Example 4 (Sonata No. 9, bars 17-32)

There are many passages in Soler’s sonatas which could be more easily performed on two manuals than on one as, for instance, all the passages in which a crossing of the hands is required, which happens with great frequency in Soler’s sonatas (see Example 5), but this is

Example 5 (Sonata No. 10, bars 93-116)
still not conclusive evidence that these sonatas were written exclusively for the harpsichord. Therefore, if one takes the enquiry no further than to the mere technical resources of the instrument, Soler’s sonatas could have been written for either the harpsichord or the pianoforte.

Aside from the question of manuals, there are other differences between harpsichord idiom and pianoforte idiom. Dissonant chords and acciaccaturas are not pleasant on the pianoforte, but have an admirable effect on the harpsichord. Scarlatti used these harmonic devices very often, but we do not know of a single case where Soler employed dissonance for dissonance’s sake like Scarlatti did in the sonata exemplified below (see Example 6).29

Example 6 (Sonata XVIII, bars 154-178)

(From R. Kirkpatrick, Scarlatti, Sixty Sonatas, G. Schirmer, Inc., New York. Reprinted through permission of the publisher.)

As regards the milder form of acciaccatura, there are only two or three instances in all the ninety-four sonatas available at present, where this device is used by Soler (see, for instance, Example 7), and it is noticeable that Soler's use of the acciaccatura is, indeed, very much less conspicuous than Scarlatti's least ostentatious employment of this device (see Example 8).

Example 7 (Sonata No. 86, bars 67-75)

[ Allegretto ]

Example 8 (Sonata XV, bars 33-37)

[ Allegro ]

(From R. Kirkpatrick, Scarlatti, Sixty Sonatas, G. Schirmer, Inc., New York. Reprinted through permission of the publisher.)
In view of this it would be very tempting to conclude that Soler's austerity as regards dissonance and acciaccatura is pointing to his consideration of their effect on the pianoforte, but one must not lose sight of the fact that Scarlatti's penchant for dissonance is quite unique in the history of harpsichord music, and that Soler's reluctance to follow in Scarlatti's footsteps in this respect could just as well have been a matter of personal taste. Still, it is curious that Soler with his keen interest in matters of harmony\(^{30}\) should have taken no more than a very occasional interest in Scarlatti's chordal structures, which so often turn out to be inner pedals and pyramids of simultaneous subdominant and dominant harmonies — as R. Kirkpatrick analysed them in his memorable articles in *The Score* —\(^{31}\) and that he should have refrained from experimenting on a much larger scale with the harmonic possibilities Scarlatti had in this way pointed out. But this circumstance merely allows us to state that Soler was more inclined towards the less complicated aspects of the Galant style than was Scarlatti, and it does not permit us to conclude that Soler favoured the pianoforte above the harpsichord.

Neither does an enquiry into passages in octaves prove conclusive. As Keller pointed out,\(^ {32}\) octave passages are not regarded as compatible with true harpsichord idiom, but a glance at Scarlatti's sonatas shows that he employed the octave-technique just like all other conceivable manual intricacies with great frequency (see Example 9).\(^ {33}\)
Example 9 (Sonata CCV, bars 139-165)

Allegro


Soler's sonatas, too, abound with such octaves, of which those in Example 10 (a) and (b) can be regarded as typical.

Example 10 (Sonata No. 71, bars 75-87, and bars 106-112)
(a)

| Andantino |
An enquiry into note values proved somewhat more helpful than the consideration of octave passages. The harpsichord is much less capable of sustained notes than the pianoforte, and this is the reason for so many a characteristic shake on a long note and an inverted pedal in harpsichord music. In Examples 11 and 12 below, we quote instances of unembellished sustained notes which cannot be produced to good effect on the harpsichord and which, in our opinion, rather call for a pianoforte.

Example 11 (2nd Minuetto of Sonata No. 93, bars 10-16)

34. The passage quoted in Example 12 occurs four times in this movement, twice in part A, twice in part B. In both parts, at the first appearance of the passage a shake is indicated on the sustained note, at the second appearance in both parts it reads as quoted (or suitably transposed). Although during the period under discussion the notation of shakes lacked the faithfulness of more recent times we feel that in this particular case the alternating indication of the shake is the composer's intention, because it is consistent with the alternating decoration in the same movement, bars 6 to 12 after the double barline.

35. The organ would sustain these notes even better, but is nevertheless an unlikely instrument for these sonatas.
It is interesting to note that the above Examples are taken from Soler's sonatas in four movements, i.e. from those which we believe to belong to a later period in Soler's life (see previous chapter) but, although sustained notes of the kind illustrated are more frequent in the late sonatas than, for instance, in those of the Birchall print, they are not absent in the latter. Example 13 gives prominent evidence of this.

Still, the acoustical problem in Example 13 is of a different sort—the three-part chord with the open fifth having a greater impact, and there is the question of the best-suited register to be considered—than that in Example 11, and so we can point to the possibility—but not more than just a possibility—that the unembellished sustained notes in the multi-movement sonatas are due to the influence of the pianoforte.

The tempo indications on Soler's sonatas also point to such a pos-
sibility: there are a number of indications like Andante, Largo Andante, Cantabile, Cantabile Andantino, and Andantino expressivo (!) in the Birchall print but, where these movements are not in $\frac{3}{8}$ time, they are almost invariably marked *alla breve*, thus making little demand on the tone-gradation of which the pianoforte is so capable. The position is entirely different in the Andante Cantabile No. 56, the principal movements of the sonatas Nos. 62, 63, 65, 66, 68, 91, 93 (all multi-movement sonatas), and the Minuets marked *maestoso* in the five sonatas Nos. 91-95: the *alla breve* is nowhere in evidence, and all these slow or expressive movements can best be done justice by the flexible tone-gradation of the pianoforte. The fact that Soler took much more trouble with the tempo indications of the multi-movement sonatas than previously, also points to his awareness of the new quality of toneproduction: see for instance, the *Andante amabile expressivo* of No. 93 I, and the *Allegro expressivo non presto* of No. 95 II. All this, however, is still not conclusive, and neither is the evidence — too bulky for more than cursory exemplification here — that Soler eventually discarded the disjunct rhythmical pattern so characteristic for many a slow movement in harpsichord literature. If one compares the pattern of sonata No. 20 (see Example 14) to the nearest comparable pattern used in Soler's multi-movement sonatas (see Example 15) it becomes clear that in the latter case the melodic continuity is greater and the harmonic rhythm wider than in the former. A mere glance over the sonatas Nos. 91-99 shows that the above observation is not confined to the one case illustrated in Example 15. The same glance will notice the greater prominence of drum-basses, Alberti-basses and similar patterns in these sonatas (see for instance sonata No. 91, second movement, bars 7-23, and sonata No. 98, last movement, bars 53-71). All these factors

36. There is no reason to regard the tempo indications with undue distrust. As Table I (Chapter III) shows, Father Rubio had the opportunity to compare the tempo indications of different copyists in the case of 24 sonatas, and according to editor's notes there were discrepancies only in the cases of Nos. 63 I, 65 II and 66 I (in wording, not in tempo!) But even as regards the wording, therefore, copyists seem to have stuck to the originals rather consistently. This is also borne out by the fact that copyists have even perpetuated mistakes in spelling, which all too clearly point to Soler's authorship: such instances are one "t" in Scarlatti (on the title-page of the Paris sonatas as well as in Soler's first letter to Padre Martini — see Chapter II of this treatise —) and one "s" in expressivo (see sonatas Nos. 26 and 66). Father Rubio is of the opinion that the tempo indications are genuine (see his Foreword to vol. I).
Example 14 (Sonata No. 20, bars 1-13)

Example 15 (Sonata No. 66, bars 1-7)

point to the change of style which we discussed in Chapter IV and confirm the theory that these sonatas are, indeed, products of Soler’s later period. But, although one is inclined to associate this change of style with early pianoforte literature, there is no proof that in the case of Soler the change of style either caused or was the result of an exchange
of instruments. We find such an exchange of instruments most likely, but a definite distinction between harpsichord idiom and pianoforte idiom does not exist in Soler's sonatas.

Our second problem, namely the peculiar role of the organ in Soler's sonatas, arises from the passage quoted in Example 16, below.

Example 16 (Sonata No. 44, bars 21-33)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Example 16 (Sonata No. 44, bars 21-33)}
\end{align*}
\]

This passage, the only one of its kind in Soler's sonatas, is neither possible on the harpsichord nor on the pianoforte (even the sustaining pedal of the latter being useless here) and — unless Soler actually had a harpsichord with a pedalboard — it clearly calls for the organ.\(^37\) In connection with Example 3 in the previous chapter we mentioned that seven consecutive sonatas from the Montserrat collection may have been intended for the organ because of their compass: No. 44, from which we have quoted in Example 16, is one of these seven sonatas. This gives us an additional reason why the sonata No. 44 — together with the rest of that group — may be regarded as a work for the organ.

As regards the question of the instrument, then, we must acknowledge that Soler wrote his sonatas without clear distinction for a trilogy of keyboard instruments: the organ, the harpsichord and the pianoforte. The majority of these sonatas were without doubt meant for the harpsichord, a few for the organ and, from the evidence exemplified in this

\(^37\) This passage is all the more curious as according to Santiago Kastner (private information, May 2nd, 1965) pedals on Iberian organs were very rare, and that pedal-playing was not at all customary in Spain during the period under discussion.
chapter, it seems likely that Father Soler took the possibilities of the pianoforte into account at least when writing his multi-movement sonatas.

The lack of distinction between music for the organ and music for the harpsichord was a characteristic of the century previous to Soler and had been generally overcome in his time,\(^{38}\) while the distinction between the harpsichord and the pianoforte had very clearly been made, among others, by Soler’s contemporary C.P.E. Bach.\(^ {39} \) Father Soler occupies a curious position in the history of music by not having taken notice of either trend, and this circumstance indicates that the Aufführungspraxis in Spain differed greatly from that of the rest of Europe. It need not be emphasised that in the orbit of Buxtehude, Kuhnau, and Bach an obvious distinction between organ style and harpsichord style existed: no contemporary of these masters would have seriously considered Buxtehude’s Präludium und Fuge in F\(^ \flat \) minor as suitable for the harpsichord, or Kuhnau’s Frische Clavier-Früchte, oder sieben Sonaten as suitable for the organ; nor would anyone have taken Bach’s Italian Concerto and his French Suites as equally suited for performance on the harpsichord and on the organ. Even the possible confusion of music for the harpsichord and music for the clavichord was less common in Bach’s time than one would suppose, and “... could not have occurred frequently enough to be of any importance in formulating the principles of performance of keyboard music in the Baroque period.”\(^ {40} \)

How different in Spain, even decades after Bach! Spanish Aufführungspraxis is best summed up in Santiago Kastner’s full title to the publication of four sonatas by Soler: P. Antonio Soler: 2 x 2 Sonatas for Keyboard Instruments (Pianoforte, Organ, Harpsichord or Clavichord).\(^ {41} \) That this practice of indiscriminate interchanging of instruments, resulting in a smudging of the borderlines between the various instrumental styles, was not confined to Soler’s music, becomes evident from a study of Seixas’s organ style, about which Santiago Kastner noted his “... Befremden über dasjenige, was man zu Seixas Zeiten der Orgel zugemutet hat.”\(^ {42} \)

41. Schott & Co., Mainz, 1956. For other references to overlapping of harpsichord style over organ style see Chapter IV footnote (23).
It is important to keep in mind, however, that it was not the organ which invaded the clavier style in Spain, but that the clavier style completely blotted out the idiomatic characteristics of the organ. This is reflected in the following remark by the French organist Francis Chapelet when commenting on Seixas: “Ce ne fait plus du véritable style d’orgue, c’est entièrement la décadence de l’orgue ibérique.” 43

That Soler was, indeed, preoccupied with the exploration of the characteristic technique of the stringed keyboard, is discussed in Chapter VI and shown by the numerous Examples in Chapter VII.

43. *Loc. cit.*
CHAPTER VI

THE TITLE SONATA

Before we can discuss Soler's sonatas in technical, formal, and stylistic detail, there remains the meaning of the title "sonata" to be determined.

According to the standards set by the masters of the high-Classic period, one is today inclined to associate with the word "sonata" certain principles of form and content which, however, have no bearing on the music of the Galant style. In fact, the majority of Soler's sonatas — which in their entirety represent a model example of the style shift from the Galant to the early Classic — cannot be called "sonatas" at all (on the title-page of the Paris collection they are actually called "Toccate" — cf. Chapter II of this treatise), if that term is accepted as a definition of the ternary design with a development section. Not even the most superficial description of the formal aspects of the sonata as advanced by theorists before 1790 — like Rousseau, Schulz and Türk — pertains to Soler's sonatas: these theorists were careful not to commit themselves in their analysis beyond the statement that the "sonata" consisted in two to four contrasted movements, and it is just this definition which fails to account for seventy-six of ninety-four sonatas by Soler (and several hundred by Scarlatti) that consist only of a single movement. The same applies to W.S. Newman's recent and admittedly generalising definition that "the sonata is a solo or chamber instrumental cycle of aesthetic or diversional purpose, consisting of several contrasting movements that are based on relatively extended designs in 'absolute' music": apart from the "cycle" and the "several contrasting movements" which, as we have mentioned, do not characterise the majority of either Soler's or Scarlatti's sonatas, there is the questionable description of "relatively extended designs", which in its purposeful latitude may or may not include the often most simple binary form employed by the above composers.

1. The term "Galant" is meant here to include the first and second galant styles mentioned by W.S. Newman in The Sonata in the Classic Era, North Carolina U.P., 1963, p. 120.
2. Cf. Chapters VIII and IX of this treatise.
From these observations it becomes clear that the term "sonata" as used by Scarlatti and Soler had no bearing on the formal aspects of their music, and that their use of this term can only be understood in the light of its original meaning, namely as delimiting instrumental music from vocal music. This, in fact, is the only definite meaning the word "sonata" had throughout the Baroque period because, before the sonata crystallised a form of its own during the Classic period, it experimentally donned and discarded the cloak of many other musical designs. It is probably by reason of such catholic use of the term "sonata" that Classic theorists did not enquire into the analytical aspects of the sonata, although in connection with the symphony the binary form was minutely discussed by Scheibe as early as 1739.

But if during the Late Baroque period and the pre-Classic period the term "sonata" had no fixed formal designation, that did not preclude the sonata from having had more definite characteristics in other spheres. This fact is reflected in the discussions by the contemporary theorists we have already quoted in the matter of form: in 1755, Rousseau pointed to the close attention which sonata-composers gave to the characteristic resources of the individual instruments as regards timbre and technique; in 1775, Schulz remarked that the sonata is more capable of speechlike emotional expressiveness than any other instrumental form, and also drew attention to the tutorial usefulness and the entertainment-value of the sonata; in 1789, Türk went so far as to say that sonata-composition is more suited for the keyboard than for any other setting.

6. The "invention" of the sonata is the result of the emancipation of instrumental music, which is one of the most striking characteristics of the Baroque period. The first harpsichord-sonata was published by Del Buono, in 1641. The keyboard-sonata did, however, not become overpoweringly fashionable before about 1740, that is, before the very end of the Late Baroque. About this time the sonata was introduced to the Iberian Peninsula, the first Spanish sonata-composer being Vincente Rodriguez. V.R.'s sonata is dated 1744. (Cf. Newman, W.S., work cited in footnote (4), pp. 19 and 56; also: Newman, W.S., work cited in footnote (3), pp. 40 and 278).
9. Ibid., p. 30
10. Ibid., p. 23
12. Ibid., p. 25.
Summarising these statements, we can say that the term “sonata” had come to imply not merely an instrumental work, but a work designed to explore the idiomatic capabilities of the chosen instrument, particularly those of the keyboard. This, we feel, is the principal — though not the only — characteristic of sonata-composition during the greater part of the eighteenth century, allowing for a more profound understanding of this music than can be provided by a clinging to the misleading method of evaluating sonatas — and their composers — according to standards of formal structure.\(^\text{13}\)

How great the preoccupation with the technical aspects of instrumental writing was during the periods under discussion, is shown by the fact that in England the term “sonata” was equated with “lesson”, \(^\text{14}\) and that in other countries, too, a great amount of music was written for expressly tutorial purposes. Kelway, Arne, Hahn, Hoffmeister, Vigerue, E.W. Wolf, F. Bach, E. Bach,\(^\text{15}\) and Quantz all wrote music for the purpose of instruction, as J.S. Bach wrote his Inventionen for his pupils and, nearer to the subject of this treatise, D. Scarlatti his sonatas for Maria Barbara, consort of crown prince Ferdinand of Spain.\(^\text{16}\) In this respect it cannot be overlooked that Scarlatti published his first thirty sonatas under the title Essercizi.\(^\text{17}\)

The tutorial aim of the music — particularly in the cases of E. Bach, Quantz, and D. Scarlatti — went hand in hand with its entertainment-value: what the pupil learned, he or she was able to produce on the frequent occasions of courtly Hausmusik, as Frederick the Great so produced the sonatas and concertos for flute by Quantz\(^\text{18}\) and, no doubt, Maria Barbara of Spain — who must have been an extraordinarily dexterous performer —\(^\text{19}\) the keyboard sonatas by Scarlatti. This double-purpose of instruction and entertainment is best described in D. Scarlatti’s own Foreword to his Essercizi, in which he points out that these sonatas ”... do not expect any profound Learning, but rather an ingenious Jesting with Art, to accommodate you to the Mastery of the

---

13. The dangers of the usual “evolutionary” approach are discussed at length by W.S. Newman, work cited in footnote (4), pp. 5-6.
15. Ibid., pp. 48 and 50.
Harpsichord.” 20 H. Keller, too, implied this double purpose by stating that in Scarlatti’s sonatas “... nicht nur die reine Technik, sondern auch Geschmack, Anmut des Vortrags ... gelehrt wird.” 21

In consequence, it would appear that a large part of music-literature with the title “sonata” can be defined as works written in the characteristic idiom of an individual instrument for the purpose of tuition and entertainment.

If this definition is accepted, the title “sonata” on Soler’s keyboard-works falls neatly into place: in spite of the forbidding looking Escorial, Soler’s habitat, the style of his sonatas was perfectly suited to the “... strictly rococo and utterly superficial” atmosphere of other royal residences, like Aranjuez and La Granja, 22 and that they also served a tutorial purpose is evident from the title of one of the manuscript copies, which reads – with suitable euphemism – *Sonatas del P. fray Antonio Soler que hizo para la diversion del Serenímo Señor Infante Don Gabriel. Obra 7.a y 8.a. Año 1786. Joseph Antonio Terrès, 1802.* 23 Further evidence of the tutorial purpose is found in the title to Soler’s six concertos for two organs: *Seis Conciertos de dos Organos Obligados Compuestos por el Pe. Fr. Antonio Soler. Para la diversion del SSmo Infante de España Dn. Gabriel de Borbón, (Quaderno 1.o).”* 24

The way in which Soler combined his exploration of the idiomatic possibilities of the keyboard with his tutorial purposes deserves independent treatment and will be discussed in Chapter VII.

---

CHAPTER VII

TUTORIAL ASPECTS

I. EVIDENCE OF TUTORIAL INTENT?

Although it is unlikely that Soler — in his position as organist and choir master at the Escorial — did not have other pupils as well, it is generally accepted that his principal pupil was Gabriel of Bourbon (1752-1788), tenth son of Carlos III and Maria Amalia de Sajonia,¹ and that Soler wrote most of his sonatas for him.²

If that is true, the great number of Soler’s sonatas suggests that Don Gabriel was Soler’s pupil — seasonally — for many years, possibly for the whole period between 1760 and 1783.³ This long-lasting teacher-pupil-relationship gave Soler a twofold responsibility: he not only had to provide musical “diversion”,⁴ but in doing so had to teach his pupil all the intricacies of keyboard technique, i.e. Soler had to combine technical ingenuity with graceful musical content in order to entertain his pupil while developing his manual ability at the same time.

This circumstance allows a comparison with D. Scarlatti, whose raison d’être at Maria Barbara’s court had been exactly the same: Hermann Keller pointed out that Scarlatti’s sonatas represent a “Hohe Schule des Klavierspiels”,⁵ which deals with all the aspects of keyboard technique not by chance of style and whim, but quite intentionally for the purpose of tuition. Keller tried to prove this by showing that in many sonatas by Scarlatti the technical exercise actually became a feature of the form of these sonatas: “... an der Stelle, an der in der klassischen Sonate ein zweites Thema aufzutreten pflegt, stellt Scarlatti dem Spieler in vielen — natürlich nicht allen — Sonaten eine konzen-

³. Carlos III became king in 1759 (Cf. Altamira, R., A History of Spain, D. van Nostrand Company Inc., New York, 1949, p. 438) and it is reasonable to suppose that Don Gabriel received his first lessons from Soler when the court took its periodic residence at the Escorial during 1760. As Soler died in 1783, Don Gabriel outlived him for five years.
⁴. That is the term used on the title pages of opp. 7 and 8, and the concertos for two organs (cf. Chapter VI of this treatise).
56

trierte technische Aufgabe. Ist das technische Motiv eintaktig, so wird es noch zweimal wiederholt und dann kadenziert zu einem viertaktigen Sätzchen zusammengefasst, das dann als ganzes gleich wiederholt wird ...; ist das Motiv zweitaktig, so werden acht Takte daraus ... und sechzehn Takte! Dann geht es, nachdem das Kunststück genügend eingeprägt und glücklich gelungen ist, in flüssiger Weise gleich in die Schlussgruppe...

6.

We must note, however, that we cannot accept Keller’s reasoning as conclusive proof of the tutorial intent: extension by repetition was a feature of almost all Galant music, inseparably bound to another of its principal characteristics, i.e. the stringing together of short phrases as a vehicle for general continuity. Possible is, of course, that Scarlatti quite consciously made use of this already existing pattern of continuity to serve his tutorial aims.

In this light, the same also applies to Soler: the technical exercise as a feature of form is strongly evident in Soler’s sonatas, as a mere glance at, for instance, the sonatas Nos. 2, 4, 7, 9, 10 and 12 will show,7 and this justifies a presentation of the technical problems of Soler’s keyboard sonatas under the heading “Tutorial Aspects”. It goes without saying, however, that neither Scarlatti nor Soler always confined their technical ingenuity “to that place, where normally the second subject appears in the Classical sonata”, and that they could and did set technical problems for their pupils in any part of their sonatas.

6. Ibid., p. 78.
7. This aspect will again be referred to in Chapters VIII and IX.
In their entirety, Soler’s sonatas, indeed, represent an advanced course in keyboard technique. On the following pages we have singled out and illustrated the most important features of Soler’s technique, namely scales, two parts in one hand, tone repetitions, broken chords, leaps, and the crossing of hands.

II. SCALES

Exercises in the playing of scales abound in Soler’s sonatas, form simple slow scales for the left hand (see Example 17) to faster ones for

8. Not even in the Birchall print are the sonatas methodically graded as to their manual difficulty, and we doubt that Soler—or Scarlatti—ever took the trouble to present their works to their pupils according to a preconceived educational plan. We think it more likely that both composers catered for the need—or the royal preference—of the moment. An attempt at deciding on a chronology of Soler’s sonatas on the grounds of the manual aspects of these works is, therefore, most unlikely to succeed, particularly as it seems quite possible that Soler wrote keyboard sonatas for his own satisfaction before he began to teach Don Gabriel (Soler probably met Scarlatti in 1752, and Don Gabriel most likely took lessons with Soler as from 1760, so there is an interval of eight years during which Soler cannot very well be supposed to have refrained from the composition of keyboard sonatas. It is, indeed, unlikely that Soler did not write some keyboard sonatas even before he personally met Scarlatti in 1752, because he surely must have known Scarlatti’s sonatas even if he had not met their composer). Another difficulty meeting an attempted chronology on the grounds of tutorial considerations is the fact that Don Gabriel’s musical education was under Soler’s supervision for only one term during any one year, i.e. when the court was actually in residence at the Escurial (it was royal custom to move periodically between La Granja, Aranjuez, the Escurial, etc. Cf. Kirkpatrick, R., Domenico Scarlatti, Princeton U.P., 1953, p. 123) and that any gaps or sudden advances in Don Gabriel’s musical development would leave exactly the same inconsistencies in such a chronology. Don Gabriel’s other teacher was José de Nebra (cf. Kastner, M.S., P. Antonio Soler: 2 x 2 Sonatas, Schott & Co., Mainz, 1956, Introduction).

9. It should be mentioned here that, although Soler’s inventiveness in the technical sphere is very sparkling, he was only rarely Scarlatti’s equal in this respect. This is only partly explained by the fact that Maria Barbara of Spain, Scarlatti’s pupil, possessed truly extraordinary dexterity, while Don Gabriel, Soler’s pupil, was an excellent performer, but not of the same class as the former Queen.
Example 17 (Sonata No. 61, bars 1-8)

Allegro

the right hand (see Example 18), over rapid scales for one hand (see Example 18 (Sonata No. 53, bars 71-73)) and the division of scales between two hands (see Example 20) to rippingly fast scales (see Examples 21 and 22).

Example 19 (Sonata No. 17, bars 1-4)
Example 20 (Sonata No. 35, bars 13-24)

Example 21 (Sonata No. 10, bars 1-3)

Example 22 (Rondo No. 59, bars 27-37)
Even the glissando is demonstrated (see Example 23).

Example 23 (Sonata No. 75, bars 48-50)

Andante

An example each of decorated scales (see Example 24) and scales in "waves" (see Example 25) may conclude the demonstration of the more straightforward manner of scale-writing found in Soler’s sonatas.

Example 24 (Sonata No. 66 I, bars 27-29)

Example 25 (Sonata No. 70, bars 9-20)
Soler used the chromatic scale only fragmentarily (see Example 26), and scales in contrary motion (see Examples 27 and 28) are relatively

Example 26 (Sonata No. 19, bars 62-63)

Example 27 (Sonata No. 15, bars 16-19)

Example 28 (Sonata No. 11, bars 11-12)
infrequent.10

Other, yet more complicated types of scale writing are, however, well exemplified in Soler’s sonatas. So we find scales in interrupted motion (see Example 29), and innumerable instances of complete or fragmentary scales in steps, be they in diatonic seconds (see Examples 30 and 31), thirds (see Examples 32, 33 and 34), or even in sixths (Examples 35 and 36).

Example 29 (Sonata No. 30, bars 80-83)

Example 30 (Sonata No. 6, bars 1-5)

Example 31 (Sonata No. 43, bars 1-3)

Example 32 (Sonata No. 58, bars 36-37)

10. But apart from Example 27 see also Examples 29 and 48.
Scales in octave-steps are also found with some frequency (see Example 37), and there is also one instance of an accompanied scale for one hand alone (see Example 38).

That Soler did not stop at presenting problems of scale playing singly, but also combined the separate problems to form a complex pattern with the purpose of exacting synchronised play of both hands, is shown in Examples 39, 40, 41 and 42.

11. We have chosen this Example from many others to illustrate Soler's use of extreme pitch (cf. Chapter IV of this treatise).
Example 39 (Sonata No. 89, bars 46-52)

**Allegro**

Example 40 (Sonata No. 67, Intento, bars 125-131)

**Non presto**

Example 41 (Sonata No. 76, bars 1-6)

**Allegro**
A curious instance of scale-writing with repeated notes, first straightforward and then syncopated, appears in the last movement of sonata No. 92 (see Example 43).

Example 43 (bars 26-37)
III. TWO PARTS IN ONE HAND

Like Scarlatti, Soler demonstrated the technique of playing in thirds very frequently in his sonatas. In Examples 13 (Chapter V) and 32 (present chapter) we have already shown instances of thirds in one hand. In Example 44 such thirds are practised through ten bars. More difficult

Example 44 (Sonata No. 30, bars 189-199)
exercises in thirds are found in sonatas Nos. 17 and 21 (see Examples 45 and 46).

Example 45 (Sonata No. 17, bars 6-9)

Allegro

Example 46 (Sonata No. 21, bars 9-16)

Allegro

So far, the thirds were all for the right hand. In sonatas Nos. 8 and 73 the left hand is exercised in the playing of thirds (see Examples 47 and 48).

Example 47 (Sonata No. 8, bars 110-115)

| Andante
Example 48 (Sonata No. 73, bars 7-16)  

It must be said, however, that thirds for the left hand are rare in Soler’s sonatas and, in most cases — particularly in the Intentos — rather slower than in the innumerable instances where thirds are written for the right hand.

Sixths in either the left or the right hand are much more scarce in Soler’s sonatas than in those by Scarlatti. In this — and in the use of octaves, as we shall show below — we find the striking difference between the great virtuoso Scarlatti and the, in this respect, less generously equipped Soler. Nowhere in Soler’s keyboard works do we find a passage such as this (see Example 49): 12

To the above compare some of the examples of sixths we have found in Soler’s sonatas (see Examples 50, 51, 52, 53 and 54).

Example 50 (Sonata No. 7, bars 53-55)

Example 51 (Sonata No. 64, Intento, bars 87-90)
Example 52 (Sonata No. 30, bars 185-188)

Example 53 (Sonata No. 44, bars 51-53)

Example 54 (Sonata No. 61II, bars 26-32)

For the sake of completeness we quote an instance where the rare thirds for the left hand are mixed with the almost equally rare sixths for the right hand (see Example 55).
This difference in technical astuteness between Scarlatti and Soler is also evident in their employment of passages in octaves. If one compares Scarlatti's octaves (see Example 9 in Chapter V) to those of Soler, the former's technical superiority cannot be in doubt. Soler's technically most advanced example is found in the sonata No. 79 (see Example 56), and even that is far from making a fetish of octave-technique as is the case in the above-mentioned example by Scarlatti.
All other instances demand even less dexterity, as will be clear from a reconsideration of Example 10 (in Chapter V) and from the two passages quoted below (see Examples 57 and 58).
As certain types of broken sixths and octaves can be regarded as implied two-part writing, some such cases are demonstrated below. In Examples 35 and 36 we have already quoted some instances of broken sixths in connection with scale-writing. Other interesting examples read as follows (see Examples 59 and 60):
Broken octaves, apart from simpler ones already shown in connection with scale writing (see Example 37), take various forms, of which these five examples here are representative (see Examples 61, 62, 63, 64 and 65):

Example 61 (Sonata No. 10, bar 7)

Allegro

Example 62 (Sonata No. 13, bars 44-51)
Example 63 (Sonata No. 26, bars 44-45)

Andantino expresivo

Example 64 (Sonata No. 27, bars 5-15)

Allegro

Example 65 (Sonata No. 17, bars 45-48)

Allegro

Two parts in one hand are, of course, not restricted to pure thirds, sixths and octaves, and there are numerous phrases in Soler's sonatas in which he mixes all three (see Example 66).
An interesting mixture of thirds, fifths, sixths and octaves is, for instance, found in the sparkling sonata in G major (see Example 67).

Two-part accompaniments for the left hand can also be found; the particular phrase shown below (see Example 68) illustrates a mild form of hand stretch with one arrested finger.

That Soler was aware of the usefulness of two parts in one hand for the purpose of demonstrating delicate suspensions can be judged from Example 69.
While Soler has so far appeared much less demanding in technical versatility than Scarlatti, there is one aspect of writing two parts for one hand, in which Soler is definitely superior to Scarlatti, and that is in his polyphonic writing.\textsuperscript{13} While Soler never comes anywhere near the complexity of J.S. Bach’s fugue-writing, his Intentos contain phrases which make quite a study of multivoiced legato-playing (see Examples 70 and 71), and this is the only relic of true organ style remaining in Soler’s sonatas.\textsuperscript{14} Scarlatti did not employ polyphonic legato-playing to this extent.

Example 70 (Sonata No. 65, Intento, bars 50-63)

\textsuperscript{13} Keller, H., \textit{op. cit.}, p. 46.

\textsuperscript{14} See Chapter V of this treatise.
Example 71 (Sonata No. 63, Intento, bars 48-67)

There are only six Intentos among the ninety-four sonatas available at present, and their small number as well as the fact that they are unquestionable stylistic misfits within the framework of the sonatas to
which they form the concluding movements (sonatas Nos. 63 to 68),
leads one to believe that they appear in this context solely for tutorial
purposes, i.e. to exact polyphonic legato-playing and to promote the
understanding of that particular form of musical discipline (see Chapter
VIII (iv) of this treatise).

IV. TONE REPETITIONS

If it can be said that Soler had a preference for any particular
aspect of keyboard technique, then it surely was that of tone repetitions.
Rightly so, not only because it requires a capable performer to realise
them, but because they are — notwithstanding their having become a
Europe-wide mannerism since about 1700 — originally a feature
typical of the musical idiom of the Spanish vihuela. Scarlatti, too,
made use of tone repetition, extravagantly so, but in this respect Soler
was quite his equal, and certainly not his plagiarist: Soler’s tone repe­
titions are one of those features in his keyboard music which look
Scarlattian, but are truly Spanish, belonging to Soler by rights of
original national ownership.

Soler made use of tone repetitions in many different ways, from the
comparatively slow and insistent repetition of the same note throughout
ten consecutive bars (see Example 72), over faster repetition-patterns of

Example 72, (Sonata No. 1, bars 57-67)

Allegro

17. Cf. Chapter II of this treatise.
eight notes (See Example 73), and five, four and six notes (see Examples 74 and 75) to those of two notes, which latter are the most interesting.

Example 74 (Sonata No. 89, bars 19-31)

Example 75 (Sonata No. 58, bars 97-104)
from the "pianistic" point of view (see Example 76), particularly when they are used in combination with other technical problems (see Examples 77, 78, 79 and 80).

Example 76 (Rondo, No. 59, bars 40-41)

Example 77 (Sonata No. 2, bars 16-25)
Example 78 (Sonata No. 2, bars 38-46)

Example 79 (Sonata No. 19, bars 58-59)

Example 80 (Sonata No. 24, bars 208-212)

One of the most striking passages in which Soler combined tone repetition with octave-technique, leaps, and harmonic speculations appears in sonata No. 43 (see Example 81).
Another instance of tone repetition in connection with octave playing, this time for the left hand, has already been quoted in Example 65. Tone repetitions involving both hands are shown in Examples 82 and 83.
Unlike Scarlatti, who avoided Ablerti-basses, Soler used this poor device of “pianistic” harmonisation on many occasions. Particularly in his later multi-movement sonatas, which in many ways indicate the style shift from Galant to Classic principles, Alberti-basses and similar patterns are frequent. They are, however, not totally absent in the single-movement sonatas, as shown in example 84, which represents one of the least inspired pages of Soler’s keyboard music.

Example 84 (Sonata No. 33, bars 28-58)

Allegro

19. Cf. Chapter IV of this treatise.
In spite of their relative frequency, it cannot be said that Albertibasses are a predominating feature of Soler’s harmonisations. Examples 85, 86, 87 and 88 show Soler’s use of various other forms of accompaniment based on broken chords:

Example 85 (Sonata No. 23, bars 23-28)

Allegro