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If we in our time are still more “Bach amateurs” than “Bach connoisseurs”, in contrast to his contemporaries who were more familiar with the subtleties of his language, we are yet blessed with the privilege of being able to sense better the uniqueness of the manifestation of the holy spirit of music which is symbolized for us in the name of BACH.

ERWIN BOKKY

(1960: 261)
CHAPTER 1

1. INTRODUCTION

Historical Performance Practice represents a fusion of the disciplines of the musicologist and the practical musician. It is a branch of musicological endeavour that depends upon the practical contributions and aesthetic insights of the practical musician, as well as the meticulous research and considered judgements of the musicologist. Before embarking on the formulation of a clearly defined hypothesis for this study, it is helpful to reflect on the implications of this marriage of seemingly divergent disciplines which constitute the essence of Historical Performance Practice.

Ideally, a study such as this one should comprise a research component and a practical component. It should pay homage to the objective truths of historical, organological, bibliographical and analytical knowledge, while at the same time reflecting considerations of good taste, technique, aesthetics and unfettered creativity. The results of musicological endeavour can only assume musical meaning and function when the dynamism and vitality of creative performance brings it to life. It is therefore to the detriment of this study that it has no practical component with which to enliven the outcomes and conclusions of the research. It has however been the author’s intention to compensate for this as far as possible, continuously balancing considerations of the pseudo-scientific discipline which is musicology and the highly subjective and intuitive creativity which is musicianship. Reflecting this need for balance, Chapters 2 and 3 are largely dedicated to establishing a sound musicological basis for the interpretation of the Capriccio, whilst Chapters 4 and 5 seek to extract interpretative principles from this basis.
Whilst a marriage of the disciplines of musicology and the principles of performance is a necessary condition for research of this nature, it reveals nothing about that which the research hopes to achieve. The dichotomy implied in the words “Interpretative Analysis”, which appear in the title of this study, is of seminal importance in grasping the direction and ultimate desired outcome of this research endeavour. The word “Interpretative”, brings the contents of the research firmly within the sphere of the aesthetic concepts of perception and judgement, whilst “Analysis” denotes a more cognitive approach aimed at understanding various aspects of the music. “Interpretative Analysis”, therefore, ideally denotes a synthesis in which the understanding of the music should contribute to a more informed and thus deeper perspective in the interpretation of the music. What should emerge from this synthesis of aesthetic and cognitive experiences, is the fulfilment of the hypothesis of this study. This is namely to arrive at interpretative solutions for the Capriccio in B flat major which will bridge the spectre of the musical divide that endures between musicology and practical performance. In the ensuing study this aim is realised by pursuing specific issues (or objectives), essential to understanding and formulating possible interpretations of the Capriccio. These objectives focus on the following:

- The origin of the work and the sources from which it was handed down.
- The style in which the Capriccio was composed and conceived.
- The performance practices prevalent in the early eighteenth century and the applicability thereof to the music of J. S. Bach.
- The structure of the composition and the impact thereof on performance.
- The different instruments on which the Capriccio can be performed and the impact which this choice has on any performance of the Capriccio.
In Chapter 2 the enquiry is initially directed in Section 2.1 to firmly establishing the Capriccio as a composition by J. S. Bach. This section, which leans heavily on the work done by Hartwig Eichberg in the *Neue Bach Ausgabe* (NBA) *Kritischer Bericht*, volume V/10, emphasises the problems involved in deriving as authentic a version as possible from the existing sources of a work of which the autograph is missing. The resultant edition(s) can lay claim to the newest musicological research and knowledge, but not to textual authenticity. This is extremely important from the point of view of the performer, as it allows him/her more freedom to bring changes to the musical text in circumstances where it is believed that such changes will complement the intentions of the composer and the work in general. The second section of this chapter (2.2), is devoted to a discussion of the historical conditions which may provide an insight into the probable identity of the brother to whom the Capriccio was dedicated, a point returned to in Chapter 4 where the macro-structural analysis of the music yields findings of its own in this regard. Section 2.3 highlights the uniqueness of this kind of program music in Bach's *oeuvre* and it tries to fathom the composer's intentions in creating representative art in the Capriccio in B flat major. Were it his intention to mock the Biblical Sonatas of Johann Kuhnau, as some authors would seem to suggest, then this should be reflected in performance. If on the other hand, the Capriccio was conceived as a serious attempt at program music by an idealistic and a sentimental young Bach, such a farcical interpretation would surely do injustice to the music.

Chapter 3 aims to provide an objective musicological base of contemporary Performance Practice from which to launch the analysis of Chapter 4. Only aspects of Performance Practice deemed by the author to be relevant to this case study, are included in this chapter.
It must be emphasised that this chapter is inevitably a superficial and skeletal representation of the colossal body of existing research in this field. The justification for this somewhat superficial treatment of material is that, within the confines of this study, this material represents only the means by way of which the desired outcome can be achieved, and not the outcome itself. Chapter 3 stands in subservience to the *raison d’être* of this study, which is found in Chapters 4 and 5.

In Chapters 4 and 5 analysis interacts with intuition, fact with opinion and objective truth with subjective speculation. Those thoughts which lay claim to an original contribution to the research conducted during the course of this study, can thus be found in these chapters. Chapters 4 and 5, unlike Chapters 2 and 3, make no pretence to be “scientific” in method and conclusion. Following the largely objective general structural analysis of each individual movement in Chapter 4, the ensuing dialectic constitutes deductive argument which takes into account relevant musicological insights and interpretative artistic sensibilities. The latter shifts the focus of the inquiry from the factually based deductions of Chapters 2 and 3, to the domain of philosophical aesthetics, where the formulation of fixed and total truths is unwise, if not impossible.

Chapter 4 contains a movement by movement analysis of the Capriccio in B flat major, accompanied by interpretative comments with regard to structure, Affekt, ornamentation, rhythm and tempo. This interpretative analysis is briefly preceded by a discussion of the preferred choice of edition on which the analysis will be based and the reasons for this preference. The interpretative analysis of all six individual movements is followed by a macro-structural analysis in which the overall architectonic design of the composition, and its influence on the interpretation of the composition, is reflected upon.
Chapter 5 entails a brief discussion expounding the implications of performing BWV 992 on the clavichord, harpsichord and piano respectively. Articulation and dynamics are discussed in this chapter, as the manipulation and usage of these musical elements are inexorably intertwined with the choice of instrument. It is this chapter, more than any other, which would clearly benefit from a practical supplement in which to demonstrate and test the possibilities of the instruments under discussion. As this proved to be logistically impossible, the chapter merely proposes to underline the differences between the three instruments and to show how these differences can drastically alter performances and interpretations of the Capriccio.

Lastly, it should be said that the idea of one definitive, or more contentiously, one authentic interpretation of the Capriccio in B flat major, is not entertained in this study. Apart from the philosophically problematical implications of applying the term "authentic" to music, an art where many different legitimate interpretations of the same work can co-exist, it is the opinion of the author that justice cannot be done to this abstract art by following a rigorously dogmatic approach in either analysis or interpretation.

The system of pitch notation used in this study is the Helmholtz system, illustrated below:
CHAPTER 2

2. HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Sources

According to the Hartwig Eichberg in the Neue Bach Ausgabe (NBA) Kritischer Bericht, volume V/10, no doubt exists about the authenticity of the Capriccio in B flat major (1982: 25). Two key factors play a role in his ascertainment. The first of these is the extent to which characteristics of J. S. Bach's style can be recognised in the music. The second and most important factor is the integrity of the sources from which the Capriccio has been handed down.

With regard to the first factor, there seems to be general agreement among different authors that the Capriccio is representative of an as yet immature style practiced by the young J. S. Bach, a style which borrows inspiration from the work of other composers and in which Bach still struggles technically to perfect certain procedures. The legitimacy of this claim will be dealt with in later chapters. However, as this claim is generally made of all Bach's early keyboard works, it becomes a common factor that reinforces the authenticity of the Capriccio in B flat major rather than detracting from it. There seems to be a general consensus among Bach scholars that compositional aspects reflecting a certain stylistic immaturity with regard to the Capriccio, do not as such cast any doubt on the authenticity of the work in question.
The second factor can provide more concrete, if not conclusive evidence, in possible disputes arising about authenticity. The sources from which the work has been handed down provide a much more objective perspective than evaluations of stylistic criteria could hope to achieve. The autograph of the Capriccio in B flat major has not survived, hence the uncertainty regarding the exact date of the inception of the composition. The copies that do exist are also not originally dated (Eichberg 1982: 12). A number of copies, illustrated in the following figure, constitute the lineage from which the Capriccio has been handed down. Unless expressly stated to the contrary, all information relating to the sources and reproduced here, has been obtained from the NBA Kritischer Bericht, volume V/10, pp. 16-25.

In the following explanation of Figure 1, symbols are used to indicate lost sources which have never been found, but to all probability did exist. Letters indicate all existing copies, whereas letters in brackets are used to name copies which were known to be in existence, but have since been lost.
FIGURE 1: Sources of the Capriccio in B flat major.

Symbols:

- \( \alpha \): (Alpha) The presumed autograph which to all present knowledge is no longer in existence.

- \( \beta \): (Beta) The suspected source of copies E-G and [N]. The existence of this source cannot irrefutably be proven and is subject to theoretical conjecture. It is thus not allocated a letter.

Taken from Eichberg and Kohlhase, *Kritischer Bericht: Einzelne Überlieferte Klavierwerke II und Kompositionen für Lauteninstrumente*, p. 20.
Letters:

- **A**: A copy in the so-called Möller manuscript, a contemporary anthology ("Sammelband"). It is housed in the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz Berlin, Mus. ms. 40644. The manuscript derived its name not from the copyist, but from a later owner thereof. The identity of this person was established by Werner Wolffheim (a successive owner of the manuscript), as being Johann Gottfried Möller (1774-1833), a pupil of the organist and composer Johann Christiaan Kittel (1732-1809), who in turn was a pupil of J. S. Bach in Leipzig (Hill 1991: xix). After the Möller Manuscript was first discovered in the first decade of this century, the identity of the author remained the subject of speculation. In 1977, Hans-Joachem Schulze postulated the hypothesis of Johann Christoph Bach (1671-1721) as the most likely scribe of the manuscript. Proof to this effect was found and published in 1984. This copy of the Capriccio has been dated to approximately 1704.

- **B**: A copy made by an unknown copyist, housed in the Musikbibliothek in Leipzig, Sammlung Becker III. 8. 19. According to an analysis of the handwriting and paper, the copy stems from the second half of the eighteenth century.

- **C and C’**: A collection of pieces ("Konvolut"), comprising a complete and an incomplete copy of the Capriccio, housed in the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz Berlin, Mus. ms. Bach P 909. These copies originated at different times. The oldest copy is by the same unknown copyist of copy B and can also be dated to the second half of the eighteenth century. This copy is indicated by the letter C. The second copy has been made from the first (C), by the librarian of the Deutsche Staatsbibliothek, Siegfried Wilhelm Dehn (1799-1858). This copy is indicated by the letter C’, is incomplete and only extends to measure 48 of movement 6.
• D: A copy in an anthology owned by Professor Doktor W. Schubring of Hamburg. The handwriting is that of Julius Schubring (1806-1889). In the NBA Kritischer Bericht IV/5-6 (see source B 115), some of the manuscripts in this anthology are proved to have been derived from the Möller Manuscript, thus establishing a connection between A and D.

• E: A copy constituting part of an anthology housed in the Bibliothèque Royale in Brussels, No. II 4093, Fétis No. 2960. The copy can be dated to the second half of the eighteenth century.

• F: A copy of the sixth movement of the Capriccio by Johannes Ringk (1717-1778), housed in the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin, Mus. ms. Bach P 595, 9 an. The copy is dated approximately to the years between 1730 and 1740.

• G: A copy of the first three movements of the Capriccio of which the current owner and whereabouts are unknown. The copy was sold to an unknown buyer at an auction of Christie’s (London) on 9 December 1965. The origin and copyist are both unknown, but the written form (studied by the editors of the NBA from photographs from the Bach Institute in Göttingen), indicates its date of inception as being the second half of the eighteenth century.

• H: A copy by Johann Nikolaus Gebhardi (1787-1862), housed in the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin, Mus. ms. Bach P 320. This copy is part of an anthology of which the handwriting has been traced to Gebhardi in the NBA Kritischer Bericht IV/5-6 (source B 26). It is dated to approximately 1800 and was later owned by F. A. Grasnick. It is possibly a copy of the lost copy [M].

• J: A copy in an anthology housed in the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin, Mus. ms. Bach P 557. The copy is by Friedrich August Grasnick (1798-1877).
• **K**: A copy from the first half of the nineteenth century, housed in the Staatsbibliothek Preußischer Kulturbesitz in Berlin, Mus. ms. Bach P 319. The copy displays more than one handwriting (“Sammel-Handschrift”). The initial handwriting is possibly that of Johann Christoph Westphal the younger. (1773-1828). The rest of the piece is in the handwriting of an unknown copyist.

• **L**: A copy in different handwritings from the estate of Johann Theodor Mosewius. Previously this copy was housed in the Musikwissenschaftlichen Institut of the University of Breslau, Mf 5045. It is now housed at the Biblioteka Uniwersytecka w Warszawie, Rps Mus 98. The copyist is unknown.

Letters in brackets:

• **[M]**: A copy in the so-called Sammelband Kittel-Hauser. It was previously kept in the archives of Breitkopf & Hartel and was destroyed in the Second World War. The handwriting was that of Johann Christiaan Kittel (1732-1809) and the copy later belonged to Franz Hauser. The collection of pieces contained in this anthology contained the same works as copy H, although the order in which the works appeared was different. This leads to the conclusion that copy H could have been the source of [M].

• **[N]**: A copy of the final fugue of the Capriccio by Julius Rietz (1812-1877). His copy was studied by the editors of the Bach Gesellschaft (BG) edition and has been linked to the version presented in copy F.

• **[O]**: A copy of the third movement by August Eduard Grell (1800-1886). This copy was found by the editors of the BG to possess no importance as a source, as it had been subject to multiple changes and “improvements”. Hence copy [O] is not included in Figure 1.
From the above it emerges that A represents the oldest surviving copy of the Capriccio. By virtue of this fact alone it is the most important of the existing copies. Three factors make this copy the cornerstone of an argument in favour of the authenticity of the Capriccio:

- There is every reason to believe that Johann Christoph (the scribe of A), made his copy from Johann Sebastian's autograph.
- It is highly probable that the copy was made shortly after the work was first composed. Robert Hill estimates that the Capriccio was composed in 1703 and that copy A followed not much later (1991: xxiii).
- An analysis of Johann Christoph's copies in the Møller Manuscript and the Andreas Bach Buch (Leipzig, Musikbibliothek der Stadt Leipzig, III.8.4) reveals him as a meticulous scribe with high standards with regard to accuracy, clarity and neatness (Hill 1991: xxiv).

Copies B and C, which have both been derived from the same unknown copyist, are at the same time independent from each other. This can be deduced from the different distinctive mistakes ("Trennfehler") which occur in each copy. Both these copies can be traced to A. In the case of B, this connection is confirmed by a wrong interval in movement 6, measure 27, which can be related to an ambiguous notation in A in exactly the same spot. In C, the replacement of a natural by a flat in movement 6, measure 54, corresponds to a similar correction in A. Both B and C also share common mistakes ("Bindefehler"), which can be related to ambiguous and misleading notation in A.

According to the NBA Kritischer Bericht, volume V/10, the mere presence of copy D in Schubring's anthology indicates a probable connection to copy A, as many of the works
in Schubring's anthology have been proven to derive from the Möller Manuscript (A). Conclusive evidence of a connection between A and D is found in a mistake that the copyist of D made concerning part of the subtitle of the first movement. In copy D, the "Arioso" of the first movement is written above the second half of measure 8 instead of at the beginning of the movement. As the "Arioso" in copy A is written slightly lower and separate from the rest of the programmatic rubric, the copyist's mistaken assignment of this word to the second stave seems to stem from A.

A distinctive set of common differentiating characteristics ("Bindevarianten"), sets copies E-G apart from copies A-D and H-L. It is the contention of Hartwig Eichberg of the NBA Kritischer Bericht that similar deviations found in copies E-G (as opposed to all the other copies), point to the possible existence of a separate common origin for E-G. As the existence of such a common source is pure speculation, the theoretical nature of this copy is indicated by the symbol β. Copies E, F and G contain particular mistakes which dispel the possible theory that any one of them could serve as a model for the others. Apart from this, three factors mitigate against the thesis that any one of these copies could serve as the point of reference for the remaining two:

- E is a more recent copy than F. E also contains simplified programmatic rubrics for movements 1 and 3, whereas G contains the complete unsimplified rubrics. E can thus not have served as a model for F or G.
- F consists only of the final fugue and could thus not serve as model for the two more complete copies, E and G.
- G is without a programmatic rubric for movement 2 (E does have a rubric for movement 2) and comprises only the first three movements of the Capriccio. G could
thus not be the model for E. G is also a more recent copy than F. It thus follows that F cannot be a remnant of what is believed to be the missing parts of G.

The only possible explanation for copies E-G is the thesis of the existence of an unknown missing source, namely \( \beta \). All three these copies are assumed by Eichberg to have originated independently from \( \beta \). The assumption indicated in Figure 1, namely that \( \beta \) is derived from A, is made on the following grounds:

- In movement 1, measure 9\(^{3/4}\), the ambiguous notation of the note-head in copy A gives rise to a mistaken note (f" instead of g") in copies B-D, which clearly derive from A. The same mistake occurs in copies E and G and hence also in \( \beta \).
- In movement 2, measure 10\(^{4/4}\), the natural in the top voice in copy A can easily be mistaken for a flat. This seems a logical explanation for the flats in copies B, C and G in exactly this spot. Copy E, however, has the correct accidental, namely a natural. The contention of the NBA Kritischer Bericht is that a chance mistake by the scribe of G is less probable than the possible existence of the mistake in the presumed \( \beta \) (such a mistake having its origin in A) (1982: 23). This would substantiate the connection between \( \beta \) and A. According to this thesis, the copyist of E probably corrected the mistake.

The most probable theory regarding the missing copy [N], is that it is a later copy of F. This assumption rests on both chronological considerations and the compatibility of the two versions represented by these two copies.

A list of common distinctive traits ("Bindevarianten"), distinguishes copies H, J, K and L from copies A-G. Apart from these traits, H-L also have added articulation indications and ornamentation. H is the oldest of this particular group of copies. Eichberg thinks it highly probable that H is derived from the missing copy [M] (1982: 24). The absence of
any distinctive mistakes ("Trennfehler") between H on the one hand and J, K, and L on the other, makes it likely, though not conclusive, that copies J, K and L have H as source. Mitigating against this theory, is the fact that copy J is almost a complete replica of H and can thus possibly have served as the source for K. This theory cannot be proven. J is however not the probable model for copy L, as the order in which the different pieces in Mosewius’s anthology (L) appear, echoes that of the anthologies of Gebhardi (H) and Kittel ([M]). The order of the pieces in the Grasnick anthology, copy J, is different. This implies a direct lineage between [M], H and L. Copies K and L have mistakes which set them apart from copies J and H. This excludes any possibility that they (K and L) could have served as models for J and H.

As the version of [M] is missing, therefore precluding any cross-referential checks, the possibility that any one of copies J, K and L could derive independently from [M] and not from H, cannot be eliminated (this accounts for the absence of a connecting line between copies J, K and L and copy H in Figure 1). This being the case, the fact that the particular versions of copies K and L are doubtlessly inaccurate corruptions cannot detract from the status of copy H as the accurate copy of [M]. Hence copy H undoubtedly bears accurate testimony to the subsidiary branch of Kittel’s copy, [M], regardless of the origins of copies K and L. The uncertainty which surrounds copies H, J, K and L is reflected in the peculiar way in which they appear in Figure 1. H is set apart as the oldest of the four copies, but it is impossible to either definitely connect J, K and L to H, or to make a clearer pictorial representation of their lineage.

Establishing a convincing link between Kittel’s copy ([M]) and A has proved to be one of the most difficult tasks of the NBA Kritischer Bericht editors. The reason for this is
Kittel's unabashed attempts to improve on Bach's music in his copy. The added articulation indications, detailed figured bass in movement 3, additions to ornamentation and added bass notes to the end of movement 2, all bear testimony to this. Even more far-reaching in its implications, is a change of the bass line in measure 52 of the last movement in copy H, changing the theme of the fugue. It suggests that Kittel could have tried to improve on the unconvincing modulations in this section.

As the autograph (α), which presumably served as model for A, is unknown, all mistakes in subsidiary copies (such as [M]), can only be explained by drawing comparisons between A and the subsidiary copy. If Kittel did use copy A as his source, obvious mistakes and inconsistencies in copy A would have given him just cause for intervention in certain instances in [M]. This kind of intervention is singularly lacking in [M]. However, to deduce from this that [M] (and thus H) derived independently from A, remains impossible to prove. To the contrary, six clues point to a possible link between [M] and A:

- Movement 2 of copy H generally has the same ornamentation as the corresponding movement in A.
- The peculiar way in which the copyist of A wrote the letter “d” in the title “...de il Fratro...”, could have easily led to the copyist of H's mistake of writing “...se il Fratro...” in his copy.
- In movement 2, measure 18, copy H has two simultaneous crotchets instead of a sequence of quavers as in copy A. The beam which distinguishes the notes in A as quavers is thick and shapeless, thus making it possible for the copyist of H to mistake it for an ink blot.
• Another ink blot in measure 11, movement 2 of copy A, could be the reason for a mistaken natural in copy H.

• In the missing anthology containing copy [M], the Capriccio in B flat major is followed by a fugue in D minor by Christian Flor. The only other copy of this fugue exists in the Möller Manuscript (in which copy A is found), thus implying a link between [M] and A.

• The organist Möller, whose stamp of ownership led to the coinage of the term Möller Handschrift as the description for the manuscript of the initially unknown copyist of A, was probably Johann Gottfried Möller (1774-1833), a pupil of Kittel. Hence it is highly probable that Kittel had access to copy A.

Eichberg concludes that, based on the integrity of its sources as set out above, the thesis that the Capriccio in B flat major is an authentic composition of J. S. Bach cannot be doubted (1982: 25).

2.2 Chronology of the Capriccio in B flat Major

The Capriccio in B flat major dates from Johann Sebastian Bach’s earliest creative period, the so-called Arnstadt period of 1703-1707. It was during this time that the young composer was employed as organist at Arnstadt.

In his biography of J. S. Bach, Philipp Spitta connected the composition of the work to the departure of Bach’s brother, Johann Jacob (1682-1722), for conscription into the Swedish army (1899: 236). Although there is no concrete proof that the Capriccio was dedicated to him, it does seem highly probable. In the autumn of 1694 Johann Sebastian’s mother died.
After his father's death in January 1695, both Johann Jacob and Johann Sebastian were placed under the guardianship of their eldest brother, Johann Christoph (1671-1721). He was then 22 years of age and organist in the small town of Ohrdurf, near Arnstadt in the province of Thuringia (Geiringer 1981: 121). Here Johann Sebastian and Johann Jacob attended school together. Johann Sebastian lived in Ohrdurf for five years before his sojourn to Lüneburg at the age of fifteen.

On the grounds of the vast age difference of fourteen years between Johann Christoph and Johann Sebastian, the former seems an improbable contender as the brother to whom the Capriccio could be dedicated (Eichberg 1982: 26). This seems to be confirmed by the existence of another early keyboard piece by Johann Sebastian, entitled Capriccio in E-Dur, in honorum Johann Christoph Bachii Ohrdurfiensis, BWV 993, that was unambiguously dedicated to this elder brother. Hill contends that the words "del...fratello" in the dedication of the title of the Capriccio, are open to interpretation and that they could refer to any close male friend of Johann Sebastian (1987: 125). Schulenberg postulates the theory that the words could conceivably refer to the young J. S. Bach himself, as he was separated from his elder brother Christoph during his trips to Lüneburg and Lübeck. He concludes, however, "...that the possible reference to military trumpets in the last movement strengthens the traditional interpretation." (1992: 66).

The date postulated by Spitta as the most plausible for the composition of the Capriccio in B flat major is 1704. This date rests on the assumption that the Capriccio was written for the departure of Johann Jacob Bach to join the army of Charles XII of Sweden as "...Hautbois in der Garde...", an event noted in the Bach genealogy as having taken place in 1704 (Schmieder 1990: 720). This does not set the date beyond contention. In the first
instance the genealogy of J. S. Bach has been known to be inaccurate with regard to dates (Eichberg 1982: 26). It is therefore plausible that the date provided therein for the commencement of Johann Jacob's military service could be wrong. Secondly, Albert Protz postulated a very convincing theory whereby Johann Jacob would most probably have joined the Swedish Army between the autumn of 1706 and the summer of 1707, when Charles XII of Sweden was actively involved in recruiting soldiers from Germany while encamped at his headquarters at Altranstädt near Leipzig (1957: 406). Indeed many authors, like Geiringer, attribute the composition to the year 1706 (1981: 261). This does not overrule the proposed date of Spitta, as the Swedish army was stationed in the region of Swedish-Brandenburg during the winter of 1704-1705, making it possible for Johann Jacob to join them during that time. Schulenberg contends that the word "lontananza" more probably means "separation" or "distance" and not "departure" and that the piece could well have been written after the event (1992: 65). As it stands, however, there exists no concrete reason to doubt the date provided in the Bach genealogy, nor is there enough evidence to prove it beyond doubt.

The alleged connection between Johann Jacob's conscription into the Swedish army and the Capriccio remains a hypothesis. Eichberg finds Spitta's assumptions in this regard dubious and romanticised, but admits that biographical information is too scarce to provide any information to the contrary that is more substantive and concrete (1982: 26). The cut-off year for the composition can safely be established to be 1707. This was the year in which Johann Sebastian accepted a post as organist at Mühlhausen and in which the Swedish troops left their encampments in Sachsen. After these events the ways of the two brothers parted.
2.3 Programmatic Content

The Capriccio in B flat major is one of the few programmatic works of J. S. Bach, the others also being early keyboard works, such as the last movement of the Sonata in D major (BWV 963). The Capriccio is widely claimed to be modelled on the *Musicalische Vorstellung einiger biblischer Historien in 6 Sonaten* (hereafter referred to as the Biblical Sonatas) by Johann Kuhnau (1660-1722), published in Leipzig in 1700. The Capriccio shares with these sonatas the use of programmatic rubrics for each section.

The title of the work, as well as the six subtitles, provide important insights into the desired "Affekt" (affection) of the music. The extent to which this principle is to be taken literally, however, is placed into question by the title of "Capriccio", which does not seem to be compatible to subtitles such as those of movements 1 and 3, where the general affection is of a more lamenting character. In this regard Vendrix has noted the work's combination of "Traurigkeit und Humor" (sadness and humor) (1989: 202). Another explanation for the title "Capriccio", is provided by Rolf Dammann. He quotes Friedrich Erhard Niedt, Johann Gottfried Walther and Johann Mattheson in establishing the semantic meaning of the word "Capriccio" at around 1700. Dammann concludes that Capricci formed part of the same category of music as Boulardes, Toccatas and Preludes, that is the "fantastic style" ("fantastischen Stil") of the Fantasia (1984: 167). This would mean that the term "Capriccio", as used by Bach in 1704, would rather denote the meaning of a piece of solistic instrumental music than assuming the modern meaning of "capricious" or "humorous".
Other authors, such as Bodky, see the discrepancy between title and content as a clear attempt by the young Bach to make fun of Kuhnau’s serious approach to program music, “...since this Capriccio is clearly a parody on Kuhnau’s Biblical Sonatas.” (1960: 335-336). Of the “Lamento” constituting movement 3, which is written in the symbolically sad F minor, Bodky writes that “... Bach also ... feigned sorrow in the Lament of the Departure Capriccio. Unfortunately, the obvious caricatural intentions of the latter piece are often overlooked by interpreters.” (1960: 233). He is supported in this point of view by Schulenberg, who maintains that the work is “...overrated and perhaps misunderstood” as “The title Capriccio cannot indicate capriciousness in the modern sense”. Schulenberg continues to pose the possibility of an intentional parody of Kuhnau’s Biblical Sonatas by Bach (1992: 66). Albert Protz disagrees with this view of the Capriccio. He cites the obviously difficult circumstances of the two orphaned brothers living with their elder brother and his family, the unstable political situation of the time and the oppression of the protestant religion at the hands of the catholic establishment (something which would have affected the Bachs deeply), as sufficient reasons to believe that Johann Sebastian intended the Capriccio as a serious token of farewell to his brother (1957: 405-406).

A study of the six sonatas comprising Kuhnau’s Biblical Sonatas, reveals little to support Bodky and Schulenberg in their respective theories. Exploring J. S. Bach’s alleged “borrowing” from other composers, Norman Carrell fails to unearth tangible evidence linking the two works in his topical study entitled Bach the Borrower (1967). Spitta does find similarities between Kuhnau’s double fugue from the first movement of the “Suonata seconda” of the Biblical Sonatas and Bach’s fugue in movement 6 of the Capriccio (1899: 239). On closer examination, this alleged similarity can at the most be said to constitute the use of a common formula, but fails to justify any conclusions regarding “borrowing” or any
other forms of more tangible influence such as one would expect to find in a caricatural parody.

Compared to Kuhnau's Biblical Sonatas, Bach's use of rhetorical devices is subtle and, apart from the sound of the post horn (most probably the "Zweifußhörnchens" which could only play octaves) in movements 5 and 6, less inclined to the kind of pictorial symbolism in which the Biblical Sonatas abound. The harmonic and contrapuntal language of the two composers differ fundamentally, the "Galant-style" of the Capriccio setting it apart from the more learned and serious music of the Biblical Sonatas. The use of programmatic rubrics for each section of the Capriccio in B flat does suggest a superficial resemblance to the Kuhnau sonatas. Indeed the copies made by Johann Christoph Bach of the six Biblical Sonatas in the Andreas Bach Buch (ABB), do suggest that these works were known to the young J. S. Bach, albeit that the ABB's date of compilation is set somewhere between 1713 and 1718. In the eventuality that J. S. Bach knew the keyboard works of Kuhnau, an eventuality which is both chronologically possible and historically probable, the influence of this knowledge on the Capriccio in B flat major could be said to be most notable in the programmatic framework which the two works have in common. Apart from this, no internal or external musical evidence exists to substantiate the claims of caricatural parody which supposedly links the two compositions.

The full title and the subtitles of the Capriccio are the following:

*Capriccio in B-Dur*

*sopra la lontananza del fratello dilettissimo*

*BWV 992*
(Capriccio in B flat Major

for the departure of my beloved brother

BWV 992)

1. Arioso

Adagio. Ist eine Schmeichelung der Freunde, von denselben von seiner Reise abzuhalten.

(Arioso. Adagio. A plea by the friends to prevent him from making the journey.)

2. Ist eine Vorstellung unterschiedlicher Casuum, die ihm in der Fremde konnten vorkommen.

(A scenario of the various misfortunes that could befall him in foreign lands.)


(Adagiosissimo. The friends’ general lament.)

4. Allhier kommen die Freunde (weil sie doch sehen, daß es anders nicht sein kann) und nehmen Abschied.

(Here the friends come [since they see that it cannot be otherwise] to bid their farewells.)

5. Aria di Postiglione

Allegro poco

(Aria of the post horn

Allegro poco)
6. *Fuga all’ imitazione di Posta.*

(Fugue in imitation of the post horn.)
This chapter proposes to provide a framework for the analyses and discussions in Chapters 4 and 5. It aims to do this by exploring and giving a representative account of the vast amount of existing musicological data relating to Bach performance practice. An attempt will be made to present the positions, findings and interpretations of leading Bach musicologists where these are relevant to the proposed analysis of the Capriccio in B flat major. In order to do this methodically, this chapter will be divided into subsections comprising the essential problematical areas of historical performance practice. These subsections are:

- Affection ("Affekt")
- Articulation
- Dynamics
- Ornamentation
- Rhythm
- Tempo

The segregation of the above elements of performance practice is both necessary and musically questionable. It is necessary because it facilitates a certain degree of transparency
without which the analysis of each element would be impossible, or at the very least, obstructed. It is musically questionable in that each of these elements stands in a mutually dependant relationship to the other, a relationship which not only affects the very nature of their presentation in performance, but which also defines them in a way belied by their presentation as individual entities in performance. In isolating these elements for individual scrutiny, sight should therefore never be lost of their interdependence, which will only become central to the discussion in subsequent chapters.

In an appraisal such as this chapter proposes to provide, a selection of material is inevitable. This is so because this appraisal of existing research is not the primary object of the proposed study, but will nevertheless yield information which is indispensable to the primary object, namely the subsequent analysis. Any selection of material, no matter how carefully construed, is a subjective rendition of the truth. Antithetical opinions often lay claim to the same truth and the authors thereof succeed in presenting convincing arguments in favour of their respective irreconcilable beliefs. The ultimate test for any such claims lies in the success of their application to the music itself. Even this does not rule out subjectivity, as preference for one or the other musical solution often has to be pronounced on the grounds of subjective aesthetic considerations. The intention of this chapter is to remain as far aloof from subjective opinion as any selection of material will permit. Every effort will be made to synthesise the current state of musicological research without prematurely entering the aesthetic debate. The opinion of the author will follow timely in the next two chapters, when the myriad of opinions presented here will be applied to specific musical contexts, a process which should shed more light on their merits or deficiencies.
3.1 Affekt

The term "Affekt" is derived from the Latin word affectus (= Greek pathos) and first appeared in the German language in 1525. The meaning of the term is best described as Gemütsbewegung, which literally means to "move" the emotions. Care should be taken not to confuse "Affekt" with "Effekt" (derived from the Latin word effectus and meaning "resultant"). The relationship between the two terms can be defined as follows: "Affekt" describes an emotional event which becomes externally visible as "Effekt". In this sense "Affekt" can be said to be a rationalised emotional state or passion. In this discussion the German word "Affekt" will not be translated, as the term enjoys universal acceptance within the context of rhetorical musical expression.

In the eighteenth century, all music was believed to exhibit a certain Affekt, or emotional definition. Each Affekt (such as sadness, anger, hate, joy, love and jealousy) was a rationalised emotional state or passion. Hence the composition of works (or smaller parts of a big work) based on a single Affekt was a rational and objective process, not to be confused with the nineteenth-century concerns for spontaneous emotional creativity, which stressed the subjective portrayal of emotions. The theory whereby all elements constituting the musical fabric strove to portray a unified and objective affection, was known as the Affektenlehre.

The desire to compose works with an easily recognisable Affekt resulted in turn in the formulation of a theory in which certain musical elements were given a rhetorical function by endowing them with certain affective "meanings". The word "rhetorical" in this sense derives its meaning from oratorical art and can best be explained as denoting the use of
musical patterns to persuade or influence in the style of oratorical rhetoric. This theory of "meaningful musical patterns" in service of the Affekt of a piece, crystallised into the German doctrine of the Figurenlehre.

Initially applied only to vocal music, the musical rhetoric of the Figurenlehre was intended to elaborate upon and enrich the meaning of sung text. The absence of text acted as a restriction on the potential of purely instrumental music to display a clearly discernible Affekt. This restriction was circumvented by Kuhnau in his Biblical Sonatas, where the absence of sung text is compensated for by the composer's explanatory notes which precede the music in a program. In Bach's Capriccio, the problem of putting the meaning of the music across to the listener is solved by merely giving each movement a descriptive subtitle, thereby erecting a ready "emotional backdrop" against which the pending musical drama and the possible application of the Figurenlehre can be understood.

The question of central importance today is to what extent the Affektenlehre influenced the compositional process of Baroque composers. Was the influence restricted to a knowledge and understanding of the doctrine, or was it regarded as a pre-packaged range of emotions from which all music had to derive expression? George Buelow states that the prominent Bach scholars Pirro, Schweitzer and those influenced by them, assumed incorrectly that composers in the Baroque period worked with stereotyped musical-rhetorical figures in order to create a predetermined form of tone-painting (1980: 794). This is corroborated by Butt when he asserts that "There is no certain evidence that every composer followed the same basic rhetorical rules of composition..." (1990: 15). This seems to discard any previously conceived notion of a commonly practised compositional formula. Butt does accept, however, that the prevalence of many rhetorical analogies in treatises of the time
does create the justifiable expectation of the presence of some rhetoric in the music. Whilst thus recognising rhetorical thinking as an integral part of the intellectual apparatus of early eighteenth-century composers, current musicological opinion dismisses the notion of a strictly regimented adherence to any such doctrine by any composer. In other words, this simply means that the Baroque composer planned the affective contents of each work or section thereof in a rational way and expected an equally rational insight into the meaning of his music by his audience (Buelow 1980: 800).

Even if generalisations with regard to widespread use of the Affektenlehre and the Figurenlehre by the Baroque composer remain speculative, J. S. Bach's knowledge and application of these theories is easier to substantiate. Eggebrecht cites the title-page of the Bach Inventions as an allusion to rhetorical art (1970: 269-270). In this title-page Bach refers to "...good inventiones..." as a guideline for those who are eager to learn (Butt 1990: 9). According to Butt, three levels of rhetorical teaching (of oratorical art) is implied by these words, namely inventio, dispositio and pronuntiatio. These levels relate to an exposition in Der vollkommene Capellmeister (1739), in which the music theorist Johann Mattheson (1681-1764) laid out a fully organised plan of musical composition borrowed from those sections of rhetorical theory concerned with presenting arguments, namely inventio, dispositio, decoratio (also called elaboratio or elocutio) and pronuntiatio.

Explained simply, inventio is the basic idea or view expressed, and can easily be related to the basic Affekt traditionally associated with each piece of music or section thereof. Dispositio is the creation of the skeleton of a piece, its main sections and events, while decoratio is a continuation of the same process, expanding the basic framework by adding details, elaborating and decorating the idea (Butt 1990: 16). Pronuntiatio is the...
performance of the speech or in this instance, the composition. The task of the performer as the executor of the _pronuntiatio_ would be to gauge the intended Affekt of a piece and to consequently interpret and adjust the articulation, dynamics, ornamentation, rhythm and tempo to reflect and enhance this intended Affekt. In this sense, Affekt is the common denominator that influences all aspects of a performance, ideally creating unity and freeing performances of much of the eclecticism arrogated by personal preference.

To relay this eighteenth-century view of music as a rhetorical art to a composition like the Bach Capriccio would result in the following break-down of its composite rhetorical layers:

- **Inventio**: The ideas or views described and expressed in the programmatic rubrics.
- **Dispositio**: The tonal structure and formal structural principles employed.
- **Decoratio**: The use of melodic and rhythmic patterns to elaborate extemporise on the above.
- **Pronuntiatio**: The performance which complements and enhances all the above.

A further interesting application of the principles of rhetorical art to the Capriccio in B flat major in particular, can be made with regard to the _dispositio_. The classical sixfold version of the _dispositio_ in oratorical art poses the question of Bach's possible emulation of this rhetorical concept in his six movement Capriccio. The following juxtaposition reveals a striking resemblance between this classic structure and the movement structure adopted by Bach in the Capriccio. As shown beneath, this resemblance transcends mere numerical structural divisions to include strikingly similar functions adopted by the sections of the _dispositio_ and the movements of the Capriccio:
• **Exordium** (introductory part): Introductory plea by friends for the brother to stay.

• **Narratio** (statement of facts): Statement of the dangers that could befall him.

• **Divisio** (forecast of main points in speaker's favour): Expression of sadness at the anticipated absence of the brother.

• **Confirmatio** (affirmative proof): The final affirmation that the journey will take place.

• **Confutatio** (refutation or rebuttal): The sounding of the post horn signals the departure and the refutation of the pleas offered.

• **Conclusio** (conclusion): The flight of the horses and the sounding of the post horn as the carriage pulls away.

The above extrapolation admittedly provides only seminal and rather speculative proof of Bach's presumed knowledge and application of rhetorical concepts in pursuit of a unifying Affekt. The most systematic "translation" of rhetorical concepts into musical equivalents, however, can be found in the regimentation and systemisation of the *decoratio* into the *Figurenlehre*. To which extent then did Bach employ the principles of the *Figurenlehre* in the Capriccio to underwrite the narrative plot of his early programmatic keyboard experiment? Walter Serauky has provided convincing examples of J. S. Bach's probable knowledge and conscious usage of Isaac Vossius's theory concerning the applications of classical poetic metres to music. In an article, he identifies contextually valid instances in which these metres assume rhetorical value in both Bach's Capriccio in B flat major and Kuhnau's first Biblical Sonata (1955: 105-113). The findings of this article belong to the next chapter, but it confirms that Bach could well have consciously employed certain metres and rhythmical patterns to infuse certain musical passages with narrative meanings.
The rhetorical usage of the *Figurenlehre* was however not confined to the use of rhythms and metre. Melody, harmony, texture and mode eventually all became part of a complicated vocabulary of musical rhetoric as practised by the eighteenth-century composer. It is Bach’s possible usage of these rhetorical devices, as hinted at by Serauky's thought provoking findings, that needs to be thoroughly examined in the subsequent analysis.

3.2 Articulation

Articulation can very simply be defined as that which happens to a sound between the end of one sound and the beginning of the next sound. It therefore follows that articulation concerns the temporal aspect of music making. The term “articulation” is commonly used to describe the performer’s manipulation of the temporal dimension, a manipulation which can manifest itself in keyboard music in one of the following ways:

- The shortening of the sound by the premature release of the key.
- The lengthening of the sound by the continuous depression of the key.
- The anticipation of the second sound by a premature attack of the key.
- The delay of the second sound by a delayed attack of the key.

It is clear from the above that the importance of articulation in the performance of a work can vary considerably from one keyboard instrument to another. It is only logical that it should play a very prominent role on instruments where the end of a sound can be exactly determined by the release of the key, like the harpsichord and the organ. Indeed, on these instruments, articulation is the principle means of expression and the most effective way of
lending definition to a sound. On account of its very small sound and resultant restricted potential to derive expression from dynamics, the clavichord depends similarly on articulation as an important means through which to create musical expression. On the piano, however, the effect of articulation is weakened by the fact that the sound tends to keep resonating even after a key has been released. This weakens the pianist's control over the exact timing of ending the sound. Consequently, most issues regarding the articulation of Baroque keyboard music and the Capriccio in B flat major in particular, are relevant only to performances on the harpsichord and clavichord and are of less importance to performances on the piano.

The most readily recognisable impact of articulation on any given piece of music, concerns the texture of the music. A legato approach to articulation results in a thicker, less transparent texture, whereas as non-legato or staccato articulation creates the opposite effect. The relevant question for this study, is what the desired texture should constitute in keyboard works by J. S. Bach. Although the answer does not hinge on articulation alone, the properties of the chosen instrument and various other musical elements also playing important roles, it is nonetheless necessary to determine which method of articulation would be the most stylistically appropriate to the requirements of Bach’s idiom and time.

Butt suggests that overwhelming evidence from the seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century points towards a detached performance of runs taking precedence over a legato style in vocal music (1990: 13). He continues by cautioning the performer that only later treatises of the eighteenth century started emphasising the importance of a fundamentally legato style. In this connection he states: “We must therefore be wary of assuming ‘cantabile’ in Bach’s music to refer to a continuous legato. The importance of the words
and the 'grammatical' accentuation of the music suggest that clarity is perhaps the major component of the style.” (1990: 15). Although Butt bases his views on vocal music, he makes a point of emphasising the primacy of singing in J. S. Bach's musical education and compositional process. In so doing, he makes his remarks relevant to the whole of Bach's oeuvre, including his keyboard music.

It has to be noted that Butt does not advocate the use of staccato articulation in Bach's music, but rather suggests a mode of articulation resembling a detached manner of playing. The difference between these two ways of striking the keys is quite marked. A staccato performance would result in much shorter notes, a more brittle texture and a certain light-hearted Affekt, whereas a detached or non-legato articulation would only serve to, as it were, let some air and light into the music. Whereas it is inconceivable that staccato articulation could be applied to music with a serious and sad Affekt, this is not the case with non-legato articulation.

The desirability of “clarity of texture”, is however far from an objective standard which guarantees a uniform and universal idea of how Bach's keyboard works should be articulated. To the contrary, choosing the most appropriate articulation for Bach's music has always been and remains a polemical issue for performers and musicologists alike, in spite of the fact that it is generally agreed that articulation should enhance the clarity of texture. The problem is that textural clarity is not an objective fundamental and can mean different things to different people. Another reason for the controversy surrounding the articulation issue is the inconsistencies which abound in Bach's own markings and the resultant confusion that exists as to his own intentions in this regard. These inconsistencies provide fertile ground for wrong deductions and mistaken generalisations. In a sense, the
very inaccuracy and incompleteness of articulation indications in Bach's music are the embodiment of the fundamental spontaneity of the Baroque epoch, an epoch which would have expected the performer of any given work to plan and execute articulation according to the now obscure conventions of the time. The fact that these conventions have not remained intact to this day and are no longer a part of our musical vocabulary, compounds the problem for the Bach performer, as it challenges him/her with a myriad of difficult choices regarding articulation. Although no absolute answers would do justice to this problem, some guidelines can be extracted from the issue by looking at the function that articulation is supposed to serve in any performance and to derive from that the most prominent factors which exert an influence over articulation and the manner of its execution.

Dadelsen implies the existence of two functions accorded to articulation markings by composers, namely an interpretative function and an instructive function (1978: 103). This statement is a valuable key for the deciphering and the interpretation of the articulation markings of Bach's keyboard pieces. Slurring in the keyboard context is not related to basic technique, as is the case with string pieces (Fuchs 1985: 27-28). This eliminates the instructive function from articulation markings in keyboard pieces and limits their function to an interpretative one. Articulation markings (and all other forms of improvised articulation in the absence of markings) are thus a means to an end, a "medium" through which the performer can lend additional meaning to the musical text. Articulation is not an end in itself. This truth was implied by Georg von Dadelsen when he wrote: "Jedoch sei davor gewarnt, aus der Artikulation keine eigene Wissenschaft zu machen: Aus der Nebensache soll keine Hauptsache werden." ("Be however warned not to make an actual
science out of articulation - no fundamental can be derived from a minor matter") (1978: 111-112).

Formulated differently, articulation as a "Nebensache" does not determine the character of a work, the "Hauptsache", but is determined by the fundamental character of a work as it reveals itself in the Affekt, metrical structure and tempo. In this relationship between articulation as an interpretative feature of the musical text, and the musical text itself, lies the crucial answer as to the way in which articulation has to be approached by the performer.

Articulation is heavily influenced by the Affekt of any given work. An instance of the relationship between articulation and Affekt is found in the slurred style of articulation associated with sorrowful and gentle words. The absence of text in pure instrumental music in no way inhibited composers from exercising this vocal convention and performers from imitating it. A specific example of this is the slurred patterns which occur in movement 3 of the Capriccio in B flat major in measures 38-42 as seen in Example 1 below:

**EXAMPLE 1**

Movement 3, measures 38-42, taken from the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*.
The association of dissonance (with its affective meanings of pain and sorrow) with slurring, is unmistakable in this instance. It would seem logical to conclude that Affekt depends heavily on harmonic structure, whilst articulation exists to complement the Affekt of a work. This indirect connection between harmony and articulation is mentioned by Badura-Skoda when he writes that harmony influences articulation and that dissonances in particular are always linked to their resolutions (1993: 96).

Another particularly relevant example from the Capriccio in B flat major of the reciprocal influence of articulation and Affekt, is the cor
ta rhythm which characterises the first movement of the Capriccio in B flat major and which frequently reappear throughout the work. The Anapaest version of this rhythm (short-short-long), occurs frequently in Bach and requires various kinds of articulation, depending on the tempo and the affection of the piece. Hence this pattern would be articulated legato in an slower piece of music, such as the first movement of the Capriccio, but non-legato or staccato in a faster piece which is imbued with energy, such as the instances where it appears in movements 5 and 6.

Here then, is an example when tempo is the underlying consideration which influences articulation, though it does so in this instance only in so far as the tempo is indicative of a specific Affekt and the articulation complements the Affekt. Tempo does, however, also exercise a more direct influence on articulation when it places physical constraints on the performance of articulation. Thus certain possibilities of articulation, like Überlegato, would be impossible at certain fast tempos.

Articulation is also determined by the rhythmical and metrical relationships of a work and conversely plays an important part in clarifying such relationships in performance. In so
doing, articulation functions as a valuable structural component. In the article *Quantitas Notarum extrinseca & intrinseca*, Walther makes the following statement: “The outward and inward value of the notes: according to the former, are performed in equal length, according to the latter in unequal length; the odd part of the measure being long and the even part short.” (Neumann 1982: 34). This passage refers to the natural musical diction that is suggested by the bar line and meter. Neumann summarises its meaning as relating to a system whereby the heavy beats of musical diction (in descending order; the beginning of a measure, of a half-measure, the main beats, the first, third, fifth notes, etc., that are subdivisions of beats), naturally attract the points of melodic, harmonic and rhythmic emphasis (1982: 35). In the common usage of the time, notes were referred to as “good” (strong) or “bad” (weak). As with speech, the differentiation of strong and weak syllables and notes is achieved both through dynamics on instruments capable of producing them, or/and the manipulation of the length of notes (articulation).

Although articulation is by definition a manipulation of the temporal dimension of music, it emerges form the above that this manipulation of time can in fact be used to create the effect of strong and weak beats. Emphasis on a specific beat can namely be obtained by shortening the preceding sound and thus creating a longer silence to precede the important beat. This creates the illusion of a louder sound on the important beat and can be further amplified by the delayed entry of this important beat. Similarly, unimportant beats can remain unobtrusive if a performer clothes their execution in the uniformity of *legato* or *semi-legato* playing. These possibilities make articulation indubitably the biggest interpretative asset of instruments like the harpsichord and the organ - instruments which are otherwise unable to define important structural moments in the music.
In conclusion, it can be said that articulation markings supply the performer with guidelines regarding the most appropriate manner in which to enhance the desired Affekt, provide an indication of the metrical hierarchy of "good" notes and "bad" notes and in so doing illuminate the structural construction, as well as shaping the texture by striking a balance between the two extremes of *legato* and *staccato* playing. It is to be assumed therefore, that articulation planned and executed by any performer in absence of clear articulation markings by the composer, would similarly strive to fulfil a function correlating to one of these considerations. Just as the choice of a manner of articulation by a performer is often dictated by the influences of Affekt and metrical structure, articulation has the ability to profoundly affect and change the Affekt, metrical structure and texture of Baroque music for the better or the worse.

As Dadelsen warned, care should at all times be taken not to elevate articulation to a status independent of the context of the work in which it appears and is exercised.

### 3.3 Dynamics

This area of keyboard interpretation is inextricably intertwined with the performer's choice of keyboard instrument. While both the piano and the clavichord have the ability to produce dynamic inflections, this is not possible to the same extent on the harpsichord. As in the previous sections of this chapter, the central concern regarding this discussion of dynamics is the appropriate use and contemporary role of dynamics in the keyboard music of J. S. Bach.
The modern piano, which derives most of its expressive qualities from the dynamic manipulation of sound, was not known to J. S. Bach. The clavichord's potential for creating musical expression by producing dynamic nuances was at the very least severely limited with regard to the dynamic range which the instrument could offer. In addition, its use as a concert instrument was also impractical due to the very soft sounds which it produced. The predominant keyboard instruments of Bach's time, the harpsichord and organ, were incapable of producing gradual dynamic gradations and inflections. This does not imply that dynamics played no role in Baroque music, but only that it was often used by composers and performers in a very different manner than was the norm in later periods, when the piano with its abundant dynamic capabilities was enjoying the status of pre-eminent keyboard instrument. The typically eighteenth-century use of dynamics has been labelled "terraced dynamics", a term first used just more than a hundred years ago (Badura-Skoda 1993: 133).

Terraced dynamics is explained by Donington as "...whole passages on one level of volume (and colouring) followed by whole passages on another level." (1973: 291). The term had been coined by nineteenth-century musicians to describe the abrupt changes of volume or tone colour in orchestral works which were brought about by the alteration of the tutti and solo (or concertino) passages. The term "terraced dynamics" is also used to describe the dynamic "blocks" of sound which result from the change of manual or registration on the organ or harpsichord. Badura-Skoda makes it clear that the dynamic differences between the different sound levels ("terraces") in Baroque music, were fairly small by modern standards. This seems logical if the smaller scale and more fragile construction of Baroque keyboard instruments are considered. He makes the contentious claim that this makes it
necessary to pander to the modern listener when performing Baroque music on modern instruments by magnifying the dynamic contrasts in the music (Badura-Skoda 1993: 134).

Although the use of terraced dynamics were in part a result of the limitations of the keyboard instruments of the time, registration on the harpsichord (and organ) also had the clear purpose of clarifying the structure of the music. This was done by complementing the structure of a work by providing a variation of tone quality and tone quantity in an otherwise dynamically uniform performance. Donington makes the point that the structure of a Baroque work can imply the use of terraced dynamics (1973: 291). Probably the most famous example of this is the Concerto nach italienischen Gusto (BWV 971) from the Clavier Übung Teil II, where the dynamic indications correspond to the structurally contrasting tutti and solo episodes. Terraced dynamics also play an important structural part in fugue playing - in particular on the harpsichord. Badura-Skoda maintains that certain episodes should be played on a quieter manual, thus emphasising the return of the thematic material. He quotes support for this theory from Quantz. In addition to this use of different manuals in the harpsichord or organ, registration can provide horizontal clarity in fugues when different voices are played on different manuals with different registrations. Though structurally important, terraced dynamics which result from changes of manual and/or registration can also function simply as a way of introducing contrasts in the tone colour of the music, without fulfilling any structural function.

The emphasis on changes of manual and/or registration as a way of changing the tone colour of the music as opposed to making the music louder or softer, is important. In the case of the harpsichord or the organ, changes of manual or registration were often more concerned with changes in tone colour than changes in dynamics (Badura-Skoda 1993:...
This fact has implications for the manner of performance when a work for harpsichord is played on the piano. It would be wrong to elevate the dramatic dynamic changes brought about by the use of terraced dynamics to a level were it is used to the exclusion of more subtle registration changes aimed at varying the tone colour. The mistaken emphasis in such cases on merely dynamically contrasting blocks of sound, could result in performances where dynamic contrasts are unduly exaggerated to the detriment of the music. Quantz also warns against such exaggerated contrasts (1985: 274-275). The acceptance of only a limited and contextually justified application of terraced dynamics, legitimises the more subtle uses of tone colour on the piano, which has the potential of enriching Baroque keyboard music with its larger range of expressive possibilities.

This issue is addressed by Donington when he cautions that “...within these fairly level planes of volume, a constant play of light and shade can keep the dynamic texture alive with interest.” (1973: 291). Taking into consideration the limitations of the harpsichord in this regard, one would automatically assume that the dynamic nuances to which Donington refers are only possible on the piano and the clavichord and not on the harpsichord.

This is however only partially true. Dynamic inflection on the harpsichord is indeed marginally possible, albeit that it constitutes less a physical increase or decrease of volume, than a skilful manipulation of sound in time and space. Couperin states that the illusion of dynamic inflection can be created on the harpsichord by the application of “interruption” (cessation) and “delay” (suspension). This implies the sensitive use of what would today be known as “agogic accents” (Badura-Skoda 1993: 130). Clearly, shortening sounds or delaying their entry is more a case of manipulating the temporal aspect of sound and thus of
articulation. The listener, however, perceives this kind of manipulation as an adjustment of volume, and hence as a change in dynamics.

The importance of delicate dynamic phrasing at all times was emphasised by J. S. Bach himself, when he wrote in the autograph title-page to his Inventions and Sinfonias: "...Lehrbegierigen, eine deutliche Art gezeigt wird...gute inventiones nicht alleine zu bekommen, sondern auch selbige wohl durchzuführen, am allermeisten aber eine cantabile Art im Spielen zu erlangen..." (Those eager to learn are shown a clear way...not only of having good inventiones but also of developing these well, and, above all, of arriving at a cantabile style of playing...”) (Butt 1990: 9).

Statements like the above contradict any notion of terraced dynamics as the only legitimate approach to the dynamic usage in Bach's works, even on the harpsichord. In his Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen, C. P. E. Bach similarly encourages instrumentalists to study singing in order to reach an understanding of correct performance (1951: 151-152). The aspects of singing to be observed by the instrumentalist, is summarised by Badura-Skoda when he says "...in long notes the voice swells slightly;...high notes, on account of the greater tension of the vocal cords...are louder and more intense than low ones;...a beautiful vocal phrase usually begins and ends in a relaxed manner, reaching its dynamic peak half-way through.” (1993: 131). He continues to emphasise the importance of breathing and articulation for singers - a facet of vocal performance which has to be imitated by the instrumentalist. This emphasis on a cantabile style of singing should not be confused with the modern singing technique which involves an intense legato style with a tremendous dynamic range enhanced by vibrato. This would result in grotesque violations of stylistic purity. The call for a cantabile imitation of vocal music in
Bach’s instrumental music, should rather be seen as a dismissal of insensitive exponents of pyrotechniques at the keyboard, who often mask unmusical playing as mere conformance to a misunderstood theory of terrace dynamics.

In addition to agogic accents, the following possibilities exist for the composer and performer to create the illusion of dynamic flexibility on the harpsichord:

- An increase in the number of voices,
- The increasing or decreasing frequency of the application of fast ornaments (for example mordents),
- "...a slight lengthening of expressive notes and corresponding shortening of unimportant notes (rubato).” (Badura-Skoda 1993:130).

"Thickening" or "thinning out" the texture of the music by adding or taking away voices is part of the compositional process or Elaboratio and thus belong to the creative domain of the composer. Adding ornaments and executing articulation in order to obtain dynamic flexibility clearly identifies with the domain of the Decoratio, which can be manipulated by the performer.

The above options for dynamic manipulation on the harpsichord, are bound to influence dynamics on the piano and clavichord. It has to be noted, however, that whereas dynamic manipulation on the piano centres around the beginning of the sound (the pianist having little control over the sound once the key has been struck), it is exactly the opposite with the harpsichordist, who cannot hope to change the sound by varying the attack on the key,
but rather manipulates the sound by varying the end of the sound over which he/she has total control.

3.4 Ornamentation

Frederick Neumann states in an essay on Bach ornamentation that everything regarding Bach interpretation is controversial (1965: 4). The field of ornamentation is no exception in this regard and can be regarded as possibly the most ambiguity-ridden subdiscipline that the musicologist has to contend with when studying the performance practice of the time. Lang emphasises this by stating that "...ornamentation is full of paradoxes; this history is a science in which the opposite of any generalisation may be as true as the generalisation itself. As a matter of fact, rigid doctrinal objectivism can endanger our contact with artistic realities; the subjective response must be and must remain at the heart of the humanistic and artistic enterprise." (Neumann 1982: viii).

This comment by Lang is highlighted by the current state of Bach research in this subdiscipline. Its findings straddle rigid objectivity that stem mostly from literal interpretations of historical treatises on the one hand, and a more holistic view guided mostly by intrinsic evidence gathered from the music, on the other. It is with regard to the former view that Neumann takes issue with Robert Donington in his review (Neumann 1982: 11-15) of the latter's book, A Performer's Guide to Baroque Music. Donington's stand on the performance of trills earns his approach the epitaph of "rigid standardisation". In fact, Neumann takes issue with most of the prominent Bach scholars of his day on the issue of ornamentation, notably with Kirkpatrick, Bodky and Aldrich.
The dilemma that this situation poses to the current study, is that it complicates any effort to synthesise two opposing schools of thought in a single theory of performance practice. The limited context of this study does not allow for drawn out debate on the two stances, and as it is the expressly stated purpose of this chapter only to provide an appraisal of current musicological research in order to apply the findings thereof to more specific contexts in later chapters, the opinion presented here inevitably has to gravitate towards a more generalised version of one of the two currently held beliefs. Although mention will be made of alternative perspectives, Frederick Neumann’s Ornamentation in Baroque and Post-Baroque Music will be used as the point of departure, representing as it does the broadest and most inclusive approach of all the theorists concerned. As Neumann himself says, “...there simply is no ‘definitive’ solution to any given ornament in any given situation.” (1978: 12).

In a further attempt to restrict the size of the subject under discussion, reference will only be made to ornaments which appear in the edition used for the analysis of the Capriccio in B flat major (see Chapter 4, pages 71-72). These include appoggiaturas, arpeggiated chords, mordents, slides and trills. All these ornaments belong to the group termed “essential” ornaments, or the ornaments in the French Style. Although Bach also used Italian ornaments, or “arbitrary” ornaments, his practice of writing them out exempts the performer from trying to decide whether and where to include them in a work.

Before focusing on the ornaments mentioned above, a few general observations about the function of ornamentation will be expounded upon to charter the territory ahead.
Ornamental Function and Musical Structure

As a general precursor to the more specific discussion of different ornaments and the possibilities with regard to their execution which will shortly follow, it is necessary to formulate a broad definition of what an ornament is, what function or functions it is supposed to serve and how it relates to musical structure as a whole.

Contrasting musical ornaments to ornamentation in the fine arts, Frederick Neumann draws attention to the fact that it is not always possible to distinguish between structure and ornament in music. The reason for this is to be found in the difficulty of defining what "essential meaning" constitutes in music, and how the supposedly "essential" elements can be proved to be the direct antithesis of that which is not essential, but ornamental (1982: 243). In spite of this, he defines ornamentation as "...an addition to structure, in the sense that structure embodies what is of the artistic or...the expressive essence." He continues by saying that "An ornament serves to set off the structural elements to greater aesthetic advantage, most typically by imparting to them more grace, elegance, smoothness or variety." (1978: 3). Although this description creates the impression of a complementary relationship between ornament and structure, he recognises the fact that ornaments can, as a result of their function, fulfil a dual role as part of the integral musical structure, whilst also serving to enhance that structure.

In an essay entitled Ornament and Structure, Neumann provides an exegesis of the interpretative implications of the two concepts "ornament" and "structure" (1982: 243-250). According to him, all ornaments can be categorised into either ornaments which serve a melodic function, or ornaments with a harmonic function. The former function will
tend to predominate in linear or polyphonic music, where the use will be confined to the
typical definition provided in the preceding paragraph, namely to impart elegance,
smoothness, grace and variety to a melodic line. This largely "connective" function will
best be served if the ornament is rhythmically unobtrusive. Harmonic ornaments, on the
other hand, exert their influence in the vertical dimension of musical perception. They
create powerful dissonances which often coincide with metrically strong beats, giving them
a structural importance superseding that of the melodic ornament. The ideal habitat for
these ornaments is homophonic textures. In the case of the ornament endowed with a
harmonic function, structure and embellishment often merge into an alloy, often all but
obscuring the identity of the ornament. Much of this structural role of the ornament
depends on the rhythmic prominence thereof.

The implications of this theoretical framework on performance practice is of fundamental
importance. Intellectually sound performance practice depends on the performer's
understanding of the underlying structural design of a piece of music. This understanding
of structure will largely influence the way in which he or she thinks about the execution of
the ornaments contained within this structure. Injudiciously executing melodic ornaments
on strong down-beats will affect or change the musical structure for the worse. On the
other hand, failure to recognise harmonic ornaments and execute them as such, may well
result in an anaemic harmonic texture and a loss of musical colour and expression.
Determining the functions of ornaments in specific musical contexts is thus a musical
imperative and an indispensable guide to the performer as to their execution.
3.4.1 The Appoggiatura

The chaotic state of terminological usage concerning the *appoggiatura* is the single most important factor leading to ambiguities and false assumptions with regard to its interpretation. The terminological distinctions drawn by Frederick Neumann clear away much of this confusion and will thus be adopted in this section.

Neumann uses the term “Vorschlag” as a collective term to describe all ornaments consisting of a single note, whether short or long, on or before the beat. The term “appoggiatura” is used exclusively for the type that is either short or long, but is always emphasised and executed on the beat. For the short variety that is played before the beat and is thus unaccented, the term “grace-note” is used (1982: 204). To further restrict the margin for possible error and confusion, Neumann notes Bach’s habit of writing out the long *appoggiatura* in regular notes, thus relieving the interpreter from the responsibility of deciding whether a given ornament should be treated as a long *appoggiatura* or a grace-note (1982: 203). The whole problem surrounding Bach’s *Vorschlag* can thus be said to centre on the question of grace-note versus accented *appoggiatura*.

Rather than deciding the merits of either of these permutations at random, a more consistent application is possible when the diverse functions of each permutation is established. The grace-note serves as a melodic lubricant which eases the transition from one structural note to the next. It is thus played lightly and shortly, without emphasis, and therefore has its place before the natural accent of the beat. The grace-note thus never alters the shape of the melody and has, because of its inconspicuous place in the rhythmical scheme, little or no harmonic implications (Neumann 1982: 204). The *appoggiatura* is not
so unobtrusive. It appears at rhythmically important points in a measure and affects the contour of the melody by displacing melody notes for varying lengths of time. In this way it provides a harmonic accent and creates dissonances, which contribute to the expressive emphasis of a melody (Neumann 1982: 208).

When these two antithetical functions are objectively considered, the following practical guidelines emerge with regard to the performance of the Vorschlag:

- The use of the *appoggiatura* should never lead to forbidden harmonic practices like parallel fifths or octaves.
- As the *appoggiatura* has the exclusive harmonic function of creating dissonance and therefore greater emotional expression, one *appoggiatura* may not follow directly on another, the first thus robbing the second of its effect. The most obvious example of this happening, is when the *Vorschlag* precedes a long, written-out *appoggiatura*, as illustrated in Example 2 by Quantz, where the ornament indicated by the small note should be performed as a grace-note:

**Example 2**

![Example 2](image)

played as:

![Example 2](image)

Taken from Quantz, *On Playing the Flute*, p. 94.
In conclusion, Neumann tempers his views by stating that “...a performer is not forced to choose squarely between one or the other. Grace-notes and *appoggiaturas* are only opposing prototypes and their characteristics can be mixed in an infinite variety of ratios.” (1982: 209-210). This means that, depending on the judgement of the performer, a *Vorschlag* can straddle the beat in a variety of different shapes and be responsible for the diversity which constitutes the essence of ornamentation.

3.4.2 The Arpeggio

The arpeggio can be defined as a successive sounding of a chordally conceived group of pitches (Neumann 1978: 492). Apart from a restrictive literal interpretation of certain historical ornament tables, no explicit formulation can be found in any historical treatise as to the metrical placing of this ornament. As is the case with all other ornamentation, the context of the ornament in the musical fabric produces the most convincing argument with regard to its execution.

The arpeggio relevant to this case study is the so called chordal arpeggio and its subspecies, the intervallic arpeggio. Neumann describes the former as constituting pitches that are announced in very close succession, without any specified rhythm, and which are sustained to form the sound of the full chord. He further distinguishes between two kinds of chordal arpeggio: plain and figurate arpeggio (1978: 492). The plain arpeggio consists only of the notated pitches of the chord which are “broken” either upward or downward, as the case might be. The figurate arpeggio involves non-chordal tones which are inserted into the figuration by the performer and which are not sustained.
The intervallic arpeggio involves only two pitches. The terminological distinction from the chordal arpeggio can legitimately be made because the functions of the two differ quite substantially. In the words of Saint-Lambert, the usual execution of the chordal type has to be done at great speed, whereas the two-note break sounds "...more graceful when separated distinctly even to the point where the second [notes] are reduced to half their value." (Neumann 1978: 499). Bach indicated this arpeggio with a slanted stroke symbol in the Capriccio in B flat major.

The performing possibilities of the chordal arpeggio with regard to metrical placing can be summarised as follows:

- An on-beat start is fitting when the lowest tone of an upward arpeggio is part of the main melody. Solistic playing in the absence of a distinct melody and "...where the musical essence of a melody resides in a succession of chords..." (Neumann 1978: 493) also indicates this alternative as the most likely and suitable execution.

- If the arpeggio is of secondary importance to a melody and ends on a melody note, the anticipated start of the ornament seems logical. This execution alone would grace the melody without destroying the structurally important notes which should enjoy rhythmic priority.

With regard to the upward or downward execution of chordal arpeggios, the notated examples available from historical treatises would seem to favour the former. However, no dogmatic stance on this can be held, as there exists little evidence to support such rigidity. Furthermore, in static musical passages which call for a greater measure of animation, the arpeggio becomes inexorably intertwined with the richer elaboration of free ornamentation, making it undesirable to limit it to the stiffness of dogma. Neumann cautions that
“Whenever we have no guidance from the composer, it will generally be advisable to aim at simple, not fancy solutions.” (1978: 510).

3.4.3 The Mordent

Bach wrote mordents only in his keyboard music and he did this by used the following French symbol: ~. A possible reason for this limited use of the mordent is stated by Neumann as being “…because the rigid sounds of the former [the Clavier] were in need of the plasticity which this grace could impart by its suggestion of inflections, accents, or intensifications.” (1978: 449). In the ornament table which Bach wrote under the title “Explicatio” in the Clavier-Büchlein for his eleven-year-old son Friedeman, he transcribed the ornament as is seen in Example 3:

EXAMPLE 3

Taken from Neumann, Ornamentation in Baroque and Post-Baroque Music..., p. 441

This model is regarded by many modern scholars as definitive, so that any mordent sign is interpreted as consisting of one on-beat alternation only. This view is placed in the proper perspective by the remarks in the introduction to this thesis (Chapter 1), which address the issues of definitive and/or authentic interpretations of early music. Neumann adds the following possible models as valid interpretations of this ornament:
• A sustained mordent type consisting of two or three alternations. Mordents such as these can be useful in adding emphasis to structurally important notes, provided that the notes are long enough to accommodate them (1978: 442).

• Rhythmic displacement of the mordent to avoid stiffness or clumsiness in the melodic line. This displacement will frequently take the form of an anticipation, changing the function of the ornament from being accentual or intensifying, to serving as a melodic connective. The decision in this instance would be based on whether one views the ornament in question as being a structural or an ornamental figure. The tempo will be a factor to take into account in this regard, as the mordent will as a rule have to be executed swiftly (1978: 445).

Bach does not qualify the mordent symbol with accidentals to indicate a required whole-tone or semi-tone alteration of the auxiliary. The performer has to make the necessary adjustment, noting the mordent's strong penchant for semi-tone oscillations.

3.4.4 The Slide

The term "slide" is most commonly applied to a two-note ornament of which the constituent tones rise diatonically to the principal note and are slurred to it.

Although the rhythmical permutations of the slide are numerous, Neumann distinguishes between three basic rhythmical designs (1978: 204). They are the following:
He proceeds to categorise each of the patterns as Anapaest, Lombard and Dactylic respectively. The Anapaest pattern is to be executed as a soft grace. It has the character of a crescendo with an accentuation on the principal note. The Lombard type consists of a distinct accent on the first ornamental note. This accent is sharper in faster tempos and milder in slower tempos. The Dactylic version is executed by providing a gentle emphasis on the first note. With all these rhythmical permutations, it is important to note that the slide cannot enrich the harmony and is thus not a harmonic ornament. If it occurs on an accented beat, it will normally have to be consonant, as it would not be able to resolve satisfactorily as a dissonant. It follows that only melodic and rhythmic considerations can influence the decision of the rhythmic placing of the ornament.

J. S. Bach uses two signs to indicate slides in his music, namely the custos, also used by Kuhnau (~), and the two little notes used by French musicians (\(\cdot\)) (Neumann 1978: 217).

In choosing one of the possible executions for the slide, the following factors play a role:

- Musical considerations may eliminate certain possibilities. Thus possible parallels resulting from a Lombard style execution would make such an execution undesirable.
• A sharp initial accent will attract a Lombard execution, an unaccented or even gently emphasised syllable the Dactylic execution, and a crescendo-implying syllable the Anapaest treatment.

• An Anapaest execution, due to its neutral nature, can fit any place in a measure, whereas the Dactylic permutation is more congenial to weak beats and the Lombard execution to strong ones.

All factors being equal, the performer should make an informed choice between the different designs.

3.4.5 The Trill

The basic pattern of the trill is the alternation of a tone with its upper neighbouring tone.

As Bach never indicated chromatic alterations of the auxiliary for any of his trill symbols, he relied upon the judgement of the performer in deciding this issue one way or the other. Bach’s use of this ornament is however not restricted to this primitive design. It encompasses a wide variety of graces, indicated by Bach with any of the following symbols illustrated in Example 5:
These symbols, consisting of different variations of the chevron, are all strictly keyboard symbols of French origin. In addition to these keyboard symbols, Bach also uses the letter t for other media. This t is sometimes extended by a stroke, a fragmentary r:

The view that all trills in Bach’s music begin on the upper auxiliary note is widely accepted by modern theorists. This view also holds forth that this upper auxiliary note, or appoggiatura, is a harmonic ornament and as such needs to be played on the down-beat. This view is defended with some vehemence by a number of illustrious authors. Dolmetsch writes that any exceptions of the upper-note-on-the-beat rule is unacceptable (1946: 168). Ralph Kirkpatrick is very emphatic in his assertion that “...the Bach trill always begins on the upper note...” and that the Baroque trill has an essentially appoggiatura character (1938: xiii, xiv). Donington states his agreement with this rule (1974: 239). Even Neumann admits that “…the orthodox school, with its insistence on the on-beat auxiliary rule, has made by far the stronger impact on today’s Bach performance.” (1978: 313).
Distinguished as the above authors may be, their opinions do not carry as much weight as does primary evidence extracted from the music. It is on the basis of such primary evidence that Neumann bases his somewhat nonconformist views. Although allowing for some instances where trills may well start on an on-beat auxiliary, such as nearly all cadential trills, Neumann defies the regimentation of all trills into a single performance pattern. He distinguishes between the following realisation possibilities when the performer is confronted with the trill sign (1982: 211-212):

- The appoggiatura trill, of which the emphasised auxiliary may or may not be extended in an appui:

EXAMPLE 6

[Music notation]

- The grace-note trill, starting with the unaccented auxiliary before the beat and stressing the main note:

EXAMPLE 7

[Music notation]

- The main-note trill, which may or may not start with an appui:

EXAMPLE 8

[Music notation]
The anticipated trill:

**EXAMPLE 9**

Taken from Neumann, *Essays in Performance Practice*, p. 211-212.

Neumann also advises performers not to employ an *appoggiatura* trill where an *appoggiatura*, used alone, would be inappropriate. Likewise the grace-note trill should only be employed when a grace-note on its own would enhance the music. Where neither the *appoggiatura* nor the grace-note could comfortably be said to be a natural addition to the music, the main-note trill is recommended (1982:210).

Neumann does not stand entirely alone with regard to this contentious interpretative view. As early as 1908, Adolf Beyschlag denied the existence of a rule with regard to the use of the on-beat auxiliary in his *Die Ornamentik der Musik* (1908: 129). Similarly, Dannreuther, although he endorsed the rule in theory, provided several examples to which it could not possibly apply (1895: 165-166). Badura-Skoda also acknowledges this fact when he admits that "...there is reason to believe that Bach's 'Italian' and 'German' works suggest an execution of the embellishments that differs from the French style [i.e. the on-beat auxiliary trill]." (1993: 415).
The last word in this polemic issue does however not belong to quibbling theorists, but to the internal evidence presented by the music. Once the performer is aware of the existing differences of opinion, it is here alone that the truth will be found.

3.5 Rhythm

The rhythmical aspect of Bach performance practice is plagued by controversy on two major issues, namely the applicability of the French convention of Notes Inégales to specific works by specific composers in specific contexts, as well as the manner of execution of dotted notes. In both cases the rhythmic practices in question originate from French music, and at least a part of the polemic surrounding them is about whether these practices were widely practised by contemporary composers in countries other than France. In the specific case of J. S. Bach, opinions on this issue differ radically.

Dotted notes are not an outstanding rhythmical feature of the Capriccio in B flat major. An in-depth discussion of the applicability and execution of dotted note patterns, with specific reference to J. S. Bach's music and the Capriccio in particular, would thus be a hyperbolic response to a largely irrelevant issue. Dotted rhythms occur no more than thirty times in this work. The only movement in which it can be said to be frequent enough to qualify as a characteristic feature, is movement 2. Here, as can be seen in Example 10 on the next page, a dotted rhythm appears in the counter theme (top voice) which accompanies the short fugal theme throughout the recurring fugal expositions.
EXAMPLE 10

Movement 2, measure 2, taken from the Neue Bach Ausgabe.

The frequent appearance of dotted rhythms in this movement does however not automatically suggest the French style of execution. The method of execution is more likely to be determined by the context in which the dotted rhythms appear, than the frequency of the appearances. In this regard, the likely choice of a very lively tempo in movement 2, as well as the desirability of presenting the counterpoint in a lucid manner, argue against a "sharpening of the rhythm" such as would be achieved by "over-dotting".

In the remaining instances where dotted rhythms occur in the Capriccio, fast tempos, the vertical alignment of the respective notes and the Affekt all mitigate against applying the practice of "under-dotting" and "over-dotting".

The case for or against the usage of Notes Inégaless in the Capriccio is less clear cut. Unlike the contentious issue surrounding dotted rhythms, no intrinsic musical evidence in the Capriccio point to either the advisability or the inadvisability of employing this French rhythmical convention. In the light of this, any performer has to take cognisance of the existing antithetical musicological positions on the usage of Notes Inégaless.

The term Notes Inégaless, denotes a rhythmical practice characteristic of French music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Frederick Neumann presents a convincing argument designed to prove that the convention of Notes Inégaless applies exclusively to
French Baroque music, as opposed to Baroque music in general. The generalisation of this convention in order to encompass a broadly practised European Baroque practice by authors such as Sol Babitz, Arthur Mendel, Curt Sachs and Robert Donington, is presented by him as unsubstantiated theory (Neumann 1982: 29). In this regard he asserts that "...inequality cannot be considered a general Baroque practice, nor one that was current among German musicians outside lands of complete French musical domination;..." and continues to add that "...there seems to be no reason why it should be applied to the music of J. S. Bach." (1982: 54).

Exactly the opposite view is propagated by Robert Donington, who makes the connection between inequality and J. S. Bach largely as a result of a quotation from Johann Joachem Quantz's *Versuch einer Anweisung die Flöte traversière zu spielen* (Donington 1974: 458). This passage (Quantz 1985: 123-124) has fuelled much of the controversy surrounding *Notes Inégales*. It is the relevancy of this quotation to J. S. Bach's music which Neumann sets out to contest in his study, quoted above. Donington, after noting the tendency of some French writers to describe inequality as a French phenomenon only, embraces a more universal application of the principle (1974: 460-462).

On balance, it is the opinion of the author that Neumann's view holds fewer risks of injudicious and unsanctioned alterations to Bach's original intentions with his music, encouraging as it does restraint and a conservative approach to rhythmical alterations of the musical text. This does not mean that Neumann's views are mainstream or conventional. In many respects they are isolationist and disconcertingly radically opposed to current belief and interpretative doctrine. Nevertheless, Neumann's views continue to gain credibility against the manifold inconsistencies in the assumptions of many of his detractors.
If, however, one should feel that there is merit in the application of the *Notes Inégales* convention in specific contexts in J. S. Bach’s works, as may well be the case in the Capriccio in B flat major, the basic theoretical framework of this rhythmical convention is relevant.

The essence of performing *Notes Inégales* was the performance of uneven notes where even notes was written (Donington 1973:255). The remarkably uniform conventions of the French *Inégales* practice, can amongst other things be seen in the rules which determined which notes were eligible for inequality. In certain metres, generally speaking duple metres, the beat unit had to be divided into four parts before inequality applied. Neumann refers to this as the first category of inequality (1982: 21). In other metres, generally the triple metres, inequality applied to the subdivision of the metrical unit in two parts. This is referred to as the second category of inequality (Neumann 1982: 21).

Summarising the essence of the theorem of *Notes Inégales*, the following points are of relevance to this specific case study:

- Inequality is long-short and not short-long (short-long represents the so-called Lombard rhythm) (Neumann 1982: 23-28). Babitz and Donington contest this view. Donington asserts that inequality can either be performed by lengthening the first note and shortening the second (“standard” inequality), or by shortening the first note and lengthening the second (“reversed” inequality) (Donington 1973: 259-262).

- Neumann notes that inequality is subject to many exceptions (1982: 28-29). The most important among these are melodies that move by skips and the right of the performer
to judge the character of a piece unsuitable to the use of Notes Inégales. Donington agrees with the former of these precedents when he writes that the sighing effect of lilting inequality comes more naturally in steps than in leaps.

- Polyphonic music is not conducive to the use of Notes Inégales (Neumann 1982: 29).
- The nature of inequality as free rhythmic manipulation predestines its use by soloists (Neumann 1982: 30).
- The function of inequality was originally to grace passages that were melismatic in character and not to tamper with the melodic structure of a piece (Neumann 1982: 20).

In conclusion to this contentious issue, it should be noted that some parity does indeed exist between the views of Neumann and Donington and their respective followers regarding the essence of the theory of inequality. It is clear that any divisions that do exist, rest rather on the legitimacy of applying the convention of Notes Inégales to the music of J. S. Bach than on the content of the theory itself. This issue is not the main concern of this study and cannot be decided by any superficial assessment such as is presented here. Both points of view presented here will thus be considered in the interpretative analysis of the Capriccio which follows in the next chapter.

A distinction should be drawn between Notes Inégales, characterised by strictly regulating conventions concerning period, nationality, style, specific note values and melodic contexts on the one hand, and free agogic inflections on the other. The latter is entirely free, not regulated by convention and depends only on the judgement of the performer. This freedom is a natural result of the fact that even modern notation “...is too crude to match the infinite delicacy of rhythmic inflections, which are the sensitive performer’s means of phrasing, nuance and expressive shading.” (Neumann 1982: 70). Paul Badura-Skoda refers
to this freedom as "...all kinds of rubato, 'breathing pauses', breaks, and thematic dovetailing running counter to the beat." (1993: 17). If rhythmic manipulation should sometimes take the form of dotting a series of undotted notes, this freedom should not be mistaken for *Notes Inégales* (Neumann 1982: 70-71). The arbitrary alteration of the rhythm by the performer, whether it be right or wrong in a specific case, should be seen for what it is, namely improvisatory freedom without regard to the composer's wishes. It cannot be equated with regulated inequality to conform to the composer's wishes.

In conclusion to this discussion of rhythmical issues in Bach performance, one minor but nonetheless relevant observation of Bach's rhythmical usage needs to be made. Badura-Skoda makes an interesting point on the notation of rhythm by J. S. Bach when he mentions rhythmic ambiguities, often resulting from the position of the bar lines (1993: 24-27). Alfred Dürr's observation that "There are many examples - at least in non-dance music - in which Bach simply moves a theme two crotchets to the left or to the right.", underlines this peculiar notational habit of Bach (Badura-Skoda 1993: 24). The significance of this to the rhythmical dimension of the music, is that a failure to recognise the reasons behind such notation could result in a faulty accentuation of the melodic line. This would in turn obscure the metre and time signature for the listener. Both the harmonic structure of a specific work and the traditional theory that some beats are "good" (strong) and other are "bad" (weak), provide important clues regarding the performance of these ambiguous notations. A possible reason for these ambiguities is offered by Badura-Skoda when he suggests that it may result from an imperfect system of indicating changes in the metre of a piece (1993: 26-27). He also makes the observation that conflict between what has been written and what is heard often arises when a piece begins with a long rest, thus initially obscuring the actual position of the barline to the listener (1993: 27).
In especially one instance in the Capriccio in B flat major (movement 1), the remarked upon rhythmical ambiguities in Bach’s notation are of some importance. It will be referred to in the relevant instance in the analysis constituting the next chapter.

3.6 Tempo

“Taste is the true metronome”, wrote Anton Bemetzrieder in his Leçons de Clavecin in 1771 (Donington 1973: 243). Unfortunately taste is fickle, and Bemetzrieder’s statement rings true in so far as very little concrete guidelines have been handed down to us from the eighteenth century to assist the performer of the late twentieth century in his/her quest for the correct tempo in the performance of works dating from eighteenth century in particular.

In Bach’s works, tempo indications are the exception rather than the rule. J. S. Bach’s first biographer, Johann Nikolaus Forkel, included one of the few references to his subject’s choice of tempo in performing on the clavichord, harpsichord and organ, by writing: “In the performance of his own pieces he usually adopted a very lively tempo, though he was able, in addition to this liveliness, to add so much variety to his performance that each work, in his hands, was as it were as eloquent as speech.” (Badura-Skoda 1993: 74).

This can hardly be regarded as concrete evidence. If anything, it only fuels the subjective debate of exactly how fast “lively” is. In an effort to systemize what little evidence exists, Erwin Bodky and Robert Marshall compiled independent lists of the tempo indications used by Bach. Bodky’s list (1960: 100-101) is faulted by Badura-Skoda as being incomplete (1993: 77). The list compiled by Marshall (1985: 268) is regarded as the most comprehensive list to date. From this list it emerges that Bach’s six basic tempos, defined
as such by the frequency of their use, are *Adagio, Largo, Andante, Allegro, Vivace* and *Presto*. The fact that Bach chose to qualify tempos as *ma non, assai* and *un poco* on many occasions (the Capriccio being a particularly good example of this), proves that he differentiated between tempos in a way that was unusual for the Baroque era. Marshall also demonstrates that *Allegro* was tacitly taken to be the speed of many first movements and that Bach, in his early keyboard and organ works, preferred extreme tempo indications in both fast and slow movements, possibly in order to demonstrate virtuosity.

These deductions and tables are however far from an objective standard by which the tempo of Bach's works can be regulated. In the absence of evidence, Nikolaus Harnoncourt follows the common-sense approach when he writes that tempo in Bach's time was deduced from four factors (1982: 55). These factors were:

- The musical emotion or Affect of the piece.
- The time signature.
- The smallest occurring note values.
- The number of accents per measure.

Badura-Skoda adds rhythmic patterns, text underlay and the titles of movements to the above list (1993: 80). Apart from these factors, two very important tempo indicators especially relevant to this case study, are raised by Helmuth Perl, namely the technique of the instrument and the acoustics of the room in which the music is performed (1984: 102).

When considering a choice of tempo for a specific Bach work, the performer is thus not confronted by an absolute standard, as would have been the case had Bach provided more accurate indications of his desired tempo for the work. Instead, the performer has to
contend with a relative standard that provides ample opportunity for differing opinions. Although a melancholy piece of music would be played slower than a happy dance, the exact degree of slowness or fastness depends on the taste of the performer. The smallest occurring note values can be a good indication of what is impossible with regard to tempo by providing technical limitations to the degree of fastestness which can be achieved, but cannot fix the exact tempo within the parameters of that which is possible. Rhythmic patterns and the number of accents per measure share this function and restriction. The same holds true for the time signature, of which tempo is not an inherent quality and which can at best only provide a hint as to the appropriate tempo choice for a given work. With regard to acoustics, text underlay in vocal works and titles of movements (as provided by Bach in the Capriccio), differences in taste would almost certainly result in a different choice of tempo for each performance of a Bach work by a different performer. As will be illustrated in Chapter 5, the choice of instrument can exercise a considerable degree of influence on the suitability of any specific tempo in a specific context. The same piece played on the harpsichord and the piano will almost certainly sound better if played faster on the harpsichord and slower on the piano. Here the intrinsic qualities of the music has to be balanced with the intrinsic qualities of the instrument on which the music is being performed. In the case of the clavichord, the very restricted dynamic capabilities of the instrument would also suggest a faster tempo choice than would be possible, or indeed desirable, on the modern piano.

With regard to tempo rubato, most authors support flexibility of tempo as a natural and desirable effect in Baroque music. Flexibility of tempo is desirable to avoid an unnatural stiffness and constraint (Quartz 1985: 124). This aspect of the performance may not detract from the equally valid wish by C. P. E. Bach "...to hold the tempo at the end of a
piece just as it was at the start...” (1951: 161). Balance between the two extremes, as dictated by the music and the circumstances mentioned above, seems to be the safest path in this regard.

In view of the very limited concrete evidence available to the performer with regard to tempo, it can no doubt be regarded as one of the most subjective and controversial performance elements about which a performer will have to make choices. As a general principle, most authors seem to agree that both slow and fast movements in Bach's music would benefit from a livelier tempo than would be regarded as the norm today.
This chapter proposes to present an analysis and a resulting interpretation of certain aspects of the Capriccio in B flat major. To specify what would otherwise be a very vague statement of intent, the analysis will pause at each individual movement in turn, focusing on the following specific subsections:

- **General Structural Analysis:** An in-depth analysis of motivic, sectional and tonal structure, as well as a description of the compositional procedures used by Bach in creating this structure.

- **Affekt:** An analysis and interpretation of Bach’s usage of different rhetorical devices in the Capriccio in order to create the desired musical Affekt and to enhance the descriptive programmatic rubrics.

- **Ornamentation:** An exploration of the structural function of ornamentation in the specific musical context of each individual movement and the consequent probable interpretation of the ornamentation.

- **Rhythm:** The contextual validity of the principles of dotted notes, Notes Inégales and rhythmical freedom will be assessed in the light of the Affekt and musical context of each movement.

- **Tempo:** All of the above factors will be taken into consideration in providing an approximate metronome indication of an appropriate tempo for each movement.
At the end of the analysis of the 6 movements, a macro-structural analysis will contemplate the overall architectonic design of the Capriccio.

The acoustical properties of the chosen instrument and the acoustics of the room in which a performance takes place, undoubtedly have a decided influence on decisions regarding the two other subdisciplines discussed in the previous chapter, namely articulation and dynamics. These aspects of performance practice are at least as dependant on the instrument on which a given piece of music is performed, as it is on a thorough understanding of the music itself. As the two factors of instrument choice and acoustics will only be examined in detail in Chapter 5, it is only logical to save any conclusions relating to articulation and dynamics in performance for that chapter.

In order to complement and elucidate the analyses of movements 2, 3 and 6, graphic illustrations of the structural design of these movements are included in appendixes at the end of this study. Especially in the two fugal movements (movements 2 and 6), these graphic illustrations provide a valuable insight into Bach's thematic usage, and will be referred to in the relevant discussions of the movements concerned.

The Edition

The edition of the Capriccio BWV 992 on which this analysis is based, is the Neue Bach Ausgabe (NBA), which has been in progress since the early years of 1950 and which is published by Bärenreiter. It represents the findings of modern Bach research and has been found by the author to be by far the most uncorrupted text from which to work. The
specific volume of the NBA in which the Capriccio in B flat major appears (Volume V/10) was edited by Hartwig Eichberg in 1982.

4.1 Movement 1

Arioso. Adagio. Ist eine Schmeichelung der Freunde, um denselben von seiner Reise abzuhalten

4.1.1 General Structural Analysis

This movement is in a style of an Italian triosonata. It is characterised by a three-voice texture in which the bass does not function independently, but rather assumes the more static harmonic role traditionally associated with a basso continuo. Above this bass the two cantabile upper voices move mostly in parallel motion. The result of this is a predominantly homophonic texture.

The movement displays a ternary tonal structure not reinforced by the thematic material. The number of strong cadences at the ends of phrases create the impression of a sectionally undivided movement consisting of a collection of short phrases, mostly four crotchet beats in length. An alternative possible structural interpretation, based on the strength of the cadences involved and the thematic events, is suggested in Table 1 below. This table also presents an overview of the phrase structure and tonal structure of movement 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHRASE</th>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>TONALITY</th>
<th>POSSIBLE SECTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-2\textsuperscript{2a}</td>
<td>B flat major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2\textsuperscript{2b}-3\textsuperscript{2a}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3\textsuperscript{2b}-4\textsuperscript{l}</td>
<td>F major</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4\textsuperscript{2}-5\textsuperscript{l}_{a}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5\textsuperscript{l_{b}}-6\textsuperscript{2a}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6\textsuperscript{2b}-7\textsuperscript{l}</td>
<td>(C minor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7\textsuperscript{2}-8\textsuperscript{l}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>8\textsuperscript{2}-10\textsuperscript{1a}</td>
<td>B flat major</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10\textsuperscript{1b}-12\textsuperscript{1a}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>12\textsuperscript{1b}-14\textsuperscript{1a}</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>14\textsuperscript{1b}-17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 Affekt

The Affekt of this movement, as in all the movements of this piece, is clearly implied in the programmatic rubric provided by Bach. From this rubric the deduction can be made that the purpose of any musical rhetoric would be to portray the friends' "Schmeichelung" (blandishment) of the brother who is about to depart. Closer examination of the music reveals Bach's use of manifold rhetorical devices in order to achieve this Affekt.
The simple tonal structure of the music (B flat major - F major - B flat major), provides the
tonal stability that is required so as not to detract from the single-minded purpose of gentle
persuasion which Bach has set himself in this movement. Within this stable harmonic
environment, the soothing suppleness of the parallel sixths that are used throughout in the
two upper voices, functions as the harmonic equivalent of gentle coaxing. Often these
sixths lead to endings in which the top voice falls by a fifth (measures 3 and 4 as seen in
Example 11), a fourth (measures 2 and 6 as seen in Example 12) and a third (measure 8 as
seen in Example 13).

**EXAMPLE 11**

Movement 1, measures 3-4, taken from the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*.

**EXAMPLE 12**

Movement 1, measures 2 and 6, taken from the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*. 
The use of this particular kind of rhetoric, called *Exclamatio* (any leap up or down by intervals larger than a third), has a very strong pleading effect. Bach also creates a structure of small phrases of "insinuating" character. The similarity between the phrases with regard to melodic contour and metric length (mostly each phrase consists of four crotchet beats), seems to insinuate the same repeated request to stay, each phrase emphatically echoing the other, yet each "formulated" slightly differently (i.e. with regard to register, pitch, the division of rhythmical activity and melodic importance between the voices). This use of phrases of equal length is known in oratorical rhetoric as *Isokola*, and is used to emphasise that which is being repeated. In addition, the ornamentation, especially the five *Vorschläge* and two slides, enhance the tenderness and gentle charm of the melodic contour.

Rolf Dammann asserts that the *figura corta* (\(\text{\textcopyright}\)) which permeates the whole movement, is no less than an instrumental declaration of "Bleibe doch!" ("Please stay!") (1984: 168).

Nowhere is this view better illustrated than in measures 13-15, where the *figura corta* is relentlessly repeated five times in order to infuse this request with greater intensity and urgency. The *Anapaest* rhythm (\(\text{\textcopyright}\text{\textcopyright}\text{\textcopyright}\text{\textcopyright}\text{\textcopyright}\text{\textcopyright}\) associated with the *figura corta*, was described by Vossius as a rhythm particularly suited to moving the emotions, and can be seen as a clear
instance where Bach employed a literary rhetorical concept to create a desired musical Affekt (Serauky 1955: 110).

Bach's focus on a rationalised and objective Affekt can thus be seen not only in the tonal structure characterised by sparing modulations, but also in the melodic and structural similarity of the phrases and the monomaniacal repeated rhythmic gesticulation of the *figura corta*. This extraordinary harnessing of all musical elements to portray a single orchestrated Affekt finally culminates in the single melodic line of measures 16-17 (see Example 14 below), which rises in questioning anticipation of a positive answer to the pleading which precede it.

**EXAMPLE 14**

Movement 1, measures 15-17, taken from the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*.

The rhetorical technique of *Interrogatio* is used here in the rising intervals, only to end in dejected resignation as the ascending line is broken in the rebuttal of the descending third which anticipates the last chord.
4.1.3 Ornamentation

The following table gives an overview of the frequency at which different ornaments are used in movement 1:

**TABLE 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORNAMENT</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vorschläge</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordents</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slides</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trills</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Vorschläge

A good case can be made for treating the *Vorschläge* in this movement as grace-notes. This means that they should be played before the beat and should thus be unaccented.

Neumann thinks this execution the most desirable one in this specific instance, motivating his choice by saying that "...the graces should be of an insinuating, caressing nature..." (1978: 445). This view rests mainly on the assumption that a down-beat execution would be contrary to the gentle contour and slow tempo of the piece, unnecessarily inserting jagged accents foreign to the affection expressed on the programmatic rubric.
Alternatively, an accented performance of this grace could rely on the reasonable justification that the homophonic texture of this movement seems to encourage the use of the *appoggiatura* with its harmonic function. The stronger expressive emphasis resulting from such an execution would seemingly be in keeping with the affection of the piece as it would infuse the mostly basic harmonic progressions with all the expressive effects of dissonance. Such an execution would not result in unacceptable distortions of the melodic structure, nor would it lead to unusual harmonic practices such as parallel fifths or octaves.

The decisive factor in the choice between grace-note and *appoggiatura* in this instance, is the Affekt of this specific movement, as well as the more holistic perspective of the affective role it is meant to fulfil in the context of the whole work. This movement is supposed to gently coax and cajole - not to scare and frighten like the second movement. The harmonic vocabulary which Bach restricts himself to in these seventeen measures confirms this. It would therefore be more appropriate to adopt the grace-note execution of the *Vorschlag* in this movement and so to complement the homophonic simplicity of Bach's harmonic use. This choice would contribute to creating a bigger contrast between the first two movements and in so doing to enhance the rhetorical plan of persuasion which Bach develops in the first three movements.

The Arpeggio

The last chord of this movement can be arpeggiated, even when playing the piece on the piano where the prolongation of the sound is not an issue of practical necessity. The direction of the arpeggio can be upwards, as would be usual, but it is also possible to execute the roll "inwards". This would imply that the right hand roll from top to bottom
and the left hand from bottom to top - the movement in each hand occurring simultaneously. Keeping the Affekt in mind, the upward arpeggio may be the more tranquil choice and therefore the more appropriate.

The metrical placing of the arpeggio is influenced in this case by the fact that it constitutes the ultimate harmonic resting place of the movement. The peaceful tonic ending is of the utmost importance and therefore the arpeggio has to start on the beat - the B flat in the bass harmonically anchoring the chord in the tonic. Bach also emphasises the B flat in the top stave by inserting a mordent on this note. The execution of the arpeggio should be swift and even, the six notes of which it is comprised viewed as a single horizontal phrase.

The Mordent

Neumann writes of the first two mordents of this movement (measures 1\textsuperscript{2b} and 2\textsuperscript{13}) that "...both mordents, even the second one which falls on the heaviest beat, might best be anticipated,..." (1978: 445). He illustrates this suggestion as follows:

**EXAMPLE 15**

![EXAMPLE 15](image)

Taken from Neumann, *Ornamentation in Baroque and Post-Baroque Music*..., p. 446.
As can be seen from this example, the anticipation of the mordents is complemented by the anticipatory nature of the grace-notes, the execution of which was discussed above. The logic behind this homogeneous pre-beat execution is clearly related to the Affekt of the movement. Pre-beat mordents would provide less of an angular musical effect than ones occurring on the beat, thus serving the gentle persuasiveness of the music to the greatest effect.

The mordents in this movement can be restricted to the model of one on-beat alternation. A possible exception is the mordent of measure 12¹, which could well be extended into a sustained mordent consisting of two or three alternations. Both the length of the B flat and the structural importance thereof would encourage such an extension.

The Slide

A clue with regard to the performance of the two slides in this movement is provided by the slide of measure 9³⁻⁹⁴, shown here in Example 16. A down-beat execution here would result in very audible parallel fifths between the outer voices:

EXAMPLE 16

Movement 1, measure 9, taken from the Neue Bach Ausgabe.
This effectively excludes the *Lombard* style execution and would suggest an anticipated *Anapaest* rhythm, again complementing the pre-beat execution of the grace-notes and mordents. Although no similar mistake would result from an down-beat execution of the slide in measure 4\(^3\), the affection of the piece does not encourage the almost aggressive effect of the *Lombard* style execution. Both the *Dactylic* and *Anapaest* patterns could however be successfully employed in this instance.

The Trill

The numerous trills in this movement provide a compelling argument against the use of a stereotyped pattern as advocated by some theorists. The trill preceded by the *Vorschlag* in measure 1\(^4\), shown here in Example 17, would seem to indicate that the other trills, not graced in this way, should be executed as main-note trills.

**EXAMPLE 17**

[Music notation image]

Movement 1, measure 1, taken from the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*.

The reverse argument, namely that Bach only indicated his intention once, characteristically not marking consequent passages, is disproved by his careful alteration of the ornamentation in similar passages. His concern in adding ornamentation seems more with ensuring varying executions of similar passages (thus conforming to the very spirit of
ornamentation) than of creating a uniform or standard execution of such passages.

Evidence to this effect is presented by measure 3\(^{4a}\), where the grace-note is written without the addition of a trill and measure 5\(^{4a}\), where the trill is presented without the grace-note.

The most likely interpretation of the different trills found in this movement is indicated in the following table:

TABLE 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRILL</th>
<th>MEASURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appoggiatura trill</td>
<td>(3^{3b}, 4^{4a}, 6^{4a}, 13^{2a}, 13^{4a})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace-note trill</td>
<td>(1^{4a})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main-note trill</td>
<td>(1^{3b}, 2^{3b}, 2^{4b}, 5^{3b} \text{(RH and LH)}, 5^{4a}, 6^{3b}, 7^{2b}, 9^{2b}, 10^{3a} \text{(RH and LH)}, 11^{1a}, 11^{4b}, 15^{3a}, 15^{4a} \text{(RH and LH)}, 16^{1b} \text{(RH and LH)}, 17^{1a})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a number of these instances, different interpretations are possible. Thus the appoggiatura trills can, where not employed in a cadential function, also be played as grace-note trills. Of special note is the trill in measure 7\(^{2b}\), which substitutes the mordents used by Bach in similar phrase-beginnings earlier on in the movement. This context suggests that the trill can be played as a main-note trill, this being the only execution to emulate the emphasis on the starting-note of the phrase as is consistently achieved by the mordents in previous instances.
Measure 15\textsuperscript{3a} also provides a clear example of why the *appoggiatura* trill cannot unequivocally be held to be the only correct way of executing trills in the music of Bach. It emerges from this example that the undisputed harmonic function of the *appoggiatura*-trill, namely to provide dissonance and thus greater expression, would be contradicted by its insertion in this context. Here the main-note trill provides the implied harmony with a jarring dissonance, whereas an *appoggiatura*-trill would change this dissonance into a consonance ill suited to this context. This lends credibility to the assumption made earlier, namely that Bach's failure to continue writing trills preceded by little notes such as the one notated in measure 1\textsuperscript{4a}, signals his wish to have the other trills in the movement executed as main-note trills. The trill in measure 15\textsuperscript{3a} sets the example for the performance of similar trills in measures 10\textsuperscript{3a}, 11\textsuperscript{1a}, 15\textsuperscript{4a} and 17\textsuperscript{1a}, all of which should be executed as main-note trills.

4.1.4 Rhythm

It has to be admitted that this first movement of the Capriccio lends itself in more way than one to the possible application of *Notes Inégales*. Firstly, the quadruple metre is frequently divided into four, placing it in the so-called first category to which inequality could apply (Neumann 1982: 21). Furthermore, the piece is not of a particularly polyphonic texture, lends itself to the rhythmic manipulation of an impassioned plea full of pathos, has frequent stepwise melodic movement and should preferably be played at a moderate speed. If one were an advocate of the application of the theory of *Notes Inégales* to Bach's music, there exists no immediate impediment to prevent its usage in this movement of the Capriccio. Possible instances where it could be applied in its long-short format, are measures 2\textsuperscript{1}, 5\textsuperscript{1}, 5\textsuperscript{2}, 7\textsuperscript{2}, 9\textsuperscript{4}, 13\textsuperscript{1}, 13\textsuperscript{3} and 16\textsuperscript{1}.
On the other side of the argument, it can be said that the sporadic nature of occurring instances where inequality could be justly applied in this movement, places a question mark over the intended use thereof. If Bach had wanted short-long rhythms in each of the above mentioned instances, it would have been very little trouble to notate it. In addition to this speculative argument, it has to be said that configuring the above instances to long-short rhythms in the general context of this pleading *Arioso*, sounds stylistically forced and out of character. It is the infrequency of the long-short rhythmical pattern, that above all else contributes to it presenting itself so ill at ease in this context.

The pathos which this movement requires can be coaxed from the music by exercising a degree of rhythmical freedom not regulated by the restrictions of *Notes Inégaless*. This rhythmical freedom which is unregulated by convention and which depends only on the judgement of the performer was alluded to on pages 64-65, where both Neumann and Badura-Skoda was quoted in support of its validity in performance. Care should however be taken to steer the exercise of rhythmical freedom away from sentimental excesses such as the constant creation of pauses before structurally and metrically important notes, as this practice would result in sentimentality totally foreign to the character of the music. The biggest danger of this occurring is at the ends of phrases where *rallentandos* seem to come naturally. Of such phrases this movement possesses an abundance (see measures 2\textsuperscript{1}, 3\textsuperscript{1}, 4\textsuperscript{1}, 6\textsuperscript{1}, 7\textsuperscript{1}, 10\textsuperscript{1}, 12\textsuperscript{1}, 15\textsuperscript{1}, 17\textsuperscript{2}).

Rhythmic flexibility should rather be applied with due attention to the minute intricacies of the phrase and the sub-phrase, the place and degree of its application being dictated by the relationship between individual notes and the resulting structure of the phrase. This careful usage of rhythmical freedom should ideally result in a flexibility more "thought" than
actually executed. In the instances where a *rallentando* is appropriate, the best chance of achieving this without crude exaggeration rests in a subtle lengthening of the last note of the *rallentando*. This is best achieved when the performer listens attentively to the dying sound before continuing with the start of the next phrase, *a tempo*.

The cadence of measure 9\textsuperscript{4}-10\textsuperscript{1} (see the Example 18 below) is a case in point. Here the illusion of a *rallentando* can be created by a *non-legato* articulation of the octave in the bass and a reflective lengthening of the resolution chord of the cadence before the restart of the "pleading" *corta* rhythm.

**EXAMPLE 18**

![Example 18](image)

Movement 1, measures 9-10, taken from the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*.

The listener would perceive this as a subtle *rallentando*, whereas it is actually no more than the imaginative manipulation of sound in time by the performer - a manipulation which depends less on actually slowing the tempo down, than it does on drawing its effect from the sheer power of the imagination. Any effort to slow the tempo by physically delaying the sixteenth-notes in the top voice of measure 9\textsuperscript{4} would break the tempo and thus the spiritual momentum.
The rhythmical ambiguity of this movement has already been remarked upon in the previous chapter. On first hearing the piece, it is indeed possible to mistake the third beat of the measure for the first, both as a result of the rests with which the movement starts and as a result of an *anacrusis*, created by the initial start on the sub-division of a weak beat. The truth is only unveiled to the listener in measure 5\(^1\), when the physical bar line is audible for the first time. As has been pointed out in the previous chapter, this use of rhythmical ambiguity is not unknown in J. S. Bach’s music. In this instance it most probably has symbolic value in that it can be seen to imply the ambiguous outcome of the departing brother’s proposed ventures, thus constituting a most appropriate backdrop to the plea for him to stay.

4.1.5 Tempo

The *Adagio* indicated by Bach as the preferable speed for this movement should not be interpreted too slowly. Although Marshall convincingly illustrates that *Adagio* represents the slow end of the tempo continuum in Bach’s music (1989: 266), this finding is placed in the proper perspective in the context of the Capriccio by Bach’s intensification of this indication in movement 3, where he evidently wants an even slower tempo. An overly slow tempo in movement 1 would thus compromise the tempo relationships of the work as a whole. An approximate tempo of a crotchet = 42 (Bodky suggests a crotchet = 40) (1960: 336), would ensure the essential balance between the required rhythmical flow and predominantly sad affection of the music.
4.2 Movement 2

*Ist eine Vorstellung unterschiedlicher Casuum, die ihm in der Fremde könnten vorfallen.*

4.2.1 General Structural Analysis

This very short fugal movement comprises a pattern of five measures, followed by two sequences of equal length, the whole of which is repeated three times in all. It culminates in a *codetta* of four measures which, in spite of its brevity, still succeeds in stating the *attaca* theme and answer three times and in so doing maintains the agitation which characterises the whole movement. These sequential patterns are illustrated in the colour-coded graphic illustration in Appendix A at the end of this study.

Appendix A shows very concentrated fugal writing which never amounts to more than *fugato*, as Bach does not venture to develop his material with the ingenious contrapuntal techniques which are a hallmark of his mature work in this genre. Nevertheless, it would be wrong to equate the sparseness and brevity of this movement to immaturity. These two characteristics serve rather to enhance the Affekt of the music in a masterful way, as will be explained later.

The tonal structure of the movement, also illustrated in Appendix A, presents an astonishing tonal adventurism in the nineteen-year-old Bach. He embarks upon his tonal journey in the key of G minor in measure 1. From here he completes a downward journey through the circle of fifths by allowing the *comes* to enter in and on the subdominant tonality, an unusual procedure. The sequences that form the backbone of the movement's musical structure take their creator through no less than nine changes of tonal landscape in
the space of nineteen measures, resulting in the movement beginning in G minor and ending in C minor/major (see Appendix A). The unsettling aural effect of these swiftly changing tonalities is amplified by the heavily ornamented texture which offers no respite from the resulting dissonances which confront the disorientated ear. Significantly, Bach deviates twice only from the minor mode (measures 11-15 when the music modulates to E flat major and A flat major), and then only briefly as part of his descent in the circle of fifths. Again, as is the case with the fugal structure, the tonal structure admirably enshrines the Affekt of the music.

4.2.2 Affekt

The affection of this movement contrasts dramatically with that of the previous one. Here the music imparts a spirit of urgency and fretful anxiety which streams forth in an uninterrupted torrent of warning and foreboding against the dangers that are darkly hinted at in the programmatic rubric. The rhetorical devices used by Bach are no longer just aimed just at persuading the departing brother to stay, but now attempt to frighten him into staying.

Schulenberg unconvincingly suggests that the music "...is more convincing as an expression of grief than of physical danger, thanks to the motetlike style...and the generous use of tritones and other dissonances." (1992: 66). This interpretation strays from Bach's deliberate choice of words in the programmatic rubric. Had he meant to write a portrayal of grief, he would surely not have used the key-word "Casuum", which literally means "fall" or "downfall", but rather a word like "Kummer" or "Trauer". Surely the presence of
tritones and dissonances can also be explained within the context of the Affekt which the composer chose to portray?

Serauky, basing his views of 1955 on the Bach Gesellschaft edition of the Capriccio, takes his cue for the interpretation of the Affekt of this movement from the Andante inserted injudiciously by the editors in brackets before the programmatic rubric. This dubious tempo and character indication was removed in the Neue Bach Ausgabe of 1982, thus reflecting the opinion of the newest Bach scholarship and research of that time, namely that it could not be justified. In spite of identifying the Spondee rhythm (--) as the most distinctive rhythmical figure of this movement, Serauky explains its use as proof of Bach's ironic humor (1955: 110). This view can be refuted on two counts. Firstly the Spondee was used to musically convey emotions of earnestness, respect and attentiveness. Secondly, Serauky's explanation (like that of Schulenberg above), simply chooses to ignore the composer's stated affective desire, namely to portray the various dangers which could befall the brother in foreign places.

The closely knit structure of the fugue allows no space for free material or episodes as Bach erects this ominous backdrop of lurking danger against which the later “story” of the Capriccio unfolds. This is clearly a rhetorical device aimed at creating a sense of urgency and unassailability in the “argument”, whilst avoiding anything which could possibly divert attention from the pending dangers. Endless misfortunes are sketched by the entries of the dux and comes which occur in continuous rapid succession.

Bach starts his imaginary journey of horror in the tonality of G minor, the change of mode from the first movement amply illustrating his change of persuasive tack. The G minor
tonality does however maintain a close association with the main tonality of the piece, B flat major. He uses G minor only twice in the ensuing movement as he descends progressively to more remote tonalities. The frequent destabilising modulations are held together only by the almost exclusive use of the minor mode and the sequential development of the thematic material. Adding to the harmonic instability is the myriad of ornaments which raises the tension with often crunching dissonant clashes in the contrapuntal writing and a thickening and clouding of the texture.

The “downfall” or “fall” denoted by the word “Casuum”, is musically imitated by the intervals at the beginning of the fugal theme. The melodic contour of the theme head consists of the following intervals: minor sixth down - minor second up to the tonic ($d^2 - d^2 - f\text{is}^1 - g^1$). This rhetorical device is known as *Katabasis* and refers to the use of a voice or musical passage to reflect the contextual connotation of “descending”. *Katabasis* is, as used in this context, part of the *Hypotyposis* rhetorical group, that is a word used in a musical context to describe musical figures which serve to illustrate the pictorial nature of specific words. Whilst the theme may therefore not literally represent “...des Umkippens der Postkutsche...” (“...the overturning of the post coach...”) (Müller 1935: 283), it does generally suggest misfortune.

Bach’s use of *Katabasis* is not restricted to the thematic structure of the fugue. He employs this rhetorical device as a structural principle throughout the whole movement. This can best be seen when studying the structural illustration of the fugue found in Appendix A. From this illustration it is clear that the fugal entries are designed as a mimesis of continuous falling as they repeatedly follow the entry pattern of Soprano - Alto
This already remarkably consistent rhetorical usage in service of the Affekt does not stop here. The young Bach masterfully manipulates the harmonic structure of the movement to create yet another layer of rhetorical meaning. The *comes* of the fugue is not written in the usual dominant, but in the subdominant - surely a conscious attempt to avoid the expected and to spring an unexpected tonal surprise. This subdominant entry occurs in all the expositions and relentlessly implies the fearful concept of the unexpected becoming the rule and the unforeseen becoming the norm. The tonality of the four fugal expositions is also subjected to *Katabasis* as they tumble downwards through the circle of fifths towards the extraordinary ultimate harmonic goal of B flat minor: G minor - C minor - F minor - B flat minor. The relationship between the penultimate tonal stop of B flat minor and the home tonality of B flat major suggests a journey gone wrong - a destination not reached. The tonality of B flat minor was described by Charpentier in 1695 as “Obscur et terrible” (Dammann 1984: 171). The repetition of the harmonic *Katabasis* is in itself a rhetorical device called *Repetitio*. Its function is to emphasise that which is being repeated.

The fugue finally comes to rest in C minor, a fifth lower than the G minor in which it started. The C minor tonic chord is ultimately changed to a major in a *Tierce di Picardi* which opens the harmonic door to reveal the next movement - a lament in F minor. This rhetorical device is called *Mutatio Toni*, i.e. the sudden shifting of mode for expressive reasons.
4.2.3 Ornamentation

Ornamentation is a characteristic feature of this short movement of the Capriccio. The table below indicates no fewer than five different ornaments being used forty-seven times in total in the brief space of nineteen measures:

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORNAMENT</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vorschläge</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chordal Arpeggios</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervallic Arpeggios</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mordents</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trills</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Vorschlag

The Vorschläge in this movement should all be executed as grace-notes. The first two grace-notes appear in the very first measure during the initial statement of the theme. Had they been constantly included whenever the theme appeared, the exact execution of the ornament would have been subject to speculation. However, only two of the subsequent appearances of the theme include these grace notes, and then only the grace-note preceding the fourth beat. This being the case, it seems justifiable to assert that the grace-notes do not constitute integral structural material and should thus not displace the structural notes.
of the theme. They should thus not be played as down-beat ornaments with a harmonic function (appoggiaturas).

The same argument can be used to justify the performance of the Vorschlag in measure 2 as a grace-note. In this instance the grace-note precedes the third beat of the counter theme which appears throughout the movement. The grace-note is never repeated and does therefore not constitute an important structural element worthy of displacing a structural note in the counter theme.

The Arpeggio

This movement contains examples of both the chordal and intervallic arpeggios discussed in Chapter 2.

Neumann makes special mention of the chordal arpeggios found in this movement in his Ornamentation in Baroque and Post-Baroque Music, as he finds them an interesting study in contrasts. The contrast is namely between the two arpeggios indicated in measures 6 and 11 on the one hand, and the arpeggio gracing the penultimate chord of the movement in measure 19 on the other. Of the first two arpeggios he writes, “The theme itself has a clear rhythmic definition, and in its first statement the on-beat start of the first note is further emphasised by a mordent. Hence, on its re-entry in m. 6, its decisive on-beat placement is important, therefore requiring the prebeat start of the arpeggio.” (1978: 497). This contrasts with the last arpeggio, which occurs in a cadential formula with no great importance attached to its rhythmic integrity. This arpeggio can start before or on the beat,
as the exact location of the beat may already have "...been blurred...with a cadential retard."
(Neumann 1978: 497).

The two arpeggios in measures 6\(^\text{1}\) and 11\(^\text{1}\) can be executed in the traditional upward broken chord, but there is no reason why they should be restricted to this conventional performance. An interesting possibility is to execute these two arpeggios differently and in so doing to create the variety which is the very function and soul of ornamentation. Thus the first arpeggio can entail a down-beat execution contrary to Neumann's preference, consisting of an upward "break" of the chord notated in the bass clef, and a downward "break" of the treble clef component of the chord. These two breaks should start simultaneously on the beat and roll towards each other at a lightning speed. The effect is that of a dazzling dissonant chord from which the starting note of the theme (c\(^\text{"}\)), is audibly distilled from the cluster by virtue of it being the first note struck, thus not contradicting or ignoring the structural implications mentioned by Neumann. This effect is entirely in keeping with the jarring tonalities which characterise the movement and also provides an unparalleled dramatic edge to the cadence. The arpeggio in measure 11 can be rolled upwards, but as has already been explained, this would require an anticipated execution of the arpeggio in order not to displace the important structural starting note.

Nothing prevents the performer from inserting an arpeggio in the first chord of measure 19, although no arpeggio is indicated here. If an arpeggio is indeed improvised on this chord, it would be wise to relate the performance thereof to the performance of the arpeggio on the penultimate chord. Thus the first chord of measure 19 can be rolled downward, followed by an upward rolling arpeggio on the penultimate chord.
The eight intervallic arpeggios in measures 4\textsuperscript{2a}, 4\textsuperscript{2b}, 5\textsuperscript{2a}, 5\textsuperscript{2b}, 9\textsuperscript{2a}, 9\textsuperscript{2b}, 10\textsuperscript{2a} and 10\textsuperscript{2b} would have to be executed very swiftly as the rapid tempo does not allow for the graceful, slower execution described by Saint-Lambert in Chapter 3, page 52. These arpeggios do not occur during statements of the theme or answer and their precise relationship to the beat is thus not so important. The upward "break" can either straddle the beat or else a pre-beat or down-beat execution of the bottom note could be equally successful.

The Mordent

A fast tempo choice would limit the execution of the mordents to the common interpretation of one on-beat alteration. The oscillations will vary between semi-tone and whole-tone alterations and the performer's choice in this regard will depend upon the harmonic context. Hence the first mordent in measure 1 has a penchant for a semi-tone oscillation, the C sharp being the seventh degree of the dominant key of G minor. A whole-tone alteration would however not be out of place here if the performer prefers not to create the tonal ambiguity for which the C sharp is inevitably responsible. The very next mordent on beat 3 of the first measure would certainly not consist of a semi-tone oscillation, as this would result in the playing of a G sharp totally foreign to the G minor tonality of the passage. The following table indicates the possible oscillations of the mordents in this movement.
TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oscillations</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semi-Tone</td>
<td>$1^a, 1^4a, 2^a, 6^a, 7^a, 8^a, 11^4a, 12^4a, 17^2a$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whole-Tone</td>
<td>$1^a, 3^1, 6^3, 11^3, 14^2a$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Trill

The first trill of the movement (measure $1^2$), is preceded by a grace-note. The grace-note, as has already been argued, is best played before the beat. Hence this trill can be described as a grace-note trill, starting with the unaccented auxiliary before the beat and stressing the main note. This trill and the similar one in measure $2^3$ do suggest that the trills not similarly preceded by grace-notes should be executed as main-note trills. These main-note trills can vary in length, the trill in the top voice of measure $6^2a$ obviously providing less scope for a prolonged execution than the trill in measure $14^3$. Decisions regarding the chromatic alterations of the auxiliary should rest on harmonic considerations.

4.2.4 Rhythm

Rhythmically, this movement leaves very little to the discretion of the performer if a fast tempo is selected. In general, the affection of intense agitation and urgency, coupled with the multi-layered texture of the music, inhibit the use of *tempo rubato* and the general exercise of rhythmic freedom, however subtly employed. The performer should rather strive toward a continuous, uncompromising motoric motion of which the breathless quality should only be suspended in the arpeggiated penultimate chord. Although this
arpeggio has to start exactly on the second half of the second beat, the subsequent chord and resolution can be executed much more freely, expressing the release from and the sudden end of the tension of the preceding polyphony.

4.2.5 Tempo

With regard to tempo, the Andante, printed in brackets before the programmatic rubric in the Bach-Gesellschaft edition, is to be viewed with suspicion. If Marshall’s claim, founded on very convincing evidence, that Bach’s tempo ordinario can be taken to be allegro (1989: 265), it seems highly improbable that this movement can be judged to be even slower than the tempo ordinario. If anything, the affection of the music, the smallest occurring note values (the occasional sixteenth-notes), the number of accents per measure and the time signature suggest a tempo faster than allegro. The omission of a tempo indication in the Neue Bach Ausgabe thus seems nearer to the truth than the ill-advised Andante indicated by its predecessor. A tempo of a crotchet = 100 would adequately convey the required sense of urgency and danger. Although the performance of especially the ornamentation provide technical difficulties at such a speed, a slower tempo such as the crotchet = 60 as suggested by Bodky (1960: 336), runs the risk of conveying a cumbersome tiredness, thus contradicting the very essence of that which the music seeks to express.
4.3 Movement 3

Adagiosissimo. Ist ein allgemeines Lamento der Freunde.

4.3.1 General Structural Analysis

This movement is a small scale passacaille, comprising a statement of a ground bass of four measures, followed by eleven variations. The ground bass is presented in its initial statement in measure 1 as follows: \( f f | e e | f d^b B^b | c c \). The structure of the ostinato centres around the minor seconds of the rhetorical device of the Passus Duriusculus (\( f - e \) and \( d^b - c \)), which Bach also used in 1724 as an ostinato bass for the opening chorus of his cantata Weinen, Klagen, Sorgen, Zagen (also, as is the case with this movement, in F minor). The fundamental melodic structure of the bass ostinato in this movement ("Urlinie"), can be isolated as \( f - e - d^b - c \), with the \( f \) and \( B \) Flat of measure 3 serving the double function of harmonic filler (for the harmony \( ii^6 \)) and melodic lubricant (as echappé and appoggiatura respectively).

Each variation is based on the same harmonic formula in F minor (a rare key in the early eighteenth century). This harmonic formula is: \( i- | vii^7 0 - | ii^9 - | v- | i \). The ostinato bass mutates rhythmically and melodically as the variations progress, the mutations varying from insignificant changes of register (variations 2 and 10) to adventurous chromaticism in which the ostinato all but totally disappears (variation 11). In most of the variations, however, the structural and melodic characteristics of the ostinato bass remain clearly identifiable.

As Appendix B at the end of this study amply illustrates, movement 3 is saturated by a myriad of rhetorical techniques. These techniques serve three basic functions:
• To create the desired Affekt expressed in the programmatic rubric.
• To create melodic, harmonic and rhythmic variation in both the bass ostinato and the upper voice.
• To create a structurally unified whole.

The first one of these functions, namely to create the Affekt stipulated in the programmatic rubric, will be discussed in the next subsection of this chapter. The other two functions are relevant to this structural analysis (summarised in Appendix B) and thus the rhetorical techniques which are employed to this end merit the following description and explanation:

• Suspiratio: The breaking up of a melody by rests to illustrate the text or program.
• Paronomasia: The repetition of a musical idea on the same notes, but with new additions or alterations for emphasis.
• Polyptoton: The repetition of a melodic idea in a different register or different part.
• Exclamatio: A melodic leap up by a minor sixth.
• Pathopoeia: Movement through semi-tone steps outside a harmony or scale. It is used to express affections such as sadness, fear and terror.
• Hypotyposis: Musical rhetorical figures serving to illustrate words or poetic ideas and frequently stressing the pictorial nature of the words or program.
• Antitheton: A musical contrast used to describe things contrary or opposite.
• Anticipatio Notae: The anticipation of notes such as occurs in musical "sighing" figures.
• Katabasis: Descending intervals, scales or tonalities. This rhetorical device frequently forms part of the Hypotyposis class of figures.
• *Anabasis*: Ascending intervals, scales or tonalities. Like the *Katabasis* above, *Anabasis* is mostly used within the context of the *Hypotyposis* class.

The above definitions should be used as a key for interpreting and understanding the rhetorical devices listed in the analysis of movement 3 as presented in Appendix B at the end of this study.

The architectural aspect of the *Lamento* does not only rest on Bach’s ingenious ways of balancing the inherent contrasts and unifying repetitions of the progression of variations, but boasts a more sophisticated overall plan which becomes evident when the last column of Appendix B is surveyed. Bach “thins out” the texture of variations 6 and 11 to a single voice, reminding the listener involuntarily of the first statement of the ground bass. This creates a macro-design which inevitably holds implications for the performance of the problematical sixth and eleventh variations.

The overriding question concerning these variations is if they should not be elaborated upon. The “thin” texture of the music and especially the absence of a second voice in these two variations expose the music so as to sound almost sketchy and in need of the free melodic ornamentation and elaboration which is not uncommon in music of the period. Schulenberg remarks that these phrases “...serve somewhat like ritornellos; the first two of these are figured, and some harmonic filling-in seems necessary...” (1992: 67). Although there is undoubtedly a case to be made for freely elaborating the sparse writing in these variations, it also holds true that any such elaboration would detrimentally affect the intricate architectonic design of the whole. In this regard the effect of the single voice as opposed to the dominant presence of two voices, should not be underestimated as a means
of creating dynamic definition of the structure. The performer has to weigh opposing aesthetic considerations and exercise his preference in this regard as tempered by knowledge of the relevant musical factors.

Tonality, length, positioning within the larger whole of the Capriccio and the emotional depth of expression combine to make this movement the centrepiece of the Capriccio.

4.3.2 Affekt

The word "Lamento" in the programmatic rubric of this movement indicates the pervasive air of sorrow which hovers over this lachrymose procession of variations. Contrary to the impression created in the programmatic rubric, this movement is more than just a general lament for the departing brother. As can be deduced from the title of the next movement, the friends only accept the brother's departure as an inevitable fact after the Lamento. Hence this movement once again serves the function of persuasion and is part of the continuing process to convince the brother to stay. After the first two movements, it forms the affective climax of Bach's persuasive efforts. The first movement concentrated on gentle blandishment, the second threatened unknown danger if the journey was to go ahead and the third tries to elicit sympathy and tears from the brother for the plight of those who have to stay behind.

It is therefore not surprising that Bach chose to clothe the Lamento in the key of F minor, a plunge two fifths down the circle of fifths from the preceding G minor of movement 2. This harmonic descent represents a harmonic Katabasis. Serauky uses the word "tonale Mittelspitze" (tonal centre) to describe the structural implications of Bach's choice of
tonality (1955: 108). F minor is after all the minor dominant of B flat major, the main tonality of the Capriccio. As such it does not only create the tension of an expected return to the main tonality, but the anomaly of the “unusual” minor dominant also complements the Affekt by portraying the disruption of the normal that would result from the absence of the brother. The concept of the function of the third movement as a tonal and structural climax and pivot point for the Capriccio as a whole, is further elaborated upon in the macro-structural analysis at the end of this chapter (see section 4.7, pages 128-133).

Bach spares no rhetorical device in his effort to convince the brother to stay. The most fundamental of the devices which he employs is the Passus Duriusculus (the descending minor seconds f/e and d♭/c) which is found in the descending tetrachord comprising the bass ostinato. It is significant that Bach chooses to cast this bass ostinato in the Trochee rhythm (– ∪), originally a dance rhythm described by Vossius as affectively feminine and weak (Serauky 1955: 106). This rhythm also figures prominently in the melismatic upper voice, for example in the “sighing" motifs of variations 1, 2, 5, 9 and 10, thus contributing to the musical unity of the movement.

Appendix B provides an overview of Bach’s usage of the rhetorical gestures of the Figurenlehre: Anticipatio Notae in the frequent musical “sighs”, Katabasis and Anabasis (both within the context of Pathopoeia and Hypotyposis), Suspiratio, Gradatio and Polyptoton (refer to pages 99-100 for an explanation of these rhetorical devices). The significance and appropriateness of most of these rhetorical devices (such as Katabasis, Anabasis and Pathopoeia) are obvious from their respective meanings and the musical contexts in which they appear.
With regard to the use of *Paronomasia* in the second and third variations, the general concept of a set of variations based on a fundamental harmonic melodic progression, as is the case in this *Lamento*, already indicates the probable use of *Paronomasia*. Indeed Bach does apply this rhetorical device to create emphasis. Variations 1-3 display a kind of organic evolvement: the "sighs" of variation 2 having their origin in variation 1 and the perfect fourth *Anabasis* of variation 2 finding its way into variation 3. Thus this repetition of musical ideas with slight alterations (*Paronomasia*), transcends its rhetorical function of emphasis and assumes a unifying structural role (as was also the case with the use of the *Trochee* rhythm). Although *Gradatio* is applied to greatest effect in variation 9, as is indicated in Appendix B, it is interesting to note that Bach's treatment of the upper voice throughout the movement mostly amounts to no more than a series of sequences, again making *Gradatio* an important structural melodic principle of the *Lamento*.

Lastly, it is conspicuous that Bach uses *Suspiratio* very frequently in this movement. His use of the affective properties of silence is however not restricted to this rhetorical device. In the introductory four measures, as well as in variations 6 and 11, the bass is presented *tasto solo*, with the recitave-like upper voice conspicuously silent. As Vendrix noted in this regard, "...nichts kann besser den Tod versinnbildlichen als die Stille." ("...nothing can portray death better than silence.") (1989: 199).

4.3.3 Ornamentation

The impression of this movement as existing only in "shorthand" notation, is largely a result of the absence of any ornamentation. This absence is even more profoundly experienced within the context of the heavily ornamented movement which precedes it. Although freely
adding ornaments to this movement cannot stylistically be censured, a few factors mitigate against the use of such artistic discretion in this specific instance.

Firstly, the already mentioned contrast with the preceding movement is a legitimate reason to refrain from burdening the simplicity of this music with excess ornamentation. Indeed the absence of all ornamentation is entirely consistent with the already existing and marked contrasts of Affekt, tempo and dynamics. Secondly, the interrelated melodic chromaticism of the variations are not ideally suited to an abundance of improvisatory ornamentation. Thirdly, an excess of free ornamentation could obscure the delicate architecture of this movement.

Schulenberg's somewhat superficial analysis of the Capriccio leads him to make the highly controversial assertion that "...the reference in the title to general ("allgemeines") lamentation implies a rather heavy, full-voiced realisation, with both hands striking as many tones of each harmony as they can." (1992: 67). He continues to suggest the possible realisation of measures 13-15, indicated in Example 19 on the next page, in which he identifies a rhythmic hiatus on the down-beats.

In his edition of the Capriccio, Ferruccio Busoni transcribes the skeletal *Lamento* (which he also includes in unchanged format), as a *Study*. The transcription is given the subtitle of *Andante Sostenuto, alla Passacaglia* and indeed much is made of the ostinato bass pattern, whilst the texture of the music is thickened by octave doubling and rich chordal dissonances. This results in a style audibly more at home in the late nineteenth century than in 1704. Today, this contextually reckless superposition of a later style on music of an earlier time under the guise of “completing” the music, would probably be frowned upon by most musicians and musicologists (not to mention performance practice purists). Busoni’s transcription is however not far removed from what Schulenberg advises the performer to do in rendering this so-called “sketchy” movement. Indeed, Busoni invokes exactly the same reasons and motivations for transcribing the third movement as Schulenberg does. Busoni writes that “Bach’s figured basses require filling up with the harmonies intended; our modern ideas, however, allow us greater freedom in ornamenting and embellishing, a licence of which the Editor has made use in the version here given.” (1914: 36).

The problem with this approach is that Busoni’s “modern ideas” of 1914 have since become the outdated arrogance which we attribute to the good-willed ignorance of
composers and musicians of the late nineteenth century as regards earlier music. It can be
said of this transcription that it is a fine reworking of Bach's original Lamento into a
different work of different character and different style, but certainly not that it is Bach’s
Lamento correctly interpreted. In much the same way, Schulenberg’s above hypotheses
and suggestions of 1992 will indubitably age as time goes by.

It is the opinion of this author that the advice of both Schulenberg and Busoni has to be
treated with the greatest circumspection. Midst the extremes of total abstention of
improvised ornamentation by the performer and sweeping suggestions to add layers of
sound to the music, there remains a middle ground of moderation where good judgement
can dictate the inclusion of one or more ornaments without resulting in a distortion of the
musical structure, fabric and character. This approach acknowledges the place and validity
of free ornamentation in Baroque Music, whilst it treads carefully and respectfully on the
domain of the creative intentions of the composer.

4.3.4 Rhythm

The time signature (3/4) and prominence of the quaver as the smallest note value in this
movement, theoretically make the music ideal for the application of Notes Inéga les.
Furthermore, the stepwise movement of the sighing patterns is seen by Donington as the
ideal conditions for the application of “lilting” inequality. Donington would also interpret
the slurs in measures 37-42 as clear indicators for the application of inequality, in this
instance probably long-short inequality. Indeed the acceptance and application of this
theory would do much to explain the discrepancies in slurring between the right and left
hands and the absence of continued slurring indications in measure 43.
With regard to the rest of the movement, the application of *Notes Inégales* seem unlikely. The stepwise movement of variations 1, 2, 7, and 8 does not encourage such an execution, if only because these pairs of variations (1 and 2, 7 and 8) are audibly motivically related. Hence they are of structural importance and this structural effect would probably be weakened by altering the rhythm. If Donington's theory regarding the use of slurs to indicate the application of *Notes Inégales* (as stated in the above paragraph), is correct, the absence of slurs in these instances could indeed indicate a distinct wish on the part of the composer not to have inequality apply.

No concrete conclusion with regard to the application of *Notes Inégales* in any of the above instances is possible. The performer has to make the fundamental decision of whether the concept of inequality applies to the music of J. S. Bach or not. If the answer to this question is positive, care should still be taken to ensure historically and stylistically correct applications. Furthermore, inequality has to be applied consistently to all recurring passages which are similar in character. If not, it has to be ignored as an option altogether.

The specific demands of the music should also serve as a criterion. In this respect the Affekt and the structure of the music are to be considered, as well as the relationship of the movement to the whole musical context in which it finds itself. In the case of the Capriccio, the near total absence of the occurrence of *Notes Inégales* in the rest of the work, seems to support an interpretation stripped of this specific performance convention. The Affekt of the movement itself does not preclude the use of inequality, but can just as well be served by a more flexible and less regimented exercise of rhythmical freedom. Structurally, the *Lament* is of such intricate design that structured rhythmical alterations
such as the application of *Notes Inégales* must be done in extremely good taste and cautious frugality.

As has been stated in the previous chapter, differentiation between the application of the highly organised principle of *Notes Inégales* on the one hand, and the application of improvisatory rhythmical freedom on the other, is possible. The latter kind of rhythmical manipulation could well be applied in this movement to add grace and melodic flow to the rather austere sounding processions of quarter notes. This approach would complement the previously discussed option of a free melodic ornamentation of the *Lament*. As with the question regarding ornamentation, it is also a consideration here not to alter the texture, structure or character of the music in any way.

4.3.5 Tempo

The indication of *Adagiosissimo* which appears at the start of this movement, places it at the very slow end of the scale of tempo markings which Bach used. Although the degree of slowness will inevitably be held ransom to the limitations of the instrument (the less resonant tones of the harpsichord and the clavichord requiring an acute awareness of the balance between very slow tempos and the effects thereof on articulation), it is without doubt the slowest of the movements included in the Capriccio and should be played at a tempo of about a crotchet = 52. It is interesting to note that Bach used this tempo indication no more than five times in his music (Marshall 1989: 265) and that it can thus be described as an uncommonly slow indication. *Tempo rubato* must be applied with taste and discretion, as too much rhythmic leniency will tend to “break” the tempo rather than “bend” it and in so doing will destroy the very fragile texture of the music.
4.4 Movement 4

Allhier kommen die Freunde (weil sie doch sehen, daß es nicht anders sein kann) und nehmen Abschied.

4.4.1 General Structural Analysis

The eleven measures comprising this movement are no more than a short interpolation between movements 3 and 5. Its function is to bridge the chasm between the contrasting tonal and emotional worlds represented by these two movements. The music is dramatic, modulatory and improvisatory in character, reminding strongly of Italian *recitativo accompagnato*. Bach uses a variety of tonal materials within the brief space of eleven bars, during which he whisks briefly through no less than six tonalities (see Table 6 on the next page). Among these is a flitting reference to the main tonality of the Capriccio, B flat major, in measures $5^{\text{th}}-6^{\text{th}}$. 
The open tonality of the music (the movement begins in E flat major and ends in F major), confirms the dependency of movement 4 on the larger context in which it appears. It is however not only tonal considerations which lead to the conclusion that this movement fulfils a bridge-function. The first eight measures continue the Trochee rhythm which characterised the ostinato bass of the preceding movement, thus rhythmically linking these two movements.

This rhythmic link leads Serauky to mistakenly classify this movement as no more than an "Anhang" (appendix) to movement 3 and not as a movement in its own right (1955: 111).

This interpretation is flawed on four counts:

- It does not take full cognisance of the contrasting Affekt and character which clearly separates movements 3 and 4. This degree of contrast could rather be associated with a different movement that with a Coda.
• It ignores the consistent practice of Bach to demarcate the different movements of the Capriccio by separate programmatic rubrics.

• It fails to identify the important tonal, structural and affective bridging function which this movement fulfills.

• It fails to take macro-structural factors into consideration, according to which this movement contributes significantly towards creating a tonal and structural symmetry spanning the first five movements.

The brevity of the movement presents the performer with a temptation to repeat it, an ill-advised notion which will not be in accordance with the inherent transitional nature thereof.

Table 7 illustrates the structure of the movement.

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: Introduction</td>
<td>1-3</td>
<td>Arpeggiated chords emulating the <em>Trochee</em> rhythm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: Middle Section</td>
<td>4-9\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>Imitation between voices; quaver notes in constantly descending stepwise movement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C: Codetta</td>
<td>9\textsuperscript{1}-11</td>
<td>Tonic pedal point; strong cadential progressions (F: IV-I\textsuperscript{6}-vii\textsuperscript{6}-I-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the light of the transitional function of this movement, it would be misguided to attempt too literal a reading of the programmatic rubric in the interpretation of the music. Movement 4 is intended to snap the listener out of the mood induced by the dirge-like procession of the preceding F minor ostinato in anticipation of the excitement of the pending journey. The rather unexpected major mode in which the movement starts seems to indicate an acknowledgement of the inevitability of the brother’s departure and a wilful determination to make the best of it. The juxtaposition of two contrasting modes in movements 3 and 4 (Mutatio Toni), effectively terminates the apprehension which saturates the music in the preceding three movements.

The descending runs characterising the melodic contour from measure 4 until the end of the movement can be interpreted as a Katabasis rhetorical figure. It could signify the “going away” or “leaving” of the brother. It is also possible that the frequent and unrelenting modulations could signify the futile attempts of the friends to keep the brother from leaving. Seen in this light, the harmonic scheme could be interpreted as representing Hypotyposis. The movement ends with a fermata above and under the last chord, possibly signifying the finality of the brother’s choice to depart.

The opportunities for freely adding ornamentation to this movement are limited to the imaginative arpeggiation of the existing chords. The merits of doing this are not confined to mere practical considerations, namely the prolongation of the sound in the case of
performance on the harpsichord or clavichord, but in this specific instance would contribute towards the structural and affective aesthetic of the music. It is therefore also desirable to arpeggiate the chords in a performance of the Capriccio on the piano.

The brilliance of a swiftly arpeggiated first chord would complement the angularity of the already sharply juxtaposed elements of tempo, dynamics, texture and Affekt. It will facilitate an immediate momentum and burst of energy. This arpeggiation should not be limited to the chords in the opening three measures, but can also be applied to some of the chords in measures 9 and 10 and certainly to the last chord.

The static nature of the first three measures calls for greater animation than just the normal upward execution of the arpeggio. Varying the types of arpeggio employed and the execution thereof would also be in keeping with the improvisatory character so typical of Baroque ornamentation. One possibility of performance that would create this free sense of animation, adheres strictly to the notated pattern of sounds and rests, but conjures up a dazzling display of virtuosity within this framework. The two chords in measure 1 are executed in the normal upward motion. In measure 2, the interesting possibility of executing the first chord as a figurate arpeggio is exploited. This means that the arpeggio consists of non-chordal tones and chordal tones - all compressed into a roll. Here one could play a downward E flat major scale starting on the upper B flat (bes') and continuing all the way down to the lowest E flat (es) before sweeping upwards again and ending on the E flat in the treble clef (es'). All of this should be executed in one motion. The second chord of the measure is rolled in the conventional upward fashion again. The first chord of measure 3 is rolled first from the top to bottom and back again - this time without the inclusion of non-chordal tones (in his 1914 edition, Ferruccio Busoni here recommends
rearranging the order of the notes in the chord in order to create a more sonorous sound). The last chord in measure 3 can then again be arpeggiated upwards.

This richer elaboration approaches free ornamentation without digressing into tasteless excess. It sets the mood for the whole movement and provides the necessary flourish to herald the impending journey.

In measure 6 the spacing of the chord in the left hand makes the performance thereof as an arpeggio inevitable. The traditional upward roll would suffice in this instance. In measure 9 the bass can be arpeggiated to create the allusion of an accelerando. This can continue up to the first two chords of measure 10. Arpeggiating these chords will also complement the rising intensity of the music.

The last chord of movement 4 will also have to be arpeggiated due to its wide spacing. One cannot help but feel that ending on this chord after the preceding tonal tumult and breathless short phrases would be unsatisfactorily abrupt. This could be avoided by adding to the top F (f') a lower E auxiliary (e') which returns to F (f'). This last F (f') can then be extended by a mordent to add a sense of completion and finality to the music.

4.4.4 Rhythm

In keeping with the improvisatory nature of the music, this movement lends itself more to rhythmic manipulation than any other in the Capriccio. Inequality cannot be considered a serious option here, as the beat unit is not divided into four parts, as the strict rules of the convention dictate. However, the flourish with which the movement starts, the powerful
effect of the almost static Lombard rhythm in the first three measures and the accumulative motoric urgency created by the cascades of quavers, all point towards a built-in accelerando in the music.

It is clear that the arpeggiation of the chords in the first three measures will infuse the music with vitality and rhythmic definition. In the opinion of the author, it would not be stretching the prerogative of the performer too far to suggest that the Trochee rhythm of these measures be borrowed by the descending scales of quavers. It is deliberately not suggested that dotted rhythms substitute all the quaver passages, as this would inevitably result in a French Overture style not suited to this movement. The passages best suited to adapt the dotted rhythms would be measures 4\textsuperscript{1}-4\textsuperscript{3}, 6\textsuperscript{1}-6\textsuperscript{2} and 7\textsuperscript{1}-7\textsuperscript{4}. This liberty should not be extended to all passages of quavers, as this would detract from the randomness and improvisatory air which is the essence of spontaneous ornamentation.

Measure 9 signals the end of the quaver passages. The execution of the bass chords as upward arpeggios would contribute to continuing the accelerating momentum of the music, which does seem to ask for an almost imperceptible accelerando at this point. The pedal point in the top line reinforces the urgency and intensity of the music here. The chord on the third beat of measure 10 needs to be played with due emphasis (preferably not arpeggiated) as a brief respite before the impending breathless rush for the end. Thereafter the quavers should cascade in a brilliant accelerando to culminate in the final flourish.
4.4.5 Tempo

Schulenberg mistakenly refers to this movement as "...a short adagio transition..." (1992: 67). The chordal flourishes, the strutting *Lombard* rhythm and the cascading quavers can only be done justice to by a tempo of approximately a crotchet $= 96$. This tempo is entirely consistent with the bridging function of the movement that is also reflected in the dynamics and structure of the Capriccio as a whole, as it forms part of the gradual acceleration process which characterise the last three movements.
4.5 Movement 5

\textit{Aria di Postiglione (Allegro poco)}.

4.5.1 General Structural Analysis

This movement, which reintroduces the main tonality of B flat major, is the simplest one of the Capriccio with regard to structure and content. However, the simplicity of the music does not prevent Bach from introducing a measure of contrapuntal elaboration by freely inverting the counterpoint after the double bar in measure 6. The twelve measures constituting the movement is not divided in a $6+6$ structure as might have been expected, but rather in a $| 5 :| 7 :||$ structure. The two sections, indicated in Table 8 below, have to be repeated.

\textbf{TABLE 8}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Tonal Structure</th>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3\textsuperscript{1}</td>
<td>B flat major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{1}-3\textsuperscript{4}</td>
<td>F major</td>
<td>(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{4}-5</td>
<td>B flat major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-7\textsuperscript{4}</td>
<td>G minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-9\textsuperscript{4}</td>
<td>D minor</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>B flat major</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rolf Dammann identifies a well thought-out motivic structure which belies the apparent simplicity of this movement (1984: 174). The two motifs which he identifies is:

a  A three- or four-voice "arioso" fragment in homophonic style (the upper voice of measure 1).

b  A monodic fragment symbolising the signal of the post horn (measure 2).

These motifs alternate in a regular pattern: (a - b, a - b, a - b / a - b, a - b, a - b). Their use in constructing the movement can be described as follows:

a  Melody ascends and descends. Ambit of a sixth. B flat major: I - IV - V\(^7\) - I.

b  Post horn signal sounds four times bes" - bes'.

a  Modulates to F major. Ambit of a sixth. B flat major: V\(^6\) - I\(^6\) - I, F major: V - I.

b  Post horn signal sounds twice f" - f'.

a  B flat major: V\(^6\) - I - IV - V - I. Ambit of a sixth.

b  Post horn signal sounds three times: bes" - bes'. Supporting chords in the first and fourth beats. Mordent on the last note of the post horn motif.

a  G minor: i - i\(^6\) - V - iv\(^6\) - V - I\(^6\). Melody is now presented in bass. It resembles the melody of measure 1.

b  Post horn signal sounds four times: g' - g. Fourth time only upwards g - g'.

b Post horn signal sounds nine times in different pitches and registers: twice d - d', then f'- f', d - D, f' - f', bes - Bes, bes" - bes', twice bes - Bes.

a B flat major: vii⁶ - I⁶ - IV - V - I. Ambit of a sixth.

b Post horn sounds thrice: bes" - bes', bes - Bes, bes" - bes'. Last note has a mordent similar to the end of the first section. Fermata over and under the double bar line.

From the above it is clear that the frequency of the post horn signals in the two sections differ. This difference in frequency can be summed up as follows:

A  |:4x - 2x - 3x :|, that is 9 times in total.
B  |:4x - 9x - 3x :|, that is 16 times in total.

It will also be noted that there is some similarity between the post horn repetitions of the two sections (see the numbers printed in bold above). Nevertheless, the second section has almost twice the number of post horn motifs compared to the first.

4.5.2 Affekt

It is significant that Bach decides to use the Dactylic metre for the post horn motif which he introduces for the first time in this movement. According to Vossius this metre denotes something “pretty and pleasant” (“schön und angenehm”) (Serayk 1955: 111). This
would seem to denote a happier frame of mind than was prevalent in the first three movements. Indeed the music breathes an air of gayness and carefreeness.

Motif (a), as described by Rolf Dammann’s analysis in the preceding section, is understood by Heller as denoting the melody of the post horn, whilst motif (b) is understood as the sound of the coachman’s whip (1950: 61). Bodky seems to have taken his interpretation from Heller, as he also refers to “...the trumpet tune of the coachman, and that of his whip,...” (1960: 253). If Curt Sachs is to be believed, the octave motif is rather to be understood as an imitation of the “2-Fuß-Posthörnchens” on which only two pitches, one octave apart, could be blown (1930: 255). This explanation presents itself as the most likely one for this example of Hypotyposis (“word-painting”).

The increased frequency of the sound of the post horn in the second section of this movement (see the preceding analysis), may well indicate the gathering momentum of the post coach as it pulls further and further away.

4.5.3 Ornamentation

The sparse ornamentation of this rather naive piece of music is consistent with the general Affekt thereof and the Stil Galant simplicity. Carefully chosen and stylistically tastefully applied spontaneous ornamentation would however not detrimentally affect these attributes. Possible instances where ornamentation could conceivably be added, are measures 4\textsuperscript{a} (trill in top voice), 6\textsuperscript{a} (trill in bottom voice) and 11\textsuperscript{a} (trill in top voice).
The existing three ornaments in measures 1⁴, 5⁴ and 12⁴, all have the cadential function of adding finality to the cadence of which they form part. The trill in measure 1⁴ should be executed as a main-note trill, whilst the two mordents present no problems regarding execution. A trill can possibly be added to measure 4⁴ and the mordent in measure 12 extended to more than the usual amount of oscillations to emphasise the finality of the cadence in relation to the one in measure 5.

4.5.4 Rhythm

Rhythmically, this movement offers little room for any manipulation. The uncomplicated nature of the music would best be served by executing the rhythm as written, whilst guarding against the natural tendency to rush the tempo at places like measure 7.

4.5.5 Tempo

The tempo indication of Allegro poco is the only instance of Bach’s use of this term in the whole of his oeuvre (Marshall 1989: 264). If Allegro is taken as the tempo ordinario, the “poco” intones a slightly slower performance. The Affekt would however suggest a tempo which reflects and complements the atmosphere of resigned acceptance and underlying excitement for the impending journey as portrayed in the music. A tempo of a crotchet = 92 seems suitable to accommodate the subtleties of articulation and the requirements of the affection.
4.6 Movement 6

Fuga all' imitazione di Posta

4.6.1 General Structural Analysis

The closing fugue comprises 58 measures in 4/4 time and is therefore the longest movement of the Capriccio. As Appendix C illustrates, the texture is predominantly woven from three voices. Only in measure 37 is the three-part texture expanded into four voices, the additional voice effectively raising the intensity and dynamic level of the music as it nears its final climax. Unlike the fugato of movement 2, Bach does not venture into distant tonalities in this movement. The most distant tonality found is the D minor of measure 48, a tonal excursion a mere ten measures from the end.

The theme of the fugue has pronounced rhythmic qualities, starting as it does with a single, clearly marked crotchet (bes) followed by a quaver pause. From there it rapidly gathers momentum in a series of semi-quavers and quavers. The quaver pause followed by two semi-quavers (measure 1) becomes the figura corta (ffJ) in measure 2, reminding of the first movement where this rhythmical figure features prominently. Rhythmically the theme makes use of both the Dactylic (− ○ ○) and Anapaest (○ ○ −) rhythms.

The theme encompasses four measures and an ambit of a ninth (g - a'). Harmonically it exploits the tonic-dominant relationship, modulating in measure 3 from B flat major to F major. $B^b$: I- IV- V- V: I- V- I- V- I. Of the ten times that the theme and answer are stated during the course of the fugue, only four appearances (the red horizontal lines in Appendix C) comprise the theme, whilst the remaining six (the green horizontal lines in
Appendix C) comprise tonal answers consisting of a variety of intervallic variations. In measure 40, the answer is lengthened by four quavers, whilst the last statement of the answer in measure 50 is shortened considerably. It is conspicuous that the episodes (free material stated in all the voices simultaneously—see the magenta horizontal lines in Appendix C) are relatively short (one or two measures). The exception to this tendency is the last episode, which starts in measure 42 and continues for six measures until measure 47. In all the appearances of the theme of answer, it is accompanied by a counter theme (see the blue horizontal line in Appendix C), which mimics the post horn which was introduced in the previous movement.

With regard to the sectional structure of the fugue, Rolf Dammann asserts that the following sectional divisions represent the most likely interpretation of Bach’s intentions in this regard:

**EXAMPLE 20**

Taken from Dammann, *Analysen*, p.176.
He continues to indicate the relationship of the different sections to one another in terms of the length of each section (see Example 21), remarking that the "irregularity" of no complete expositions of the theme in all voices in sections 3 and 4, is in keeping with the free and improvisatory character of the Capriccio genre (1984: 117).

EXAMPLE 21

1. 1-15 / 15
2. 16-32 / 16 1/2
3. 32-48 / 16
4. 48-58 / 10 1/2

Taken from Dammann, Analysen, p.177.

Both the theme (and answer) and counter theme, provide ample material for melodic and rhythmic elaboration. Indeed the coherence of the fugal structure as a whole stems largely from the fact that most melodic and rhythmic motifs in the fugue can be derived from these two themes. Spitta finds this especially true of the counter theme when he writes, "..., interesting images constantly come out, developing themselves most naturally from the second theme, so that, in fact, the whole art of subject-treatment is here brought to bear." (1899: 243)

Although the downward octave jump which characterises the counter theme is most easily recognised in its different guises throughout the fugue, the theme also provides ample inspiration for Bach in the gathering momentum of the contrapuntal writing. The characteristic upward leap of a perfect fifth which grows to a major sixth and the
downward interval of a third are all melodic characteristics of the theme which are found echoed in almost any measure in the fugue. Rhythmically the corta rhythm (both in the Anapaest and Dactylic versions) forms the basis of much of the rhythmical interest of the fugue.

The graphic illustration of Appendix C reveals a fugue without much in common with the more mature keyboard fugues of Bach. The theme is not subjected to any wide range of contrapuntal techniques such as diminution, inversion or retrograde motion. Even stretto is never found, except a semblance of it in measures 55 and 56, where a simultaneous statement of theme and answer appear in the soprano and bass voices for a fleeting moment in the last breathless thematic statement before the end. Nevertheless, Spitta calls this fugue a master-fugue (1899: 243) and indeed it is the trumpeting of a mighty spirit on the ascent.

4.6.2 Affekt

This fugue stands apart from the rest of the Capriccio in that it leans towards abstract music. Even the programmatic title does not suggest a scene which is to be “enacted in sound”, but rather a theme which should serve as basis for the contrapuntal elaboration which is to follow. Also setting it apart from the pieces which precede it, is the fact that the closing fugue can hold its own as a piece of music, totally divorced from the program which governs the rest of the Capriccio and the context in which it appears.

Nevertheless, movement 6 is not entirely devoid of rhetorical devices and deliberate enhancements of the Affekt. The sparing modulations and dominance of B flat major is
clearly a deliberate attempt to create a unity of Affekt. In contrast to the "bumpy" tonal
clearly a deliberate attempt to create unity of Affekt. In contrast to the “bumpy” tonal
ride predicted in movement 4 as a warning against the journey, it is as if this fugal journey is deliberately exempted from any tonal tribulations in the form of excessive modulation. The post horn motif which characterises the counter theme is used extensively throughout the movement in order to invoke the image of the travelling coach.

4.6.3 Ornamentation

The lack of written ornamentation in this movement reflects the fact that the tempo and polyphonic texture of the fugue is not conducive to extensive free elaboration and ornamentation. The ultimate chord of the movement and the whole Capriccio is a B flat major chord. This chord can be rolled upwards so as to extend the sound and to create a flourish of finality.

4.6.4 Rhythm

If a very fast tempo is selected for the performance of this fugue, as is suggested by the author as the most suitable choice, the music acquires a motoric regularity with regard to rhythm and metre. It is suggested that fluctuations of mood as well as certain structural aspects of the fugue be reflected in other elements of the music, such as dynamics and texture, rather than in audible rhythmic manipulation. Indeed this fugue offers little opportunity for any imaginative manipulation of the rhythm.
Movement 6 is the fastest movement of the Capriccio. As such it fittingly forms the climax to the *accelerando* which spans the last three movements. The contrapuntal structure leaves little room for flexibility of tempo and the Affekt of the music makes such freedom undesirable. A tempo of a crotchet = 138 imparts the virtuosic brilliance with which to end the Capriccio in a glittering flourish.
4.7 Macro-Structural Analysis

The overall structure of the Capriccio in B flat major and the manner in which Bach creates coherency between often contrasting styles and emotional palettes in the six movements, reflect the work of a skilful musical architect.

The longest movement in the Capriccio is the closing fugue constituting movement 6. This movement seems to be very much a piece apart from the rest of the work. Not only is it the longest of the six movements, but it is the only music included in the Capriccio which can hold its own as abstract music when performed. Although it comprises a fitting climax to the Capriccio for reasons which will be alluded to later, it is not dependant on the program which defines the work as a whole. Busoni's transcription of this fugue in less "historically aware" times, complete with frequent ossias and other technically dazzling additions, is a confirmation of its distinctive inherent virtuosic properties which sets it apart from the other pieces in the set. Spitta also notices this when he writes that the first five movements of the Capriccio depict the various moods and scenes that were occasioned by the impending departure of the brother. The closing fugue is described by him as an appended feature (1899: 236).

Bach dispels any possible eclectic and random effect resulting from the inclusion of the sixth movement, by forging a clever link between the fifth and the sixth movements. This is achieved by the anticipation in movement 5 of the post horn theme which characterises the counter theme of the fugue in the sixth movement. The reappearance of the figura corta in the sixth movement (both in the Anapaest and Dactylic forms), adds a cyclical dimension to the work, as it echoes the extensive use of that rhythmical figure in movement 1.
Furthermore, the last three movements belong together by virtue of a subtle *accelerando* which spans them. In this context, the sixth movement belongs at the end of the Capriccio as the apotheosis of the emotional catharsis heralded by the fourth movement - a catharsis which is expressed among other things in the gradually fastening tempo which culminates in the dazzling brilliance of the sixth movement.

The link between the first three movements is a tonal one. Bach ends the first movement in B flat major and starts the second in the relative minor, G minor. Movement 2 ends on the dominant of F minor, which is subsequently resolved to the tonic on the first note of movement 3. In this manner, the contrasting first three movements are forged into a tonal unit. Although these techniques point to a deliberate attempt to create structural unity in all of the six movements constituting the Capriccio, it is also true that there are no seamless transitions between the different emotional extremes expressed by the individual movements.

The lengths of the different movements are indicative of their importance to the whole of the Capriccio. Thus the long third movement forms the centrepiece of the first five movements, which belong together by virtue of their shared program. This is also acknowledged by Walther Serauky when he identifies the tonality of this movement as the "tonale Mittelspitze" (tonal centre) of the "tonale Symmetrie des Ganzen" (tonal symmetry of the whole). The fourth movement's transitionary and improvisatory characteristics are reflected in the fact that it is the shortest movement in the Capriccio. Indeed the relationships of the lengths of the six movements reinforce the interpretation posed by the tonality, namely of a structure consisting of five movements with an added sixth movement. This interpretation is visually illustrated in the pie chart comprising Figure 2.
FIGURE 2: Graphic illustration of the structural relationships of the Capriccio in B flat major.

Much has been written in this study about Bach's use of rhetorical devices. Rolf Dammann provides a graphic illustration of the tonal structure of the Capriccio, which is seen in Figure 3 on the next page:
FIGURE 3: Graphic illustration of the tonal structure of the Capriccio in B flat major.


Taken from Dammann, Analysen, p. 179.

Dammann maintains that Bach’s use of tonality in the Capriccio has very little structural function and should rather be seen in the context of the *musica pathetica* so characteristic of the Baroque. From this perspective the open tonal endings of movements 2 and 4 is described by him as the use of the rhetorical device *Clausula minus principalis* (1984: 179). Without questioning the accuracy of this point of view, it is difficult to deny that these cadences (even when fulfilling a rhetorical function), make perfect sense when viewed as structural principles intended to increase the structural unity of the whole. A further example of the structural significance of Bach’s rhetorical usage was mentioned in Chapter 3, pages 30-31, when the theory was postulated that the basic structural framework of the Capriccio could have its roots in oratorical rhetoric. This theory repudiates Dammann’s emphatic denial that rhetorical usage could in any way contribute to a certain structural organic unity in the Capriccio (1984: 178-179). Indeed, in the opinion of the author, much of the structural unity which emerges from an analysis of the Capriccio in B flat major depends on Bach’s conscious rhetorical usage.
Referring back to the link between Johann Kuhnau’s Biblical Sonatas and the Capriccio in B flat major, which was discussed at some length in Chapter 2, the question does arise as to the possible relevance of number symbolism as a guiding structural principle in this work.

Kuhnau’s Biblical Sonatas, like Bach’s Capriccio, was dedicated to an unknown person. In the preface to Kuhnau’s Biblischer Historien, however, this brilliant mathematician includes a mathematical puzzle to reveal the identity of this unknown person as that of Agostino Steffani, a great friend of the philosopher and mathematician Leibniz (Tatlow 1991: 53).

According to Tatlow, Kuhnau’s use of the natural-order number alphabet in this instance, links this mathematical procedure to Bach, who was, according to him, certain to know the Biblical Sonatas (1991: 53).

The question arises whether the peculiar numerical relationships of the number of measures which comprise the different movements of the Capriccio \((17 + 19 + 49 + 11 + [12 \times 2] + 58)\), have any significance in hiding the identity of the unknown brother to whom the piece has been dedicated. All attempts to unearth such numerical symbolism in the Capriccio are dependant on the existence of a mathematical puzzle similar to that of Kuhnau’s. As the autograph of the Capriccio has been lost, the existence of such a puzzle cannot be verified.

In an effort to establish if the Capriccio’s structure is indeed inspired by objective number symbolism in imitation of the Biblical Sonatas, attempts were made to search for a link between Kuhnau’s mathematical puzzle and the structural numerical relationships of the Biblical Sonatas. Discovering such a link would enable one to relate the application thereof to the structure of the Capriccio in an attempt to establish the identity of the unknown brother to whom the piece is dedicated beyond any doubt. The relevance of the numerical relationships of the Kuhnau puzzle to the structural proportions of the six sonatas comprising the set of Biblical Sonatas, could however not be ascertained. It must therefore
be concluded that if J. S. Bach imitated the Kuhnau example by revealing the identity of the
brother in a mathematical puzzle, the numbers concerned would not necessarily be reflected
in the structure of the music.

Of interest, however, is the fact that the total number of measures of the first five
movements of the Capriccio is 108, the same number that is spelt by applying the number
alphabet to the name of Johann Jacob Bach:

TABLE 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>J</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ 9 + 1 + 3 + 14 + 2 = 108 \]

The sixth movement comprises 58 measures, thus again spelling the name Johann:

TABLE 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ 9 + 1 + 3 + 13 + 13 = 58 \]

No conclusive evidence exists, however, to formally claim this as a principle which Bach
consciously employed as a unifying or structural element. At the most it can be viewed as a
curious coincidence which nonetheless has some relevance in that it asks a relevant
question.
CHAPTER 5

5. COMPARATIVE INTERPRETATIONS OF BWV 992 ON THE CLAVICHORD, HARPSICHORD AND PIANO

This chapter proposes to consider the appropriateness and implications of performing the Capriccio in B flat major on the harpsichord, clavichord and piano respectively. As was explained in the introduction to Chapter 4 (page 71), certain aspects of performance practice are so closely linked to the instrument on which a given work is performed, that is was deemed more logical to include their discussion in this chapter than in Chapter 4. Therefore, even though Chapter 4 contains the bulk of the analysis of the Capriccio in B flat major, an analytical view is also taken in this chapter of the aspects of articulation and dynamics and their respective applications to the Capriccio.

Being as it is the principal means of expression on the harpsichord, articulation is discussed as a separately numbered subsection (5.3.2) of section 5.3, which concerns the interpretation of the Capriccio on the harpsichord. As was the case in Chapter 4, a movement by movement analysis of matters relating to articulation is conducted. Interpretative considerations relating to dynamics are discussed in a similar way in subsection 5.4.1, within the context of the interpretation of the Capriccio on the piano in section 5.4, whilst dynamic manipulation on the harpsichord is given due consideration in subsection 5.3.1, which is devoted to a discussion of registration on the harpsichord.
The purpose of this chapter is not to provide a didactic essay on the correct way in which to perform Bach on any of the three instruments included in the discussion. Discussion of technical intricacies, such as the different possibilities of fingering certain passages or, in the case of the piano, considering pedalling technique and the application of selective pedalling in specific instances, are avoided. So too is any discussion of a definitive and correct hand position, the desirable extent of hand and arm movement in playing on any of the instruments concerned, the best way in which to effect a *cantabile*, *legato* or dry *staccato* sound, or the relationship between physical technique and the mental process. These issues are only touched upon when deemed relevant to the broader interpretative issues, as is the case with fingering and articulation on the harpsichord, and pedalling and dynamic manipulation on the piano.

5.1 The Desirability of Interchanging Instruments with respect to J. S. Bach's Keyboard Music

"The choice of Keyboard Instrument, - mainly between organ and harpsichord - , was by 1600 as unimportant as it seems to be important by 1960. The amount of pleasure derived from the performance was the only guide." (Leonhardt in Sweelinck 1974: XII).

This statement of Gustav Leonhardt in reference to the keyboard compositions of Jan Pieterszoon Sweelinck (1562-1621), also rings true for the Capriccio in B flat major which was composed more than a hundred years later in 1704. The Capriccio in B flat major was, as was the custom of the time, not written for any specific keyboard instrument. It was written, to use the terminology of the time, for *Clavier* or *Manualiter*, which meant that it could have been written for either the harpsichord or clavicord. Having said this, it must
be emphasised that the keyboard instruments in Bach’s time were not standardised. Thus the term “harpsichord” would not infer a single possibility with regard to instrument choice, but could in fact refer to distinct Italian or French types of harpsichord, the latter being produced as single- and double-manual instruments (Schulenberg 1992: 10). German harpsichord makers borrowed elements from both Italian and French models, sometimes producing experimental models with three manuals as well as hybrid instruments such as the *Lautenwerk* (Lute-harpsichord). Hence the variety of instruments from which to choose an appropriate one for the performance of an early Bach keyboard work, presents the performer with a choice far more complicated than a mere choice between the harpsichord or clavichord. Developments in keyboard instruments such as the Hammerklavier or the “bundfrei Clavichord” (a development of the second decade of the eighteenth century), was not known to J. S. Bach in 1704 and thus do not present “authentic” choices for the performance of the Bach Capriccio (which dates from the Arnstadt period of 1703-1707).

The question arises whether authenticity is a relevant issue when the choice of instrument is concerned. Is it important that the performer should be aware of Bach’s intentions and preferences with regard to the choice of instrument for each of his keyboard works? If so, should he/she alter their fundamental interpretation of the work in order to accommodate this knowledge?

In answer to this question, Auerbach states that the question of the proper instrument is without significance for the keyboard works of Bach. She proceeds to state a belief which negates the importance of this choice to Bach’s art on the basis of the scarcity of evidence, her argument being that a lack of evidence leads to too much personal conjecture and thus
renders the intention of accommodating Bach's intentions null and void (1930: 24). In the case of the Capriccio this may be considered a valid statement, as physical evidence of which instruments Bach used as the young organist at Arnstadt, other than the church organ, does not exist and thus renders speculation inevitable. Later in his life Bach was certainly used to working in an environment where pragmatism, rather than musical aesthetic, influenced not only the choice of instruments, but also the number and quality of instrumentalists and singers. This can be clearly seen in correspondence of Bach which can be dated to the Leipzig Period (1723-1750) and in which the Cantor complained to the Town Council about the compromises that had to be made in the performances of the music for which he was responsible (Geiringer 1981: 176-179).

The quagmire regarding the choice of the most appropriate, or more controversially, most "authentic" instrument on which to perform Bach's works, is however largely diffused by the fact that for all their differences, keyboard instruments of the early eighteenth century (including organs, clavichords, harpsichords and even the early forte-pianos), shared certain basic characteristics which distinguished them from their modern counterparts. These shared characteristics seem to minimise the polemic question of the interchangeability of instruments. The most important of these common characteristics are summarised by Schulenberg as follows:

- Limited dynamic capabilities.
- Absence of a damper pedal or any other mechanism fulfilling a similar function.
- Distinct timbres of the different registers of the keyboard.
- Light but efficient actions when properly regulated.
• A well defined attack and release of each note, resulting in precise control over articulation and ornaments by the practised player.

In addition to these shared characteristics mentioned by Schulenberg, it can be added that individual tones on the older stringed keyboard instruments seem to take a bit longer to achieve full resonance than is the case on a modern piano, but that they also fade much more quickly, providing us with a common denominator to determine the choice of tempo on these archaic instruments. Most notes also seem to be richer in harmonics than modern instruments, so that textures become more transparent, even in a complex contrapuntal structure (Schulenberg 1992: 10).

Taking the above factors into account, it can be concluded that in the early eighteenth century one keyboard instrument could easily be substituted for another without the change dramatically affecting or changing the character of the work. In the Bach oeuvre this general statement can be applied to the early keyboard works of the Arnstadt period from which the Capriccio dates, even if some of the later Bach keyboard compositions stylistically demand performances on the harpsichord. Even in view of Bach's undoubted interest in instrument building and design as demonstrated by his planning and supervising of the rebuilding of the organ at Mühlhausen and his playing of the pianos at Sans Souci in 1747, it is factually correct to state that, other than stylistic indicators such as clear cantus firmus parts indicating the preferred use of the organ or idiomatic harpsichord writing such as various types of broken chord figuration and accompaniments (the so-called style brisé), the Bach keyboard sources rarely give an explicit indication of instrument. It would be more in keeping with the prevalent circumstances in Bach's formative years to talk about a general keyboard style as opposed to a harpsichord- or clavichord style, but even this could
be misleading as “Bach acted as a typically Baroque composer in recognising no fundamental difference between sacred and secular music, nor even between vocal and instrumental composition...He applied devices of the keyboard style to music for strings alone, and the technique of the violin to clavier compositions.” (Geiringer 1981: 202).

If interchangeability of instrument was the dictum of Bach’s time, pragmatic requirements outweighed composers’ preferences and, as Auerbach states, we can only speculate in any case about all of this and the instruments which Bach used, it does seem logical for performers in the late twentieth century to regard the issue as negligible and to perform Bach’s keyboard works without discrimination and recrimination on clavichords, harpsichords and modern pianos. Unfortunately, this would be an unconvincingly simplistic escape from what is a very controversial and complex issue. Inasmuch as the interchangeability of instruments seems to have been a non-issue in the early eighteenth century, it has become a highly contentious and disputed one in the twentieth century.

The reason for this is not difficult to find. Whereas the keyboard instruments of Bach’s time all share similar acoustical and mechanical constraints (see pages 137-138), the modern grand piano is in no way limited to the same extent. No longer can it be said that interchanging instruments will not alter the character of the music significantly, as the modern piano does not conform to the basic uniformity of characteristics and sound of its predecessors. The damper pedal, steel frame, steel strings, nimble (though heavier) action and sheer size of the modern grand piano enable pianists to not only interpret the music which they play, but also to change, enhance or deform it in ways not thought possible before. This enhanced power of the performer to create, has raised the concern of “authenticity” in keyboard performance with regard to earlier keyboard works.
The "authenticity" debate is one which is too complex to pursue in this limited context. Suffice it to say that whilst it would be reasonably easy to create an imitation of how the Capriccio in B flat major would have sounded in the early eighteenth century by playing on period instruments with well researched historical performance techniques, such an imitation is not to be confused with authenticity in the strict sense of the word. An authentic performance would demand not only that the composer's exact intentions were known to the artist (an impossible demand when made of J. S. Bach's music) and meticulously adhered to, but also that the audience listen to the music and respond to it in a similar way as an audience of the early eighteenth century would do. Only under these impossible conditions could the term "authentic" perhaps apply to a performance.

If true authenticity is thus unattainable in the performance of early keyboard works, regardless of which instrument is used in performance, it must surely follow that the "authenticity" argument should not exclude the modern piano as a legitimate instrument on which to interpret J. S. Bach's music. As is the case with any other instrument, successful interpretation of Bach's music on the piano will depend on the performer's adeptness in hiding the weaknesses of his instrument and exploiting and bringing to the fore the strengths thereof during the course of a performance.

5.2 Interpretation on the Clavichord

The basic clavichord design is less varied than that of the harpsichord, the name of which can imply a myriad of possible mutations. On a clavichord, the sound is produced by means of a small brass wedge, called a tangent. The tangent is attached to the rear end of the key and hits the string from below. It presses against the string as long as the finger remains on
the key, dividing the string into two parts, namely a section which is allowed to vibrate, and a section which is damped by a small piece of cloth woven through the strings. The pitch of the tone, which is produced on the sounding side of the string, depends entirely on the place where the string is hit. A simple representation of this mechanism is provided in Figure 4 below.

**FIGURE 4: Mechanism of the clavichord.**


Clavichords manufactured before approximately 1710, made good use of the economic advantages of this principle of sound production, using one string to produce two or even more than two tones. These clavichords were known in the German vernacular as "gebunden", or "fretted" in English. It was this kind of clavichord which J. S. Bach would have known when he composed the Capriccio in 1704. Clavichords built in the second decade of the eighteenth century used one string for each tone and as a result were called "bundfrei" in German, or "unfretted".
The clavichord has two unique characteristics which set it apart from other keyboard instruments of the early eighteenth century, the second of these also distinguishing it from the modern piano. Firstly, its method of tone production yields a tone of small volume, but of great flexibility and sensitivity. The clavichord sound is thus susceptible to dynamic manipulation, the loudness of the tone depending on the force with which the tangent strikes the strings. This means that the performer has direct control over the loudness of the sound. Secondly, the performer can continue to influence the sound after the note has been struck. This is made possible by the fact that the tangent remains in contact with the string as it is sounding. By increasing or decreasing the pressure on the key, the pitch of a note can be altered after it was begun, thereby producing a *portamento* or a *Bebung* (*vibrato*).

In comparison to the modern piano, therefore, the clavichord has a greater ability to influence and even marginally change a sound after a key has been struck. Considered from this perspective, it offers a larger coloristic pallet from which the performer can choose in interpreting the music. The dynamic range of the instrument is however small in comparison to the extreme dynamic contrasts which can be achieved on the modern piano. Its *pianissimo* is practically inaudible, whilst any attempt to achieve more than a very temperate *forte* will result in too much pressure on the strings, thereby increasing their tension and distorting their pitch. A *mezzo forte* can thus be considered the upper limit of its range. Within this relatively small dynamic range, however, the performer can achieve considerable control over dynamic and coloristic effects.

In section 5.1, the principle of freely interchanging keyboard instruments for pieces written for "Clavier" in the early eighteenth century, was elaborated on. If this supposedly
generally accepted eighteenth-century custom were to be extended to the present day, it
ought to matter little on which keyboard instrument a performer chooses to perform a work
like the Capriccio. Nevertheless, even if contemporary custom does provide the performer
with the widest possible license with regard to the choice of keyboard instrument, the
question of the suitability of any instrument to a specific work like the Capriccio still needs
to be assessed.

The Capriccio in B flat major is, on balance, a work of delicate construction and many
exquisite lyrical moments. Moderately slow movements such as movements 1 and 3 can
only benefit from the clavichord’s ability to create exquisite nuances and tonal shadings.
Furthermore, the clavichord has the undeniable advantage of being able to play the music as
it was written, while maintaining the interest of the listener with the aid of the myriad of
gradations of tone and phrase which good players can elicit from the instrument. Apart
from this, the clavichord was supposed to have been the favourite instrument of J. S. Bach.
Forkel’s well-known description of Bach’s preference for the clavichord over any other
keyboard instrument of his time (David and Mendel 1966: 311) may not be universally
unchallenged, but has lead Erwin Bodky, among others, to espouse the values of the
instrument for the performance of many of J. S. Bach’s keyboard works. The Capriccio in
B flat major can doubtlessly be included in this category.

A number of factors gainsay the clavichord’s suitability for the performance of the
Capriccio. Movements 2, 4, 5 and 6 ask for an exuberance and vitality which is very
difficult to achieve through the muted sound of the clavichord. The macro-structure of the
Capriccio clearly reveals a work consisting of contrasts in texture, tempo, Affekt and,
preferably, dynamics. No performance on a clavichord can fully succeed in complementing
this intrinsic characteristic of the Capriccio. These limitations aside, a number of instances (like the large chordal progressions of movement 4 and the virtuosic writing of movement 6 such as in the right hand of measures 42-43), present themselves as very idiomatic for the harpsichord. These passages seem to point to a performance on the harpsichord as the most preferable of the instrumental options. Apart from these musical considerations, there is the very real possibility that a fretted clavichord (which was the one known to Bach) may have found the tonalities of especially movement 2 unplayable. The most obvious factor mitigating against the use of the clavichord, however, is the muted quality of its sound. Even in terms of a performance in a very modest chamber music setting, the clavichord will probably have to be discreetly amplified during performance.

Do any of these factors exclude the clavichord as a possible instrument on which the Capriccio can be performed? The author does not hold this to be the case. On a good instrument, a skilled clavichord player can, notwithstanding the limited dynamic pallet of the instrument, create the requisite contrasts in Affekt which characterise the Capriccio. This is possible because dynamic differences are relative to where the performer chooses the outer limits of his/her dynamic range, and also because Affekt does not rely solely on the ability to produce dynamic extremes for its successful portrayal. Tempo, articulation and controlled phrasing (at which the clavichord excels) are equally important. Furthermore, passages which remind of idiomatic writing for the harpsichord (such as the chords of movement 4) are certainly not unplayable on the clavichord.

The argument with regard to the playability of the Capriccio on a fretted clavichord is for the most part an irrelevant one, the unfretted clavichord finding itself in the same position as the modern piano in that Bach knew neither when he composed the Capriccio. In
principle, both instruments can be rejected as possible choices for performing the Capriccio only by invoking the desirability of "authenticity". In section 5.1, however, this notion has already been dismissed as an impossible pursuit, an argument which will be developed further and concluded in Chapter 6. Suffice it to say then that Bach would have used the fretted clavichord to play the Capriccio if that were to be the nearest instrument to hand. He would just as certainly have played it on the unfretted clavichord when that instrument was developed later.

The last objection to the use of the clavichord in the case of the Capriccio, namely its perceived unsuitability as an instrument for performances in large concert venues, is a result of the changed perceptions of the end of the twentieth century with regard to the function and very *raison d'etre* of music. In the early eighteenth century, there was no "concert hall" or "concert public" which flocked to be entertained by Bach and his creations. Bach's non-liturgical music was indeed intended for connoisseurs and amateurs, a purpose which was well served by the self effacing but musically rewarding sound of the clavichord. Hence, from a historical perspective, the clavichord cannot be ruled out as a contender on which to perform the Capriccio in B flat major. Today, the audience demand for greater audibility could well be accommodated by the amplifying of the clavichord sound in a chamber music setting.

5.3 *Interpretation on the Harpsichord*

The main difference between the harpsichord and the clavichord is the way in which the two instruments produce their tone. Whereas the tangent of the clavichord hits the string from below and stays on the string as long as the finger stays on the key, the harpsichord
has a plectrum that plucks the strings. These plectra of the early harpsichords were made from quills or, in later productions of the instrument, of leather. The plectra were attached to the upper end of a jack - a piece of wood set into vertical motion by pressing down a key. If the finger was lifted from the key, the jack would fall back and an escape action would prepare the plectrum for the next plucking. The metallic brilliancy resulting from this method of tone production has the drawback that the tone cannot be directly influenced by touch. Therefore, unlike the touch-sensitive clavichord, no crescendo or diminuendo is possible on the harpsichord. Figure 5 below gives a simple illustration of the mechanism of the harpsichord.

FIGURE 5: Mechanism of the harpsichord.


5.3.1 Registration

In section 5.1, which focused on the interchangeability of keyboard instruments in the early Bach keyboard œuvre, mention was made of the fact that the use of the term “harpsichord”
in the early eighteenth century denoted no standardised form of the instrument. The inherent weakness of the harpsichord, namely its lack of dynamic variation of tone, encouraged instrument builders of the eighteenth century to start adding additional sets of strings to the harpsichord in order to introduce the possibility of at least varying the tone colour of the instrument. This enabled a different set of strings to be brought into play by using hand or knee stops and in so doing varied the tone colour by either adding a second set of 8' strings, or by making a tone sound an octave higher (a 4' stop). The addition of a set of strings sounding an octave lower (a 16' stop) is a product of the twentieth-century revival of the harpsichord. On most harpsichords a harp stop or buff stop was added. This prevented prolonged vibration to the strings and was thus basically a damping device. It also altered the tone quality of the instrument to considerable effect, as did the lute stop, which actuated a row of jacks which plucked the strings very close to the nut, thus producing a very thin and brittle tone. On harpsichords with two keyboards, a coupler could be built into the mechanism, enabling the player to activate all the strings to play simultaneously, the so-called “full work” of the instrument.

From the above it is clear that, when considering a performance of the Capriccio in B flat major on the harpsichord, a kaleidoscopic array of choices present themselves in terms of which instrument to choose for the performance. A performance on a single keyboard instrument with only an 8' register would come closest to making the music sound exactly as written, but could be uninteresting and even contrary to the many contrasts and changing moods which pervade throughout the Capriccio. Though this conservative approach will not be able to lay claim to the elusive and controversial notion of “authenticity”, it would restrict the possibility of random recreation and tasteless modification of the Capriccio in order to appeal to a wider modern audience.
If one excepts the premise, however, that such musical conservatism is singularly lacking in creativity and originality, the question clearly is to what extent the performer should exercise the freedoms of registration without creating a work completely foreign to the one which the composer actually wrote. Schulenberg clearly feels that becoming too adventurous with regard to registration can upset the architectural design and unity of a composition. He writes that “Both authenticity and musicality urge a conservative approach to registration, and the interpreter’s ingenuity is best exercised in other domains” (1993: 14-15). Robert Donington also formulates unambiguous support for this point of view when he writes that “There can be no doubt that a moderate and restrained registration suits a great proportion of harpsichord music very much better than a continual dancing on the pedals. It is true that some pieces cry out for a showy registration…, but far more need a broad scheme of contrasts, mostly at section endings, without much use of sensational colourings and great crescendos and diminuendos. Quite often the only changes really required are those gained by moving from one keyboard to another, for a contrast of colour, of volume, or of both (1989: 575). In the opinion of the author, this view concurs most accurately to the musical demands of the Capriccio in B flat major. Although this matter is admittedly largely determined by taste, the dangers of an overly flamboyant registration in creating an unrecognisable musical pastiche from a very simple and delicate work, become apparent whenever one ventures down this path.

Even within the confines of a more conservative approach to registration, a myriad of possibilities present themselves as legitimate registration options. As the Capriccio in B flat major does not present complicated registration choices and certainly does not demand elaborate and frequent changes of tone colour, this study will not attempt to explore all the possible options available to the performer. Any registration of the Capriccio will have to
clearly reflect the fact that the whole composition consists of six contrasting movements which can each be registrated differently. Assuming that the instrument which is being used has two keyboards, the upper keyboard with an 8' register and a lute stop, and the lower with an 8', 4' and a coupler, a possible registration may well look as follows:

Movement 1: 8' with lute stop (RH and LH)
Movement 2: 8', 8" and 4' (RH and LH)
Movement 3: 8' with lute stop (RH and LH)
Movement 4: 8" and 4' (RH and LH)
Movement 5: measures 1-5: RH 8" and 4', LH 8'
               measures 6-12: RH 8', LH 8" and 4'
Movement 6: 8', 8" and 4' (RH and LH)

A registration such as the above would serve the function of promoting architectural clarity in combination with and as an extension of articulation, phrasing and tempo. It is namely simple, functional and does not pander to the modern ear's demand for manifold and extreme contrasts. On the other hand, critics might call it Spartan and unimaginative. Clearly, it represents only one simple approach which cannot claim to be either normative or authentic. Much more imaginative possibilities within the confines of stylistic propriety are available at the individual discretion of every performer.

5.3.2 Articulation

The principal means of expression on the harpsichord is not the potential tone colours which can be invoked by registration, but rather the possibilities posed by imaginative
articulation. The differences between the mechanical construction of the harpsichord and the piano result in much lighter and more manipulable touch on the harpsichord. Whereas dynamic manipulation on the clavichord and the piano centres around the start of the tone, with very little control over the sound once it is produced, the harpsichord can best lend definition to a tone by exercising more precise control over the end of the sound. As articulation can be defined as that which happens to a sound between the end of one sound and the beginning of the next sound, it follows that this is the harpsichord’s most useful interpretative asset. It is important to note that an inseparable interdependence exists between articulation and the choice of tempo in any given piece of music. This means that the recommendations with regard to tempo, as made in Chapter 4, would inevitably influence decisions concerning articulation. As certain of the tempos preferred by the author (such as the very fast tempos for movements 2 and 6) are controversial, it is possible that there may also be disagreement about the resulting choice of articulation.

Before embarking on a full scale discussion of the articulation of the different movements of the Capriccio, a clarification of terminology is called for. Different possibilities of articulation are traditionally referred to by an established Italian terminology which includes words like legato, semi-legato, non-legato, staccato, staccatissimo or legatissimo. These words convey stereotypes associated with modern conceptions of articulation on modern instruments and have been found by the author to be of limited use in an eighteenth-century context where minute differences of articulation are essential. Although providing any discussion on articulation with the necessary terminological framework, these terms are too vague and broad to enable one to accurately describe the essence of early eighteenth-century articulation. In order to customise these terms for their use in this study, the characteristic eighteenth-century articulation on the harpsichord shall be called a “Baroque
legato”. This term will infer neither a staccato style of playing, nor a legato in the later romantic mould. It rather denotes an inclusion of elements of both of these concepts, consisting as it does of “closer knit” horizontal lines (legato) and more “airy” passages (staccato) respectively, whilst drawing a clear distinction between the eighteenth-century meaning of the terms and contemporary understanding thereof. In a Baroque legato the legato playing is more “porous” and the sounds less closely connected than would be the norm in modern legato playing, whilst the non-legato playing enforces the theorem of “good” and “bad” notes as set out in subsection 3.2 of Chapter 3, pages 37-38. Though the terms legato and non-legato are thus still freely used in this study for want of a more accurate terminological framework, the usage thereof should be understood to impart the meanings relevant to the context of a Baroque legato as outlined above.

In movement 1, the Affekt makes a legato (or Baroque legato) execution of the characteristic corta rhythm desirable. True legato being impossible on the harpsichord, the illusion of a legato can be sustained by creating prominent agogic accents on the first and third beats of each measure respectively. Of these accents, the first beat should always be the stronger. Other than this adherence to the dictum of “good” and “bad” notes, the desirability of a legato execution is supported by the mostly stepwise movement in the two upper voices, of which the flowing character would be enhanced by a legato performance.

The bass contains a number of big leaps of which the execution varies, their performance depending on the context in which they appear. The downward leap of a fifth in measure 13 should be played legato, as neither the metrical placement of the leap, nor the harmonic context, suggests otherwise. A non-legato execution of this leap would namely result in the “bad” part of the beat being accented. The octave leaps which occur as part of
cadential patterns, for example in measures $4^4$, $5^4$, $6^4$, $7^4$, $9^4$ and $11^4$, could be played *non-legato* to assist in creating the effect of a rallentando and to lend more weight and prominence to the cadences concerned. In the case of the cadence of measure $9^4$, the F in the bass which is tied to the resolution chord in measure $10^1$ presents a problem with regard to this doctrine of *non-legato* execution. A *non-legato* execution can however still be achieved by separating the octave in the bass, but restriking the octave instead of just the lower F on beat $9^{\text{th}}$, holding on to the top F as the lower F is separated from the resolution chord. In all of the cadences mentioned above, a *non-legato* resolution in the bass is also advisable.

An interesting problem is posed by the leaps in the bass in measures $2^2$ and $3^2$, illustrated in Example 22 below:

**EXAMPLE 22**

Movement 1, measures 2-3, taken from the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*.

Disconnecting the intervals in the bass would result in an accentuation of the "bad" or weak part of the second beat. Under normal circumstances, this would be contrary to the doctrine of "good" and "bad" notes as set out in Chapter 3. In this instance, however, the metrical duplicity of the music seems to encourage such a breach of convention. The result
is that the first note on the second beat (in both cases B flat), will be perceived by the listener as the last note of the previous phrase. The second part of the second beat will be perceived as the start of the new phrase, either as an up-beat, or as the first beat of the new measure. The validity of a non-legato performance of this interval is reinforced by Bach’s deliberate sustainment of this metrical duplicity throughout the whole piece, the *corta* rhythm in the upper voices often starting after a rest and more often than not emphasised by the addition of a mordent.

In the name of consistency, the phrasing suggested by this manner of articulation should be emulated in the rest of the movement. This does not mean that the performer should resort to inflexibility, thus making musically illogical decisions such as separating the two parts of the beat in measures 4$^2$, 6$^2$ and 9$^2$. In the first two of these instances Bach sustains the ambiguous rhythmical effect by the writing in the upper parts, whilst in the last instance the rhythmical duplicity is in the process of being finally shed to reveal the true position of the bar line in measure 10$^1$.

The articulation in movement 2 should be aimed at clarifying the already cluttered texture. Regardless of the choice of instrument, the measure-long *attaca* theme has a strong rhythmic character which lends itself to some form of accentuation of the "good" first and third beats of the measure. The mordents on these beats in the first statement of the theme (see Example 23 overleaf) confirm this.

It is interesting to note that in the subsequent statements of the theme in the remaining three voices, the mordents are not repeated. This may be as a result of the last two entries
(see measures 3-4) shifting their metrical position and starting on the third beat of the measure, as is indicated below in Example 23:

EXAMPLE 23

Movement 2, measures 1-6, taken from the Neue Bach Ausgabe.

In each of these instances, the entry of a new voice and the subsequent rising dynamics and thickening texture are enough to raise the third beat of the measure in prominence above the first (with the proviso that no mordent is played on the third beat), thus maintaining the rhythmic character of the theme. With the first entry of each sequence, the doctrine of "good" and "bad" notes is reinstated by Bach's emphasising the first beat with a preceding arpeggio, while the third beat is again marked by a mordent.

These structural subtleties have to be echoed in the articulation of the performance. The "sculpting" of the thematic entries is clearly not only the function of ornamentation, but also implies the sympathetic use of articulation. In this instance it means a small break before the crotchet which occurs alternatively on the first and third beats of the measure.
The clue to how this is to be achieved is provided by the mordents in the first statement of the theme. The fingering which the author suggests to execute these ornaments, showed in Example 24, provide a natural melodic break before the crotchet on the third beat.

**EXAMPLE 24**

Movement 2, measure 1, taken from the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*.

This same break is a natural imperative in the bass entry of each sequence, and should thus be consistently performed in the other entries as well. Although the performance of the counter theme should be in tandem with the theme and answer statements (it comprises the same rhythmical qualities), the rest of the texture will not benefit from "jumpy" *non-legato* playing. Such playing would loosely scatter the notes of the already characteristically segmentary structure of the music.

The printed slurring of the two-note patterns in measures 38-42 of movement 3, shown in Example 25 overleaf, reveal a few interesting features of Bach's use of articulation markings. Although the printed edition of the Capriccio consulted for this study does not have the same authority as that of the lost autograph, certain provisional and cautious observations can be made with regard to these markings.
Movement 3, measures 38-42, taken from the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*.

Firstly, it confirms the relationship between articulation and Affekt described on page 36 in Chapter 3. The two-note grouping evident in the articulation markings unequivocally illustrate the rhetorical “sighing” produced by the natural stepwise pairs. Secondly, it reinforces Dürr’s observation on the inconsistency in Bach’s editing (1974: 252). The most obvious example of this is the top voice in measure 43, which is just a continuation of the pattern set in the previous measures and where no articulation markings have been inserted. Other similar passages, such as variation 1 (measures 5-8), where the top voice engages in a stepwise chromatic descent of two-note pairs and variation 2 (measures 9-12), where a similarly conceived motif occurs, have no articulation markings even though no execution other than the rhetorical “sighing” pattern is conceivable.

It is interesting to note that Bach does not write a slur over the interval of an octave in measure 40 in the bass, as he takes care to do just that in the last movement, where the initial appearances of the octave interval post horn theme is slurred to ensure a *legato* execution. This would seem to lend credibility to the theory that larger intervals are usually played in a detached way. This theory is returned to in the discussion of the articulation of movement 5.
The overriding articulation in this movement is more legato in conception than non-legato. The exceptions to this are the already mentioned “sighing” motifs and large intervals, where a detached execution should only be striven for when such an execution would complement the metrical and rhythmical relationships. Hence the large intervals in the top voice of measures 34\textsuperscript{1}, 35\textsuperscript{1} and 36\textsuperscript{1} would not be candidates for non-legato performance. Fingering is of paramount importance in respecting the doctrine of “good” and “bad” notes in expressive music such as this.

In movement 4, the articulation has to complement the greater sonority obviously intended in the thicker texture of the chordal writing. This would mean connecting and holding as many of the sounds as possible, excepting the instances where physical demands dictate a non-legato execution. The chords in the first three measures need to be separated as the rests indicate, whereas the natural tendency of emphasising the rhythmical structure by making agogic “breaks” before the strong first and third beats of each measure, should be yielded to. This detached way of playing must not be exaggerated so as to attract attention, but should rather be seen as a way of sharpening the rhythmic definition of the music.

The sprightly character of the music in movement 5 would be enhanced by a very subtle non-legato performance of the semi-quaver runs, such as seen in Example 26 overleaf (the articulation markings are the author’s own).
Movement 5, measure 1, taken from the Neue Bach Ausgabe.

The exact nature of the detached performance would depend on the tempo, but the desired effect would be to create an "airy" and "transparent" texture rather than to distort the tempo and Affekt by producing audible gaps between the notes. The syncopation in the left hand of measure 1 should be emphasised as an attractive effect by making an agogic accent before beat 1.  

The slurs marked above the recurring octave imitations of the post horn, indicate a legato performance somewhat contrary to the more usual detached performance of such large leaps. This theory of the "correct" performance of leaps was also referred to with regard to the performance of an octave interval in measure 40, movement 3 (see page 156), and will now be considered more carefully.  

Badura-Skoda formulates a general principle whereby stepwise passages should on the whole be played legato and larger intervals and leaps should be detached. In the same passage he states that octave leaps should never be played legato. In a footnote to this passage he cites post horn motifs in the fifth and sixth movements of the Capriccio in B flat major as rare exceptions to this "rule", as "...the legato octave leaps imitate the sound of the post-horn." (1993: 96). Indeed the Neue Bach Ausgabe indicates slurs over most,
though not all, of the octave leaps in movement 5, as well as in only sixteen instances out of more than seventy-five occurrences of this melodic pattern in the closing fugue. The puzzling inconsistency of the articulation markings in this instance seems, oddly enough, consistent with Bach’s normal editing. It is remarked upon by Alfred Dürr when he says that although Bach edited performing parts, he evidently did not always have the time or energy to mark recurrent passages consistently (1974: 252). Bearing in mind that the autograph of the Capriccio in B flat major is no longer in existence, it is also relevant here to note Dürr’s findings that autograph material is more consistently marked than secondary copies (1974: 253). In addressing the question on how these markings should be interpreted, it is useful to consider that generally articulation marks are considered to indicate exceptions to the conventions of articulation (Butt 1990: 6), thus lending credibility to Badura-Skoda’s theory that these octave leaps should be played legato in defiance of the convention and in accordance to Bach’s markings. In movement 6, the metrical implications of the theme would suggest the following articulation to emphasise the “good” and “bad” parts of the measure respectively (the fingering and articulation markings in this example are the author’s own):

EXAMPLE 27

Movement 6, measures 1-4, taken from the Neue Bach Ausgabe.
The characteristic octave leap in the counter theme has been marked by slurs and a *legato* execution is therefore desirable. On the whole, the semi-quavers need to be played more *legato* than detached, as a totally detached performance would seriously disrupt the flow of the music and obscure the meter where detached playing as the exception should be reinforcing it. This *legato* should signify nothing more than a brittle and sparkling finger *legato* which has nothing in common with the *Uberlegato* characteristic of the romantic pianism to which the modern grand pianos are geared. This effect ought to be attained without too much difficulty, as the tempo of the music will not accommodate an *Uberlegato* attack.

5.4 Interpretation on the Piano

Interpretation of an early eighteenth-century keyboard work on a modern grand piano raises a number of fundamental questions. The most important of these, is if the piano ought to be employed to imitate the sound and effects of earlier, more "authentic" instruments like the harpsichord, or if it should be allowed to exploit the full range of its capabilities regardless of whether this results in a performance which J. S. Bach could never possibly have conceived. The philosophical dilemma which envelopes the authenticity issue is considered at some length in the conclusion to this study in Chapter 6. Suffice it to state here, that if the issue is not whether or not the performance of early Bach keyboard works on the piano is appropriate or not, but rather if the piano is to be used as an imitation of the harpsichord or as an instrument in its own right, the latter possibility seems to present the only musically justifiable option.
This is so because successful performance depends on a performer's ability to hide the defects of his/her instrument on the one side, whilst bringing to the fore the advantages of the instrument on the other. It would therefore be inconceivable not to exploit the dynamic capabilities of the piano, which is its biggest asset, in imitation of the harpsichord, which is very restricted in this regard. Indeed, any performance of the Capriccio in B flat major on the piano benefits immensely from the piano's dynamic capability. Because dynamic manipulation is such an inherent characteristic of performance on the piano, discussion of the dynamic interpretation of the Capriccio was omitted from the analysis of Chapter 4 and reserved for this section of Chapter 5. As was the procedure with the analysis of other musical elements in Chapter 4 and of articulation in the preceding subsection 5.3.2 of this chapter, the interpretation of dynamic aspects of each individual movement of the Capriccio is considered in the ensuing discussion.

5.4.1 Dynamic Interpretation of the Capriccio in B flat major

In movement 1, the formal structure does not at any time suggest the application of terraced dynamics. The affection of the music and the "Arioso" indication would much rather suggest a well maintained cantabile in the upper voices, executed within the framework of a maintained small dynamic range of pianissimo to piano. This movement does not, within the confines of its own brevity and single Affekt, call for dramatic contrasts and should not be distorted to provide such contrasts to the modern ear so used to hearing them. The interest of the listener should rather be drawn to the infinite varieties of colour within each beautifully conceived phrase. Illuminating the clarity of the phrase structure of the music must therefore be understood by the performer as one of the chief aims of his/her dynamic usage. To this end the piano is admirably suited.
Of particular note is Bach’s writing in measures 16 and 17, which seems to facilitate a natural *diminuendo*. Bach gradually “thins out” the voices until only a single voice completes the journey to the final chord:

**EXAMPLE 28**

[Image of musical notation]

Movement 1, measures 15-17, taken from the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*.

In the light of this obviously intentional *diminuendo*, the advice of Badura-Skoda to restrike the tied pedal-note (F) (1993: 141) should be discarded in this instance, as the fading sound contributes to the desired effect of quiet resignation. The mordents in this single line, the upwardly thrusting contour and the final chord that consists of no less than six notes, emphasise the need not to weaken the effect of this *diminuendo* with the production of an insipid sound, but rather to complement the Affekt by maintaining the intensity of the passage.

The abstract and often contradictory relationship between intensity and dynamics is also illustrated in measure 14, illustrated in Example 29. Here the mounting intensity, surfacing in the repetition in the upper voices, should rather be achieved by adding mordents to the upper voice of the four main beats than by the execution of a stylistically ill-advised dramatic *crescendo*. Dynamics can have little function here other than to pander to
romanticised hyperbole. The dramatic elements here are part of the compositional structure - the sense of doom and foreboding provided by the bass which descends relentlessly and impassively by step, only to give way to resignation as the second inversion of the tonic (measure 14) resolves at first to a substitute chord for the dominant (ii6) and then finally surrenders to a dominant pedal-note.

**EXAMPLE 29**

![Example 29](image)

Movement 1, measures 14-15, taken from the *Neue Bach Ausgabe*.

It is a common error of pianists to favour dynamics above all other means at their disposal to attain expression and definition in performance. The utilisation of what constitutes the most obvious advantage of the piano is not in itself wrong. Its use to the exclusion and consequent extinction of other techniques does however undermine the stylistic integrity of interpretations of earlier keyboard music on the piano.

It has already been mentioned in Chapter 4 that the Affekt of movement 2 differs fundamentally from that of movement 1. This contrast has to be echoed in the dynamics which the performer employs. Though this can equally well be done by registration on the harpsichord (as has been demonstrated in section 5.3.1 of this chapter), the piano with its potentially greater extremes of dynamic contrast can perform the same function to better
effect. The agitation embedded in the spirit of the music should be reflected in the
generally high dynamic level of *mezzo forte* to *forte*. The differentiation in dynamic shading
is achieved by the composer in the way in which he adds and removes voices from the
texture, thus achieving a dynamic build-up and waning which loosely corresponds to the
overall structure of the music. In this regard the performer has little more to do than to
note and to elucidate what Bach has craftily composed into his music. Dynamic misuse
often degrades fugal textures to nothing more than uninteresting *crescendos*. The resulting
harsh and insensitive playing is then seen as the obligatory result of "emphasising the
theme-entry".

Also on the smaller structural level, performers should strive to avoid creating a murky
assimilation of the different horizontal layers by merely increasing the volume with each
thematic entry. The already mentioned combination of dynamics, articulation and
ornamentation should rather combine to help define each important entry. Dynamic usage
in this context should also not be understood to simply infer the restrictive meaning of
providing accents on structurally important notes. The performer could well explore the
possibility of making an almost imperceptible *diminuendo* before the start of each entry,
thus creating the illusion of a new entry being played louder. In reality, however, the same
dynamic level is maintained throughout.

In the same way in which the affection of the third movement is the total antithesis to the
previous movement, the dynamics have to reflect this. Even more so as was the case with
the first movement, the dynamic levels should be restricted to what would sound to the
untrained ear like a small dynamic range of *piano* to *pianissimo*. Within the confines of this
self-imposed denial of the grandiose dynamic brush-strokes of romanticism, the performer
can transcend the limits of the recreative artist and can create a kaleidoscope of sounds and inter-sound relationships which show the soft dynamic range of the piano to be a microcosm of colour and nuance. The performer should be sensitive to the relationship between the composed dynamic contrasts derived from the musical texture and the general architecture of the movement in the planning and implementation of his/her macro-dynamic design.

The thick chordal texture of the music in movement 4 involuntarily raises the dynamic level to provide a stark contrast to the preceding movement. Although dynamic accentuation can be employed to provide added rhythmic vitality, care has to be taken not to thus reduce the music to a square, march-like series of regimented notes. In the stylistic context, it must again be cautioned that "thinking" of points of emphasis, rather than attacking dynamic accents, would provide the more suitable result.

Movement 5 is the only movement in the Capriccio which, in the opinion of the author, is prone to the application of terrace dynamics. The most obvious application would be to play the repetitions of the two sections at contrasting or at least differing dynamic levels. Terraced dynamics should preferably not be applied to statements of the post horn theme, such as found in measures 1, 5, 7, 9 and 10. In all of these instances Bach’s presentation of the theme coincides with a "thinning out" of the texture. This in itself provides a charmingly subtle dynamic effect which could only be detrimentally effected by the coarser interventions of terraced dynamics. These monophonic statements of the post horn theme should not be played softer than the surrounding three-voiced texture, but should rather be played as brightly as possible, its sprightly character highlighted by the silence of the other voices.
Although Badura-Skoda fervently defends the role of terraced dynamics in fugue playing when he says that "...certain episodes should be played on the quieter manual." (1993: 135), the fugue of movement 6 hardly offers the performer the opportunity to do this. The better advice in this instance comes from Quantz, who writes that it is permissible in fugue playing to moderate the volume of the notes preceding the entry of important thematic material so as to emphasise it (1985: 277). Keeping in mind the relatively high dynamic volume which should accompany the exuberance of the music, it seems even more appropriate, as accenting each entry would escalate the volume to intolerable levels of harshness. A maintained dynamic level of forte is desirable. Having said this, it must be emphasised that this does not exclude the subtle dynamic gradations so necessary to communicating an intelligible phrase structure.

5.4.2 Pedalling

Although sometimes used as a dynamic aid, both the una corda and the damper pedal function largely as coloristic devices in piano performance, their use affecting the overtone structure of each sound. The softer sounds which result from the use of the una corda and the more resonant sounds associated with the use of the damper pedal, are only by-products of pedalling, the main function of the pedals being to introduce a variety of colour in the homogeneous timbre pallet of the piano.

This clear distinction between the ultimate function of pedalling (the creation of diversity of tone colour) and one of the results of the use thereof (to enhance already existing dynamic gradations), is of paramount importance when the desirability of pedalling is considered in the performance of early eighteenth-century keyboard music. Compared to the
harpsichord, the piano is capable of pitifully little variation of tone colour. If the use of the pedals can help to remedy this hiatus, it is hardly logical to discourage its use in works like the Capriccio.

The problem with applying pedalling in early eighteenth-century keyboard works is however not one of its use, but rather of its misuse and abuse. The damper pedal is all too frequently employed to help the pianist to negotiate technically demanding passages in a cloud of sonorous obscurity, whilst the una corda can easily be used to replace an intense and controlled pianissimo. It is thus in the soothing over of technical deficiencies where the use of inappropriate pedalling poses its most irresistible temptation. The ultimate danger of pedalling lies however not in the possibilities of shunning the technical demands of a given work, but rather in the randomly available dynamic and coloristic changes which this technical swindling can introduce. Pedalling can easily result in an inappropriate stylistic rendition of early keyboard music, to which the broad brush strokes of modern day dynamic contrasts is anathema.

Pedalling is too subtle a technique to lay down dogmatic instructions for its use in any work. What could work on one instrument and in one acoustical space may be either too much or too little on another instrument and in a different room or hall. It is the opinion of the author that pedalling is a legitimate option in piano performance of any repertoire, also of the early keyboard music of J. S. Bach. In the case of the Capriccio in B flat major, movements 1 and 3 stand out as possible instances where the lyricism of the music can be enhanced by the singing sonorities created by the use of the damper pedal. As in so much connected with performance, however, the success of pedalling will no doubt depend on the taste and stylistic grasp of the performer, as well as his/her ability to listen.
CHAPTER 6

6. CONCLUSION

Music is an enigmatic art. It constitutes a difficult philosophical concept and it poses unique and complex questions about the ontology, aesthetics and authenticity of the performing arts. This study of J. S. Bach's Capriccio in B flat major has thrown many of these problematical considerations into sharp relief.

With regard to ontology (the study of "being" in the abstract), there is, philosophically speaking, doubt about the "state of being" of a work of art of which the original manuscript has been lost. As has been revealed in Chapter 2, the Capriccio in B flat major exists only in the form of copies which can be said to derive from a supposed manuscript. Although the Capriccio in B flat major can reasonably be accepted to have been composed by J. S. Bach according to the source analysis of Chapter 2, the final proof of this remains to be found. Uncertainty therefore pervades the existence of this early Bach keyboard work, uncertainty which cannot but influence any attempt to interpret the music.

Apart from the ontological dilemma, further philosophical and aesthetic problems come to the fore in the Capriccio's "purpose of being", which can be said to involve the portrayal of an extra-musical program. Music as a form of representational art, such as program music purports to be, presents at best a nebulous association of sound and meaning which needs greater clarification. Although the historical context as outlined in Chapter 2 can assist the listener and performer in exploring the extra-musical idea which Bach tried to convey in the
Capriccio, it must be concluded that Bach's program is too vague for a precise understanding of his intentions. In addition, his medium is too abstract to function as representational art in the strict sense of the word. Thus the Capriccio also presents the musicologist, performer and listener with the difficult task of marrying the essentially abstract "state of being" of the music, with what would seem to emerge from the research of Chapter 2 as a real life event, namely the departure of J. S. Bach's beloved brother. It is in this regard that the *Affektenlehre* and Bach's use thereof as expounded in Chapters 3 and 4, play a key role.

When one adopts an aesthetic perspective, the Capriccio likewise presents a multitudinous array of problems. It is clear from Schulenberg's and Bodky's comments that they regard the Capriccio merely as a quaint reminder of the imperfect early strivings of a great musical genius who is yet to flower and bear fruit. For these eminent musicologists the Capriccio is interesting music because of the later reputation of the composer, but not because it is inherently good or pleasing music. Bodky refers rather condescendingly to the B flat major Capriccio as "...still a very sketchy, immature piece,..." and finds it "...really touching to see how Bach was, around 1704, still far away from being able to organise a fugue." (1960: 336). The analysis of the Capriccio in Chapter 4 substantiates this partly, in that it reveals a fugato in movement 2 and a fugue in movement 6 which are admittedly simple when compared to Bach's later monumental achievements in this genre. Schulenberg concedes that the B flat major Capriccio is Bach's most famous early work but states that "...one must wonder if the work is to be taken entirely seriously." (1992: 66). Undoubtedly the atypical *Stil Galant* which characterises the music, the theory that Bach was parodying Johann Kuhnau's Biblical Sonatas, the sparse textures and sometimes improvisatory nature of the music and the almost frivolous sentimentality of sections of the music encourage
these authors to entertain this view. Apart from these considerations, E. Krüger has made
the observation that in many respects the Capriccio portrays signs of technical immaturity
by the young Bach (1970: 135). As examples of this she also cites the closing fugue of the
work in which she identifies sudden and short modulations, a fragmented structure and the
use of unrelated motivic material (1970: 135). These traits can, according to her, also be
seen to an extent in movements 1, 2, 4 and 5.

These negative and somewhat facile judgements raise the difficult issue of the inherent
nature of the aesthetic experience in relation to art. They seem to imply that good art is
always mature, technically perfect and without flaw. This represents a far reaching
assumption which, although raised by this study, demands a study of its own. Suffice it to
conclude here that this study, in particular the analysis of the Capriccio in Chapter 4, has
revealed the Capriccio as a well constructed and balanced work. Bach's conscious and
systematic application of the Affektenlehre, coupled with a structurally functional
manipulation of the harmonic structure, tempo and dynamics, forge the Capriccio in B flat
major into a coherent whole which is anything but frivolous, sketchy or immature. This
much can be said purely on the merits of the intrinsic musical evidence. To approach any
piece of music or work of art in an aesthetic manner, however, will always render a
subjective result and diverse opinions as to its inherent worth and value. The Capriccio in
B flat major is no exception to this rule of thumb.

Lastly, this study has had to run the gauntlet between the desirability for authenticity in
performance and the impossibility of attaining authenticity in the strict sense of the word.
The question of authentic performance practice is a daunting spectre for a late twentieth-
century musician and musicologist to confront when it relates to an early eighteenth-
century piece of keyboard music. A large part of this study has been dedicated to this polemical issue. Chapter 3 attempted a general survey of performance practices typical to the Baroque period. This was done in search of the ever elusive definitive authentic performance practice in Affekt, articulation, dynamics, ornamentation, rhythm and tempo. Chapters 2 and 4 tried to probe and fathom the intentions of the composer with the Capriccio in B flat major by means of a historical and structural analysis and the interpretation of that analysis within the constraints of the performance practices outlined in Chapter 3. Chapter 5 investigated the possibility of performing the Capriccio on authentic instruments in order to identify more clearly Bach’s original intentions with the piece. This method of interpretative analysis was launched under the supposition that authentic performance should be attainable under the following conditions:

- A proper understanding of the historical context of a work.
- An in-depth knowledge of the formal structure and design of a work.
- A knowledge and musical application of performance techniques of the period in which the work was composed.
- A perspective that takes due consideration of the original instruments for which a work was composed.

The conclusion of the author is, however, that the notion of “authentic” performance is a fallacy. This opinion can be justified on two counts:

- Too little is known about the manuscripts, historical context, performance traditions and instruments of the early eighteenth century to justify any claim that adherence to these considerations would guarantee “authenticity” in any performance. This
conclusion emanates clearly from this study, where subjective speculation rather than objective fact emerges from the relevant investigations.

- "Authenticity" as a philosophical concept entails far more that the attainment and application of the relevant knowledge and contemporary performing techniques and instruments. It also demands that an early eighteenth-century work be performed today with the tastes and preferences of the performers of the early 1700's, as well as that the listener of today hear the music in the same way as audiences in Bach’s time would have heard it and perceived it. Both these requirements present impossible demands. Performers and audiences of the late twentieth century suffer the irremediable constraint of knowledge. This knowledge, emanating from our vantage point at the turn of the twentieth century, shapes our perception and apprehension of art as we look back in time. It also presents us with the irretrievable loss of the possibility of authentic musical experiences of soundscapes past as a fait accompli.

In Chapter 1, which formed an Introduction to this study, the ultimate destination of this research endeavour was defined as the formulation of possible interpretations for the Capriccio in B flat major. This was to be achieved by a fusion of the cognitive and aesthetic approaches to this specific work - a fusion which was to lead to a deeper understanding of the music and ultimately to a more informed interpretation of the music. The paradigm from which the research was conducted can be described as one of "historical awareness". It entailed researching the origin of the work and the sources from which it was handed down, the style in which the Capriccio was composed and conceived, the performance practices of the time and the different instruments on which the composition could be performed. From within this "historically aware" paradigm the structure of the music was analysed in order to elucidate the intrinsic qualities of the music.
which influence and mould any performance thereof. Lastly, interpretative judgements had to be made and certain tastes were given preference over others, thereby undeniably blunting the scientific edge of any conclusions arrived at with highly subjective considerations.

Admitting that authentic performance practice constitutes a fallacy, does however not amount to deriding it or underestimating its value. It certainly does not intimate that interpretation of historical musical works is a matter for the performing individual, a heathen shrine where the offerings of arrogance, ignorance and vanity can replace the virtues of true understanding and enlightenment. To the contrary, it is not the contention of the author that authentic performance is undesirable, merely that it is unattainable. Even so, seeking knowledge and understanding of the music as was attempted in this study, even if the result is highly subjective, is the surest way in which truth and integrity in musical performance can be preserved - integrity with regard to intent and truth with regard to content.

Egyptian Thebes was famous for a colossal black statue - a seated stone figure - which uttered a sound like the breaking of a lyre-string every day at sunrise. The statue of Memnon is a fitting metaphor for not only the Capriccio in B flat major, but for all music. It is the rays of truth and integrity which lend music its noble voice.
# Appendix A

## Sectional Structure

| Measure | A | A' | A'' | A'''
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Fugal Structure

- **S**: Red
- **A**: Green
- **T**: Blue
- **B**: Purple

## Tonal Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>c/C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Key to Appendix A:

- **Red** = Theme
- **Green** = Answer
- **Blue** = Counter Theme
- **Purple** = Free Material
## APPENDIX B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variation</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Mutations of Passus Duriusculus (f - e - d\textsuperscript{b} - c)</th>
<th>Description of Variations if Upper Voice</th>
<th>Structure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bass entry</td>
<td>1-4\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>Basic Harmonic Outline in F minor: i-vi\textsuperscript{7}0-</td>
<td>Introduction (4 measures)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bass entry</td>
<td>5-8\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>Repeat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9-12\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>Octave displacement of two notes.</td>
<td>Anticipatio Notae, Katabasis, Suspiratio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13-16\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>Katabasis (Pathopoeia) and rhythmic variation.</td>
<td>Perfect fourth (Paronomasia), descending triad pattern, Suspiratio.</td>
<td>A\textsuperscript{1} (20 measures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17-20\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>Katabasis and eighth notes on third beat.</td>
<td>Sincopated pattern, Katabasis, Suspiratio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>21-24\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>Structural note (E) in m. 22 in top voice, octave displacement, Suspiratio.</td>
<td>Big intevallic jumps (Anabasis, Katabasis), diminished sevenths.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>25-28\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>Arpeggiated chords (Anabasis, Katabasis), first beats mark descending tetrachord.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Link (4 measures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>29-32\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>Similar to no. 3 with use of Suspiratio.</td>
<td>Katabasis (Pathopoeia), Suspiratio.</td>
<td>A\textsuperscript{2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>33-36\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>Katabasis (Pathopoeia), descending tetrachord marked by 1st notes of groups, Suspiratio.</td>
<td>Exclamatio, Anadiplosis, Katabasis (downward 5ths), Suspiratio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>37-40\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>Musical sighs, bass joins top voice in parallel movement, Suspiratio.</td>
<td>Gradatio, Anticipatio Notae, Polyptoton.</td>
<td>(16 measures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>41-44\textsuperscript{3}</td>
<td>Octave displacements.</td>
<td>Anticipatio Notae, Katabasis, Suspiratio.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>45-48</td>
<td>Elaboration includes Katabasis and Anabasis (Pathopoeia).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Codetta (5 measures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Final cadential note.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX C:

## SECTIONAL STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FUGAL STRUCTURE

- **S** = Theme
- **A** = Answer
- **T** = Counter Theme
- **B** = Free Material

## TONAL STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TONAL</td>
<td>B\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>B\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>B\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**KEY TO TABLE 4:**

- **red** = Theme
- **green** = Answer
- **blue** = Counter Theme
- **purple** = Free Material
## APPENDIX C (continued):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>26</th>
<th>27</th>
<th>28</th>
<th>29</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>31</th>
<th>32</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tonal Structure
- F
- B♭

### Tonal Structure (II)
- F
- B♭
### APPENDIX C (continued):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEASURE</th>
<th>38</th>
<th>39</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>41</th>
<th>42</th>
<th>43</th>
<th>44</th>
<th>45</th>
<th>46</th>
<th>47</th>
<th>48</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>53</th>
<th>54</th>
<th>55</th>
<th>56</th>
<th>57</th>
<th>58</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FUGAL STRUCTURE

### TONAL STRUCTURE
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