. Measure 86 seems to continue the refrain antecedent, but the transposition has changed (from tonic to subdominant), and we quickly find ourselves in a lengthy transitional phase, mm. 86–123. This second phase is expanded by a variety of techniques common to continuations, as I have indicated in the score of ex. 4.15. These techniques include model-sequence,

---

<sup>48</sup> I discussed Petty's concept of *Fortspinnung*-type sentences in chap. 3. According to Petty (1995, 160–67), Bach's *Fortspinnung*-type sentences have either one or two cadences. There is always a cadence at the end, and sometimes another at the end of the *Vordersatz* (presentation). Up to this point I have discussed Petty's concept of the *Fortspinnung*-type sentence in relation to Bach's sonata expositions only. Petty, however, recognizes that they are also common in Bach's developments and recapitulations. See Petty 1995, 281.

fragmentation, and interpolation (a type of internal expansion). The transitional phase closes with a contrapuntal cadence that overlaps the beginning of the closing phrase in m. 123. The closing phrase, mm. 123–30, is a transposition in the subdominant of the entire refrain theme. The conclusion of the transposed theme (PAC, m. 130) brings closure to part 1 of TR.

Part 2, mm. 131–65, subdivides into two phrases. The first phrase, mm. 131–38, is an expanded statement of the refrain antecedent, transposed to the subdominant. The expansion takes the form of an arpeggiated tonic chord of Bb major, interpolated between the second and third measures of the phrase.

The second phrase, mm. 139–65, is a *transition-like unit*.<sup>49</sup> In response to the previous antecedent, it begins with the basic idea of the consequent. It continues beyond the basic idea and reaches the IV harmony of Bb major, corresponding to the first beat of m. 7 (the third measure of the consequent). But the IV arrives a beat later than expected, delayed by a beat's rest. At this point the consequent is abandoned in favor of a fantasia-like interpolation, beginning in m. 143. The interpolation incorporates model-sequence technique and imitative counterpoint, emphasized by frequent changes of dynamics. In m. 155 Bach re-starts the descent in thirds (in registrally reinforced parallel tenths) that had sputtered to a halt in mm. 140–42. This time the rhythm is correct but the descent spirals out of control, continuing unchecked through six extra thirds, abetted by the example of mm. 86–91. The consequent's PAC is thus lost. Instead, the phrase

---

<sup>49</sup> Caplin (155) describes a *transition-like unit* as a *core substitute* that “usually begins in one key with a standard initiating function (presentation, compound basic idea), modulates to some other key (development or home), and closes with an HC or dominant arrival. Model-sequence technique of limited scope may appear somewhere in this unit (usually in connection with a continuation function), but not in a way that gives rise to a genuine core.”

concludes with a tonic-key HC in m. 165, the dominant having arrived two measures prematurely by means of a sequential progression in mm. 160–63.<sup>50</sup>

An understanding of this long refrain/couplet section can benefit from two differing perspectives. Edward Laufer's consideration of the connection between fantasy and improvisation by classical composers and the influence of these elements on the design of particular compositions offers a perspective on the twists and turns that occur here. Although Laufer is not discussing works by C.P.E. Bach, his description that "the composer seemingly loses his way, goes astray, and returns to the crossroads, so to speak, to try again," seems apt here.<sup>51</sup> Laufer continues his discussion with the suggestion that this process may be facilitated by a motto or middleground motive. Perhaps the refrain theme becomes such a motto in the Rondo in F.

Hepokoski and Darcy's rotational theory also offers an important analytic tool as the basis for understanding this rotation and, consequently, the formal aspects of this rondo. According to their understanding, the two measures between the premature dominant arrival and the HC are filled with significant music: a tonic-key transposition of mm. 19–20—the concluding measures of the transitional phrase (TR) from Rotation 1. These measures had introduced the exposition's medial caesura (MC); they play an analogous role here.

The transposition of TR from Rotation 1 is more than a clever reference to the transition. It is significant because it is followed by a tonic-key transposition of S, the subordinate theme (mm. 166–77). The tonic-key transposition of TR from Rotation 1

---

<sup>50</sup> According to Caplin (1998, 31; 2001, 200) the final harmony of a cadence may not be part of a sequential progression. Therefore the V harmony in m. 163 is not an HC but a *premature dominant arrival*. The HC arrives in m. 165, where a brief intervening sequence is broken.

<sup>51</sup> Laufer (1988, 99).

before the entrance of transposed S frequently indicates the presence of an expanded rotation that occurs in a Type 4<sup>1-exp</sup> sonata-rondo. This type of sonata-rondo has three rotations, which include an exposition in Rotation 1, an expanded recapitulation in Rotation 2, and a P<sup>ff</sup> (+ coda) in Rotation 3. (Hepokoski and Darcy, 409-411).<sup>52</sup> Rotation 2 is expanded by a large interpolation in the TR. In this formal design, the sonata-rondo lacks an actual development section.

The Rondo in F differs in some ways from the Type 4<sup>1-exp</sup>. In the Rondo in F, there are two developmental rotations. The second of these occurs in Rotation 3 and includes the motion to V<sub>A</sub>, the arrival of the interruption. It is followed by the recapitulation with the transposition of S in the tonic and the closing ESC. The final refrain, therefore, occurs in the coda. Rotation 3, however, is very similar to Rotation 2 of a Type 4<sup>1-exp</sup> sonata-rondo. As I indicate on the score of ex. 4.15, most of the shorter interpolations are actually subsumed by a very large interpolation, a developmental expansion that begins in m. 85 and continues through m. 159.<sup>53</sup> It is at the start of m. 159 that the TR resumes from where it left off at the point the interpolation began and continues its pre-determined path within the rotational ordering. As a result the sequential progression leads to the transposition of the final two measures of Rotation 1's TR and the arrival of V<sub>A</sub>. Example 4.16 illustrates the interpolation, and its relationship to the refrain theme and the transition from Rotation 1.

One ramification of the transposed return of the transition from the exposition (TR from Rotation 1) is the return of S before the return of P<sup>ff</sup>. In rondos, especially non-

---

<sup>52</sup> The concept of an expanded transition in a recapitulation is also discussed in Galand 1990, 124-132 and 151-54; 1995, 42-5; Daverio 1994, 115ff; Irving 2003, 78-9.

<sup>53</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy (410) refer to two possibilities: a developmental expansion or an individualized episode.

sonata-rondos, tonic-key HCs are normally followed by tonic refrains. Hepokoski and Darcy emphasize the rotational notion that S is a continuation of the modular pattern established by the expositional rotation (19). That is, P<sup>rf</sup> occurs at the beginning of the rotation and S always arrives after the medial cadential close of TR. In the case of the Type 4<sup>1-exp</sup> and in the Rondo in F, the long interpolation in the TR masks the rotational progression from P<sup>rf</sup> to S. With the elimination of the interpolation, the TR resumes its theoretical prototype: in the same sense it is a rhythmic expansion. As Hepokoski and Darcy claim, the arrival of transposed TR, which prepares for the return of S and not P<sup>rf</sup>, negates the assumption of a suppressed refrain alluded to in the traditional paradigm indicated by the letters ABACB' A (410).<sup>54</sup>

The importance of this very large interpolation that leads to the arrival of the dominant in m. 163 should not be overlooked, however. Not only does the interpolation dramatically pose as a cadenza-like structure, but its conclusion indicates a momentum to the climax of the rondo. This climax results from: (1) the fortissimo octaves that precede the arrival of the resumption of the TR (m. 155); (2) the sequential progression, which is dynamically charged with alternating dynamics of *forte* – *piano*; (3) the *forte* measures that follow with the transposed TR; and (4) the sudden drop in dynamic level to *piano* with the arrival of the HC in the final measure of the TR, indicating a moment of reflection before continuing the *forte* transposition of S that follows.

The conflict that results from the delay of progression of the rotation by the interpolation may be one of many that are intrinsic to this piece. Not only does Bach simultaneously offer a rondo and a sonata—and the resulting conflict between the divisions of refrain and couplet as well as exposition, development, and recapitulation—

---

<sup>54</sup> See also Daverio 1994, 115-16; Galand 1990, 174-75; 1995, 44; Irving 2003, 78-9; Grayson 1998, 82.

but he also frequently blurs the function of individual phrases and sections by numerous subdivisions and expansions. Again, the large interpolation of the TR exemplifies this technique contradicting the division of the TR into the sections I accounted for above.

### 3. Rondo in C Major, H. 260: An analysis

The Rondo in C Major, H. 260 (example 4.17), is organized by a series of four tonic refrains and three intervening couplets. It is monothematic rondo with a structure that is not divided by an interruption. Figure 4.5 provides an intrathematic and interthematic analysis of this rondo.

As I discussed earlier in this chapter (see pp. 122-23), the opening refrain and first couplet of this rondo resemble the opening sections of a Classical rondo. The couplet includes a transposition of the refrain's consequent phrase as the concluding basic phrase of the couplet. It is followed by a retransition—acting, in phrase-rhythmic terms, as a cadence-altering suffix.

In this rondo, the main body of couplet 1 is followed by a retransition that, as usual, de-tonicizes V. The retransition, mm. 25-33, expresses a fantasia-like character that first becomes apparent from its subdivision into two parts by a caesura that concludes a composed *rallentando* in m. 27. The first part is a three-measure, cadence-altering suffix, which is actually a basic unit of two measures expanded to three by the augmentation of its last two melodic pitches (the *rallentando*). The bass destabilizes the previous dominant-key PAC by moving to the chordal third, B; more important, the first measure (m. 25) tonicizes F major (IV), contradicting the previous key, G major (V), and turning the re-tonicized G of mm. 26–27 into an active dominant. (The overall progression, in terms of C major, is V–IV<sup>6</sup> [passing]–V<sup>6</sup>.)

The passage that follows the composed *rallentando*, mm. 28-33, is quite different from the three-measures that precede. It introduces new material—a loose-knit, theme-like unit of six measures, beginning with a one-measure model and its varied sequential repetition, also one measure. As in a sentence, fragmentation follows, signaling continuation function; an HC closes the entire unit.

As shown in ex. 4.18a, the retransition forms a single dominant prolongation, leading from the tonicized V in m. 24 to its lower neighbor, F (first reached in m. 29), to the HC in m. 33. (Notice that both parts destabilize the dominant by tonicizing the subdominant.) Along the way, not only is G de-tonicized but the mode changes from major to minor. Although both parts of the retransition are distinct in phrase-structural terms, the second is a fantasia-like continuation of the first (note the continued *piano* dynamic and the repetition of G4 across the phrase boundary). The only other occurrence of this new idea is, surprisingly, not in a later retransition but in the coda.

The postponed refrain 2 arrives in m. 34. Bach varies both phrases but especially the consequent, turning its contrasting idea (corresponding to mm. 7–8) into a fantasia-like cascade of arpeggios; in so doing, he deprives the refrain of its closing PAC. Both the V–I leap of the bass and the melodic resolution of leading tone to tonic are withheld. Bach then expands the tonic by unfolding its triad in the top voice over the subsequent four measures. The fermata above the rests in m. 45 adds to the fantasia-like character.

Figure 4.5 Rondo in C Major, H. 260: Intrathematic and interthematic functions

Refrain 1: (mm. 1-16)

Antecedent, mm. 1-4: I:HC

Consequent, mm. 5-8: I:PAC

Reprise, mm. 9-16

Couplet 1: (mm. 17-33)

TR, 17-20: I → V:HC

S, 21-24 (transposed consequent): V:PAC

RT 25-33: V → V<sub>A</sub>Refrain 2: (mm. 34-45)

Antecedent, mm. 34-37: I:HC

Consequent, mm. 38-45: I (no PAC)

Couplet 2: Developmental (mm. 46-90)

Pre-core, 46–53: transitional introduction; prolongs V/III (III:HC)

Pseudo-core 1, 54–67: III → III<sup>#</sup> (V<sup>7</sup>/VI)

Pseudo-core 2, 68–86: VI:PAC

Retransition, 87–90: suffix follows pseudo-core 2; VI – II – V<sup>6</sup> – IRefrain 3/Couplet 3: Conflated refrain and couplet (mm. 91-139)

Antecedent, 91–94: I → V (I:HC)

Consequent, 95–97: incomplete (no cadence); reinterpreted as pre-core

Couplet 3: Developmental, with elements of *fantasia*

Pre-core, 95–104: I → V (I:HC); begins as consequent

Suffix, 104–6: standing on the dominant, cut off abruptly (V<sup>6</sup> suppressed on downbeat of 106)Interpolation, 107–39: III<sup>#</sup> → V<sup>6</sup>

Pseudo-core 1, 107–21

Part 1: expanded and transposed antecedent, 107–112 (III<sup>#</sup>:HC)Part 2: varied reprise or failed consequent, 113–21 (III<sup>#</sup>:HC)Pseudo-core 2, 122–39: false retransition (V<sup>6</sup> as passing chord); series of sequences and fantasia-like figuration; returns to dominant with previously suppressed V<sup>6</sup> (139). Resolution displaced by rest.Refrain 4: (mm. 140-57)

Antecedent, 140–43

Consequent, 144–57: includes cadenza-like expansion (147–56)

Coda: (158-76)Retransition theme from couplet 1, 158–63: substitutes for refrain antecedent; I<sup>b</sup> → V<sub>A</sub>

Consequent, 164–76: expanded; ends with return of 40–45 (I, but no PAC!)

Refrain 2 is followed by a large second couplet, mm. 46–90. The opening phrase, mm. 46–53, is a pre-core that exemplifies what Caplin calls a *transitional introduction* (Caplin, 147). A pre-core generally begins with the tonic of the exposition’s subordinate key. Occasionally, however, a pre-core begins with the dominant of a new key, not the subordinate key; the subsequent phrase brings the tonic of this new key. Because of this dominant-tonic harmonic motion, a transitional introduction behaves like an upbeat to the phrase that follows. Although “transitional introduction” describes a phrase that arrives after the close of an exposition, I have adapted this term to describe a phrase that follows a tonic refrain. Instead of beginning, then, in the home key of C or the subordinate key of G, this pre-core begins with the triad of B major, V of the submediant, E minor—a surprising harmony to follow a C-major PAC. The unusual juxtaposition is underscored by a change from *pianissimo* to *fortissimo*. In the added paragraph to his chapter on fantasia for the revised edition of his *Essay*, Bach cites this passage (along with two others from the same rondo) to show how one can add “spices” [*Gewürze*] to a composition by “a wealth of continually new, pleasing, and striking modulations” (Kramer, 552).

The pre-core maintains a *Fortspinnung*-like figuration throughout. After a provisional resolution of the opening dominant to I<sup>6</sup> of E minor, a change of pattern brings a series of descending fifths whose goal is an HC in the same key. What follows is, in Caplin’s terms, a pseudo-core, beginning in m. 54 with a root-position E-minor triad.

The pseudo-core begins with a transposition of the opening two measures of the refrain antecedent. As we see in the score, this version is quickly abandoned when

another transposition begins on F♯. The bass, however, returns just as quickly to E. The head-motive of the refrain theme, E–F♯–E (m. 54), has been recast as E–F♯–E (bass, mm. 54–60). By m. 60, however, the E harmony appears in its major form and is now heard as V of A minor. With the addition of the seventh in m. 66, the pseudo-core closes with a dominant arrival, V<sup>7</sup>/VI (V<sup>7</sup> of A minor).

A second pseudo-core follows. It begins similarly with a transposition of mm. 1–2, this time in A minor. Again Bach stops and repeats the two measures, a half-step higher and in the major (B♭ major).<sup>55</sup> Here Bach departs from the previous pattern and quotes the entire antecedent in B♭ major. In m. 75 he begins the consequent but leaves it incomplete: abandoning B♭ major, he descends in parallel tenths to the E dominant seventh chord, V<sup>7</sup> of A minor (m. 79). This dominant is then prolonged until the couplet closes in A minor with a PAC in m. 86. A cadence-altering suffix follows with a retransition, leading this time not to the dominant of C major but to the tonic itself (without an authentic cadence).

Refrain 3 begins in m. 91. The antecedent, as expected, closes with an HC in its fourth measure. The consequent begins predictably after the HC, but remains incomplete. Following its third measure, m. 97, it is overtaken by developmental phrases of the following couplet, which seems to have arrived early. Figure 4.5 illustrates the gradual reinterpretation of the consequent phrase of the refrain as couplet 3. Like the Rondo in F, H. 266, refrain 3 and couplet 3 are conflated. The tight-knit opening of the consequent becomes extremely loose-knit as the phrase becomes a pre-core. The loose-knit character of the couplet increases at such a pace that the conclusion of the pre-core's

---

<sup>55</sup> The motion from the  $\frac{6}{4}$  chord on C to a root-position B♭-major triad, from the end of m. 69 to the beginning of m. 71, is the second example from the Rondo in C that Bach offers in the added paragraph to his *Essay*.

suffix (following the HC in m. 104) is suppressed by a rest in m. 106. By continuing the contrary motion of the outer voices at the end of the suffix, I have speculated in ex. 4.18b that the listener expects  $V^{\flat}$  in m. 106. Not only, then, is the consequent left incomplete, but the pre-core as well—this is a suffix that cancels the cadence of the preceding phrase without proposing a viable alternative.

With the suppressed dominant and the beginning of the first pseudo-core phrase, which follows suddenly on (and in)  $III^{\#}$  (E major), it becomes evident that fantasia elements have been injected into the developmental process.<sup>56</sup> As I suggest in Figure 4.5, the two pseudo-core phrases that compose the remainder of the couplet are part of a large interpolation that ultimately concludes at the end of m. 139 with the previously missing  $V^{\flat}$ . In fact, the interpolation might have ended sooner, in m. 124, where it seems that  $V^{\flat}$  might be the goal of a retransition. However, *Fortspinnung* continues beyond the arrival of this harmony. As a result, this  $V^{\flat}$  becomes part of a bass passing motion (C4–A3) in a false retransition.

The arrival of  $V^{\flat}$  in m. 139 instead of a root-position V is a fundamental aspect of the form of this work. Normally, a root-position V functions as the dominant in a tonic HC as it did in the two previous rondos I have discussed. In the Rondo in C, the absence of this V indicates there is no interruption or its resulting structural division. Instead, the  $V^{\flat}$  arrives as the lower neighbor of the root of the tonic, thus unfolding a structure based on a large neighbor motion.

Couplet 3 is followed by refrain 4 in m. 140. Again, the antecedent is heard in its normal form. The consequent, however, contains a large expansion that begins after its

---

<sup>56</sup> The motion from C major to E major in mm. 105–107 is the third and final example that Bach offers from this rondo in the added paragraph described earlier.

third measure, continuing through m. 156 with final closure in m. 157. The expansion is cadenza-like in character and creates tension by delaying the close of the final consequent for ten measures.

Refrain 4 is followed by a coda, mm. 158–76. The coda begins with a literal return of the six measures that ended couplet 1—the final part of the theme-unit called RT (mm. 28–33). This phrase ends with a tonic-key HC, the same cadence type as the refrain's antecedent. In its original appearance this phrase was used to lead to the refrain antecedent; here it seems to substitute for it.<sup>57</sup> It is followed by a varied version of the refrain consequent, with the fantasia-like ending previously heard in mm. 40–45, the end of the refrain to which retransition 2 originally led. Thus the coda does not include a PAC.

In summary, the Rondo in C, H. 260, is a seven-part rondo in which two parts, refrain 3 and couplet 3, are fused into one. This fusion de-emphasizes the sectionalization of the form and gives priority to the rondo's large-scale harmonic motion, an aspect of inner form. It does this in part by repeatedly delaying or otherwise frustrating the resolution of dominants: the tonic-key HC in m. 94, the end of the antecedent in refrain 3, which does not resolve to a PAC in the following consequent phrase; the standing on the dominant that falls flat when its concluding dominant,  $V^{\flat}$ , is withheld (m. 106); the apparent arrival of the missing  $V^{\sharp}$  (m. 124) that proves to function as a mere passing chord. Even the genuine arrival of  $V^{\flat}$  (m. 139) participates in the game of deferral and deception, as its outer-voice diminished fifth, B3–F5, fails to resolve in the prescribed way.

---

<sup>57</sup> See above, p. 116, for a discussion of substitute phrases in the first couplets of Bach's rondos.

#### 4.7 Summary

In this chapter, I have investigated the formal aspects of Bach's late independent rondos. I have approached them from differing perspectives in order to appreciate the variety of elements that Bach integrated into their construction. As my analyses have shown, Bach relies on particular traditional aspects of rondo form, like the formation and repetition of opening refrains, but subsequently uses this refrain material in non-traditional ways. For example, transpositions of part or all of a refrain to distant keys refer to the refrain, yet, as my analyses indicate, do not indicate a true refrain. Only true refrains return in the tonic key and effect the formal divisions of these works.

Bach's opening sections most often consist of a refrain theme, transition, subordinate theme, and a retransition. They resemble the opening refrains and couplets of Classical-period rondos and, frequently, simpler versions of Classical-period sonata expositions. Bach's interior couplets, particularly the third, are often expanded by *Fortspinnung*-type sentences and developmental phrase structures, often forming large interpolations. In the Rondo in F, the third rotation becomes subsumed by conflicts of developmental and recapitulatory processes that result from Bach's manipulation of various elements of its sonata-rondo form. Occasionally, as in the Rondo in C, a root-position dominant is never attained. In this case, the arrival of the  $V^6$  at the conclusion of the third couplet results from a motion to the lower neighbor of the tonic.

As Schenker emphasized in his *Beitrag zur Ornamentik*, variety was for Bach a creative touchstone. Although he frequently employed the traditional framework of tonic refrains with intervening couplets, sonata forms also informed his ideas. As a result,

Bach maintained a great diversity within these structures. Chapter 5 will delve more deeply into the inner form of Bach's rondos

## Chapter 5

Exploring the interaction of outer and inner form in C. P. E. Bach's late rondos

### 5.1 Introduction

The focus of chapter 5 is an examination of a rondo's inner form and its relationship to its outer form. Inner form concerns a work's large-scale harmonic and linear structure (Rothstein 1989, 104). This knowledge is obtained through the analysis of voice leading and harmonic motion. As deeper levels approach, surface divisions begin to recede and larger-scale harmonic and linear structures emerge. An investigation of Bach's late rondos indicates that beneath their surface organization as rondos, deeper unifying principles shape their structures.

In the three analyses of Bach's late rondos that I offer in this chapter, I shall illustrate that there is a complex interaction between these deep-level motions and the rondo's outer-form features. These analyses will reveal a variety of methods that Bach employs to unify his musical material. As I shall demonstrate, he frequently connects surface features to those of the deep middleground through motivic parallelism: opening refrain motives are expanded to form the basis of the deep middleground. Often, refrain-theme material is recast as a subordinate theme or a new theme shares the same middleground voice leading as the refrain theme.

Sometimes interactions between surface divisions in the outer form proceed synchronically with events in the inner form. At other times they conflict. As my analyses will demonstrate, because of the changing dialogue between outer- and inner-form features, the plan of each rondo is unique.

The notion of a synthesis of outer and inner form in a rondo is far from a revelation. After all, the repetitious nature of a simple rondo with refrains that return in the tonic and couplets that modulate to different, usually related, keys would indicate that theme, harmony, and voice-leading move synchronically. The value of commenting on a rondo's inner form would be questionable if the rondo's underlying long-term voice-leading motion simply reflected this simple progression of keys of these alternating sections: I-V-I-VI-I-I<sup>b</sup>-I, for example. In this situation, outer form might suffice as an analysis.

As a result of my investigation of these rondos, however, I have discovered conflicts that occur, not only between outer and inner forms but within outer form itself. These conflicts result from a variety of techniques. Some obscure divisions between sections through the suppression of conventional cadences. As I shall demonstrate in my analysis of the Rondo in E, H. 265, three sections—refrain 2, couplet 2 and refrain 3—combine to form one large section owing to the suppression of cadential closure. Other techniques create divisions that are in some sense specious. In the Rondo in G, H. 268, a false refrain arrives in the middle of a couplet, distracting the listener from the expected progression of its outer form.

Such alterations or loosening of outer-form features result in the dissociation of sections from their traditional formal functions. In addition, the sublimation of conventional surface features allows for more flexible interaction with long-range harmonic and linear motions, fundamental to the rondo's inner form.

In addition to delineating a work's voice-leading procedures and harmonic goals, the process of investigating a work's inner form offers insight into tensions that result

from varying levels of melodic and harmonic motion. In his analysis of the Rondo in G Major, H. 268, David Schulenberg acknowledges the presence of long-range processes at work, particularly “the progressive heightening of tension within the individual sections and in the design of the work as a whole” (Schulenberg 1984, 153). I propose that certain rondos, including H. 268, possess long-range harmonic and linear relationships that create tension at various levels of middleground as their inner forms unfold.

As I proposed in chapter 4, my examination of these rondos presumes that only tonic statements of the refrain theme function as true refrains. In the analyses that follow, I shall demonstrate that not only must all refrains be in the tonic key; all tonic refrains are not equal. With this perspective in mind, I shall compare analyses based on voice leading and tonal motion with analyses based on divisions of musical material as discussed in chapter 4.

## 5.2 An analysis of the Rondo in Bb Major, H. 267

### 1. Introduction

Bach’s Rondo in Bb Major, H. 267, is presented in complete score in ex. 5.1. It has three tonic refrains and four transpositions of the complete refrain theme.<sup>1</sup> In addition, on one occasion there is a transposition of the antecedent phrase only. With this analysis, I shall demonstrate through a study of the rondo’s voice-leading, harmonic structure, and thematic plan that it is a sonata-rondo.

Like the rondos discussed in detail in chapter 4, the opening refrain and first couplet together function as an exposition. Bach does not, however, offer a tonic refrain following couplet 1. Contrary to most other rondos or sonata-rondos, there is no

---

<sup>1</sup> I also discuss aspects of the Rondo in Bb in chap. 4 on pp. 113, 117-118, 124.

retransition (RT) following the EEC (the first PAC of S), but rather a cadence-altering suffix that prepares for subdominant harmony at the beginning of the development.<sup>2</sup>

The large development section begins on the subdominant with a transposed P<sup>rf</sup>, initiating a second rotation.<sup>3</sup> As a result, traditional divisions of refrain and couplet are suspended at the onset of the development. Instead of conforming to the parameters of rondo form, the melodic, harmonic, and voice-leading design of the exposition and development sections resembles that of a Type 3 sonata (Hepokoski and Darcy's designation for a textbook sonata form) more than that of a simple rondo. The possibility that this is not a sonata-form movement arises at the end of the exposition only when new music arrives instead of the repetition of the exposition (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, 388, 405).

In addition, I shall discuss the function of the numerous non-tonic repetitions of the refrain theme that occur in this rondo. Because these repetitions—complete and incomplete—are so frequent, a listener's first response upon hearing them may be to consider the resulting key scheme as the rondo's organizing principle. Figure 5.1 illustrates such an analysis.

Figure 5.1 Rondo in Bb Major, H. 267: Key-scheme analysis of refrain-theme repetitions

Mm. 1-20	I
Mm. 33-40	V
Mm. 52-59	IV
Mm. 80-87	II
Mm. 99-106	♯ IV
Mm. 119-122	III (antecedent only)
Mm. 156-163	I
Mm. 224-237+ <sup>4</sup>	I

<sup>2</sup> According to Hepokoski and Darcy, 416, this situation is unusual for a sonata-rondo. I discuss this aspect of Bach's rondos that do not have tonic refrains after the exposition in chap. 4, pp. 117-118.

<sup>3</sup> In chapters 4 and 5 I use the analytic terminology offered by Hepokoski and Darcy 2007.

<sup>4</sup> M. 237+, the cadential close of the rondo, includes an unmeasured cadenza.

As I demonstrate in the voice-leading analyses of ex. 5.2a, a deep middleground graph, Figure 5.1 does not distinguish keys that influence the rondo's middleground structure from those that appear only on the surface.<sup>5</sup> As ex. 5.2a indicates, not all of the harmonies represented in Figure 5.1 are of equal weight; that is, they do not all appear on the same voice-leading level. Nor does Figure 5.1 include the arrival of the deep-level dominant that is interrupted in m. 155 (prolonged from m. 138). This is because the arrival of the interrupted V does not coincide with a transposed statement of the refrain theme.

The conflict that arises between the numerous transpositions of the refrain theme and the large-scale harmonic and linear structure requires further consideration. Because this rondo is an interrupted form, I will consider its analysis in two parts; the first part, the exposition and development, leads to the interruption in m. 155 and the second part, the recapitulation, follows.

2. Part I (mm. 1-155): An analysis of the harmonic and linear structure of the exposition and development

Considering only the tonic statements of the refrain theme as refrains invites a different perspective from that proposed by Figure 5.1, where each refrain of the theme in each key would seem to be of equal importance. Example 5.2a illustrates, however, that the transpositions of the refrain theme ( $P^{rf}$ ) to the dominant, F, in m. 33, and to the subdominant, Eb, in m. 52 (Eb first arrives in m. 48), are not present in the bass in the deeper middleground. (The beginning of each transposition is indicated by an arrow in ex. 5.2a.) Their inner-voice status, nor their relationship to each other, does not become apparent until the arrival of II, C minor, in m. 68, when the preceding Eb becomes the

---

<sup>5</sup> Carl Schachter (1999, 142) discusses the conflict in the analysis of key succession and what he describes as the “governing linear and chordal pitch structure.”

third of the C minor triad.<sup>6</sup> The first two transpositions of the refrain theme, to V and IV respectively, are thus not events at a deep level but participants in a larger modulation to C minor whose arrival activates the descent of the Urlinie to scale-step  $\hat{4}$ . From this perspective, then, the deep-level dominant that often arrives at the end of the exposition and is usually prolonged through the development is not achieved until the end of the development section.

Bach emphasizes the modulation to C minor by offering a new theme, mm. 60-67 (indicated in Fig. 5.2 as S<sup>1</sup>), an eight-measure sentence that provides a harmonic transition from Eb to C minor. It concludes with an HC in C minor. This theme is followed by a twelve-measure phrase that consists of a four-measure model, a four-measure sequence, and a closing four-measure cadential progression that again leads to an HC in C minor in m. 79. The HC is followed by the rondo's third transposition of the refrain theme, this time to C minor. The transposition closes with a PAC in m. 87.

Following the transposition of the theme to C minor, the Eb of the Urlinie is transformed enharmonically to D# in m. 96 (see ex. 5.2a). At the same time, the Eb in the tenor moves to its upper neighbor, F. The augmented sixth that results resolves to octave Eb's and the arrival of E major, ♯IV, initially heard as the goal of an HC.

Although E major will again become V of A minor on the foreground level in m. 107, it is first prolonged by a transposition of the refrain theme in m. 99-106.<sup>7</sup> In m. 107, using a suffix similar to the one that followed the conclusion of the transposed refrain theme in the dominant in m. 41, Bach begins the destabilization of E major in the foreground by

---

<sup>6</sup> The transformation of Eb from the bass to the inner voice can be seen in the foreground and more detailed middleground graphs found in Appendix A.

<sup>7</sup> Refer to Appendix A for foreground and middleground analyses of this rondo.

introducing its seventh, leading to a series of two descending fifths, A and D. The A-minor harmony that results is quickly reinterpreted through the introduction of C# as the dominant of D minor, and an HC in the latter key ensues in m. 114. In the deeper-level middleground graph of ex. 5.2a, however, the A-major harmony is represented by a chromatic passing tone, C#.

The arrival of III, D minor, and the descent of the Urlinie to scale step  $\hat{3}$  in m. 119 initiates a transposition of the antecedent phrase of the refrain theme. D minor is the first key to arrive since C minor that is diatonically related to the tonic, Bb major. As shown in ex. 5.2a, the keys of E major (m. 97) and A minor (m. 112), like those of F major and Eb major, result from inner-voice motion. The return to a diatonic key coincides with the unfolding of the fundamental structure of the rondo. Following the arrival of D minor, the fifth of its triad moves to its upper neighbor, the sixth Bb, in m. 130. In m. 137 Bb becomes the fifth of an applied  $V_6^6$  in preparation for the arrival of the dominant and scale step  $\hat{2}$  in m. 138. The dominant arrives in m. 138 and is prolonged by a standing on the dominant until m. 155. It is then followed by an interruption of the *Ursatz*.

It is important to recognize that I do not base this last part of my analysis on modern editions of this rondo. In these editions, the tonic root, Bb, appears beneath the inner-voice motion from 5 to 6 in m. 130. In the first edition of this rondo, published by C. P. E. Bach in 1783, Bach places D in the bass, avoiding a root-position tonic (see Berg 1985, 1:146-149). The erroneous Bb in the bass that appears in modern editions would significantly alter the linear and harmonic progression before the arrival of the dominant by inserting a premature return to the tonic following the arrival of III, instead of a continuous motion from III to V.

The deep middleground voice-leading reduction of ex. 5.2a illustrates the top-voice melodic line as  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}-\hat{2}$ . If the rondo's refrain theme had been an antecedent-consequent phrase structure, this melodic line would have been its paradigm. However, the first phrase of the refrain theme only descends as far as an implied scale-step  $\hat{3}$ . Example 5.2b presents the opening four measures of the refrain theme. In both voice-leading schemes presented in these examples, Bach embellishes the descending line of the top voice with a 5-6 motion. At the same time, he integrates the double neighbor-tone motion that occurs in the lower voice of the opening of the refrain theme, D-Eb-C-D, into the middleground. As these examples indicate, Bach includes an expanded motivic repetition of mm. 1-4 in the middleground between mm. 1-119.

Example 5.2c illustrates Bach's reliance on the motion  $5 \rightarrow 6$  as the basis of the top voice of the transition that begins couplet 1. Here, it provides motion to the dominant-key HC in m. 32. Simultaneously, there is an upper neighbor motion of 5-6-5 at a deeper level of the middleground that accompanies the harmonic motion from the tonic to the dominant between mm. 20-36.

The voice-leading paradigm  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}-\hat{2}$  and the double neighbor-tone occur even when the refrain theme is not present. As I illustrate in ex. 5.2d, the  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}-\hat{2}$  paradigm is the basis of the new theme in C minor. Although the top voice in m. 60 begins on scale-step  $\hat{3}$ , G5, in Eb major, our perception of its context changes as the phrase progresses. By m. 63 the G5 is heard as scale step  $\hat{5}$  in C minor, the initiator of the  $\hat{5}-\hat{6}-\hat{4}-\hat{3}-\hat{2}$  motive into the inner voice. The double neighbor figure also appears; this time, the

itches, Eb-(F)-D-Eb, are divided between the tenor and second soprano voices and the pitches, D-Eb-C-(D), are divided between the second soprano and alto voices.<sup>8</sup>

3. Part II (mm. 156-237): An analysis of the harmonic and linear structure of the recapitulation

The recapitulation begins in m. 156, following the interruption in m. 155. It consists of refrain 2, couplet 2, and refrain 3. Refrain 2 has two repetitions of the refrain theme. The first repetition is an exact restatement of mm. 1-8. The second repetition (mm. 164-186) undergoes an improvisatory-style expansion and offers a closing scale flourish in tenths that does not include the closing PAC.

Although Bach could have concluded the piece as a rondo at the end of the second refrain, a second couplet begins in m. 187 with a transposition to the tonic minor of the new theme from the development (mm. 60-67). The theme ends with the arrival of the dominant as the goal of a tonic–key HC. Dominant harmony is then prolonged through the following phrase (mm. 195-201). The phrase is expanded by a suffix similar to the one that follows the new-theme section of the development (mm. 88-98). In the development, the suffix facilitates a modulation to a new key; in the recapitulation it prolongs dominant harmony.

As I indicate in Figure 5.2, an outer form analysis of the rondo, the couplet does not conclude in m. 223 when the final refrain begins. Instead, its ending overlaps the beginning of the closing refrain. Bach is able to suppress the division between couplet and refrain by taking advantage of the ambiguous opening of the refrain theme on a tonic  $\frac{6}{3}$ . According to ex. 5.2e, cadential closure does not occur until m. 227. This cadence is the IAC that always closes the first phrase of the refrain theme. Here, it simultaneously

---

<sup>8</sup> Parentheses indicate implied tones.

concludes couplet 2 and the first phrase of the third tonic refrain. At the same time, the IAC initiates the descent of the *Urline* to scale steps 4 and 3 in mm. 226-227.

Before concluding the theme for the last time, the dominant returns in m. 233 with the descent of scale step  $\hat{3}$  to scale step  $\hat{2}$ . It is prolonged until the final tonic at the conclusion of m. 237. Bach uses a variety of improvisatory techniques he considered appropriate to the free *fantasia*: figuration, chromaticism, and the abandonment of bar lines (Bach 1753–62/[1994], 123-24 and 325-41; Mitchell 1949, 153 and 430-442). In addition to increasing the length and drama of the recapitulation, the latter part of the dominant prolongation, beginning in m. 233, functions as an elaborated organ point. Bach commented in the final chapter of his *Essay* that in addition to an opening and closing tonic organ point, “the dominant organ point can also be introduced effectively before the close” (328; 432). The voice-leading graph of ex. 5.2f illustrates the prolongation of the dominant in the final, partially measured conclusion of the rondo in m. 237.

Figure 5.2 Rondo in Bb Major, H. 267: A sonata-rondo

**Rotation 1: Exposition** (mm. 1-51)

Refrain 1 (mm. 1-20)	Couplet 1 (mm. 21-51)	
P <sup>rf</sup>	TR(MC) S (transp. P <sup>rf</sup> with EEC)	Suffix
I	V:HC V:PAC	IV

**Rotation 2: Development** (mm. 52-155)

P <sup>rf</sup> TR/S <sup>1</sup> (MC)	S (transp. P <sup>rf</sup> )	S (transp. Antec. of P <sup>rf</sup> )	
IV	II: HC	II:PAC	III → V <sub>A</sub>
52	60-67	80-87	119 155

**Rotation 3 + Rotation 4: Recapitulation** (mm. 156-237)

Refrain 2 (mm. 156-86)	Couplet 2 (187-227)/Refrain 3 (223-237)
P <sup>rf</sup>	TR/S <sup>1</sup> (MC)' P <sup>rf</sup>
I	I:HC → I → V → I:PAC

The voice leading motion between mm. 213-225 is reminiscent of previous motions of 5-6—particularly the 5-6 motion that occurs above III before the arrival of the structural dominant at the end of the development. In the recapitulation, C, scale step  $\hat{5}$  in the dominant key, F, moves to its upper neighbor, D. As I show in the voice-leading analysis of ex. 5.2g, in this case the sixth becomes part of a passing motion, eventually moving up to the seventh. At the end of the development, the sixth is part of a neighbor motion. Bach demonstrates a final dramatic flair by reiterating the 5-6 motion as the motivic basis for the prolongation of the dominant in the closing cadenza-like passage that forms the final non-metered measure of the rondo (see ex. 5.2f).

#### 4. Summary of the Rondo in Bb Major, H. 267

The Rondo in Bb Major, H. 267, is a sonata-rondo. Because the listener is easily distracted by the numerous transpositions of the refrain theme, the formal aspects of this piece are not immediately apparent. Contrary to these emphatic rondo-like repetitions, however, are the underlying sonata-form aspects of its construction.

As my analysis indicates, the form of H. 267 is deeply influenced by the omission of the return to the tonic following the conclusion of the exposition. At the onset of the development, traditional divisions of refrain and couplet are suspended. In contrast to the development sections of Bach's keyboard sonatas that conclude with PACs in keys related to the tonic (often VI), the development of this sonata-rondo culminates with an active dominant ( $V_A$ ) that is followed by an interruption.<sup>9</sup> The omission of tonic return allows the harmonic and linear motion to progress on a variety of levels from the beginning of the exposition through the development, creating numerous short- and long-

---

<sup>9</sup> See Petty 1999 for a detailed discussion of development sections in Bach's keyboard sonatas.

term relationships that result in “the progressive heightening of tension” described by David Schulenberg.

### 5.3 An analysis of the Rondo in E Major, H. 274

#### 1. Introduction

The Rondo in E Major, H. 274, consists of three tonic refrains and two couplets. A complete score of the rondo is given in ex. 5.3.<sup>10</sup> Although the opening refrain and first couplet resemble the exposition of a sonata-rondo, the Rondo in E is a five-part rondo and not a sonata-rondo. Like the Rondo in Bb, H. 267, however, Bach does not rely on the alternation of refrains and couplets as its sole organizing principle. As I will demonstrate through voice-leading analyses, motivic repetition and phrase overlap influence both the outer and inner forms of this rondo.

#### 2. An analysis of the harmonic and linear structure in the context of refrains and couplets

The opening refrain is a compound sixteen-measure period. Two aspects of its construction become immediately apparent. First, the top voice begins with an upbeat and is not joined by the bass until the third beat of the first full measure. As a result, the bass enters with the root of the tonic triad on a weak beat. A tonic downbeat does not occur until measure 4. Second, as I point out in chapter 4, the closing phrase of the refrain does not parallel the opening tonic of the opening phrase, but begins, instead (m.9), with a continuation of the dominant chord of the previous HC.<sup>11</sup> Again, like the opening phrase, the tonic downbeat appears in the fourth and fifth measures (mm. 12-13), followed by the cadential progression II<sup>6</sup>-V-I.

---

<sup>10</sup> Refer to Appendix A for foreground and middleground analyses of this rondo.

<sup>11</sup> See chap. 4, pp. 112-113.

Like the opening refrain, the first couplet is a period that also presents two eight-measure phrases. The first phrase concludes with a dominant HC in m. 24. The second is a varied transposition in the dominant of the closing phrase of the refrain. The dominant PAC in m. 32 is followed by two suffix phrases that provide a retransition in preparation for the second refrain. The first phrase is an eight-measure suffix that reinterprets the dominant PAC as a tonic HC. The second is an eight-measure basic phrase, expanded to nine, that repeats this same goal. Taken together, the four phrases of the first couplet form a subordinate-theme complex that includes a transition, subordinate theme, and two retransitions.<sup>12</sup> As we see, then, the opening refrain and first couplet, including the retransitions, resemble the opening exposition-like sections of many of Bach's other late rondos. In this sense, the outer and inner forms in this section interact as they would in a conventional sonata exposition: the motions of  $I \rightarrow V$  in the bass and  $3 \rightarrow 2$  in the top voice occur simultaneously with the formal organization of the exposition.

Beginning with the arrival of refrain 2 in m. 50 the outer and inner forms of this rondo interact in a manner that distinguishes it from other rondos. As I shall demonstrate with the analyses that follow, the Rondo in E is organized by a deep middleground voice-leading motion that results from the conflation of an interior couplet and its surrounding refrains. The conflation emanates from the relaxation of particular traditional surface divisions of these sections—their endings and beginnings. At the same time, other aspects of their identity related to theme and harmony are maintained.

---

<sup>12</sup> Caplin (1998, 133, 137) observes the frequency of the arrival of a subordinate-theme complex following the opening refrain of a rondo or a sonata-rondo. He particularly singles out the rondos and sonata-rondos of Mozart. I discuss Caplin's description of a subordinate-theme complex and its application to C. P. E. Bach's late rondos in detail in chap. 4.

Bach uses a variety of voice-leading techniques to conceal the divisions between sections. He conflates refrain 2 with couplet 2 by suppressing the PAC at the conclusion of the refrain.<sup>13</sup> A comparison of the voice-leading analyses of refrain 1 (mm. 1-16) and refrain 2/couplet 2 (mm. 50-68) in ex. 5.4 indicates that the dominant chord expected to follow the  $\text{II}^6$  at the end of m. 67 does not arrive as it does at the end of its corresponding measure of refrain 1 (m. 15). Instead, the  $\text{II}^6$ , which preceded the dominant as a member of the closing cadential progression in the closing phrase of the refrain theme (mm. 14-15), now functions as a passing chord within a motion of descending sixths in the inner voices between mm. 64 and 76.<sup>14</sup>

Couplet 2 may be said to begin at the point that the dominant arrival is subverted. In fact, as my analyses will show, couplet 2 continues to subvert dominant arrival, even at its conclusion. As I demonstrate in ex. 5.5, the deeper middleground voice leading shows an ascending motion by half step from the tonic to  $\text{II}^\#$  in m. 82. But when this applied dominant resolves, it offers the parallel minor, B minor, in m. 83 instead.

The avoidance of the major dominant at this point instigates a long passage that expands a chromaticized voice exchange between m. 83 and m. 123. Example 5.5a is a deep middleground voice-leading reduction that illustrates the voice exchange in the context of the middleground of the entire rondo. Example 5.5b (with pitches of the bass indicated one register higher) shows how the voice leading progresses from the initial harmony of the chromaticized voice exchange, with B2 in the bass and D5 above, to its conclusion with D#2 in the bass and B4 above. As the voice-leading reductions indicate,

---

<sup>13</sup> As I discuss in chap. 4, p. 154, Bach uses this same technique in his construction of refrain 3 and couplet 3 in the Rondo in C, H. 260.

<sup>14</sup> I regard the harmony of mm. 14-15 and 66-67 as  $\text{II}^6$ , not IV, on the basis of the F#s that begin to appear at the ends of mm. 14 and 66. The parallel harmony in mm. 6-7 was clearly IV.

B2 descends a sixth by step to the D#2 in m. 123. This forty-measure span includes a large interpolation initiated by a large-scale chromatic passing tone, Bb2 (m. 89), that occurs between B2 (m. 83) and A2 (m. 119).<sup>15</sup> As a result of a 5-6 motion in the top voice (not shown here), Bb2 first appears in m. 89 as the bass of  $\frac{6}{3}$  G-minor triad.<sup>16</sup>

As I indicate in ex. 5.5b, the passage encompassing mm. 92 to 118, following the arrival of Bb2, is an interpolation. According to my interpretation, Bb2 takes precedence over the following G3, which initiates a transposition of the refrain theme in G minor between mm. 92 and 107. There are three reasons for this choice; the first two can be ascertained by referring to the score (ex. 5.3). First, there is the obvious change of register upward with the arrival of G3 following the lower Bb2. Second, Bach chooses to emphasize this  $\frac{6}{3}$  triad by having it linger with a fermata. Most importantly, it can be explained by the priority of the Bb as a prolonged passing tone within a descending bass line (see ex. 5.5b). The bass line may be momentarily diverted by the time spent in G minor, but as I have already described, following this transposed refrain, the bass descent continues to its completion. The interpolated transposition of the refrain, therefore, remains clearly in the realm of couplet 2.

Following the transposition of the theme, Bach employs a series of applied dominants—illustrated in ex. 5.5c—as a means of return from the G2 of m. 107 to the Bb2 in m. 111. This time, the prolonged Bb becomes the root of a  $\frac{5}{3}$  triad. Before continuing on to the next note of the descent, A2 in m. 119, inner voices move contrapuntally through an enharmonically respelled augmented-sixth chord (C-natural = B#). The augmented sixth resolves in m. 119 to octave C#'s, above the bass note A2.

---

<sup>15</sup> Rothstein (1989, 87-91) discusses expansion by parenthetical insertion from an historic as well as analytic perspective.

<sup>16</sup> See the complete voice-leading analysis of this rondo in Appendix A.

The resolution of the chromatic passing tone B $\flat$ 2 to A2 is emphasized by *fortissimo* octaves, which continue with the rapid, diatonic descent, G $\sharp$ 2, F $\sharp$ 2, E2, to D $\sharp$ 2. The arrival of D $\sharp$ 2 in m. 123 completes the descending sixth-progression.

Although the descending sixth has been completed, a sense of instability remains because D $\sharp$  is the bass not only of a  $\frac{6}{3}$  triad but also of a V $\frac{6}{5}$ . Following a short, improvisational passage (mm. 123-127), the final refrain enters with the promise of tonic harmony. The resolution of V $\frac{6}{5}$  is complete, however, only when the inner voice A4 resolves to G $\sharp$ 4 in m. 131. At the same time, D $\sharp$  has returned to its obligatory register (D $\sharp$ 3) and moves to its upper neighbor, E3, before resolving in m. 131. The delay of resolution causes the final phrase of couplet 2 to overlap the opening phrase of refrain 3.

Refrain 3 includes two statements of the tonic refrain. The consequent phrase of the first, however, fails to cadence with a PAC after two attempts. The first conclusion is aborted by the arrival of a deceptive cadence in m. 147, the second by an HC in m. 157 (corresponding to m. 40 in couplet 1). The dominant harmony of the HC is prolonged by a suffix phrase that concludes with the same HC in m. 166 (corresponding to m. 49). The postponement of tonic closure permits greater emphasis on the dominant before the final tonic conclusion of the rondo.

### 3. Voice-leading, harmonic structure, and thematic plan: The formation of a five-part rondo

Figure 5.3 presents an outline of the outer form of the Rondo in E that illustrates the division of musical material into refrains and couplets. The voice-leading reductions of exs. 5.5a and b show how Bach facilitates the conflation of the closing three sections and the implications of this conflation for the rondo's form. The arrival of D $\sharp$ 2 in m.

123 is fundamental to this process, and as I will show, its selection as a melodic and harmonic goal influences both the inner and outer forms of this rondo.

Figure 5.3 Rondo in E Major, H. 274: An outline of its outer form

**Refrain 1** (mm. 1-16) **Couplet 1** (mm. 17-49)

P <sup>rf</sup>	TR(MC)	S (transp.- varied P <sup>rf</sup> after-phrase with EEC)	Suffix
I	V:HC	V:PAC	V <sub>A</sub>

**Refrain 2/Couplet 2/Refrain 3:** Conflated refrain-couplet-refrain (mm. 50-183)

**Refrain 2** (mm. 50-67?)

Fore-phrase (mm. 50-60): I – I:HC

After-phrase (61-67?): V – I – II<sup>6</sup>

**Couplet 2** (mm. 65 – 131): (I) – II<sup>#</sup> - V<sub>4</sub> - ( chrom. voice exchange ) – V<sup>6</sup> - I

**Refrain 3** (mm. 127-183): V<sup>6</sup> – I

Fore-phrase (mm. 127–135): V<sup>6</sup> - I – I:HC

After-phrase (136 – 166): V – I – V – VI(DC) – I:HC (expanded and incomplete)  
(Reprise)

Fore-phrase: 166 – 174: I – I:HC

After-phrase: 175-183: V – I – II<sup>6</sup> – V – I:PAC

Example 5.5b indicates that D#2 is the goal of an unfolded V<sup>6</sup> (B2 - F#2 - D#2).

Yet, a deeper-level middleground voice-leading analysis suggests an additional context.

As the voice-leading reductions in exs. 5.5a and b illustrate, D#2 is the lower neighbor of E2 in m. 50 of refrain 2 and E2 in m. 131. Because couplet 2 and refrain 3 overlap, D#2 is held over into the beginning of refrain 3 and, therefore, resides in both sections. By composing out this large neighbor motion, Bach unites the final three sections, refrain 2, couplet 2, and refrain 3, with an expansion of the E-D#-E motive that occurs in the refrain theme in both the inner voice in m. 1 and the bass voice in mm. 1-4.

This neighbor motion is not the only basis of unity for these sections. As we see between mm. 83 and 128 in ex. 5.5b, the opening top-voice melody of the refrain theme, B-A-G#-F#-E-D#-E, is also composed-out in the bass line. The opening tone of the

melody, B, is expanded by chromatically inflecting it with a motion to B $\flat$  in m. 89 (for more detail see the foreground voice-leading analysis in Appendix A). As I illustrate in ex. 5.5b, following a long interpolation B $\flat$ 2 then moves down to A2 with the remainder of the opening motive following rapidly. Bach, therefore, unifies refrain 2, couplet 2 and refrain 3, altering the conventional parameters of their outer form, with an expanded elaboration of the opening counterpoint of the bass and top-voice motives of the refrain.

The actions that occur on the surface influence the inner form. By conflating refrain 2 with couplet 2, the voice leading is allowed to continue uninterrupted by cadential closure in the tonic at the conclusion of refrain 2. At the same time, arrival of the V $\frac{6}{5}$  as the goal prior to the tonic return of refrain 3 avoids a deep middleground interruption that might occur following the arrival of a root-position dominant at the end of couplet 2. As the result of these outer form events, D $\sharp$ , the bass of the V $\frac{6}{5}$ , emerges as an important goal of the large scale harmonic and linear structure—the inner form—of this rondo.

#### 4. Summary of the analysis of the rondo in E Major, H. 274

The outer form of the Rondo in E Major, H. 274, consists of three tonic refrains and two couplets. Its inner form consists of a large scale harmonic and linear motion that results from the expansion of a neighbor motion in the bass. The unusual construction of its refrains and couplets blur the divisions of musical material common to most rondos. As in the Rondo in B $\flat$ , H. 267, the divisions between refrain and couplet relax as the rondo progresses. This loosening of formal function relies on the cooperation between elements that order both the surface and the large-scale harmonic and voice-leading aspects of the rondo. These elements include an opening theme with a delayed bass

entrance, an interpolation that results from the expansion of a chromatic passing tone prolonged by a transposition of the refrain theme, a chromaticized voice exchange, motivic parallelism, and the reliance on a simple neighbor motion as the basis of the work's middleground voice-leading structure.

#### 5.4 An analysis of the Rondo in G Major, H. 268

##### 1. Introduction

Bach's Rondo in G Major, H. 268, is a sonata-rondo. An initial investigation of its outer form may suggest that it consists of four tonic refrains and three couplets. However, as I shall demonstrate in the following analysis, one iteration of the tonic refrain conflicts with both the outer and inner forms of the rondo. The elimination of this refrain from the legitimate succession of refrains restores the unity of the second couplet of the rondo that had been divided by the refrain's intrusion. The divisions of its outer form are indicated in Fig. 5.4 and in the score of ex. 5.6.

Like many of the rondos discussed previously, the opening refrain and first couplet combine to form a sonata exposition. The first rotation, then, consists of an opening refrain ( $P^{rf}$ ), a first couplet that has three phrases: a transition (TR), a subordinate theme (S) that is a transposition to the dominant of the refrain theme's consequent phrase, and a lengthy retransition (RT). The second rotation consists of refrain 2 and a very long couplet that serves development function. Rotation 3 is proportionately comparable to Rotation 1. It consists of an expanded closing refrain with recapitulatory function.

Figure 5.4 Rondo in G Major, H. 268: An outline of its outer form

**Rotation 1: Exposition** (mm. 1-31)

Refrain 1 (mm. 1-16)	Couplet 1 (mm. 17-31)	
P <sup>rf</sup>	TR(MC) S (transp. P <sup>rf</sup> with EEC)	RT
I	V:HC V:PAC	I:HC

**Rotation 2: Development** (mm. 32-154)

Refrain 2 (mm. 32-39)	Couplet 2 (mm. 40-154)
P <sup>rf</sup>	
I	V <sub>A</sub>

**Rotation 3: Recapitulation** (mm. 155-187)

Refrain 3 (mm. 155-187)
P <sup>rf</sup>
I:PAC

2. The development: Conflicts in outer and inner form

As indicated in Figure 5.4, the development begins with Rotation 2 and the second refrain (P<sup>rf</sup>) in m. 32. Couplet 2 begins in m. 40. I propose that although Bach refers to a series of couplets and refrains between mm. 40 and 154, a study of the middleground voice-leading obtains one unified motion toward an important harmonic goal, the arrival of the dominant in m. 144. Most important, this motion continues regardless of the entrance of what seems to be a tonic refrain in m. 56.

My use of the term “seems” is deliberate because the actual arrival of a tonic refrain is questionable. The two-measure lead-in that connects the B-minor harmony in m. 54 to the G-major harmony in m. 56 is unconvincing. Example 5.7 reproduces the lead-in and provides a voice-leading reduction of it. On the second half of the second beat of m. 54, the fifth above the bass, F#4, moves to the sixth, G4. The syncopation of this pitch, the first in a series, emphasizes its arrival. G4 then ascends through a passing

tone, G#4 to A#4. The diminished fifth outlined in m. 55, A#4 – E5, resolves to B4 and D5, respectively. Simultaneous to the arrival of B4, G3 enters in the tenor in m. 56. As I show in the voice-leading reduction of ex. 5.7, G3 participates in an expanded voice exchange that prolongs 5 → 6 above the bass, B. In this situation, it does not function as the root of a tonic chord. In addition, the entrance of G in the tenor is weakened by the design of the lead-in itself, which functions only as a lead-in to the melody of the refrain. As I described above, this takes the form of a diminished fifth, A#4 – E5. There is no voice-leading motion in the bass between the B-minor harmony of m. 54 and the sudden entrance of G3 in m. 56. My analysis, therefore, does not indicate the arrival of G as the root of tonic harmony.

The notion that this is not the arrival of a true tonic calls into question the status of the refrain iteration itself. In order to establish a context for this iteration, consideration must be given to what follows its PAC in m. 67. Measure 68 initiates the return of three of the same pitches, E-G-A#, that forms the basis of the lead-in of mm. 54-55. One can easily imagine C#5 in m. 68 as the continuation of an inverted diminished-seventh chord on A#, the leading tone to B, from the end of m. 55. Example 5.8a, a hypothetical version of the score, and ex. 5.8b, a voice-leading reduction of these measures, illustrate this relationship between m. 55 and m. 68.

Second, as shown in ex. 5.8.b, the resolution of the diminished chord to the mediant, B minor, in mm. 68-69 reproduces the same voice-leading motive that first appears in mm. 52-54, right before the lead-in begins. This motive consists of a descent of a third in parallel tenths between the top voice, beginning with F#, and the tenor, beginning with D. It concludes with a root-position mediant chord. The F# of the top

voice is decorated by a motion to its upper neighbor, G. This motive repeats a third time in mm. 72-73 (see ex. 5.8c), introduced by the same diminished chord in m. 71. This time, however, there is an implied voice exchange that suppresses the opening pitches of the motive as I indicate in m. 72. In an effort to avoid exact repetition, Bach further manipulates the motive through octave displacement.

In consideration of these issues, I believe that mm. 56-67 are an interpolation that temporarily diverts the listener from B-minor harmony. This particular iteration of the refrain theme does, indeed, demand attention. Bach sees to this by adding particular expressive elements to the theme. He lists these elements in an added paragraph to the final chapter on fantasy for the revised edition of his *Essay*. These elements include “the alternation of high and low register, of loud and soft, [and] of various tempos and note values...” (Bach 1753-62/[1994], 17\*; Kramer 1985, 552).

Bach’s increased use of expressive elements becomes obvious in a comparison of mm. 56-67 with the previous refrains of mm. 1-8, mm. 9-16, and mm. 32-39. In the iteration of mm. 56-67, he begins with extreme contrasts of dynamics, which emphasize new harmonies with *fortissimo* chords on the final weak beats of the opening two measures. These additions to the opening of the theme as well as the increased frequency of dynamic changes from every two measures to almost every measure clamor for the listener’s attention. An increase in tension is also created by rhythmically expanding the interior portions of the phrases by two measures each. Although it is not unusual for Bach to incorporate elements related to fantasy in his rondos (certain expressive elements appear in all of the refrains in this rondo), I believe the notion that this iteration is itself a

fantasy results from its unexpected entrance, emphasized by fantasy elements, and its ineffectual exit: nothing has changed—this reference to the theme is inoperative.

Because it is not an actual refrain, its arrival conflicts with the progression of refrains and couplets that define the outer form of the rondo. The addition of this pseudo-refrain increases the number of refrains and couplets, but the resulting divisions seem to contradict the melodic and harmonic motion on the surface. As a result, there is tension on the surface between what is authentic and what is not: a listener must distinguish between a meaningful event and its recollection.

The sudden arrival of these measures also presents a conflict with the inner form. As the following analyses will indicate, the motion to B minor is one point of arrival in a motion away from the tonic that characterizes this part of the harmonic and linear structure of the rondo. The sudden return of the tonic in mm. 56-67 seems to contradict the motion to B minor. Beneath the surface, however, the interpolated tonic return disappears. It is not retained in the middleground and, therefore, has no bearing on the rondo's inner form. True tonic refrains, however, are reflected in the middleground structure. In the Rondo in G, their occurrence is reflected by the simultaneous arrival of tonic harmony and the beginning of the exposition, development, and recapitulation sections. (See my voice-leading analysis of this rondo in Appendix A.)

Although mediant harmony is emphasized by its frequent arrival, it is never tonicized as a key. As I argue in my reading of ex. 5.9a, its root, B, results from motion to an inner voice. The inner-voice motion to B leads to the lower chromatic half step, Bb. Bb then shifts to the top voice through a voice exchange in mm. 81-82, participating in a chromatic descent from the *Kopfton*, B $\sharp$ . The descent concludes with G $\sharp$ , the third of

VI#, in m. 89. On its way, it moves through A in m. 86 as the bass ascends from Db to D $\sharp$ . A second voice exchange, this one chromaticized, follows, leading to an augmented-sixth chord, which resolves to an E-major triad. Example 5.9b illustrates the deep-level voice leading of descending tenths between mm. 1 and 89. The Bb and A in the top voice are passing tones that fill in the motion between B and G#. The F $\sharp$  that arrives in the bass of the augmented sixth chord in m. 88 is a passing tone between G and E.

The descending stepwise motion in the bass from the tonic G to E brings us to within a whole step of our goal, the dominant. However, instead of continuing the descent to D, the descent abruptly ends with a reverse of direction and the movement up a half step to F major—a key that is not diatonically related to E major, the tonic, or the dominant. It is, however, the bass of the augmented sixth chord that just led to the E-major triad. This time (see m. 93 in ex. 5.10a), F $\sharp$  arrives as the root of triad that functions as the VI in a deceptive cadence. The cadence is initiated by the addition of a seventh to the preceding E-major triad, now treated as a dominant. Instead of returning to the dominant for cadential closure in A minor, F-major harmony is prolonged by a complete transposition of the refrain theme.

E-major harmony returns in m. 115 following the F-major transposition. His process, however, is improvisatory and includes arpeggiation of a diminished seventh and an augmented sixth chord, chromaticism, a slowing of harmonic rhythm, two fermatas, and, finally, an *ellipsis*. The ellipsis, indicated in ex. 5.10a, occurs between m. 114 and m. 115. Theoretically, it is the omission of dominant preparation for the return of E-major harmony in m. 115. The augmented sixth of m. 114 is left unresolved while the listener is offered a fermata over a rest—i.e., silence. The resolution of the diminished-

seventh and augmented-sixth chords to B major, the dominant of E major, is left to our imagination.

This is actually the second time that disappointment results from an unresolved A# diminished-seventh chord. The first time occurred at the conclusion of the lead-in of mm. 54-55, when only the two upper voices resolved before the sudden arrival of the interpolated theme reiteration of m. 56. As I previously proposed, the diminished chord continues in m. 68 following the interpolation, resolving back to B minor in m. 69. Following m. 114, rather than resolving to B major, the listener is again surprised by an early arrival—this time a transposition of the refrain theme in E major without its expected preparation. I have included the missing dominant in parentheses in ex. 5.10a. Bach offers an example of ellipsis in his chapter on improvisation in his *Essay* (Bach 1753–62/[1994], 440; Mitchell 1949, 442).

There is a more profound relationship between the events of m. 56 and m. 115 than the element of surprise. Measure 115 is also the beginning of a section that refers to the musical material that begins in m. 56. Both m. 115 and m. 56 initiate passages that refer to the refrain theme: m. 56 the pseudo-refrain and m. 115 a transposed variation. Following the cadence of the variation in m. 122, Bach transposes mm. 68-91—the section that follows the pseudo-refrain—with one important alteration that I will explain shortly. The transposition concludes in m. 146, following the arrival of the dominant. Because it is a transposition, the dominant is preceded by an augmented-sixth with the same voice-leading approach to E major in m. 88. The route from E major to D, the dominant, is illustrated in ex. 5.10c.

With the exception of some minor variation, the only important alteration of musical material in this transposition occurs in the first measure of the *Fortspinnung* section, m. 138. As I show in Figure 5.5 and in the score of ex. 5.6, the ascent is one half-step higher in this measure than in the comparable measure, m. 83, so that succeeding measures lie a whole step (rather than a minor third) below corresponding measures in the earlier passage. The reason for this becomes apparent in ex. 5.9c, a deep-middleground voice-leading reduction that illustrates the path from the tonic at the beginning of the rondo to the arrival of the dominant in m. 144. As this reduction indicates, the descending line to the dominant must travel a distance of a minor third between mm. 1-89 and only a major second from this point to m. 144. Bach accounts for this half-step difference by altering the *Fortspinnung* passage in the transposed version by a half step. Ex. 5.9d offers a voice-leading analysis of the original version and ex. 5.9e, the transposed version. If a transposition had occurred here, a C#-major triad would have been reached instead of the D-major dominant triad, as I illustrate in ex. 5.9f.

Figure 5.5 Comparison of mm. 68-91 and mm. 123-146

Original version: mm. 68-91

Transposed version: mm. 123-146

Measure 83: D-D#-(Eb)-E  
Ascends M2

Measure 138: B-C- C#-D  
Ascends m3

The harmonic and voice-leading goal is achieved in m. 144 with the arrival of D in the bass and the simultaneous descent from scale step  $\hat{3}$  to scale step  $\hat{2}$  in the top voice. The arrival of the dominant is followed by a ten-measure suffix that prolongs the dominant seventh with motives from the retransition of the subordinate-theme complex

of couplet 2 and the suffix that followed the initial arrival of E major (locally V of A minor) in m. 89. In addition, a sequence that recalls harmonies heard earlier in this section is interjected: G minor, E<sup>7</sup> (which this time resolves to A), and finally, B minor. After the arrival of B minor in m. 152, the dominant seventh quickly returns in m. 154. The suffix is followed by an interruption of the background structure prior to the return of the tonic refrain in m. 155.

A study of the transposition reveals how tension is created by postponing, altering, and interpolating. As I show in ex. 5.10a, the E-major that arrives following the augmented sixth in m. 89 is a dominant. It does not resolve, however. Shortly after its arrival it moves to its upper neighbor, F<sup>♯</sup>, in m. 93, where it pauses for a transposition of the refrain theme in F major. It returns to an unstable E that is part of an A<sup>♯</sup> diminished chord in m. 111 that leads to the ellipsis I discuss above. E major returns in m. 115 and again pauses for a transposition of the theme, concluding in m. 122.

As I show in ex. 5.10b, the transposed section begins in m. 123. Between mm. 123-132, E major is again destabilized, returning to its dominant status. However, it still does not resolve to a tonic. Upon the entry of its seventh in m. 133, the sense that no harmonic or melodic motion has occurred since m. 91 becomes apparent. For this reason, I consider the material following the E<sup>7</sup> in m. 92 up to the return of E<sup>7</sup> in m. 133 to be an interpolation and have indicated this in exs. 5.10a and b.

As the voice-leading analysis in ex. 5.10c indicates, harmonic and melodic motion increases when the seventh of E major passes through a motion to B<sup>b</sup> in m. 136, while the E in the bass ascends by step through an inner voice to G<sup>♯</sup>. The remainder of ex.5.10c, reveals how the harmonic and linear motion proceeds to the structural

dominant, D, and the descent to scale-step  $\hat{2}$ , A. Example 5.9c offers a deep-middleground analysis of mm. 1-144.

As my analyses have demonstrated, the section of this rondo delineated by mm. 40-154 functions as a development in a sonata-rondo form. Reference to it as a couplet, however, may seem inappropriate because of its great length. Although this is a valid concern, much of the couplet's length results from interpolations and expansions that prolong and delay arrival of the dominant goal. In addition, the frequent use of improvisational devices produce wrong turns described by Laufer (99) "in which the composer loses his way, goes astray, and returns to the crossroads, so to speak, to try again." An expectation of non-conformance to traditional parameters of rondo form may be inferred as a consequence of this sensibility.

### 3. Recapitulation

The tonic refrain of mm. 155-162 initiates the recapitulation. Because the subordinate theme in this sonata-rondo is a variation of the consequent phrase of the refrain theme, distinguishing the subordinate theme in the tonic from the refrain theme could be problematic. A second repetition of the refrain theme would normally complete the closing section of a simple rondo, but would provide insufficient closure to a sonata-rondo.

This circumstance is avoided at the last moment, right before the conclusion of the consequent phrase of the second statement of the refrain in m. 170. Instead of presenting the dominant of the expected PAC with its descent of the top voice to scale-steps  $\hat{2}$  and  $\hat{1}$  in m. 170, the counterpoint suddenly changes direction. Adapting the same technique of coupling as he used in the TR zone of the exposition, an inner voice moves

up an octave to the soprano and ascends a third. As I illustrate in ex. 5.11, the pitches of this third are the same in both phrases, but the harmony is different. In the exposition the TR leads, as expected, to an HC in the dominant. Here the TR music leads to an HC in the tonic, as is normal in sonata-form recapitulations.

Dominant harmony of the tonic-key HC is prolonged through phrases stylistically similar to those of a concerto cadenza. The first begins as an overlap to the one that closed in m. 172. It closes with another tonic-key HC in m. 180, despite the apparent dominant-key HC one measure earlier. (One might regard m. 180 as a cadence-altering suffix.) The last phrase of this group concludes in m. 183. This technique of prolonging the final dominant is common to the recapitulation of the subordinate theme in the classical-period sonata and concerto.<sup>17</sup>

The rondo finally concludes with a dramatic statement of the long-awaited consequent phrase. After all the tension created by the unfulfilled HC, the consequent phrase begins *piano*. In contrast, he adopts the top-voice motive as the bass and broadens the register and volume with *fortissimo* octaves in both hands in the final two measures.

#### 4. Modal mixture as a unifying element in the deep middleground structure

Bach uses modal mixture to serve a variety of functions throughout this rondo. In addition to its use as an expressive tool, modal mixture presents conflict between harmonies, stimulates voice-leading patterns and their melodic repetitions, and is often the substance of harmonic prolongation. After identifying how it influences particular surface features in the rondo, I will discuss the influence of these features on deeper levels.

---

<sup>17</sup> As noted by Caplin (1998, p. 167), “But it is also typical for the cadential area of the subordinate theme to undergo greater expansion than it received in the exposition. As a result, the most powerful cadential emphasis in the form is accorded the confirmation of the home key instead of the subordinate key.”

Modal mixture becomes strikingly apparent in the retransition of the exposition (mm. 25-31). In this phrase the flat sixth, B $\flat$ , of the dominant key, is emphasized, simultaneously invoking the parallel minor of the tonic. The conflict between B $\natural$  and B $\flat$  continues through refrain 2 when B $\flat$ , emphasized by a turn, appears as a passing tone in m. 37.

Because the development makes great use of modal mixture, I will offer a quick summary of its use in this section. In m. 50 Bach introduces the enharmonic equivalent to B $\flat$ , A $\sharp$ , as a lower neighbor tone to B. As I demonstrated in my earlier discussion of the lead-in of mm. 54-55, A $\sharp$  then becomes the root of a diminished-seventh chord and the leading tone of B minor. With the harmonic motion to B $\flat$  minor in m. 81 (see ex. 5.9a), the root, B $\flat$ , shifts to the top voice through a voice exchange. In this register, it functions as a chromatic passing tone from B $\natural$  to A in m. 86 with the arrival of a passing augmented-sixth chord. The A then resolves to G $\sharp$  with the arrival of E major in mm. 88-89 (see exs. 5.9a and b). B $\flat$  returns immediately, however, with the arrival of F major in m. 93. With the approaching tonicization of E major in m. 115, A $\sharp$  resurfaces in mm. 110-114. After E major once again becomes a dominant in m. 132, B $\flat$  reappears in m. 136 as the third of a tonic-minor chord. In the second part of ex. 5.10c, a deep middleground voice-leading graph of mm. 89-144, B $\flat$  is shown as a chromatic passing tone in the top voice that facilitates the descent from the *Kopft*on, B $\natural$ , to scale-step  $\hat{2}$ , A, in m.144. This process requires two voice exchanges and an octave transfer, both of which are illustrated in the first part of ex. 5.10c. The augmented-sixth chord that results from these voice-leading operations resolves to the dominant in m. 144.

Example 5.12 illustrates how the introduction of modal mixture at the conclusion of the exposition reflects the deep middleground of the exposition and development sections. As mentioned above, the retransition, shown in ex. 5.12a, introduces Bb. Examples 5.12b and c illustrate two middleground levels of these measures. Example 5.12b indicates the frequent occurrence of Bb, first heard in m. 25 in a reference to the tonic minor. In m. 28, Bb arrives above the leading tone, C#, forming a diminished seventh that resolves to the dominant, D. Example 5.12c shows this motion and a similar harmonic motion that occurs two measures later when D returns; this time, bass D is approached from its upper neighbor, Eb, while the leading tone, C#, reappears in an inner voice, resolving to alto D. At the same time, Bb arrives in the upper voice and resolves to the fifth of the triad. Although this harmonic-melodic motion occurs in a seemingly unimportant phrase—a suffix, its significance cannot be dismissed. As I illustrate in exs. 5.12d (a repetition of ex. 5.9c for ease of viewing) and e, both of these approaches to the dominant are repeated in m. 143 in the deep middleground of the rondo prior to the arrival of the structural dominant at the end of the development.

The recapitulation is diatonic in character and contains only one example of modal mixture. This occurs in m. 179, the dramatic highpoint of the section. Here, Bach inserts a Bb as a passing tone to A and the arrival of the dominant HC—the goal of the outer voices as they move in contrary motion to a *forte* climax with a fermata before they reach the dominant.

##### 5. Summary of the analysis of the Rondo in G Major, H. 268

As I stated in the opening paragraph of this study, David Schulenberg refers to the existence of long-range processes that result in an increase of tension as this rondo

progresses. Through an examination of the rondo's inner form, I have demonstrated that mm. 56-67 are an interpolation that occurs on the surface creating conflict in the unfolding of the rondo's outer and inner forms. The premature arrival of the tonic refrain postpones the closure of the second couplet, seemingly dividing it into two separate couplets. As a result, the outer form appears to have an extra refrain and couplet. At the same time, the interpolation conflicts with the long-range harmonic and melodic processes that occur in its inner form. The premature arrival of tonic harmony intrudes on the motion to the dominant within a large couplet that leads to an interruption before the final refrain section. As a result, these conflicts create an increase of tension both on the surface and in the deeper musical process. This process, fundamental to sonata form, is the unfolding in the deepest middleground of the division of the structure.

A final consideration of this rondo must revisit Schenker's reference to it in *A Contribution to the Study of Ornamentation* discussed in chapter 1. In this *Study* Schenker describes the "lowering of tonality from G major... to F major... to E major" as an improvisatory act (1976, 27)—an opinion he retained through *Free Composition*.<sup>18</sup> Schenker's description is correct; the descent from G does include motions to F to E, but these pitches are not actual keys, they are passing tones that fill in the descent from tonic to dominant. As my analyses indicate, arrival on F♯ is actually the arrival of the bass of a passing augmented-sixth that resolves to E. The E continues a descent to E♭, the bass of another passing augmented sixth, to the dominant, D. The detours made on the pitches F and E do not indicate the arrival of keys, but, along with the arrival of E♭, indicate the

---

<sup>18</sup>See my chapter 1, 26-30.

unfolding of a passing motion. In his discussion in *Free Composition* of the occasional transposed refrain in works by later composers he declares:

Only within a larger passing motion did they occasionally allow an A section to appear in a different (illusory) key. This liberty creates the effect of a developmental section, but such a passage, strictly speaking, belongs to a particular contrasting section, to a C or D (1979, 142).

I believe, as my examples indicate, that the same can be said for the Rondo in G, H. 268.

### 5.5 Chapter Summary

As these three analyses indicate, Bach employs a variety of techniques in his late rondos to create relationships that both unify musical material and promote tension between the surface and the deep middleground. Often musical material is unified by recasting refrain-theme material as subordinate themes or by composing new themes that frequently share the same middleground voice leading as the refrain theme. As illustrated in the examples in this chapter, frequently, motives are presented in the foreground in expanded forms as the basis of voice-leading events on varying levels of the middleground. Such repetitions between levels serve both to unify surface events and to shape long-term musical relationships that occur beneath the surface

Frequently, there is a loosening of the formal functions of rondo sections. This process is reflected in the conflation of refrains and couplets, obscuring surface divisions in the outer form that may become monotonous in an ordinary rondo. This occurs in the Rondo in E Major, H. 274. In the Rondo in G, H. 268, instead of conflating sections, two couplets are created falsely from one by adding a pseudo-refrain that functions as a parenthetical interpolation on the surface as well as in the middleground. These events offer information about the surface, i.e., this is a refrain (outer form) and at the same time project different information about processes beneath the surface i.e., this is not a refrain

(inner form). This contradictory information results in deep conflicts between a rondo's outer and inner forms.

Because Bach creates a dialogue between outer- and inner-form features, the plan of each rondo is unique. Their uniqueness does not result solely from the treatment or number of refrains and couplets or from the progression of keys that hover on the surface, but from the connections formed between elements of the voice leading of a refrain theme and the unfolding of the deep-middleground structure. As these examples demonstrate, Bach elaborates voice-leading paradigms to create musical surfaces that are often surprising. More profound, however, are elaborations that shape the deep middleground, and, ultimately, the interaction of inner and outer forms.

## Chapter 6

New perspectives on the late rondos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: A summary

### 6.0 Introduction

In the preceding chapters, I have argued that previous studies of Bach's late rondos have been deficient in numerous areas. Many inadequacies have resulted from a lack of recognition of differing aesthetic perspectives in the late eighteenth century, a confusion of terminology in both the eighteenth and twentieth centuries, and the application, almost exclusively, of a theme-based approach in their analysis. I will summarize below the issues most important to a new perspective of these works.

### 6.1 The late rondos: An evaluation of their historical context in the eighteenth and twentieth centuries

It is important to recognize a connection between historical and formal contexts that emerge in a study of Bach's late keyboard rondos. This connection results from two circumstances. First, certain writers of the late eighteenth century, perhaps unaware of the fluent approach to the rondeau of the French *clavecinistes*, misunderstood the formal organization of Bach's rondos, thereby isolating these works from a tradition that was more flexible than they recognized. The most tenacious assumption—that repetitions of the refrain theme in keys other than the tonic were actual refrains—resulted in the analysis of the divisions of musical material by theme, discounting phrase rhythm, harmony, and voice leading as co-determinants of formal structure.

The second reason their historical and formal contexts cannot be separated lies in the confusion of terminology involving cadential punctuation that occurs simultaneously with this theme-based approach. As I noted in chapter 1, Kollmann, perhaps influenced

by his interest in poetic versification, adopted concepts of period structure from Kirnberger's early writings, which did not require a PAC to close a period. Kollmann's notion that transpositions of the refrain theme were true refrains was not based on any systematic consideration of cadential punctuation. As a result, the type of period discussed by Forkel and later Kirnberger, which formed the basis of Koch's compositional theory, was not a factor in Kollmann's approach. His approach, ultimately, was exemplified by his choice of terminology: "proper" rondos were those with refrains only in the tonic key; "improper" rondos were those with refrains in other keys.

The idea that Bach's rondos were considered unusual at the time of their publication may be assumed from the contemporary discussion they generated. Not only did they seem to contradict traditional rondeau form by offering repetitions of the refrain theme in keys other than the tonic, but they contained unusual harmonic progressions, sudden shifts to chromatic keys, long passages of figuration, sudden changes in dynamics, alterations of meter, and other fantasy-like elements. Often, in response to these seemingly abrupt characteristics, writers used their analyses to demonstrate the organizational unity of a particular rondo. Forkel relies on the unity of the logical progression of musical ideas; Kollmann claims unity in the logical progression of modulations.

The historical relevance of Kollmann's determination that Bach's rondos were either proper or improper resonated throughout the twentieth century, transmitting a theme-based concept of these works. Again, this perspective was enhanced by inconsistencies in terminology. As I demonstrated in chapters 1 and 3, the terms period

and ritornello, for example, were used liberally and rarely defined. Distinctions in phrase function between tonic statements of the theme, transposed statements of the theme, and phrases that contained partial statements or thematic incipits were not considered. As a result, the distinctions made in many analyses between refrain and couplet were vague or inconsistent.

## 6.2 The late rondos: Genre and form

As a result of an in-depth study of the late rondos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, I argue that certain aspects of them are related to the traditional rondeau of the French *clavecinistes*. However, most importantly, they reflect Bach's unique interpretation of the parameters of this genre. Two important compositional elements that are often cited by writers as particular to Bach's rondos—the use of transpositions of the refrain theme as refrains and the lack of complete closure at the ends of couplets—are elements that appear in the rondeaux of François Couperin and Jean-Philippe Rameau. The rondeaux of the French *clavecinistes* presented Bach with many suggestive models for his rondos.

Bach's approach to rondo form developed over time. He uses techniques similar to those of Couperin in the finales of some sonatas from the 1740s and in his French-style character pieces (rondeaux in two-reprise form) of the 1750s. In these works, Bach writes out refrains and frequently includes transpositions of the consequent of the refrain theme—or makes reference to it—in the couplet. He frequently approaches the cadence at the conclusion of the couplet's first phrase in a manner similar to the approach to the cadence of the refrain antecedent. In addition, he often leaves couplets harmonically open and increases the length of couplets as the rondeau progresses.

In Bach's late rondos, the opening refrain and first couplet, and often the second refrain as well, share similarities with his early rondeaux. As in the earlier pieces, the first couplet consists of two phrases: in a major key the second phrase cadences in the dominant; in a minor key, in the mediant. The same pattern of cadences is found as in the refrain: an inconclusive first cadence is followed by a PAC. Often the second phrase is a transposed version of the refrain consequent. According to my analysis, this phrase is the closing phrase of a two-phrase period, the entirety of which functions as a couplet.

By giving the first phrase of the couplet modulatory function in the late rondos, however, Bach treats this phrase differently from corresponding phrases of his early rondeaux. In addition, first couplets in his late rondos are most often followed by retransitions. As I indicate in my analyses in chapter 4, Bach's opening sections most often consist of a refrain theme (most often with a written-out repetition, sometimes varied), transition, subordinate theme (often a partial transposition of or a reference to the refrain theme), and a retransition. As a result of this set of relationships, the opening sections of his late rondos are similar in construction to the expositions of Classical rondos and sonatas.

Most important to an understanding of the form of these works, however, is the recognition of changing functions of thematic material. As a basis for this concept, I referred to Petty's analysis of Bach's sonata movements. Here, Petty demonstrates that Bach used transposed versions of opening themes as medial or closing material in large *Fortspinnung*-type sentences. I argue the same alteration in function of transpositions of refrain theme material in the late rondos. This consideration provides a basis for

understanding that true refrains return only in the tonic and transpositions of the refrain theme serve another function within the divisions of couplet material.

As my analyses indicate, the organization of refrains and couplets following the exposition is unique to each rondo. In most, but not all, of the late rondos, the first couplet is succeeded by a return to the tonic with the entrance of the second refrain. There are usually one or two interior couplets. Couplet length increases as the rondo progresses (this is a feature shared with the early rondeaux). Couplets often consist of numerous periods; some contain complete transpositions of the refrain theme, others incomplete transpositions. Couplets are frequently characterized by expanded *Fortspinnung*-type sentences and developmental phrase structures. Some couplets contain large interpolations and/or rhythmic expansions, which may be facilitated by chromaticized voice exchanges.

The length and complexity of these structures occasionally inhibit the perception of refrains and couplets by seemingly abandoning such divisions for long stretches. A good example is the third couplet of the Rondo in F, H. 266, analyzed in chapter 4 as a two-part development section. A complex transition-like unit follows the opening  $P^{rf}$  of the development's second part (see figure 4.4), but this unit also encompasses a long interpolation. Although sectional divisions are blurred by the length and complexity of this couplet, Bach emphasizes the conclusion of the section with the entrance of a tonic-key version of the exposition's TR. This version of TR closes with a I:HC. This HC, the goal of the development section, is followed by an interruption and division of the

background structure. This part of the form (along with the beginning of the recapitulation) recalls Hepokoski and Darcy's "Type 2" sonata form.<sup>1</sup>

Bach developed a variety of formal designs by modifying surface divisions, thus enabling the creation of long-range harmonic and linear relationships. One technique conflates interior refrains and couplets. As I demonstrate in chapters 4 and 5, Bach takes this approach to blurring divisions in the Rondos in C, H. 260, and E, H. 274. In the Rondo in Bb, H. 267, Bach alters the opening refrain-couplet paradigm by substituting a cadence-altering suffix for a retransition following the EEC at the conclusion of the secondary theme. Because the suffix prepares subdominant harmony, there is no return of the tonic refrain. As a result, harmonic and linear motion continues unimpeded by the distinction of couplet and refrain usually found here in rondo and sonata-rondo forms. In this rondo, Bach seems to suspend the progression of refrains and couplets at the beginning of the development, opting for an organization that resembles a sonata movement more than a rondo.

### 6.3 Tension on the surface and within

Each of Bach's rondos offers a different organization of refrains and couplets, resulting in multiple interpretations of rondo and sonata-rondo formal designs. By conflating these sections and/or integrating their functions with those of sonata form, Bach occasionally presents conflicts in their realization. These conflicts create tension on the surface and at deeper levels.

One example of a surface alteration to rondo form that affects both inner and outer form occurs in the Rondo in F just discussed. In rondo form and often in sonata

---

<sup>1</sup> Hepokoski and Darcy, *Elements of Sonata Theory*, 353-54. In chapter 4, I discuss the resemblance of other aspects of its form to their Type 4<sup>1-exp</sup> sonata-rondo.

form, the primary theme returns in the tonic following a couplet or development section. Following the I:HC that concludes the third couplet (development section) of the Rondo in F, however, the recapitulation begins with a tonic transposition of S instead of the tonic refrain—the latter does not arrive until the coda. Although this procedure has frequently been noted in the sonata-rondos of Mozart, the Rondo in F is the only one of Bach's late rondos to adhere to this plan.

The Rondo in G, H. 268, also presents conflicts both on the surface and in its deeper structure. In its second couplet, Bach includes a false entrance of the refrain that, in effect, divides the couplet into two couplets. As I demonstrated in chapter 5, the arrival of this refrain is unprepared and its departure is followed by a continuation of the same diminished harmony that preceded it. Not only does this pseudo-refrain conflict with the outer-form progression of formal sections, but the unprepared arrival of tonic harmony conflicts with the middleground harmonic and linear motion expressed by the rondo's inner form.

Very often the couplet that arrives before the final refrain section concludes with a drive to a tonic-key half cadence (I:HC). This occurrence often signals an interruption of the background structure and the imminent arrival of recapitulatory material. As my examples in the previous chapters demonstrate, each rondo that follows this paradigm takes a different path in both outer and inner form to the goals that lead to and follow this division.

Not all of Bach's late rondos, however, are sonata-rondos and not all reach a I:HC at this juncture. The Rondos in C, H.260, and E, H. 274, do not attain a root-position dominant prior to their final refrain sections. Although both rondos unfold a series of

refrains and couplets, their inner forms are not sectional. In both of these rondos, the basis of the deep middleground is a neighboring motion in the bass.

Bach uses many other techniques to create tension both on and beneath the surface. Many of the stylistic elements described by writers since the eighteenth century that I listed above are evidence of these procedures. These include many of the elements of fantasy: figuration, interpolation, cadenza, fermata, rests, changes in tempo (including the frequent use of *rallentando*) and meter (including the suspension of it), and harmonic detours to distant and unexpected keys. In addition, there are other compositional techniques that Bach uses to create tension on a variety of levels: long-range voice exchanges that facilitate long rhythmic expansions, as well as other internal and external phrase expansions; sentence structures that have thematic, harmonic, and phrase-rhythmic requirements for completion; formal sections that share similar requirements on a larger scale; and predetermined goals that are directed by deep-middleground harmonic and voice-leading motions. Frequently, these deep-middleground motions are motivic repetitions of refrain theme material.

As an example of delay influenced by elements of fantasy, I offer the third refrain/couplet (mm. 91–140) of the Rondo in C. As I discussed in detail in chapter 4, Bach includes a cadenza, a large interpolation, the sudden arrival of a distant key with a partial transposition of the refrain theme, rests, fermatas, contrasts in tempo, dynamics, register, and phrasing, and extensive figuration that ultimately builds up to the arrival of  $V^{\frac{6}{5}}$ . This  $V^{\frac{6}{5}}$  is the climax at the end of the section, but its resolution is delayed by a rhetorical pause (another rest). Here again, Bach concludes an outer-form section with a

harmony that, from the perspective of inner form, cannot be regarded as a goal but merely as a medial element: a neighboring chord.

#### 6.4 Conclusion

As my study argues, Bach adapted many compositional techniques and formal plans to his late rondos. Although the opening sections of his rondos are partly influenced by those of the French *clavecinistes*, the flexibility of his approach resulted in the creation of a variety of interpretations of this form. In this sense, each of his late rondos reflects a different formal concept. Often, deep-middleground harmonic and voice-leading motions are fundamental to this plan. Since rondos were generally perceived as sectional forms defined by consistent returns to the tonic, Bach had to subvert these returns in order to maintain these underlying relationships.<sup>2</sup>

If, as I discuss in chapter 1, the concepts of unity and diversity in musical expression were important issues to Bach's contemporaries, then Bach's late rondos are indeed a practical result of this philosophy. Since their publication, writers have been commenting on the disunities of their surfaces. These disunities—sudden changes in key, dynamics, textures, tempo, register, etc.—are real, demanding the listener's attention. At the same time, many of Bach's techniques provide unity on a variety of levels from the foreground to the deepest levels of middleground. It is hoped that the present study contributes to a more profound understanding of these fascinating works.

---

<sup>2</sup> Bach may have been influenced by his father's Gavotte en Rondeau, from the Partita No. 3 in E Major, BWV 1006, for solo violin, which I discuss in chapter 1.

### Reference List

- Bach, Carl Philipp Emanuel. 1753–62/[1994]. *Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen*. 2 vols. Berlin. Facsimile edition, edited by Wolfgang Horn, 2 volumes in one. Kassel, Ger.: Bärenreiter.
- . 1949. *Essay on the true art of playing keyboard instruments*. Trans. and ed. William J. Mitchell. New York: W. W. Norton.
- . [195-?]. *Sonatas, fantasies and rondos, for piano solo*. 2 vols. Kalmus Piano Series 3092, 3093. New York: E. F. Kalmus; Melville, NY: Belwin Mills Publishing Corp.
- . 1985a. *The collected works for solo keyboard by Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, 1714–1788*. Ed. and introd. Darrell Berg. 6 vols. New York: Garland Publishing.
- . 1985b. *Great keyboard sonatas*. 2 vols. New York: Dover Publications.  
(Originally published 1861–1874, in *Le trésor des pianistes*, vols. 12 and 13, edited by Aristide Ferrenc and Louise Ferrenc, Paris.)
- . 1994. *Briefe und Dokumente kritische Gesamtausgabe*. Ed. Ernst Suchalla. Vol. 2. Göttingen, Ger.: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1997. *The letters of C. P. E. Bach*. Trans. and ed. Stephen L. Clark. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Bach, Johann Christian. [1768?]/1973. *Twelve keyboard sonatas*. Welcker. Facsimile of 2nd issue of 1st edition, edited and with an introduction by Christopher Hogwood. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Baker, Nancy K. 1976. Heinrich Koch and the theory of melody. *Journal of Music Theory* 20:1–48.
- Berg, Darrell. 1975. The keyboard sonatas of C. P. E. Bach: An expression of the mannerist principle. PhD diss., Univ. at Buffalo.
- . 1988. C. P. E. Bach's character pieces and his friendship circle. In *C. P. E. Bach studies*, ed. Stephen Clark, 1–32. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.
- Bonds, Mark Evan. 1991. *Wordless rhetoric: Musical form and the metaphor of the oration*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

- Brossard, Sébastien de. 1707. Minuetto. In *Dictionnaire de musique*, 3rd ed., 60. Amsterdam: Estienne Roger.
- Burkhart, Charles. 1978. Schenker's "motivic parallelisms." *Journal of Music Theory* 22:145–75.
- Cadwallader, Allen, and David Gagné. 1998. *Tonal music: A Schenkerian approach*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Caplin, William. 1987. The "expanded cadential progression": A category for the analysis of classical form. *Journal of Musicological Research* 7 (2–3): 215–57.
- . 1991. Structural expansion in Beethoven's symphonic forms. In *Beethoven's compositional process*, ed. William Kinderman, 27–54. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press.
- . 1994. Hybrid themes: Toward a refinement in the classification of classical theme types. In *Beethoven forum 3*, ed. Christopher Reynolds, 151–65. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press.
- . 1998. *Classical form*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press.
- . 2001. The classical sonata exposition: Cadential goals and form-functional plans. *Tijdschrift voor Muziektheorie* 6 (3): 195–209.
- . 2004. The classical cadence: Conceptions and misconceptions. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 57 (1): 51–117.
- Chrzanowski, Witold. 1911. Das instrumentale Rondeau und die Rondoformen im XVIII. Jahrh. PhD diss., Universität Leipzig.
- Clercx, Suzanne. 1935. La forme du rondo chez Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. *Revue de Musicologie* 16:148–67.
- Cole, Malcolm. 1970. Rondos, proper and improper. *Music and Letters* 51:388–99.
- . 2001. Rondo. In *The new Grove's dictionary of music*, 2nd ed., ed. Stanley Sadie and John Tyrrell, vol. 21, 651. New York: Grove Dictionaries.
- Couperin, François. [1888?]/1988. *Pièces de claveçin*. Ed. Johannes Brahms and Friedrich Chrysander. London: Augener. Republished as *Complete keyboard works*, 2 vols. New York: Dover Publications.
- . 1972. *Pièces de claveçin*. Ed. Kenneth Gilbert. Paris: Heugel.

- . 1973. *Pièces de claveçin. A facsimile edition of the Paris 1713–1730 edition.* New York: Broude Bros.
- Cramer, Carl Friedrich. 1783–87. *Magazin der Musik.* Hamburg, Ger.: Musicalische Niederlage.
- Daverio, John. 1994. From “concertante rondo” to “lyric sonata”: A commentary on Grayms’s reception of Mozart. In *Brahms studies*, ed. David Brodbeck, vol. 1, 111–36. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press.
- Dreyfus, Laurence. 1996. *Bach and the patterns of invention.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- Fishman, Lisa. 1997. Critical text as cultural nexus: The journalistic writings of J. N. Forkel, C. F. Cramer, and J. F. Reichardt. PhD diss., Stony Brook Univ.
- Forkel, Johann Nicolaus. 1777. *Ueber die Theorie der Musik, insofern sie Liebhabern und Kennern nothwendig und nützlich ist.* Göttingen, Ger.: Im Verlag der Wittve Vanderhück.
- . 1778–79. *Musikalisch-kritische Bibliothek.* 3 vols. Gotha, Ger.: C. W. Ettinger.
- . 1788. *Einleitung* (introduction) to *Allgemeine Geschichte der Musik.* Vol. 1, 39–43. Leipzig, Ger.: Im Schwickertschen Verlage.
- Galand, Joel. 1990. Rondo-form problems in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century instrumental music, with reference to the application of Schenker’s form theory to historical criticism. PhD diss., Yale Univ.
- . 1995. Form, genre, and style in the eighteenth-century rondo. *Music Theory Spectrum* 17 (1): 27-52.
- Grassineau, James. 1740. Rondeau. In *A musical dictionary*, 205. London.
- Grayson, David. 1998. *Mozart, piano concertos no. 20 in D minor, K. 466, and no. 21 in C major, K. 467.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Hausler, Rudolph. 1987. Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, Rondos für „Kenner und Liebhaber“. In *Musikreflektionen: I, Beiträge zur musikalischen Analyse*, ed. Musik-Akademie der Stadt Basel, 9–35. Winterthur/Schweiz, Switz.: Amadeus.
- Head, Matthew. 1995a. Fantasy in the instrumental music of C. P. E. Bach. PhD diss., Yale Univ.

- . 1995b. "Like beauty spots on the face of a man." *Journal of Musicology* 13 (2): 156–57.
- Helm, E. Eugene. 1989. *Thematic catalogue of the works of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach*. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.
- Hepokoski, James, and Warren Darcy. 2006. *Elements of sonata theory*. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Kirnberger, Johann Philipp. 1771–79/1988. *Die Kunst des reinen Satzes in der Musik*. 2 vols. Berlin and Königsberg, Ger. Facsimile edition, 2 volumes in one. Hildesheim, Ger.: Georg Olms Verlag.
- . 1982. *The art of strict musical composition*. Trans. David Beach and Jürgen Thym. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.
- Koch, Heinrich Christoph. 1782–93/1969. *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*. 3 vols. Rudolstadt and Leipzig, Ger. Facsimile edition. Hildesheim, Ger.: Georg Olms Verlag.
- . 1802/1985. *Musikalisches Lexikon: welches die theoretische und praktische Tonkunst, encyclopädisch bearbeitet, alle alten und neuen Kunstwörter erklärt, und die alten und neuen Instrumente beschrieben, enthält*. Frankfurt, Ger.: Bey A. Hermann dem Jüngern. Facsimile edition. Hildesheim, Ger., and New York: Georg Olms Verlag.
- . 1983. *Introductory essay on composition*. Trans. and ed. Nancy Kovaleff Baker. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.
- Kollmann, Augustus Frederic Christopher. 1789/1973. *Symphony for the pianoforte, a violin, and a violoncello, with analytical explanations of the subjects and imitations, the counterpoint inversions, and the rhythmical order it contains, opus VII*. Reprinted in introduction by Imogene Horsley in *An essay on practical musical composition, according to the nature of that science and the principles of the greatest musical authors*, by Augustus Frederic Christopher Kollmann, x–xxviii. New York: Da Capo Press.
- . 1796/1817. *An essay on musical harmony; according to the nature of the science & the principles of the greatest musical authors . . .* London. First American edition, with notes. Utica, NY: Seward & Williams.

- . 1799/1973. *An essay on practical musical composition, according to the nature of that science and the principles of the greatest musical authors*. England.  
Reprinted, with introduction by Imogene Horsley. New York: Da Capo Press.
- Kramer, Richard. 1985. The new modulation of the 1770's: C. P. E. Bach in theory, criticism, and practice. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 38 (3): 551–92.
- Laufer, Edward. 1988. On the fantasy. *Intégral* 2:99–133.
- Leisinger, Ulrich. 1994. Rondeau. In *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, ed. Ludwig Finscher. Kassel, Ger.: Bärenreiter.
- Lester, Joel. 1992. *Compositional theory in the eighteenth century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.
- . 2001. Heightening levels of activity and J. S. Bach's parallel-section constructions. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 54 (1): 49–96.
- London, Justin. 1990. Riegel and *Absatz*: Poetic and prosaic aspects of phrase structure in eighteenth-century theory. *Journal of Musicology* 8 (4): 505–19.
- Mattheson, Johann. 1739/1954. *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*. Hamburg, Ger.  
Facsimile edition, edited by Margarete Reimann. Kassel, Ger.: Bärenreiter.
- . 1981. *Johann Mattheson's Der vollkommene Capellmeister: A revised translation with critical commentary*. Trans. Ernest C. Harriss. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.
- Miyake, Jan. 2004. Multiple themes in the new key area of sonata form expositions. PhD diss., Graduate Center, City Univ. of New York.
- Ottenberg, Hans-Günter. 1987. *C. P. E. Bach*. Trans. Philip J. Whitmore. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Petty, Wayne. 1995. Compositional techniques in the keyboard sonatas of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: Reimagining the foundations of a musical style. PhD diss., Yale Univ.
- . 1999a. C. P. E. Bach and the fine art of transposition. In *Schenker studies* 2, ed. Carl Schachter and Hedi Siegel, 49–66. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- . 1999b. Koch, Schenker, and the development section of sonata forms by C. P. E. Bach. *Music Theory Spectrum* 21:151–73.

- Poos, Heinrich. 1993. Carl Philipp Emanuel Bachs Rondo a-Moll aus der Zweiten Sammlung [...] für Kenner und Liebhaber. In *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: Beiträge zu Leben und Werk*, ed. Heinrich Poos, 119–70. Mainz, Ger.: Schott.
- Powers, Doris Bosworth. 1995. Johann Nikolaus Forkel's philosophy of music in the Einleitung to volume one of his *Allgemeine Geschichte der Musik*: A translation and commentary. PhD diss., Univ. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Rameau, Jean-Philippe. 1966. *Nouvelles suites de pièces de claveçin*. Ed. Erwin R. Jacobi. Kassel, Ger.: Bärenreiter.
- . 2004. *Pièces de claveçin: neue Ausgabe sämtlicher Clavierwerke*. Vol. 1, ed. Siegbert Rampe. Kassel, Ger.: Bärenreiter.
- Ratner, Leonard G. 1956. Eighteenth-century theories of musical period structure. *Musical Quarterly* 42 (4): 439–54.
- . 1980. *Classic music: Expression, form, and style*. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Reed-Knouse, Nola Jane. 1983. The theories of Joseph Riepel as expressed in his “Anfangsgründe zur musicalischen Setzkunst.” PhD diss., Univ. of Rochester.
- Reicha, Anton. 1824–26. *Traité de haute composition musicale*. 2 vols. Paris: Zetter.
- Reichardt, Johann Friedrich. 1782–91/1969. *Musikalisches Kunstmagazin*. 2 vols. Berlin. Facsimile edition, 2 volumes in one. Hildesheim, Ger.: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Richards, Annette. 2001. *The free fantasia and the musical picturesque*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- . 2006. *C.P.E. Bach studies*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Rink, John. 1993. Schenker and improvisation. *Journal of Music Theory* 37 (1): 1–54.
- Rothgeb, John. Thematic content: A Schenkerian view. In *Aspects of Schenkerian theory*, ed. David Beach, 39–60. New Haven, CT: Yale Univ. Press.
- Rothstein, William. 1989. *Phrase rhythm in tonal music*. New York: Schirmer Books.
- . Forthcoming. National metrical types in music of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. In *Communication in late eighteenth-century music*, ed. Danuta Mirka and Kofi Agawu. Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. 1768. Rondeau. In *Dictionnaire de musique*. Paris: Chez la Veuve Duchesne.

- Schachter, Carl. 1987. The gavotte en rondeaux from J. S. Bach's partita in E major for unaccompanied violin. *Israel Studies in Musicology* 4:7–26.
- . 1999. Analysis by key. In *Unfoldings: Essays in Schenkerian theory and analysis*, ed. Joseph N. Strauss, 134–60. New York: Oxford Univ. Press.
- Schenker, Heinrich. 1904/1908. *Ein Beitrag zur Ornamentik, als Einführung zu Ph. Em. Bach's Klavierwerken*. Vienna: Universal Edition. Revised ed. Vienna: Universal Edition.
- . 1925/1974. Die Kunst in der Improvisation. In *Das Meisterwerk in der Musik*. Vol. 1. Munich, Ger.: Drei Masken Verlag. Facsimile edition. Hildesheim, Ger.: Georg Olms Verlag.
- . 1935/1956. *Der freie Satz*. Vol. 3 of *Neue musikalische Theorien und Phantasien*. Vienna: Universal. Rev. 2nd ed., ed. Oswald Jonas. Vienna: Universal Edition.
- . 1971. *Die letzten fünf Sonaten Beethovens: Kritische Einführung und Erläuterung. Op. 109*, rev. ed. Ed. Oswald Jonas. Vienna: Universal Edition.
- . 1976. A contribution to the study of ornamentation. Trans. Hedi Siegel. In *Music forum*, ed. Felix Salzer, vol. 4, 1–139. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- . 1979. *Free composition*. Trans. and ed. Ernst Oster. 2 vols. New York: Longman.
- . 1994. The art of improvisation. Trans. Richard Kramer. In *The masterwork in music, a yearbook*, ed. William Drabkin, vol. 1, 1–19. New York: Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Schmalfeldt, Janet. 1991. Towards a reconciliation of Schenkerian concepts with traditional and recent theories of form. *Music Analysis* 10 (3): 233–87.
- Schulenberg, David. 1984. *The instrumental music of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach*. Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press.
- . 1994. Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. In *Eighteenth-century keyboard music*, ed. Robert L. Marshall, 191–229. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Sisman, Elaine R. 1993. *Haydn and the classical variation*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Univ. Press.

- Sulzer, Johann Georg. 1771–74/1967–70. *Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste*. 5 vols. Leipzig, Ger. Facsimile of 1792–94 edition. Hildesheim, Ger.: Georg Olms Verlag.
- Swack, Jean. 1988. The solo sonatas of Georg Philipp Telemann: A study of the sources and musical style. PhD diss., Yale Univ.
- . 1993. On the origins of the *Sonate auf Concertenart*. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 46 (3): 369–414.
- Troschke, Michael von. 2004. Rondo. In *Handwörterbuch der musikalischen Terminologie. Im Auftrag der Kommission für Musikwissenschaft der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur zu Mainz* hrsg. von Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht, ed. Albrecht Riethmüller, vol. 5. 1–7. Stuttgart, Ger.: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Türk, Daniel Gottlob. 1789. *Klavierschule*. Leipzig and Halle, Ger.
- . 1982. *School of clavier playing*. Trans. and ed. Raymond H. Haggh. Lincoln: Univ. of Nebraska Press.
- Walther, Johann Gottfried. 1732. *Musikalisches Lexicon*. Leipzig, Ger.: Wolfgang Deer.
- Wolf, Eugene K. 1981. *The symphonies of Johann Stamitz*. Utrecht, Neth.: Bohn, Scheltema & Holkema.



Volume 2

Examples

The late keyboard rondos of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach:

Issues of genre, form, and voice leading

By

Karen G. Mandelbaum

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Music in partial  
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,  
The City University of New York

2008

## Table of Contents

### Volume II

Chapter 1. Eighteenth- and twentieth-century perspectives on the late ronds of C. P. E. Bach.....	212
Example 1.1 C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in G Major, H. 523/iii .....	212
Example 1.2 Augustus Frederic Christopher Kollmann, Symphony for the Pianoforte, a Violin and a Violoncello, op. 7/i, mm. 1–10.....	213
Example 1.3 From Augustus Frederic Christopher Kollmann, <i>An essay on musical harmony; according to the nature of the science &amp; the principles of the greatest musical authors . . .</i>	
a. Example 332b.....	214
b. Example 333, 5-bar period.....	214
Example 1.4 C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268, mm. 1–111 .....	215
Example 1.5 C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in C Minor, H. 283, mm. 55–109 .....	219
Chapter 2. Formal principles of the eighteenth-century keyboard rondeau: Developing a context for the ronds of C. P. E. Bach .....	221
Example 2.1 François Couperin, <i>Pièces de Claveçin</i> , opening refrains	
a. <i>La Princesse de Sens</i> .....	221
b. <i>Le Gazoüillement</i> .....	221
c. <i>Les Rozeaux</i> .....	222
d. <i>La Favorite</i> .....	222
Example 2.2 François Couperin, <i>Pièces de Claveçin</i>	
a. <i>Les Amusmens</i> .....	223
b. <i>Les Bergeries</i> .....	225
Example 2.3 François Couperin, <i>Allégrèsse des Vainqueurs</i> , <i>Seconde Partie de la Triomphante</i> .....	227
Example 2.4 François Couperin, <i>Allégrèsse des Vainquers</i> .....	229
Example 2.5 François Couperin, <i>Les Amusemens</i> , 2 <sup>ème</sup> <i>Rondeau</i> .....	231
Example 2.6 François Couperin, <i>Les Bergeries</i> .....	233

Example 2.7	François Couperin, <i>Les Bergeries</i> , couplet 3, mm. 29–34, rhythmic reduction.....	236
Example 2.8	Jean-Philippe Rameau, <i>Musette en Rondeau</i> .....	237
Example 2.9	Jean-Philippe Rameau, <i>Les Tricotets</i> .....	238
Example 2.10	Jean-Philippe Rameau, <i>Gigue en Rondeau</i> .....	240
Example 2.11	Johann Christian Bach, Sonata in E Major, op. 5, no. 5/iii: mm. 1–57 .....	241
Chapter 3.	Exploring the formal structures of C. P. E. Bach’s early rondos and pseudo-rondos .....	243
Example 3.1	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in C Major, H. 28/ii .....	243
Example 3.2	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in C Major, H. 28/ii a. mm. 61–68.....	245
	b. mm. 69–76.....	245
Example 3.3	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in C Major, H. 28/ii, mm. 92–97 .....	246
Example 3.4	François Couperin, <i>Les Amusemens</i> .....	247
Example 3.5	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata No. 1 in A Minor, H. 30/ii .....	249
Example 3.6	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata No. 1 in A Minor, H. 30/ii a. mm. 1–8 .....	251
	b. mm. 33–52.....	251
	c. mm. 33–52, middleground .....	251
Example 3.7	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in B Minor, H. 36/ii a. mm. 1–6 .....	252
	b. mm. 20–26.....	252
Example 3.8	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in B Minor, H. 32.5/ii .....	253
Example 3.9	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in B Minor, H. 32.5/ii a. m. 1 .....	255
	b. mm. 20–23.....	255
Example 3.10	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in G Minor, H. 47/ii a. mm. 1–4.....	256
	b. mm. 44–55.....	256

Example 3.11	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in G Major, H. 56/iii .....	257
Example 3.12	C. P. E. Bach, <i>La Buchholtz</i> , H. 93 .....	259
Example 3.13	C. P. E. Bach, <i>La Buchholtz</i> , H. 93	
	a. mm. 1–8 and 8–17 .....	260
	b. Refrain antecedents, mm. 1–4 and 16–27 .....	261
	c. Chromaticized voice exchange, mm. 21–27 .....	261
Example 3.14	C. P. E. Bach, <i>La Louise</i> , H. 114.....	262
Example 3.15	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata No. 1 in A Minor, H. 30/i, Wayne Petty’s phrase analysis of the exposition .....	264
Example 3.16	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in G Minor, H. 68/i.....	266
Example 3.17	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in G Minor, H. 68/i, closing phrase, mm. 17–28 .....	267
Example 3.18	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata No. 1 in A Minor, H. 30/ii .....	268
Example 3.19	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata No. 1 in A Minor, H. 30/ii	
	a. Closing phrase reduced to eight measures, mm. 9–18.....	270
	b. Opening phrase, mm. 1–8 .....	270
	c. Closing phrase, mm. 9–18.....	270
	d. Second period closing phrase, mm. 53–69.....	271
	e. First period opening phrase, mm. 1–8; and second period closing phrase, mm. 53–69.....	271
	f. Middleground voice-leading reduction, mm. 1–8 and 53–69 .....	272
Chapter 4. Exploring the formal structures of C. P. E. Bach’s late rondos: The outer form.....		273
Example 4.1	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in D, H. 261 .....	273
Examples 4.2	C. P. E. Bach, opening refrains	
	a. Rondo in Bb, H. 267 .....	274
	b. Rondo in D Minor, H. 290 .....	274
Example 4.3	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 271 .....	275
Example 4.4	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in D Minor	
	a. Opening refrain and couplet.....	276
	b. Couplet 1, mm. 12–21.....	277

	c. Hypothetical basic phrase .....	277
Example 4.5	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 274 .....	278
Example 4.6	C. P. E. Bach, modulations following couplet 1	
	a. Rondo in Eb, H. 288 .....	279
	b. Rondo in Bb, H. 267 .....	281
Example 4.7	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in A, H. 276.....	282
Example 4.8	C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in D Minor, H.208/i, Wayne Petty's annotated score of the exposition.....	283
Example 4.9	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in F, H. 266.....	284
Example 4.10	Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Sonata in C, K. 545/iii .....	286
Example 4.11	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in Bb, H. 267 .....	287
Example 4.12	From Koch, <i>Introductory essay on composition</i>	
	a. Example 388.....	289
	b. Example 390.....	289
Example 4.13	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 265 .....	290
Example 4.14	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 265	
	a. mm. 24–28.....	298
	b. mm. 24–27, reduction .....	298
	c. Figure 473 from C. P. E. Bach, <i>Essay on the true art of playing keyboard instruments</i> , and mm. 24–27 .....	298
	d. mm. 31–32, reduction .....	298
	e. mm. 34–37.....	299
	f. mm. 42–47, reduction .....	299
	g. Suffix, mm. 54–57 .....	299
Example 4.15	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in F, H. 266.....	300
Example 4.16	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in F, H. 266, P <sup>ff</sup> antecedent and Rotation 1 TR as prototypes for Rotation 3 TR (expanded).....	306
Example 4.17	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in C, H. 260 .....	307
Example 4.18	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in C, H. 260	
	a. mm. 24–33, RT.....	315
	b. Hypothetical version of m. 106 .....	316

Chapter 5. Exploring the synthesis of outer and inner form in C. P. E. Bach's late rondos .....	317
Example 5.1 C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in Bb, H. 267 .....	317
Example 5.2 C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in Bb, H. 267	
a. Deep-middleground voice-leading reduction, mm. 1–138 .....	323
b. Reduction of opening of refrain theme, mm. 1–2 .....	323
c. Reduction of opening of TR, mm. 20–32 .....	324
d. Reduction of new theme, mm. 60–67 .....	324
e. Reduction of mm. 213–237.....	325
f. Dominant prolongation, mm. 233–237.....	325
g. Comparison of mm. 119–138 and 213–226.....	326
Example 5.3 C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 274 .....	327
Example 5.4 C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 274, comparison of mm. 1–16 and mm. 50–83 .....	331
Example 5.5 C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 274	
a. Deep-middleground voice-leading reduction.....	332
b. Chromaticized voice exchange and resulting motivic repetitions, mm. 83–123.....	332
c. Reduction of mm. 83–119 with interpolation.....	332
Example 5.6 C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G Major, H. 268.....	333
Example 5.7 C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268, lead-in and its reduction, mm. 54–56 .....	340
Example 5.8 C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268	
a. Hypothetical version of mm. 51–69 .....	341
b. Reduction of mm. 51–69.....	341
c. Reduction of mm. 69–73.....	341
Example 5.9 C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268, middleground voice-leading reductions	
a. mm. 1–89.....	342
b. Deeper middleground, mm. 1–89 .....	342
c. mm. 1–144.....	342
d. Original version, mm. 1–89.....	343
e. Transposed version, mm. 115–144.....	343
f. Hypothetical version .....	343

Example 5.10	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268	
	a. Deep-middleground voice-leading reduction with ellipsis, mm. 89–122.....	344
	b. Reduction of mm. 115–132.....	344
	c. Reduction, from VI <sup>#</sup> to V, mm. 89–144.....	344
Example 5.11	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268, comparison of mm. 17–20 and mm. 167–172.....	345
Example 5.12	C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268	
	a. RT, mm. 25–31.....	346
	b. Reduction of RT, mm. 24–28.....	347
	c. Middleground voice-leading reduction, mm. 24–30.....	347
	d. Deep-middleground voice-leading reduction, mm. 1–144.....	348
	e. Deeper-middleground voice-leading reduction, mm. 1–144.....	348
Appendix A.	Three graphic analyses.....	349
1.	The Rondo in Bb, H. 267.....	349
2.	The Rondo in E, H. 274.....	359
3.	The Rondo in G, H. 268.....	364

## Chapter 1

Example 1.1 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in G Major, H. 523/iii

[Antecedent] [Consequent]

Grazioso e poco Allegro Eman: Bach.

*p* Subject

7 [I] [I:HC] [I] [Reprise] Subject varied

10 [V] [I:PAC]

14

17 [Modulating Phrase Like Antecedent] Volte Subito [I]: [PAC]

Modul: from G to D

21 [Antecedent] [Consequent]

26 [V:HC] [V] [V:HC] [V]

Modul: from D

[V:PAC]

Example 1.2 Augustus F.C. Kollmann, Symphony for the pianoforte, a violin, and a violoncello, Op. 7/i

*Allegro con spirito*

*Violin* *f*

*Cello* *f*

*Piano* *f*

*F Major*

*mf*

*mf*

*III Violin* *mf*

*f*

*f*

[L.C.] *f*

*F Major*

\*These slurs found only in piano reduction (n. 7).

Example 1.3 From Augustus F.C. Kollmann, *An Essay on musical harmony; according to the nature of the science & principles of the greatest musical authors...*

a. Example 332b

Musical score for Example 332b, a 5-bar period in G major. The score is written for two staves: a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The music consists of a single melodic line in the treble clef and a simple harmonic accompaniment in the bass clef. The melody begins with a quarter rest, followed by a quarter note G4, a quarter note A4, a quarter note B4, and a quarter note C5. The accompaniment consists of a steady eighth-note pattern in the bass clef, starting on G3 and moving up stepwise to C4.

b. Example 333, 5-bar period

Musical score for Example 333, a 5-bar period in G major. The score is written for two staves: a treble clef staff and a bass clef staff. The music consists of a single melodic line in the treble clef and a simple harmonic accompaniment in the bass clef. The melody begins with a quarter rest, followed by a quarter note G4, a quarter note A4, a quarter note B4, and a quarter note C5. The accompaniment consists of a steady eighth-note pattern in the bass clef, starting on G3 and moving up stepwise to C4.

## Example 1.4 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in G, H.268

*Andante un poco*

6

10

14

18

23

## Example 1.4 (continued)

27

31 *Adagio* *Tempo I*

35

38

42

47

51

*f* *p* *pp* *ten.* *ff* *p* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *f* *p* *ten.* *ten.* *f* *p* *ten.* *f* *ten.* *p*

C#

B

Detailed description: This musical score is for a piano piece, continuing from Example 1.4. It consists of seven systems of music, each with a treble and bass clef staff. The key signature is one sharp (F#). The piece begins at measure 27. The first system (measures 27-30) features a melody in the right hand with slurs and accents, and a bass line with a forte (*f*) dynamic. The second system (measures 31-34) is marked *Adagio* and *Tempo I*. It includes dynamics like *pp*, *f*, *p*, and *ten.* (tension). The third system (measures 35-37) continues with *p* and *ten.* dynamics. The fourth system (measures 38-41) features a more active right hand with *f* and *ten.* markings. The fifth system (measures 42-46) includes a section marked C# and dynamics *p*, *f*, and *ten.*. The sixth system (measures 47-50) includes a section marked B and dynamics *p*, *f*, and *ten.*. The seventh system (measures 51-54) concludes with dynamics *p*, *f*, and *ten.*.

## Example 1.4 (continued)

Musical score for Example 1.4 (continued), measures 56-83. The score is written for piano and features a complex rhythmic and harmonic structure. The key signature is one sharp (F#), and the time signature is 4/4. The score is divided into systems of two staves (treble and bass clef).

Measures 56-60: The first system begins with a piano (*pp*) dynamic. The right hand features a melodic line with slurs and accents, including a *ten.* (tension) marking. The left hand provides a harmonic accompaniment with chords and moving lines. Dynamics include *pp*, *ff*, *ten.*, *pp*, *ff*, *mf*, *p*, and *f*.

Measures 61-65: The second system continues the melodic and harmonic development. The right hand has a more active melodic line with slurs and accents. Dynamics include *p* and *f*.

Measures 66-70: The third system shows a change in texture. The right hand has a more melodic line with slurs and accents, including a *ten.* marking. The left hand has a more active accompaniment. Dynamics include *f*, *p*, *ten.*, *ten.*, and *p*.

Measures 71-74: The fourth system continues the melodic and harmonic development. The right hand has a more melodic line with slurs and accents, including a *ten.* marking. The left hand has a more active accompaniment. Dynamics include *f*, *p*, *ff*, and *p*.

Measures 75-78: The fifth system continues the melodic and harmonic development. The right hand has a more melodic line with slurs and accents, including a *ten.* marking. The left hand has a more active accompaniment. Dynamics include *f*, *p*, and *f*.

Measures 79-82: The sixth system continues the melodic and harmonic development. The right hand has a more melodic line with slurs and accents, including a *ten.* marking. The left hand has a more active accompaniment. Dynamics include *p*, *f*, *ten.*, *p*, and *f*.

Measures 83-86: The seventh system continues the melodic and harmonic development. The right hand has a more melodic line with slurs and accents, including a *ten.* marking. The left hand has a more active accompaniment. Dynamics include *f*, *p*, *f*, and *p*.

## Example 1.4 (continued)

85

Musical score for measures 85-86. The piece is in G major and 2/4 time. The right hand features a complex rhythmic pattern of eighth and sixteenth notes, while the left hand provides a steady accompaniment of quarter notes. Dynamics include *f*, *p*, and *f*.

87

Musical score for measures 87-88. The right hand continues with a similar rhythmic pattern to the previous measures. Dynamics include *f*, *p*, and *f*.

89

Musical score for measures 89-94. Measures 89-90 feature a melodic line in the right hand with a *ten.* (tension) marking and a *pp* dynamic. Measures 91-94 show a more active right hand with *f* dynamics and *ten.* markings. The left hand remains accompanimental.

95

Musical score for measures 95-99. The right hand has a dense, flowing melodic line with *f* dynamics and *ten.* markings. The left hand provides a steady accompaniment with *p* dynamics.

100

Musical score for measures 100-103. The right hand continues with a melodic line, featuring *f* dynamics and *ten.* markings. The left hand accompaniment includes *p* and *f* dynamics.

104

Musical score for measures 104-107. Measures 104-105 show a melodic line in the right hand with *f* dynamics and *ten.* markings. Measures 106-107 feature a more rhythmic right hand with *f* dynamics.

108

Musical score for measures 108-111. The right hand has a rhythmic pattern of eighth notes with *f* dynamics. The left hand accompaniment includes *f* dynamics.

Example 1.5 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in C Minor, H. 283, mm. 55-109

55

59

62

65

70

(Ritornello 4 Hausler)

76

81

I:HC

I:PAC

Expansion

## Example 1.5 (continued)

(Episode 4? Hausler)

87

91

Resumption Of Antecedent

94

(Hausler Rit. 5)  
Consequent

Expansion

96

100

107

1

2

3

4

5

(I)

I:HC

## Chapter 2

Example 2.1 François Couperin, *Pièces de claveçin*, opening refrains

2.1a.

*La Princesse de Sens.*  
Tendrement.

Rondeau.

2.1b.

*Le Gazouillement.*  
Gracieusement et coulé.

Rondeau.

1<sup>er</sup> Couplet.

2.1c.

*Les Rozeaux*

Tendrement, sans lenteur.

Musical score for "Les Rozeaux" in 6/8 time, key of D major. The score consists of three systems of piano accompaniment. The first system has four measures. The second system has four measures. The third system includes a first ending (1.) and a first couplet (1<sup>er</sup> Couplet.) with two endings (1. and 2.). The piano part features a rhythmic accompaniment with eighth and sixteenth notes, often beamed together. There are several trills and grace notes throughout the piece.

2.1d.

*La Favorite.*

RONDEAU Gravement sans lenteur.

Chaconne  
a  
deux tems.

Musical score for "La Favorite" in 2/4 time, key of D minor. The score is a rondo (RONDEAU) and consists of two systems of piano accompaniment. The first system has four measures. The second system includes a first ending (1.) and a first couplet (1<sup>er</sup> Couplet.) with two endings (1. and 2.). The piano part features a rhythmic accompaniment with eighth and sixteenth notes, often beamed together. There are several trills and grace notes throughout the piece.

## Example 2.2a François Couperin, Pièces de claveçin

*Les Amusemens.*

*Sans lenteur.*

*Premier Rondeau.*

*2 fois Reprise.*

*2 fois Fin. 1<sup>er</sup> Couplet.*

*Deux fois. Répétition de la 1<sup>re</sup> Reprise, sans renvoi.*

*Deux fois. 2<sup>o</sup> Couplet.*

*Répétition du premier Rondeau, sans renvoi.*

The musical score consists of six systems of two staves each. The first system begins with the tempo marking 'Sans lenteur.' and the title 'Les Amusemens.' The first system is labeled 'Premier Rondeau' and includes the instruction '2 fois Reprise.' The second system is labeled '2 fois Fin. 1<sup>er</sup> Couplet.' The third system is labeled 'Deux fois. Répétition de la 1<sup>re</sup> Reprise, sans renvoi.' The fourth system is labeled 'Deux fois. 2<sup>o</sup> Couplet.' The fifth system is labeled 'Répétition du premier Rondeau, sans renvoi.' The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and ornaments.

Reprinted by permission of Broude Brothers Limited, Williamstown, MA.

Example 2.2a (continued)

The musical score is presented in six systems, each with a vocal line and a piano accompaniment line. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, and dynamic markings. The score is annotated with several performance instructions and structural markers:

- System 1:** The vocal line begins with the instruction "2 fois. Reprise." above the staff.
- System 2:** The vocal line is marked "2 fois. Fin." and "1<sup>er</sup>me Rondeau." The piano accompaniment includes the instruction "Trois doubles Croches egales, pour chaque temps." below the staff. The system concludes with "Deux 1<sup>er</sup> Couplet."
- System 3:** The vocal line is marked "Le même que cy devant" and "Rondeau sans renvoi." The piano accompaniment continues with rhythmic patterns.
- System 4:** The piano accompaniment is marked "2<sup>me</sup> Couplet." below the staff.
- System 5:** The vocal line is marked "Le même que cy devant." and "Rondeau sans renvoi." The piano accompaniment continues.
- System 6:** The piano accompaniment concludes with the instruction "Fin." below the staff.

Example 2.2b

*Les Bergeries*  
*Les Bergeries*  
*Rondeau.*

*Nâvement.*

*Reprise.*

*Fin. 1<sup>er</sup> Couplet...  
 Voyez ma méthode  
 page 66.*

*à la Reprise du  
 Rondeau. Fin. suiv*

The image displays a musical score for a piece titled "Les Bergeries Rondeau". The score is written in 6/8 time and consists of two staves: a treble staff and a bass staff. The music begins with a treble clef and a key signature of one flat (B-flat). The tempo/mood is indicated as "Nâvement." (moderately). The score includes various musical notations such as eighth and sixteenth notes, rests, and ornaments (marked with 'x'). There are repeat signs and a section labeled "Reprise." which repeats the initial melody. The piece concludes with a "Fin." and a reference to "1<sup>er</sup> Couplet... Voyez ma méthode page 66." The final section is marked "à la Reprise du Rondeau." and ends with "Fin. suiv".

Reprinted by permission of Broude Brothers Limited, Williamstown, MA.

Example 2.2b (continued)

2<sup>e</sup> Couplet. *Méthode, 66.*  
 Au Rondeau; Dont on ne joue le commencement,  
 qu'une fois: mais, bien, deux fois la Reprise. *Fin.*  
 3<sup>e</sup> Couplet.  
*Méthode, même page.*  
 On Reprend le  
 Rondeau, comme au Commencement.

The musical score is written for a single melodic line on a treble clef staff. It is in a key with one flat (B-flat) and a 3/4 time signature. The piece is divided into three main sections:

- 2<sup>e</sup> Couplet:** The first section, labeled "2<sup>e</sup> Couplet. Méthode, 66.", consists of two staves of music. The melody is characterized by eighth-note patterns and includes various ornaments such as mordents and grace notes.
- Rondeau Section:** The second section is a rondeau, indicated by the text "Au Rondeau; Dont on ne joue le commencement, qu'une fois: mais, bien, deux fois la Reprise. Fin." It begins with a whole rest in the first staff, followed by a melodic line in the second staff. The text "Fin." appears at the end of this section.
- 3<sup>e</sup> Couplet:** The third section, labeled "3<sup>e</sup> Couplet.", consists of four staves of music. It features more complex rhythmic patterns, including sixteenth-note runs and repeated eighth-note figures. The text "Méthode, même page." is placed between the second and third staves of this section.

The score concludes with the instruction "On Reprend le Rondeau, comme au Commencement.", indicating that the rondeau section should be repeated from the beginning.

Example 2.3 François Couperin, *Allégresse des Vainqueurs*, *Seconde Partie de la Triomphante*

*Allégresse des Vainqueurs.*

*Seconde Partie de la Triomphante.*

*Rondeau*

*Méthode page 69.*

*1<sup>er</sup> Couplet.*

*2<sup>e</sup> Couplet.*

## Example 2.3 (continued)

This musical score, labeled "Example 2.3 (continued)", consists of eight systems of staves. Each system typically contains two staves, with the upper staff in treble clef and the lower staff in bass clef. The music is characterized by intricate rhythmic patterns, including frequent sixteenth and thirty-second notes, and the use of trills (marked "Tr").

Key features of the score include:

- Trills:** Several trills are indicated by "Tr" above notes in the upper staves.
- Rhythmic Complexity:** The piece features complex rhythmic figures, often involving groups of sixteenth or thirty-second notes.
- Articulation:** Numerous accents (marked with a small "x") and slurs are used throughout the score.
- Rehearsal Marks:** Numbers 1 and 2 are placed above the staves to indicate specific points in the music.
- Final Marking:** The word "Tourné." is written at the end of the piece on the right side of the final system.

Chapter 2 - Example 2.4 François Couperin, *Allégresse des Vainqueurs* (Gilbert Ed.)

**Refrain 1**  
**Phrase 'a'**  
 Rondeau. ALLÉGRESSE DES VAINQUEURS.  
 SECONDE PARTIE.

5 **Phrase 'b'**  
 V<sup>4</sup>-I

9 **Phrase 1**  
 V I:HC (%)

14 **Phrase 2**  
 V I:PAC 1<sup>er</sup> Couplet.

19 **Phrase 3**  
 V I:PAC (%)

24 **Refrain 1**  
**Hybrid of 'a' and 'b'**  
 V I:HC (%)

30 **Phrase 1**  
 V I:PAC (%)

36 **Phrase 2**  
 V I:PAC 2<sup>er</sup> Couplet.

41 **Phrase 3**  
**Transition of 'b'**  
 V I:PAC (%)

47 **Phrase 4**  
 V I:PAC (%)

Example 2.4 (continued)

This musical score consists of 12 systems of music, each with a measure number at the beginning. The systems are numbered 53, 58, 64, 70, 76, and 82. Each system contains two staves of music. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, beams, and slurs. Dynamic markings like *Molto firm.* and *Molto, poco, fto.* are present. A section labeled "3<sup>rd</sup> Couplet." is indicated between measures 76 and 82. The score concludes with a double bar line at the end of the 12th system.

Example 2.5 François Couperin, *Les Amusemens*, 2<sup>ème</sup> Rondeau

2<sup>ème</sup> Rondeau.

4 1<sup>er</sup> Couplet.

7

11 III:PAC

15 I:HC

Example 2.5 (continued)

18 *2<sup>e</sup> Couplet.*

22

26 *Le même que cy devant.*

30

34

Example 2.6 François Couperin, *Les Bergeries*

*Les Bergeries.*

Naivement.

Rondeau.

3 1. 2. 6

I I<sup>6</sup>

8 1. 2. 1<sup>er</sup> Couplet.

V I:PAC

10 1. 2.

I:HC

13 1. 16 I<sup>6</sup>

V I:PAC

*Voyez ma Méthode, page 66.*

Example 2.6 (continued)

17

2.  
2<sup>e</sup> Couplet,  
*Méthode, 66.*

I 20

Refrain 3: 'a' and 'b'

22

25

I:HC I<sup>6</sup> 28

V I:PAC

29

2.  
3<sup>e</sup> Couplet.

VI<sup>6</sup> VI  
G min:I

Detailed description of the musical score: The score is for a piano accompaniment in G minor (one flat) and 3/4 time. It consists of five systems of music. The first system (measures 17-20) is the second couplet, starting with a first ending bracket over measures 17-18 and a second ending bracket over measures 19-20. The second system (measures 21-22) is the beginning of Refrain 3, with a first ending bracket over measures 21-22 and a second ending bracket over measures 23-24. The third system (measures 25-28) continues the refrain, with a first ending bracket over measures 25-26 and a second ending bracket over measures 27-28. The fourth system (measures 29-32) is the third couplet, with a first ending bracket over measures 29-30 and a second ending bracket over measures 31-32. Chord symbols are placed below the staff: 'I' at measure 20, 'I:HC' and 'I<sup>6</sup> 28' at measure 28, 'V' and 'I:PAC' at measure 32, 'VI<sup>6</sup>' at measure 29, and 'VI G min:I' at measure 31.

Example 2.6 (continued)

32

*Méthode, même page.*

III:PAC

36

40

B $\flat$ : I:HC

I

43

I:HC

I $^{\flat}$  48

46

V

I:PAC



Exemple 2.8 Jean-Philippe Rameau, *Musette en Rondeau*

Musette en Rondeau

tendrem.<sup>[en]</sup> §

1) fin.

1.<sup>re</sup> Reprise. I  
9 2) 3)

2.<sup>de</sup> Reprise  
17 I:HC §

3.<sup>me</sup> Reprise  
25 3) 4)

29

34 I:HC §

Example 2.9 Jean-Philippe Rameau, *Les Tricotets*

**Les Tricotets**  
Rondeau

**1 Refrain Antecedent**

**7 Consequent**

**13 I:HC Couplet 1 Fore-phrase**

**1<sup>st</sup> Reprise**

**20 I:PAC Fine After-phrase Transposed Consequent**

**V:HC**

**26 D.C. al Fine V:PAC**

Jean-Philippe Rameau. 1966. *Nouvelles suites de pièces de clavecin*. Ed. Erwin R. Jacobi Kassel, Ger.: Bärenreiter. Reprinted by permission.

## Example 2.9 (continued)

33 **Couplet 2** **Fortspinning**

2<sup>e</sup> Reprise

VI

39

45 **Retransition (RT)**

VI:PAC

51

*D. C. al Fine*  
I:HC

Example 2.10 Jean-Philippe Rameau, *Gigue en Rondeau*

**Gigue en Rondeau**

**Refrain**

§ **Fore-phrase** **After-phrase**

6 **1.<sup>re</sup> Reprise Opening Phrase**

12 **Fortspinning IV V<sub>4-3</sub> I:PAC** §

18 **After-phrase: Transposed + Varied Consequent** **2.<sup>e</sup> Reprise**

24 **III:HC III** **III:PAC**

30 **III:PAC**

Example 2.11 Johann Christian Bach, Sonata in E Major, Op. 5, no. 5/iii: mm. 1-57

The musical score is presented on a single grand staff with a treble clef and a key signature of one sharp (F#). The tempo is marked *Prestissimo*. The score is divided into three main sections:

- Prestissimo:** Measures 1 through 8. Measure 4 is marked with a bracket and the number 4. Measure 8 is marked with the number 8.
- Refrain 1:** Measures 9 through 16. Measure 9 is marked with the number 9. Measure 12 is marked with the number 12. Measure 16 is marked with the number 16.
- Couplet 1:** Measures 17 through 27. Measure 19 is marked with the number 19. Measure 27 is marked with the number 27.

The notation includes various rhythmic values such as eighth and sixteenth notes, as well as triplet markings. The piece concludes with a final cadence in measure 27.

Example 2.11 (continued)

The musical score is divided into two systems. The first system contains measures 30 through 49, and the second system contains measures 50 through 56. The score includes vocal lines and piano accompaniment with various harmonic markings.

**System 1 (Measures 30-49):**

- Measures 30-33: **Refrain 2**
- Measure 34: **Couplet 2**
- Measures 38-40: **Couplet 2**
- Measures 41-43: **Couplet 2**
- Measures 44-46: **Couplet 2**
- Measures 47-49: **Couplet 2**

**System 2 (Measures 50-56):**

- Measures 50-52: **Refrain 3**
- Measures 53-55: **Refrain 3**
- Measure 56: **Refrain 3**

**Harmonic Markings:**

- Measure 34:  $V$
- Measure 41:  $V$
- Measure 42:  $I^{\sharp}$
- Measure 43:  $V$
- Measure 44:  $I^{\sharp}$
- Measure 45:  $V$
- Measure 46:  $I^{\sharp}$
- Measure 47:  $V$
- Measure 48:  $I^{\sharp}$
- Measure 49:  $V$
- Measure 50:  $V$
- Measure 51:  $V$
- Measure 52:  $V$
- Measure 53:  $V$
- Measure 54:  $V$
- Measure 55:  $V$
- Measure 56:  $V$

Example 3.1 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in C Major, H.28/ii

Theme (Period 1)

ANDANTE. *p*

I V

9

17

26

36

Appendix

Theme (Period 2)

46

III:PAC

56

V:HC I



Example 3.2 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in C Major, H.28/ii

61 64 68 69 71 73 76

a: mm. 61-68

b: mm. 69-76

I:-0. I:-0. I:-0. I:-0.

10 10 10 10 10 10

Amin: I IV Dmin:III III:IAC IV IV IV:IAC I:HC

Example 3.3 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in C Major, H.28/ii, mm. 92-97

a.

92 94 95 96 97

IV  $V_5^7$   $V_5^7-3\#$

b.

92 97

IV  $V_5^7$

Example 3.4 François Couperin, *Les Amusemens*

3<sup>ème</sup> Rondeau.

1<sup>er</sup> Couplet.

4 7 11 15

III:PAC  
Refrain  
I:HC I

Example 3.4 (continued)

18 *2<sup>e</sup> Couplet.*

22

V: HC V<sup>6</sup>

26 *Le même que cy devant.*

V/V V:PAC I

30

34

I:PAC

Example 3.5 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata No. 1 in A Minor, H. 30/ii (“Württemberg” 1)

Period 1: Phrase 1  
 † Opening Motive

ANDANTE

Phrase 2

I:HC I<sup>6</sup>

13 16 Appendix

V:PAC

Period 2: Phrase 1  
 † Andante Opening Motive

Adagio.

V I

25

Phrase 2: Transposition

30 33

VI:HC VI

## Example 3.5 (continued)

Musical score for Example 3.5 (continued), measures 36-64. The score is written for piano in G major (two sharps) and 3/4 time. It consists of six systems of two staves each (treble and bass clef).

Measures 36-41: Measure 36 begins with a triplet of eighth notes in the treble and a quarter note in the bass. Measure 37 has a '2' above the treble staff. Measure 41 ends with a fermata.

Measures 42-46: Measure 42 has a slur over the treble staff. Measure 46 ends with a fermata.

Measures 47-52: Measure 47 has a slur over the treble staff. Measure 52 ends with a fermata. The tempo marking *Adagio.* appears above the treble staff in measure 52.

Measures 53-57: Measure 53 has the tempo marking *Andante.* above the treble staff and a piano dynamic *p* below it. Measure 57 has a forte dynamic *f* below the treble staff. The rehearsal mark **I:HC** is placed above the treble staff in measure 57.

Measures 58-63: Measure 58 has a slur over the treble staff. Measure 63 ends with a fermata.

Measures 64-68: Measure 64 has a slur over the treble staff. Measure 65 has a triplet of eighth notes in the treble. Measure 66 has an infinity symbol  $\infty$  above the treble staff. Measure 67 has a trill *tr* above the treble staff. Measure 68 ends with a fermata.

Example 3.6 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata No. 1 in A Minor, H. 30/ii

a. mm. 1-8

b. mm. 33-52

c. mm. 33-52 middleground

## Example 3.7 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in B Minor, H. 36/ii ("Württemberg" 6)

a. mm. 1-6

ADAGIO  
NON MOLTO.

I I

V I:IAC

b. mm. 20-26

I 7 IV

Example 3.8 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in B Minor, H. 32.5/ii

Molto Adagio.

Opening phrase

I

3

I:HC

6

8

p

VI:HC

f

VI<sup>6</sup>

VI

Opening Motive

10

pp

f

12

tr

p

IV

Detailed description of the musical score: The score is for a piano sonata in B minor, 3/4 time, marked 'Molto Adagio'. It consists of six systems of two staves each. The first system (measures 1-2) is labeled 'Opening phrase' and 'I'. The second system (measures 3-5) is labeled '3' and 'I:HC'. The third system (measures 6-7) is labeled '6' and 'VI:HC'. The fourth system (measures 8-9) is labeled '8' and contains dynamic markings 'p' and 'f'. The fifth system (measures 10-11) is labeled '10' and contains dynamic markings 'pp' and 'f', with the 'Opening Motive' identified in measure 10. The sixth system (measures 12-13) is labeled '12' and contains dynamic markings 'tr' and 'p', with the Roman numeral 'IV' at the end. The key signature has two sharps (F# and C#), and the time signature is 3/4.

Example 3.8 (continued)

15

17

19

21

23

25

28

*p* *f* *p* *f* *pp*

*tr* *tr* *tr* *tr* *tr* *tr* *tr*

*2* *3* *3*

II

V

I

Suffix

V - I:PAC

V I:PAC

Example 3.9 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in B Minor, H. 32.5/ii

a. m.1

D: I  $V_5^6$  I

b. mm. 20-23

D: II  $V^8 - 7$  I

## Example 3.10 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in G Minor, H. 47/ii

a. mm. 1-4

(1) *Adagio*

I

V<sup>7</sup> I  
(Weak-Beat PAC)

b. mm. 44-55

44

1 2

16 4

3 p f p f p

V HC

51

p p p p p

I : PAC

Example 3.11 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in G, H. 56/iii

*Allegro*

Reprise 1

8 I

I: HC I Reprise 2

15 V I: PAC I

22 V: HC V

29 V: PAC

35

Example 3.11 (continued)

This image shows a handwritten musical score for Example 3.11 (continued). The score is written on ten staves. The first five staves contain musical notation, with measure numbers 40, 45, 52, 58, and 64 marked at the beginning of their respective staves. The notation includes various rhythmic values, stems, and beams. The sixth and seventh staves are empty. The eighth and ninth staves are also empty, and the tenth staff is partially visible at the bottom of the page.

Example 3.12 C.P.E. Bach, *La Buchholtz*. H. 93

*Allegro.*

Refrain 1

Couplet 1 I:HC

5 I

10 I V I:PAC III (III)

III:HC

Refrain 2

15

20 III:PAC I

26

32 I:HC DC

V I:PAC

Example 3.13 C.P.E. Bach, *La Buchholtz*, H. 93

a. mm. 1-8 and 8-17

The musical score consists of two systems of music, each with a treble and bass clef. The first system, labeled 'Theme', covers measures 1 through 8. It begins with a treble clef and a bass clef. The melody in the treble clef features several triplets and slurs. The bass line provides harmonic support. Below the staff, chord symbols are indicated: I<sup>6</sup>, I, IV<sup>#</sup>, V, I, I<sup>6</sup><sub>5</sub>, V, and I. Measure numbers 1, 4, 5, and 8 are marked above the staff. A 'mm.' marking is present at the beginning. The second system, labeled 'Couplet', covers measures 8 through 17. It starts with a treble clef and a bass clef. The melody continues with triplets and slurs. Chord symbols below the staff are: F Maj:, I, IV<sup>5-6</sup>, V, I<sup>6</sup>, I, V, and I. Measure numbers 8, 12, and 16 are marked above the staff. A 'Couplet' marking is at the beginning of the system. A 'D min: 3' and 'F Maj:' marking is present at the start of the second system.

Example 3.13 C.P.E. Bach, *La Buchholtz*. H. 93

b. Refrain antecedent, mm. 1-4 and 16-27

Opening refrain antecedent, mm. 1-4

Closing refrain antecedent, mm. 16-27

c. Chromaticized voice exchange, mm. 21-27

Example 3.14 C.P.E. Bach, *La Louise*. H. 114

*Allegretto.* *La Louise.*

Refrain 1

9 I:HC Couplet 1

18 V: I:PAC VI

27 VI:HC

35 Refrain 2

45 VI:PAC I Couplet 2 I:HC

54 (I:PAC)

V:HC

Example 3.14 (continued)

61

Appendix

71

C# V:PAC d5 10

79

d5 10 Refrain 3 d5 V10

88

97

I:PAC

105

Coda

115

Example 3.15 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in A Minor, Wayne Petty's phrase analysis of the exposition

C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in A minor H30 ("Württemberg" #1), I, exposition: Annotated score

OPENING PHRASE  
 MODERATO  
 1 2 3 4  
 a: I  
 TRANSITIONAL PHRASE (Fortspinnung) first sequence  
 4 8  
 piano  
 III  
 second sequence  
 5 6 7 8  
 forte  
 IV (10-7 pattern, descending-fifths sequence)  
 CLOSING PHRASE (Schlussatz, = small Fortspinnung type)  
 link  
 Opening phrase (transposition of bars 1-3, varied)  
 9 10 11  
 V7 of V  
 e (-V): I  
 continued...

Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach, *Die sechs Württembergischen Sonaten für Klavier, Wq. 49*, edited by Rudolf Sieglisch. Reprint. Bärenreiter No. BA 6498, 1989. Reprinted by permission. Wayne Petty. 1995. Compositional techniques in the keyboard sonatas of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: Reimagining the foundations of a musical style. PhD diss., Yale Univ. Reprinted by permission.

Example 3.15 (continued)

POST-CADENTIAL PHRASE

The musical score is divided into several sections with the following annotations:

- (lead-in)**: Marked at the beginning of the first system.
- continuation (Fortspinnung)**: A bracket spans measures 12 through 14.
- cadential idea**: A bracket spans measures 14 through 15.
- echo-repetition of preceding continuation**: A bracket spans measures 15 through 16.
- POST-CADENTIAL PHRASE**: A large bracket encompasses the entire section from measure 12 to 20.
- cadence tone**: An arrow points to the first measure of the second system (measure 16).
- interpolation**: A bracket spans measures 17 through 18.
- second repetition of preceding continuation**: A bracket spans measures 18 through 19.
- harmonic closure avoided**: An arrow points to a measure in the second system.
- perfect cadence**: A bracket spans measures 20 through 21.

Dynamic markings include *piano* and *forte*. The score includes first and second endings for the final cadence.



Example 3.17 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in G Minor, H. 68/I, closing phrase, mm. 17-28

mm. 17 20 23 24 27 28

$\hat{3}$   $\hat{2}$   $\hat{2}$   $\hat{1}$

B $\flat$ : I<sup>6</sup> Gmin: III<sup>6</sup> (IV)<sup>6</sup> V<sub>5</sub><sup>6</sup> I II<sup>6</sup> V (VI - V<sub>5</sub><sup>6</sup>) I II<sup>6</sup> - V I III

Example 3.18 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in A Minor, H. 30/i

**1st Period**

Opening phrase  
 Presentation  
 Continuation  
 Cadential  
 Closing phrase  
 Sequential "presentation"

Compound basic idea  
 V I<sup>6</sup>  
 PAC Appendix HC  
 13 Continuation  
 Cadential  
 18  
 E: IV II V<sup>7</sup> VI V<sup>4</sup>-<sup>3</sup> I V<sup>4</sup>-<sup>3</sup> I A:<sup>6</sup>V

**2nd Period**

Opening phrase  
 Modulatory compound basic idea  
 Continuation (model-sequence)

21  
 25  
 30  
 35  
 40

Cadential  
 lead-in  
 Transitional phrase  
 Presentation  
 Continuation  
 Compound basic idea

I IV V/VI  
 I IV V I I  
 F<sup>#</sup>min.:I II<sup>6</sup> V I I

Example 3.18 (continued)

Appendix

The musical score is divided into several sections with annotations:

- Measures 42-51:** Labeled "Cadential". Measure 51 is marked "I:HC V".
- Measures 52-63:** Labeled "Closing phrase". This section includes a "Sequential 'presentation'" starting at measure 53, marked "Andante" and "p". A "model sequence" is indicated between measures 53 and 57, with notes *b*, *c#*, *d*, and *c#*. Measure 57 is marked "V - 7 m.3". Measure 61 is marked "Expansion".
- Measures 64-68:** Labeled "Continuation - cadential". Measure 64 is marked "V - 7 I#". Measure 68 is marked "V I V<sup>6</sup> 5-3 I".
- Measures 69-72:** Labeled "Basic phrase". Measure 69 is marked "m.4", 70 "m.5", 71 "m.6", and 72 "m.8".

Example 3.19 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in A Minor, H. 30/ii

a. Closing phrase reduced to eight measures. mm. 9-18

b. Opening phrase, mm. 1-8

c. Closing phrase, mm. 9-18

Example 3.19 C.P.E. Bach, Sonata in A Minor, H. 30/ii

d. Second period closing phrase, mm. 53-69

mm. 53 57 64 67 69  
 Presentation (Compound Basic Idea) Continuation PAC  
 Expansion Expansion  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8  
 II# V7 I V7 I V<sub>4-3</sub> I

e. First period opening phrase, mm. 1-8 and second period closing phrase, mm. 53-69

mm. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 HC  
 Opening Phrase - 1st Period Continuation  
 Presentation  
 3  
 mm. 53 57 65 67 69  
 Closing Phrase - 2nd Period Continuation  
 Presentation  
 3 4r

## Example 3.19 (continued)

f. Middleground voice-leading graph, mm. 1-8 and 53-69

mm. 1 4 8

I V I V I V<sup>7</sup> I IV I I:HC

mm. 53 57 65 67 68 69

I<sup>#</sup> V<sup>7</sup> I<sup>#</sup> V<sup>7</sup> I V<sup>7</sup> V I:PAC

## Chapter 4

Example 4.1 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in D, H.261

**Refrain 1: Antecedent**  
Allegretto

**Consequent**

$I^6$   $I:HC I^6$

**Varied Reprise Antecedent**

**Couplet 1 Fore-phrase**

6  $V$   $I:PAC$

**Consequent**

$V$   $I$

**5 - 6 After-phrase**

17  $V:HC$

**Cadence-altering Suffix**

21  $V:PAC$

**Refrain 2**

27  $I$

The image displays a musical score for C.P.E. Bach's Rondo in D, H.261, with various phrase structures and harmonic progressions labeled. The score is in 3/4 time and D major. It is divided into several systems of music. The first system (measures 1-5) is labeled 'Refrain 1: Antecedent' and 'Allegretto', with a 'Consequent' phrase. The second system (measures 6-11) is labeled 'Varied Reprise Antecedent' and 'Couplet 1 Fore-phrase'. The third system (measures 12-16) is labeled 'Consequent' and '5 - 6 After-phrase'. The fourth system (measures 17-20) is labeled 'Cadence-altering Suffix'. The fifth system (measures 21-26) is labeled 'Refrain 2'. The sixth system (measures 27-31) is labeled 'Refrain 2' and 'Allegretto'. The score includes various dynamic markings (p, f, ff) and articulation marks (accents, slurs, trills). Harmonic progressions are indicated by Roman numerals and symbols like I:HC and V:HC.

## Example 4.2 C.P.E. Bach, opening refrains

a. Rondo in B $\flat$ , H. 267

**Refrain 1**  
*Allegro.*

The score for Rondo in B $\flat$ , H. 267, consists of four systems of music. The first system is the main refrain, starting at measure 1. The second system, starting at measure 6, is labeled 'Cadence-altering Suffix' and 'Refrain Repetition'. The third system, starting at measure 13, is labeled 'V - I:PAC' and 'I:IAC'. The fourth system, starting at measure 19, is labeled 'I:PAC'. The music is in 3/4 time and features a mix of eighth and sixteenth notes.

## b. Rondo in D Minor, H. 290

**Refrain 1: Antecedent**  
*Allegro di molto*

The score for Rondo in D Minor, H. 290, consists of three systems of music. The first system is the main refrain, starting at measure 1, and is labeled 'Refrain 1: Antecedent' and 'Suffix'. The second system, starting at measure 5, is labeled 'Consequent'. The third system, starting at measure 9, is labeled 'V'. The music is in 3/4 time and features a mix of eighth and sixteenth notes.

Example 4.3 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 271

**Refrain**  
Poco Andante

8

12

16 **Couplet 1**  
1st Phrase

21 **2nd Phrase** I

24 **3rd Phrase** I

28 V

V

I

**Suffix (Post-Cadential)**

33 V:PAC

38

## Example 4.4 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in D Minor, H. 290

## a. Opening refrain and couplet

Refrain 1: Antecedent Suffix  
*Allegro di molto*

5 Consequent I:HC

9 Couplet 1

14 Suffix Retransition 1

19 Suffix 2 Retransition 2 Refrain 2 / Couplet 2 III:PAC

24 I

## Example 4.4 (continued)

## b. Couplet 1

The musical score for 'Couplet 1' consists of three systems of piano accompaniment. The first system starts at measure 9 and includes a bracketed section labeled 'Couplet' from measure 12 to 13, with sub-measures 1 and 2 indicated below. The second system starts at measure 14 and includes annotations for 'Expansion' (measures 14-15), 'III' (measure 16), 'Expansion' (measures 17-18), and 'III Suffix' (measures 19-20). The third system starts at measure 19 and includes an annotation for 'III Cadence-altering suffix' (measures 19-20). Measure numbers 9, 12, 14, 18, and 19 are clearly marked at the beginning of their respective systems.

## c. Hypothetical basic phrase

The 'Hypothetical basic phrase' is a single system of piano accompaniment. It features measure numbers 12, 13, 16, and 18 at the top of the staff. Roman numerals 'I' and 'III' are placed below the staff at the beginning and end of the phrase, respectively.

Example 4.5 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 274

Refrain 1  
Mässig und sanft.

I

6 9

V

13 16 Couplet 1 Transition I

I:PAC

20 24 Subordinate Theme

V:HC

27 30 Suffix 1 (Retransition)

B: V I:PAC

34 37 Suffix 2 (Retransition 2)

41

48 Refrain 2 51

4 I<sup>s</sup>:HC I

## Example 4.6 C.P.E. Bach, modulations following Couplet 1

## a. Rondo in Eb H. 288

Refrain 1  
Fore-phrase  
Andantino

9 After-phrase

17 Varied Reprise

26 Couplet 1  
Transition

35 Suffix

I:PAC

V:HC

Detailed description of the musical score: The score is for a Rondo in Eb major, H. 288 by C.P.E. Bach. It is in 3/4 time and marked Andantino. The piece consists of several sections: a Refrain 1 (measures 1-8), an After-phrase (measures 9-16), a Varied Reprise (measures 17-25), a Couplet 1 (measures 26-34), and a Suffix (measures 35-42). The score includes dynamic markings such as piano (p), fortissimo (ff), and tenuto (ten.). It also features a trill (tr.) in measure 28. Performance instructions include 'I:PAC' at the end of the Couplet 1 section and 'V:HC' at the end of the Suffix section. The key signature is one flat (Eb major), and the time signature is 3/4.



## b. Rondo in Bb H. 267

The image displays two systems of musical notation for the piano accompaniment of the Rondo in Bb, H. 267. The first system, starting at measure 34, is divided into two sections: "Subordinate Theme" and "Suffix". The "Subordinate Theme" section (measures 34-38) is harmonically analyzed with the chords V/V, V :PAC, and V. The "Suffix" section (measures 39-46) is not harmonically analyzed. The second system, starting at measure 47, is harmonically analyzed with the chords V<sup>6</sup> / IV, IV, and IV. Measure numbers 47, 49, and 52 are indicated above the staff. The notation includes treble and bass clefs, a key signature of two flats (Bb), and various musical symbols such as dynamics (f, p) and articulation marks.

## Example 4.7 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in A, H. 276

**Refrain 1**  
**Andantino.**

6 **Couplet 1** **V I:PAC** **Fore-phrase**

11 **I:PAC** **After-phrase**

15 **V:HC**

17 **Suffix**

**V:PAC**

20 **Cadence-altering Suffix**

24 **Suffix 2**

25 **Retransition**

**V** **I : HC**

Example 4.8 C.P.E Bach, Sonata in D Minor, H. 208/I, Wayne Petty's annotated score of the exposition

TRANS. to V of III (8-bar sent.)  
Presentation

Continuation

Presentation

Continuation (modulates)

CLOSING in III (8-bar sent., like a "2nd theme")

Continuation

PAC with phrase overlap begins POST-CADENTIAL PHRASE (ECP)

Continuation

small suffix (codettas)

1. Allegro moderato 2

d: I

3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20

21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28 29 30 31 32

HC

F (=III): V I<sub>3</sub> beginning implied

(cf. m. 21) expanded cadential progression

small suffix (codettas)

Wayne Petty. 1995. Compositional techniques in the keyboard sonatas of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: Reimagining the foundations of a musical style. PhD diss., Yale Univ. Reprinted by permission.

Example 4.9 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in F, H. 266

**Refrain 1**  
Allegretto

I I:HC I<sup>6</sup> V

8 I:PAC'

14 Couplet 1 Transition

I II<sub>2</sub><sup>4</sup> (V<sub>2</sub><sup>4</sup>/V)

19 Subordinate Theme Continuation

II C: I:HC I

24 Cadential

I<sup>6</sup> ECP:I<sup>6</sup>

31 Suffix

IV V I:PAC



Example 4.10 Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, Sonata in C, K. 545/iii

**RONDO Refrain**  
*Allegretto*

(I) Couplet 1 II<sup>6</sup> I:HC

Transition (TR)

II<sup>6</sup> V<sup>7</sup> I:PAC

Subordinate Theme (S) Retransition (RT)

V:HC (V) G: IV V<sup>4</sup>:<sup>7</sup> I:PAC

Refrain 2 C: V:PAC

(I) I:HC

I:PAC

I:PAC

## Example 4.11 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in Bb, H. 267

Refrain 1  
Antecedent  
**Allegro**  
Consequent

I I<sup>6</sup> II<sup>6</sup> V I:IAC

6 II<sup>6</sup> V I:PAC

13 Refrain (Repetition)

19 Couplet 1  
Transition

V I:PAC Cmin: V<sup>b</sup> VI<sup>b</sup> I

26 Cadence-altering Suffix

P *f*(B<sup>b</sup>:I)

32 Subordinate Theme

V:HC V  
F: I

Example 4.11 (continued)

Musical score for Example 4.11 (continued), showing measures 39 through 74. The score is written for piano and consists of seven systems of two staves each (treble and bass clef). The key signature is B-flat major (two flats). The time signature is 4/4.

Measure 39: Treble clef has a melodic line with eighth notes and quarter notes. Bass clef has a simple accompaniment. Dynamics include *p* and *ton.*

Measure 47: Treble clef has a melodic line with eighth notes and quarter notes. Bass clef has a simple accompaniment. Dynamics include *f*, *p*, and *ton.*. The marking "V I:PAC" is present above the treble staff.

Measure 53: Treble clef has a melodic line with eighth notes and quarter notes. Bass clef has a simple accompaniment.

Measure 59: Treble clef has a melodic line with eighth notes and quarter notes. Bass clef has a simple accompaniment. Dynamics include *p*.

Measure 66: Treble clef has a melodic line with eighth notes and quarter notes. Bass clef has a simple accompaniment.

Measure 66: Treble clef has a melodic line with eighth notes and quarter notes. Bass clef has a simple accompaniment.

Measure 74: Treble clef has a melodic line with eighth notes and quarter notes. Bass clef has a simple accompaniment. Dynamics include *p* and *f*.

Example 4.12 From Koch, *Introductory essay on composition*

## a. Example 388

**Allegro moderato** Rosetti

*p* (I)

5 (I:PAC) *f*

10

15 etc.

## b. Example 390

**Allegro**

(I) (I) *p*

5 *f* (V I:PAC)

10

etc.

(I:HC)

## Example 4.13 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 265

Rotation 1  
Refrain 1

Poco Andante

*pp*

I

I:PAC

5

Varied Reprise

*f* *p* *f*

8

Couplet 1  
Transition

*p* *tr* *mf*

I:PAC

11

Subordinate Theme  
Standing On The Dominant

*pp* *f* *pp*

V:HC

15 **EEC** **Retransition (RT)**

19 **V:PAC** **Rotation 2** **Refrain 2**

22 **I:HC I**

24 **Brief Modulation**

26 **Couplet 2: Development I:** **Pre-core** **PAC**

$V_4^6/4II$   $4II$

29  **$4II$ :PAC**

31 Cadence-altering Suffix

*pp* *f*

♯II IV ♯:HC

33 Pseudo-core Model Sequence

34 Model

35 Invertible Counterpoint

*p*

36 Model Sequence

*f* *p* *f* *p*

37 Fragmentation

*f*

I:HC

38 **Rotation 3**  
**Refrain 3**

*pp*

I

41 **Couplet 3: Part 1**  
**Unit 1: Transition**

*ff mf p pp ff mf pp*

I:PAC

44

*f p*

45 **Suffix**

*f*

VI (V/II)  
(Deceptive Cadence)

47 **Unit 2: Theme**  
**Variation 1**

*pp*

II#

\* The First Edition contains a single bar line followed by  $\frac{12}{8}$  then “volti subito.”

49

51 **Variation 2** II#:PAC

53 II#

54 II#:PAC

55 **Cadence-altering Suffix**

56 V/4VI

58 Couplet 3: Part 2  
Unit 1: Theme

♯VI Varied Reprise

♯VI:PAC

62

63

64

Unit 2: Subordinate Theme Complex

Transition:

Basic Idea

65

C: I

Subordinate Theme

Standing On The Dominant

68

Contrasting Idea

73 Retransition

77  $\sharp$ III:PAC (volti subito) Rotation 4 Refrain 4

E: V :HC \* I

80

82 Couplet 4: Transition (Subordinate Theme And Retransition From Couplet 1) V I:HC

84 Final 2 mm. of RT (19-20)

86 Pseudo-core (From Couplet 2) Model Sequence V  $\sharp$ 5 I:HC

Different

\*The First Edition contains a single bar line followed by "volti subito"

87 **model F#-e-a-g#** **Sequence Varied**

10 10 10

**D# E F# E**

88 **Varied Reprise**

*p*

**D# E F# G<sup>b</sup>**

89

**E F#**

*f p f p*

**D<sup>b</sup> C<sup>b</sup> E D<sup>b</sup>**

90 **Unmeasured Fragmentation**

*f*

**G<sup>b</sup> A**

**F<sup>b</sup> E etc.**

**Augmentation** **Rotation 5** **Refrain 5**

*ff p* *pp*

**6# V I:HC**

92

*f p*

**I II<sup>6</sup>V - I:PAC**

Example 4.14 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 265

a. mm.24-28

Couplet 2: Development  
Pre-Core

$V_5^6/II$   $bII$

b. mm.24-27

24 25 26 27

5 6

10 8 1 7 6 5 5<sup>b</sup> 10 (3)

$bII$

c. Figure 473a

mm. 24-27

6

7 5

$I^5$  -  $bII^5$  -  $bII^5$

d. mm. 31-32

31 32 31 32

10 10 10 10 10 10 7° 5

E:  $bII$   
a: VI V (I  $\#IV$ ) V a:VI V  
(HC)

## Example 4.14 (continued)

e. mm. 34-37

Invertible Counterpoint

Fragmentation

f. mm. 42-47

Suffix

Unit 2

42 46 47

$\hat{3}$   $F\#:(2)$   $(1)$

10 10

g. suffix, mm. 54-57

54 57

*p* *f*

$II^\#$   $V/hVI$

Example 4.15 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in F, H. 266

Rotation 1  
*p<sup>rf</sup>*  
 Allegretto

The score is written in F major, 2/4 time, and consists of 31 measures. It is divided into several sections:
 

- Measures 1-7:** Labeled "Rotation 1". The bass line contains figures: I, I: HC, I<sup>6</sup>, and V.
- Measures 8-13:** Labeled "Couplet 1". The bass line contains figures: I:PAC, I, and I<sup>6</sup>.
- Measures 14-18:** Labeled "Couplet 1" and "TR". The bass line contains figures: V, I:PAC, and II<sup>4</sup> (V<sup>4</sup>/V).
- Measures 19-23:** Labeled "F:II" and "C: I: HC I". The bass line contains figures: V and I.
- Measures 24-30:** Labeled "Suffix". The bass line contains figures: V<sup>4</sup>/V, V<sup>6</sup>, and ECP:I<sup>6</sup>.
- Measure 31:** Labeled "Suffix". The bass line contains figures: IV and V.

 Performance markings include dynamics (*p*, *f*, *mf*, *ten.*), articulation (*tr*, *acc.*), and fingerings (e.g., 10, 6-5). The piece concludes with a repeat sign at the end of measure 31.

Example 4.15 (continued)

**Rotation 1**

*prf*

37 **Lead-in**

*Expansion*

F:V I **Couplet 2: Interior Theme (Binary)**

44 **Phrase 1**

V I: PAC **Phrase 2**

52 **VI:HC**

59 2 3 4 5 *p* *f* *p*

**Rotation 3**  
**Refrain 3**

66 *f* 6 7 8 *prf*

VI:PAC I **Refrain 3**  
**Couplet 3**

72 *p* *f* *p*

I I: I  
PAC

Detailed description of the musical score: The score is written for piano and bass. It consists of seven systems of music. The first system (measures 37-43) is labeled 'Rotation 1' and 'Lead-in', with dynamics *prf* and *p*. The second system (measures 44-51) is labeled 'Couplet 2: Interior Theme (Binary)' and 'Phrase 1', with dynamics *f* and *p*. The third system (measures 52-58) is labeled 'Phrase 2' and 'VI:HC', with dynamics *f* and *p*. The fourth system (measures 59-65) is labeled 'Rotation 3' and 'Refrain 3', with dynamics *p*, *f*, and *p*. The fifth system (measures 66-71) is labeled 'Refrain 3' and 'Couplet 3', with dynamics *f* and *prf*. The sixth system (measures 72-78) is labeled 'Couplet 3' and 'TR', with dynamics *p* and *f*. The score includes various musical notations such as slurs, accents, and dynamic markings.

Example 4.15 (continued)

**Interpolation**

**Transitional Model-Sequence Presentation (Interpolation to m. 159)**

**Model Sequence**

80 *ff*

88 **IV Fragmentation** *f* **IV** **3**

94 **Model** **Sequence** **3**

98 **Sequence** **Model** **Sequence**

101 **Sequence** **3**

104 **Interpolation through m. 121** **VI** **3**

108 *p*

The musical score consists of seven systems of piano and treble clef staves. The first system (m. 80) features a piano part with a *ff* dynamic and a treble part with a melodic line. A dashed line labeled 'Interpolation' spans from m. 80 to m. 88. The second system (m. 88) is labeled 'IV Fragmentation' and 'IV', with a *f* dynamic and a triplet of eighth notes. The third system (m. 94) shows a 'Model' and 'Sequence' section with a triplet. The fourth system (m. 98) shows 'Sequence', 'Model', and 'Sequence' sections. The fifth system (m. 101) shows a 'Sequence' section with a triplet. The sixth system (m. 104) is labeled 'Interpolation through m. 121' and 'VI', with a triplet. The seventh system (m. 108) features a piano part with a *p* dynamic.

Example 4.15 (continued)

112

(°7)

116

120

Closing Antecedent

125

VI V<sub>3</sub>/IV IV Part 2 TR 2 Opening Phrase

Interpolation IV:PAC IV

133

Interpolation to m. 156 I:HC

139 Transition-like Unit Model

147 Sequence Imitation Imitation

$I^6$

Example 4.15 (continued)

**m. 85 - Interpolation**

155 *ff* *f* 10 *p* 10 *f* *p* 10

Model Sequence

Subordinate Theme Transition

163 10 *f* 10 10 *p* 6 - 5 *f* S

V I:HC I

168 *mf* *p*

175 *f* *p* *ten.* *ten.* *f* (96) (97) C

V I:PAC  $\hat{V}^6$  <sup>5</sup> I

181 (99) (100) (101)

184 (102) (103) (104)

Detailed description of the musical score: The score is written for piano and treble clef. It consists of six systems of music. The first system (m. 155) features a piano introduction with a forte (ff) dynamic, followed by a 'Model' section with a forte (f) dynamic and a 'Sequence' section with piano (p) and forte (f) dynamics. The second system (m. 163) includes a 'Subordinate Theme Transition' with piano (p) and forte (f) dynamics, and a section labeled 'S'. The third system (m. 168) has a mezzo-forte (mf) dynamic. The fourth system (m. 175) includes piano (p), tenuto (ten.), and forte (f) dynamics, with measures 96 and 97. The fifth system (m. 181) includes piano (p) and forte (f) dynamics, with measures 99, 100, and 101. The sixth system (m. 184) includes piano (p) and forte (f) dynamics, with measures 102, 103, and 104. Chord symbols V, I:HC, I, I:PAC, and V^6 are placed below the piano staff. Measure numbers (99), (100), (101), (102), (103), and (104) are placed below the piano staff. The word 'Model' is above the first system, 'Sequence' is above the second system, and 'S' is above the third system.

## Example 4.15 (continued)

187

(105) (106) (107) (108)

191

(109) (110) (111) (112)

195

(113) (114) (115) (116)

199

(117) (118) (119) (120)

203

(121) (122) (123) etc.

$V_3$  I:PAC Coda Varied Reprise

209

*f* *ff*

217

*ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *ten.* *p* *f*

Example 4.16 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in F, H. 266; P<sup>rf</sup> antecedent and rotation 1 TR as prototypes for Rotation 3 TR (expanded)

1 2 3 4 5

TR (expanded)

Refrain: (1) (2-----) (3) (4) (mm. 18-20)

79 80 85 158 160 162 164  $\hat{2}$

I V——V<sup>11</sup>

TR

17 *ten.* *tr* *tr* *tr* 20 S

10 10 10 6 - 5 *f*

C: V I

## Example 4.17 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in C, H. 260

Refrain 1  
Antecedent  
Allegretto.

5 Consequent I: HC Varied Reprise

10 I: PAC I V7 I

15 Couplet 1 Transition

19 I: PAC I Transposed Consequent

23 V:HC V Retransition Augmentation

Example 4.17 (continued)

Musical score for Example 4.17 (continued), showing piano and vocal parts with harmonic analysis. The score is divided into systems, with measures 27, 32, 37, 41, 46, and 48 marked.

**System 1 (Measures 27-31):** The piano part features a melodic line with a trill in measure 27 and a fermata in measure 31. The vocal part has a melodic line with a trill in measure 27 and a fermata in measure 31. Harmonic analysis below the piano part shows  $I^6$  at measure 27,  $\hat{b}3(V^4 \text{ of } I)$  at measure 28, and  $\hat{2}$  at measure 29.

**System 2 (Measures 32-36):** The piano part has a trill in measure 32 and a fermata in measure 36. The vocal part has a trill in measure 32 and a fermata in measure 36. Harmonic analysis below the piano part shows  $II^6_5b$  at measure 32,  $I^{4-3}: HC$  at measure 33, and  $I^7$  at measure 34.

**System 3 (Measures 37-40):** The piano part has a trill in measure 37 and a fermata in measure 40. The vocal part has a trill in measure 37 and a fermata in measure 40. Harmonic analysis below the piano part shows  $I:HC$  at measure 37 and  $I$  at measure 38.

**System 4 (Measures 41-45):** The piano part has a trill in measure 41 and a fermata in measure 45. The vocal part has a trill in measure 41 and a fermata in measure 45. Harmonic analysis below the piano part shows  $V$  at measure 41 and  $I$  at measure 42.

**System 5 (Measures 46-47):** Labeled "Couplet 2: Pre-core Transitional Introduction". The piano part has a trill in measure 46 and a fermata in measure 47. The vocal part has a trill in measure 46 and a fermata in measure 47. Harmonic analysis below the piano part shows  $V / III$  at measure 46 and  $III^6$  at measure 47.

**System 6 (Measures 48-51):** The piano part has a trill in measure 48 and a fermata in measure 51. The vocal part has a trill in measure 48 and a fermata in measure 51. Harmonic analysis below the piano part shows  $III^6$  at measure 48.

## Example 4.17 (continued)

50

52

III:HC

54 Pseudo-core 1

III

60

62 V/VI (V of A minor)

VI

65

1

V<sup>7</sup>/VI

Example 4.17 (continued)

68 Pseudo-core 1

Antecedent

*pp* *ff* *f*

VI = A min:I

74 Consequent begins

*p* *10* *10*

*b*II:HC *b*II

79 *f* *10*

*v*<sup>7</sup>

81 *I*

83

Retransition

85 *2* *p* *f* *p*

IV V I:PAC  
VI:  
PAC



Example 4.17 (continued)

113 Pseudo-core Part 2: Varied Repetition of Antecedent

117 III<sup>#</sup>

121 Pseudo-core 2  
p Sequence 1  
f (V<sup>6</sup> Passing)

125 III:HC  
ff

129 Sequence 2

131 Fantasia-like Figuration  
mf p poco adagio

134 f allegretto p f

## Example 4.17 (continued)

136

138

Completion of Suffix Phrase: m106

140

Refrain 4  
Antecedent

I

144

Consequent

I

148

150

152

$V_5^6$

I:HC

Example 4.17 (continued)

154

156 Coda  
Suffix Theme

V I: PAC I<sup>b</sup>

159 *ff* I:HC

164 Consequent I

168 *p* *pp* *ff*

172 *p* *pp* V I

## Example 4.18 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in C, H. 260

a. mm. 24-33. RT

24 25 26 27 28 29 31 32 33

C: V (IV<sup>6</sup>) V<sup>6</sup> (I<sup>b</sup>) IV<sup>b</sup> V

## Example 4.18 (continued)

## b. Hypothetical version of m. 106

89 **Refrain 3**  
Antecedent

94 **Incomplete Consequent/Couplet 3**  
Pre-core

99

103 **Suffix**

105 (106)

$I:HC$   $I$   $V_5^6$   $I:HC$   $1$   $(V_5^6)$

## Chapter 5

Example 5.1 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in B $\flat$ , H. 267

**Rotation 1: Exposition**  
**P<sup>rf</sup> (Refrain 1)**  
**Allegro.**

6 **Suffix** *p* *f* **I**

13 **Repetition of P<sup>rf</sup>** **V** **I:PAC**

19 **Couplet 1** **TR** *ff* *p* **I**

26 **I:PAC** **Cadence-altering Suffix** *f*

32 **S** **V:HC** **V:IAC**

Example 5.1 (continued)

39 **Cadence-altering Suffix**  
EEC *p* *ten.*

47 **Rotation 2: Development**  
V:PAC *f* *p* *f* *ten.* **Suffix 2**

53 **IV**

59 **S'** **IV** *p*

66 **IV:PAC**

70 **II:HC**

74 **II:HC** *p* *f*

Example 5.1 (continued)

80

86 II:IAC

93 II:PAC

102

108  $\flat$ IV  $\flat$ IV:PAC

116

123 III:HC III III:IAC *ten. tr* *ten. tr* *ten. tr* *ten. tr* *ten. tr*

Detailed description of the musical score: The score is written for piano in G minor (three flats) and 3/4 time. It consists of seven systems of two staves each (treble and bass clef).  
 - System 1 (measures 80-85): Features a melodic line in the treble clef with eighth and sixteenth notes, and a bass line with quarter and eighth notes. Measure 86 is marked with a fermata and the annotation 'II:IAC'.  
 - System 2 (measures 86-92): Continues the melodic and bass lines. Measure 93 is marked with a fermata and 'II:PAC'.  
 - System 3 (measures 93-101): Shows a more active bass line with eighth notes. Measure 102 has a fermata.  
 - System 4 (measures 102-107): The bass line continues with eighth notes. Measure 108 is marked with a fermata and ' $\flat$ IV'.  
 - System 5 (measures 108-115): Measure 109 is marked with a fermata and ' $\flat$ IV:PAC'.  
 - System 6 (measures 116-122): Measure 116 has a fermata. The system concludes with a fermata and the annotation 'III:HC'.  
 - System 7 (measures 123-128): Measure 123 has a fermata and is marked 'III'. The final measures (124-128) feature a series of chords with the annotation 'III:IAC' and the marking '*ten. tr*' (tension trill) above each chord.

## Example 5.1 (continued)

130

(Berg Facsimile Ed.)

134

138

142  $V_A$

146 *forte* *ff* *p* *ff* *p*

151 *ff* *p* *f*

158  $V_A''$

I:IAC

I:PAC

Rotation 3: Recapitulation  
Refrain 3

## Example 5.1 (continued)

165

175

183 Couplet 2  
TR/S!

191 I I<sup>6</sup>

197 ore V<sub>A</sub> scen

200 do e<sup>b</sup> d<sup>#</sup> e

208 V<sub>A</sub> V

## Example 5.1 (continued)

216

219

222

End Couplet 2 → Refrain 3: Rotation 4

227

$I^6$   $V$

*ff* *p* *ff* *p* *f*

234

237

$I$   $V$

V - I:PAC



## c. Reduction of opening of TR, mm. 20-32

mm. 20 21 27 28 32 33 36

I (VI) V:HC V<sup>6</sup> V

I V

5 - 6 - 5

## d. Reduction of new theme, mm. 60-67

mm. 60 64 65 67

E<sub>b</sub> (F) D E<sub>b</sub> C (D)

C min.: I I:HC

Example 5.2 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in B $\flat$ , H. 267

e. Reduction of mm. 213-237

-- Couplet 2 --  
 Refrain 3 --  
 mm. 213 215 220 222 223 224 226 227 229 232 234 237

f. Dominant prolongation, mm. 233-237

mm. 233 234 237

## Example 5.2 (continued)

g. Comparison of mm. 119-138 and 213-226

mm. 119      130      138      213      215      226

<sup>^</sup><sub>3</sub>                    <sup>^</sup><sub>2</sub>                    <sup>^</sup><sub>5</sub>      P      <sup>^</sup><sub>4</sub>      <sup>^</sup><sub>3</sub>

V<sup>5</sup> - 6 - 5<sup>b</sup> V                    V<sup>5</sup> - 6 - 7 V

Example 5.3 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 274

Refrain 1  
Fore-phrase  
*Mässig und sanft.*

6 (I) N I<sup>4-3</sup>

After-phrase

IV V I

13 Couplet 1

II<sup>6</sup> V I:PAC

20

V:HC

27

RT

V:PAC

34

Example 5.3 (continued)

41 *f p f p f p f p f p f p f p*

48 **Refrain 2**  
**Fore-phrase**  
*f p f p*

55  $V_A$   $I$  **After-phrase (incomp.)**  
*f p*

62  $I:HC$  **Refrain 2** **Couplet 2**  
*f p*

68  $I$   $II^6$   
*f p f p f p f p*

77  $I^6$   
*p f*

83  $V_4$

Detailed description: This musical score is for a piano and violin. It consists of seven systems of music. The first system (measures 41-47) features a piano accompaniment with a repeating rhythmic pattern of eighth notes, alternating between fortissimo (f) and piano (p) dynamics. The second system (measures 48-54) is labeled 'Refrain 2 Fore-phrase' and includes a violin part with a melodic line. The third system (measures 55-61) is labeled 'After-phrase (incomp.)' and includes a violin part. The fourth system (measures 62-67) is labeled 'Refrain 2 Couplet 2' and includes a violin part. The fifth system (measures 68-76) includes a violin part with various dynamics and articulations. The sixth system (measures 77-82) includes a violin part. The seventh system (measures 83-88) includes a violin part. The score is annotated with various musical symbols, including Roman numerals (I, II<sup>6</sup>, I<sup>6</sup>), dynamic markings (f, p), and performance instructions (V<sub>A</sub>, V<sub>4</sub>).

Example 5.3 (continued)

89

96

103

109

115 (B<sup>#</sup>)

123

130 V<sup>6</sup> Couplet 2

After-phrase (incomp.)

I:HC

Detailed description of the musical score: The score consists of seven systems of piano accompaniment. Each system has a treble and bass clef. Measure numbers 89, 96, 103, 109, 115, 123, and 130 are placed at the beginning of their respective systems. Dynamics include piano (*p*), forte (*f*), and fortissimo (*ff*). A key signature change to B major (two sharps) is indicated above measure 115. Structural annotations include: a double bar line at measure 115; a left-pointing arrow labeled '(6<sup>#</sup>)' at measure 123; a right-pointing arrow labeled 'Couplet 2' spanning measures 123-128; a downward arrow labeled 'Refrain 2' at measure 128; a right-pointing arrow labeled 'Fore-phrase' spanning measures 128-130; and the text 'After-phrase (incomp.)' at the end of measure 130. The initials 'I:HC' are at the bottom right.

## Example 5.3 (continued)

137

145

VI:DC

151

157

I:HC

164

I:HC

171

I:HC

177

I:PAC

Example 5.4 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 274, comparison of mm. 1-16 and mm. 50-83

Refrain 1

mm. 1 4 8 12 15 16

$\hat{5}$   $(\hat{4} \hat{3} \hat{2})$   $\hat{5}$   $(\hat{4} \hat{3} \hat{2})$   $\hat{1}$

$V^5$  IV  $V^6_{4-3}$  I  $II^6$  V I

Refrain 2 ..... ? Couplet 2 .....

mm. 50 60 64 68 72 76 78 80 82 83

$\hat{5}$

6 6 6 6 6 6 6

I V  $I^5$  6 7  $II^\#$   $V^\#$

Example 5.5 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in E, H. 274

a. Deep-middleground voice-leading reduction

mm. R1 1 C1 17 22 R2 50 C2-----R3 83 123 131 177 182

$\hat{5}$   $\hat{4}$   $\hat{3}$   $\hat{2}$   $\hat{1}$

(5 - 5)

I V I  $V_5^6$  I  $V^7$  I  $II^6$  V I

E D# E

motive of opening theme, inner voice, and bass

b. Chromaticized voice exchange and resulting motivic repetitions, mm. 83-123

mm. 50 80 82 83 89 (92-118) 119 121 123 131

3 3

E - motive of opening theme - bass

P

B A G# F# E D# E

motive of opening theme and melody

c. Reduction of mm. 83-119 with interpolation

mm. 83 89 92 108 111 115 117 119

$C^\# = B^\#$

$III^5 - 6$   $III^5$

6#

## Example 5.6 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268

Rotation 1: Exposition  
Refrain 1  
Antecedent

Andante un poco

I I:HC I

6 I<sup>6</sup> II<sup>6</sup> V I:PAC

10 I:HC I

14 Couplet 1 TR

18 S

23 RT V:HC V

V

Example 5.6 (continued)

27

31

**Rotation 2: Development**  
**Refrain 2**  
(Tempo I)

Adagio

35

I

38

Couplet 2

42

I:PAC

F# : V:HC I<sup>6</sup>

47

I IV

51

G: V/III III 5—6 A#<sup>o</sup>

## Example 5.6 (continued)

56 (Interpolated refrain)

61

66 Couplet 2 resumes

70

75

79

83

I A#°

*pp ff ten. pp ff mf p f*

*p*

*f ten. ten. p*

*f p f p*

*ten. ten. p*

*f p f p*

1/2 Step

Enharmonic

Compare m. 138

Example 5.6 (continued)

85

87

89

Interpolation

95

100

104

108

## Example 5.6 (continued)

Musical score for Example 5.6 (continued), measures 112-133. The score is written for piano and features complex rhythmic patterns and dynamic markings.

Measures 112-115: Measure 112 shows a melodic line in the right hand with a slur over measures 112-114. Measure 115 begins with a *pp* dynamic and includes *ten.* markings.

Measures 118-121: Measure 118 starts with a *p* dynamic. Measure 121 features a *ff* dynamic and *ten.* markings.

Measures 124-129: Measure 124 includes *p*, *f*, *pp*, and *ff* dynamics. Measure 129 begins with a *p* dynamic.

Measures 133: Measure 133 features *f* and *pp* dynamics, along with *ten.* markings.

Example 5.6 (continued)

138

1/2 Step 1/2 Step

140

142

RT 6#

144

*p* *pp* *ten.* *ten.* *p* *mf*

150 I:HC

Rotation 3: Recap Refrain 3

I

156

*ten.* *f* *p* *ten.*

I:HC

160

*f* *p* *ff ten.* *p* *ff ten.*

I:PAC

## Example 5.6 (continued)

165

169

172

176

180

183

V:HC

V I:PAC

Example 5.7 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268, lead-in and its reduction, mm.54-56

mm. 54 55 56

III

mm. 54 56

III<sup>5</sup> - 6

7°

## Example 5.8 C. P. E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268

## a. Hypothetical version

mm. 51 54 55 → 68 69

*p* *f* *p* *ff* *p*

*ten.* *ten.*

A#

## b. Reduction of mm. 51-69

mm. 51 54 55 68 69

motive

motive

tonic refrain

F#	E	D	F#	E	D
10	10	10	10	10	10
D	C#	B	D	C#	B

(III) (III)

## c. Reduction of mm. 69-73

mm. 69 70 71 72 73

(10) (10)10

(III)



## Example 5.9 (continued)

## d. Original version, mm. 1-89

mm. 1 81 86 88 89

I m3 6# VI#

## e. Transposed version, mm. 115-144

mm. 115 136 141 143 144

VI# M2 IV<sup>b</sup> 6# V

## f. Hypothetical version

VI# 6# #IV

## Example 5.10 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268

a. Deep-middleground voice-leading reduction with ellipsis, mm. 89-122

mm. 89 91 93 111 114 115 122

interpolation (prf)

II: HC DC A#° 6# ellipsis

b. Reduction of mm. 115-132

mm. 115 122 123 124 127 132 133

interpolation transposition

II: HC

c. Reduction, from VI# to V, mm. 89-144

mm. 89 133 136 138 141 143 144 mm.89 143 144

3 2 10 10

II: HC 6# V VI# 6# V

Example 5.11 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268, comparison of mm. 17-20 and mm. 167-172

The image displays two systems of musical notation for C.P.E. Bach's Rondo in G, H. 268. Each system consists of a grand staff with a treble and bass clef. The first system covers measures 17-20, and the second system covers measures 167-172. The notation includes various musical symbols such as notes, rests, slurs, and ornaments. The first system shows a treble staff with a triplet of eighth notes in measure 17, a slur over measures 18-19, and a triplet of eighth notes in measure 20. The bass staff has a dotted quarter note in measure 17, a half note in measure 18, and a quarter note in measure 19. The second system shows a treble staff with a triplet of eighth notes in measure 167, a slur over measures 168-170, and a triplet of eighth notes in measure 172. The bass staff has a dotted quarter note in measure 167, a half note in measure 168, and a quarter note in measure 169. The notation is in G major (one sharp) and 3/4 time. The first system is labeled with 'I' and 'V:HC' below the bass staff, and the second system is labeled with 'I' and 'I:HC' below the bass staff.

mm. 17 18 19 20 mm. 17 20

mm. 167 168 170 172 mm. 167 172

I V:HC I V:HC

I I:HC I I:HC

## Example 5.12 C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268

a. RT, mm. 25-31

23 RT  
f pp  
I:HC

27 I:HC

31 Adagio (Tempo I)  
pp f P ten. ten. ff  
V7 I

## Example 5.12 (continued)

## b. Reduction of RT, mm. 24-28

mm. 24 25 26 27 28

10 10 (10) 10 10 10 10

V<sup>5</sup> 6 7° V

## c. Middleground voice-leading reduction, mm. 24-30

mm. 24 28 29 30



Appendix A

The Rondo in Bb Major, H. 267

Exposition

Refrain I

theme

mm

4 8 12 16 20

I: PAC

4 8 12 16 20

I: PAC



40 Suffix  
44  
48  
52 Development  
Couplet 2  
56  
60  
65 67  
68

(5 4 3 2 1) (5 6 4 3 2)

V IV III II I

C

V IV II

C

68 70 74 79 83 87 92 98

Musical score for the first system, measures 68-98. The score is written on two staves (treble and bass clefs). It features complex rhythmic patterns and melodic lines. A large bracket labeled 'II' spans measures 68-79. Another bracket labeled 'II: PAC' spans measures 83-87. A final bracket labeled 'IV' spans measures 92-98. There are handwritten annotations and markings throughout the score, including a circled section in measure 74 and a circled section in measure 92.

Musical score for the second system, measures 99-128. The score is written on two staves (treble and bass clefs). It features complex rhythmic patterns and melodic lines. A large bracket labeled 'II' spans measures 99-112. Another bracket labeled 'II' spans measures 116-120. A final bracket labeled 'IV' spans measures 124-128. There are handwritten annotations and markings throughout the score, including a circled section in measure 104 and a circled section in measure 124.

98 102 106 110 114 118

118 122 125 128 130 131 135

III 6

III 6

159

156  
Recapitulation  
Refrain 2

151 155

139 146

138

136

133

Musical score for measures 133-159. The score is written in treble and bass clefs. It includes a section labeled 'Recapitulation Refrain 2' starting at measure 156. The notation features various note values, rests, and dynamic markings. A double bar line is present at the end of the section.

V ————— V<sup>7</sup>

Musical score for measures 133-159, showing harmonic structure. The score is written in treble and bass clefs. It includes a section labeled 'Recapitulation Refrain 2' starting at measure 156. The notation features various note values, rests, and dynamic markings. A double bar line is present at the end of the section.

I<sup>b</sup> V<sup>7</sup>I

V

159 163 169 171 179 182 186 194

Couplet 2

Reprise

I: PAC

I: HC

I

I: HC

194 201 209 213 217 220 223 225

Refrain 3  
Couplet 2

V 5 - 6 - 5 - 6

V 5 - 6 - 5 - 6

225 227 234 237

V V<sup>7</sup>I VI

V<sup>7</sup>I V I



32 35 38 40 43 49 52 60 64 68 73 76  
Refrain 2 (50-67)  
Couplet 2 -----

V  
 V<sub>A</sub> I  
 IV V<sub>2</sub><sup>8-7</sup> V<sub>4</sub><sup>6-7</sup> V<sub>5</sub><sup>4-5</sup>  
 (II:140)  
 (II<sup>b</sup>)  
 I 5--6 IV

V  
 V<sub>A</sub> I  
 IV V<sub>2</sub><sup>8-7</sup> V<sub>4</sub><sup>6-7</sup> V<sub>5</sub><sup>4-5</sup>  
 I 5--6

76 83 86 89 92 96 100

[Couplet 2 (67-131) ----]

Musical score for the first system, measures 76-100. It consists of two staves: a treble clef staff on top and a bass clef staff on the bottom. The key signature has three sharps (F#, C#, G#). The music features complex rhythmic patterns with many beamed notes and slurs. There are several dynamic markings, including  $mf$  and  $pp$ . A large slur covers measures 83-89. At the end of the system, there are markings for  $III^b$  and  $III^b:HC$ .

Musical score for the second system, measures 101-131. It consists of two staves: a treble clef staff on top and a bass clef staff on the bottom. The key signature has three sharps (F#, C#, G#). The music continues with complex rhythmic patterns and slurs. There are dynamic markings, including  $p$ . At the end of the system, there are markings for  $V^b$  and  $V^b$ .

143 147

135

121

128

119

117

111

107

100

Couplet 2 -----  
Refrain 3

I ♯V VI  
 (♯:HC) IV ♯V 7 ♯V 4 3  
 V 6 (4) I

I ♯V VI  
 I IV V  
 V 6 I

147 155 157 160 166 170 174 182

VI V V I IV V I II I

V I II VI I

C.P.E. Bach, Rondo in G, H. 268

**mm**      **4**      **8** **16**      **20**

Rotation 1: Exposition  
 Refrain 1  
 Theme

Couplet 1  
 transition

I    IV    (I:HC) V I    IV I II V II 5 6    V:HC

I    IV<sup>b</sup>    V I    V I    V:HC

21 Subordinate Theme  
24 suffix  
28  
32 Rotation 2: Development  
34 Refrain 2

Musical score for the first system, measures 21-34. The score is written on two staves (treble and bass clefs). It includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and accidentals. Vertical lines indicate measure boundaries. Roman numerals are placed below the staff: V at measure 21, V: PAC at measure 24, I: HC at measure 28, I at measure 32, and IV at measure 34. A bracket labeled 'suffix' spans measures 24-28. A bracket labeled 'Refrain 2' spans measures 32-34. A bracket labeled 'Development' spans measures 28-32.

Musical score for the second system, measures 35-48. The score is written on two staves (treble and bass clefs). It includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and accidentals. Vertical lines indicate measure boundaries. Roman numerals are placed below the staff: V at measure 35, V: PAC at measure 38, I: HC at measure 42, I at measure 46, and I at measure 48. A bracket labeled 'suffix' spans measures 38-42. A bracket labeled 'Refrain 2' spans measures 46-48.

34 36 39 43 50 54

Couplet 2

I:HC I IV:I V:I PAC III

Fin. I:HC

I:HC II V:I PAC III

54 56 61 65 69 72

III (I) II VI IV I' II' V I' III

10 10 10 10 (10)

III

10 10 10 10 (10)

72 73 77 81 82 86 88 89 93

Amur: 28-7 VI (bc)

(10) 10

98 100 102 104 107

125

122

119

115

114

111

109

107

Musical score for measures 107-125. The score is written on two staves: a treble clef staff on top and a bass clef staff on the bottom. The music features a complex melodic line with many accidentals (sharps and naturals) and a bass line with some accidentals. There are several large, hand-drawn loops and lines connecting notes across the staves, indicating phrasing or specific harmonic relationships. Measure numbers 107, 109, 111, 114, 115, 119, 122, and 125 are printed above the staff. At the end of the score, there are two boxed-in sections, each containing the letters 'I' and 'II'.

Musical score for measures 107-125, showing a different arrangement or interpretation of the same material. It consists of two staves, treble and bass clef. The notation is similar to the first score but includes a dashed line across the top of the staves, possibly indicating a different phrasing or a specific performance instruction. The large hand-drawn loops and lines are present, connecting notes across the staves. Measure numbers 107, 109, 111, 114, 115, 119, 122, and 125 are printed above the staff.

125 127 128 132 136 141 143 144 154

8-7

V

VI

155 158  
Rotation 3: Recapitulation  
Refrain 3

162 166 169

The image displays a musical score for a piece titled "Rotation 3: Recapitulation Refrain 3". The score is written on two staves, a treble clef staff on top and a bass clef staff on the bottom. The key signature is one sharp (F#), and the time signature is 3/4. The score is divided into measures, with measure numbers 155, 158, 162, 166, and 169 indicated. The music features a complex melodic line with many slurs and ties, and a bass line with fewer notes. There are several fermatas and dynamic markings. The word "Refrain 3" is written above the staff. At the bottom of the page, there are two large, faint, stylized characters that appear to be "3" and "I".

171 172 176 179 183 187

I: PAC

I: PAC