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Preface

Recent years have witnessed an ever-growing body of research devoted to the compositional and pedagogical history of eighteenth-century music. Italian music theory, formerly an area marginal to Anglo-American scholarship, has enjoyed a healthy revival, thanks in large part to renewed scholarly attention to the partimento, a pedagogical device of notation developed in the eighteenth century at Neapolitan conservatories. Among the many benefits that musicians derived from the intensive study of partimento, this dissertation is concerned chiefly with the myriad ways in which a partimento holds the potential of developing a kind of shorthand sketch to a finished musical piece. According to Giorgio Sanguinetti, a leading scholar in this area of research, partimento “set[s] up a firm outline for all the aspects of the finished piece: length, tonal plan, harmony, texture, and style”\(^1\) and these “implications need to be unfolded in order to become real music.”\(^2\) Although a massive corpus of partimenti has been preserved and continues to be published, relatively little was transmitted for this process of unfolding a partimento’s implications to a real piece of music, a gap attributable to the oral and practical means by which those techniques must have been transmitted to musicians of the time.

Instead of the Neapolitan maestros who “never tell us how to do,”\(^3\) Sanguinetti explains *regole* (“rules”) of an “esoteric doctrine . . . for insiders only,”\(^4\) devoting the second part of his

---

1 Sanguinetti (2012), 14.
2 Ibid., 167.
3 Ibid., 100.
4 Ibid., 10.
monograph to demonstrating the process of working out partimento realizations. His catalogue of these rules covering partimento theory,\(^5\) though essential, applies only the first two basic stages\(^6\) of a ternary approach to partimento realization: 1) chord realization, pattern-identification, and simple accompaniment; and 2) added suspensions. About the third and final stage, which deals with advanced issues such as diminutions, imitation, and texture, Sanguinetti takes a step back and leaves it to the readers, as “partimenti speak for themselves” and “there are no rules.”\(^7\)

The purpose of this dissertation is to gain insight into this last stage of partimento realization, into what might be called the missing beyond. Although Sanguinetti\(^8\) and more recently Peter van Tour\(^9\) offer a few invaluable surviving eighteenth-century realizations, the distance from these realizations to a finished musical work still appears wide indeed. The present study will attempt to address the paucity of resources in realizing and developing partimenti, and to fill the gap between partimento and a real piece of music by studying the process of revision in keyboard pieces of Johann Sebastian Bach and Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach. Even though the interconnection between the Neapolitan tradition and J. S. Bach is not clearly documented, the early versions of those pieces are in many ways analogous to partimento realizations, works awaiting further elaboration to become more polished, more finished. After extensive study of such revisions by the Bachs, father and son, the last part of this dissertation will attempt to recreate the transformation from partimento to a real piece of music, with my own compositions based on partimenti. This demonstration may not be historically authentic, yet I hope it will

\(^{5}\) These rules are reconstructed from an annotated edition of Fedele Fenaroli’s books by Emanuele Guarnaccia (ca. 1825).
\(^{6}\) Sanguinetti (2012), 168.
\(^{7}\) Ibid., 169.
\(^{8}\) Ibid., 227–228, for example.
\(^{9}\) Van Tour (2015), 68 and 183.
foster a better understanding of the vital tradition of the eighteenth century and its continuity from then to the twenty-first century.

The structure of this study is as follows. Chapter 1 will begin by introducing the topic, as well as surveying the historical and theoretical aspects of the partimento tradition. The rest of Chapter 1 and Chapter 2 will review the aspects of the partimento tradition that seem to overlap most clearly with Bach’s compositional practice. Chapter 1 will discuss *partimenti semplici* from the anthology by Camillo de Nardis,\(^\text{10}\) which comprises more than a hundred partimenti, ordered progressively according to their difficulty and complexity. Realizing and analyzing partimenti from the simplest to the more complex, I will discuss some shared features of the examined partimenti: opening themes returning in the dominant, relative major, or closely related keys; sequences filling the space between thematic statements; cadences repeated in the coda. These common features are essential teaching tools for composition lessons, as they would serve as structuring principles of a finished piece, which the two Bachs also seem to use in designing and revising their pieces. Chapter 2, on the other hand, will deal with *partimenti imitati*, one with “*bassi imitati fugati* (imitated fugal basses)” drawn from the De Nardis anthology, and another from the Langloz manuscript, the largest extant collection of partimento fugues, which originate in the time and region of J. S. Bach. Comparing two imitative partimenti with such different provenance will help build a bridge between partimento and Bach’s finished pieces.

After this preliminary analysis of partimenti with my own realizations, Chapters 3 and 4 will turn to a comparative study of four pieces drawn from the *Well-Tempered Clavier*, Book II. Based on the list of manuscripts presented in Yo Tomita’s monograph (1990), a few manuscript

---
\(^{10}\) De Nardis, Camillo. *Partimenti dei Maestri: Costumacci, Durante, Fenaroli, Leo, Mattei, Platania, Sala, Scarlatti, Tritto, Zingarelli*. Milan: G. Ricordi, 1933.
sources will be selected for analysis, and each layer of revision will be compared and analyzed, along with its rhythmic reduction.

Two preludes from WTC II—those in D minor (BWV 875) and C major (BWV 870)—will be explored in Chapter 3. Both revised substantially in length, these two preludes show how Bach segmented a fairly simple piece into many sections and how he expanded them using a new formal plan. Chapter 4 will take two fugues—those in G major (BWV 884) and C major (BWV 870)—into consideration. Bach’s revision to the G-major fugue focuses on the texture and on the extension by a dominant pedal point, for which partimento realizations rarely provide sufficient opportunity, while the changes to the C-major fugue—in metric notation and through the addition of a coda—make the fugue a more finished, effective piece. The overall revision processes will be discussed with all pieces in Chapters 3 and 4, in respect to features of partimenti and Bach’s unsurpassed way of transforming a sparse partimento to a musically abundant, self-standing work.

The following Chapters 5, 6, and 7 will review and compare a few early keyboard pieces of C.P.E. Bach. These pieces were composed before 1740, when C.P.E. Bach was a student of his father’s, and before he became a professional musician. The degree of revision has dictated the order of presentation, from the simplest to the more complicated ones. Chapter 5 will analyze the third movement of the Sonata in D minor (Wq. 65/3) and the Echo from the Suite in E minor (Wq. 65/4). The D-minor sonata movement displays features that would be entirely at home within the partimenti imitati, as its two-measure theme is presented in invertible counterpoint. The Echo, also close to a partimento but this time to a partimento semplice, is treated to somewhat more extensive revision, such as prolonging the duration of sequences. Chapter 6 will discuss pieces that are revised with attention to form. Most of the changes made for the last
movement of the G-major sonata (Wq. 65/6) and the first movement of the Eb-major sonata (Wq. 65/7) mark the important events of the piece, such as extending the dominant area or recapitulation. The pieces presented in Chapter 7 show even heavier revisions, so the final version is more difficult to trace back to the original. The revisions result in changes of tempo, character, and even genre; the second movement of the Sonata in Eb Major (Wq. 65/7) is changed from Siciliano to Andante, as Bach abandons the lilting rhythm of dotted eighth notes and filled the spaces with highly decorated sixteenth notes. In the meantime, the third movement of the Suite in E minor (Wq. 65/4) is changed from a simple bipartite Cantabile into a highly expressive and richly embellished Adagio non molto. All these simple keyboard pieces by the young C.P.E. Bach demonstrate stages evolved little beyond the simple partimento realization, but the techniques he uses for the revisions provide evidence to help us recreate some of the compositional choices involved in the transformation of partimenti.

The last two chapters of this study will attempt to demonstrate how the potentiality of partimenti can be developed into a finished musical work using some of the means explored in the preceding chapters. Chapter 8 will display the generative process from Fenaroli’s C-minor partimento to a prelude, while Chapter 9 will demonstrate in stages how to build a full fugue from a partimento fugue, again using one of the fugues from the Langloz manuscript.
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<tr>
<td>BWV</td>
<td>Bach-Werke-Verzeichnis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPEBCW</td>
<td><em>Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: The Complete Works</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPT</td>
<td>Counterpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>Countersubject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS2</td>
<td>Second Countersubject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV 1772</td>
<td>Clavierwerke-Verzeichnis of 1772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Catalog of C.P.E. Bach’s Keyboard works)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAC</td>
<td>Imperfect Authentic Cadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>The London Autograph of WTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Neapolitan chord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NV 1790</td>
<td>Nachlaß-Verzeichnis of 1790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Catalog of C.P.E. Bach’s works)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 226</td>
<td>D-B Mus.ms. Bach P 226, A. M. Bach’s copy in 1739–40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 368</td>
<td>D-brd-B P 368, G. A. Homilius’s copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 595</td>
<td>D-B Mus.ms Bach P 595, J. Ringk’s copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 772</td>
<td>D-brd-B P 772, J. H. Michel’s copy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 775</td>
<td>D-brd-B P 775, J. H. Michel’s copy, later reviewed by C.P.E. Bach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 804</td>
<td>D-B Mus.ms. Bach P 804, J. P. Kellner’s copy in 1727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P 1089</td>
<td>D-B Mus.ms. Bach P 1089, J. C. Vogler’s copy in 1729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAC</td>
<td>Perfect Authentic Cadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wq.</td>
<td>Wotquenne number for C.P.E. Bach’s works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC I</td>
<td><em>The Well-Tempered Clavier</em>, Book 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC II</td>
<td><em>The Well-Tempered Clavier</em>, Book 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstract

The centrality of thoroughbass to eighteenth-century musical composition has long been recognized; but only in the past two decades has the related branch of partimento begun to receive full scholarly attention, despite its intense cultivation in eighteenth-century Neapolitan conservatories, its dissemination to other European musical centers, and its continuation as a living tradition to the present day. While scholars have demonstrated partimento’s importance as a training ground for professional musicians, the full extent of its potential for the training of composers remains largely undisclosed, in part because training in composition through partimenti was and remains an oral tradition passed from maestros to their pupils. This dissertation seeks to fill that gap by showing processes for converting the raw material of partimenti into finished musical compositions, in effect demonstrating some of the implicit knowledge that experienced partimento players would have brought to their advanced work.

Two opening chapters illustrate simple and imitative partimenti and explain some of the musical lessons they embody. The dissertation then devotes two chapters to preludes and fugues from the second book of Johann Sebastian Bach’s Well-Tempered Clavier that exist in early and revised versions. The early versions of these works are always simpler than the later ones, and they are shown to reduce to fairly simple partimento-like progressions; specific techniques that Bach uses to change these relatively simple pieces to their finished, canonic forms involve a variety of compositional methods that are explored here, most of them involving techniques of expansion. A still greater variety of techniques, some quite simple, others involving revisions to
the musical form, others producing wholesale changes of genre, appear in the revisions that
Bach’s son Carl Philipp Emanuel undertook when revising an early keyboard suite and several
early sonatas. First written in the 1730s and revised in the following decade, these movements
also reduce to simpler progressions, but exhibit a fuller range of techniques for converting sparse
works to finished forms. Three chapters are devoted to several of these movements by C.P.E.
Bach.

These techniques of elaboration and revision by two generations of the Bach family form
a basis for demonstrations that occupy the dissertation’s final two chapters. In the first
demonstration, a partimento by Fedele Fenaroli is treated to multiple elaborations, from a
figurated upper voice to a more finished, intricate version, as specific points are identified as
suitable for various kinds of expansion, as well as rhythmic and contrapuntal elaboration. The
second demonstration realizes a four-part fugue from the Langloz manuscript in multiple ways,
the first resembling what a keyboard player might first devise, later ones expanding the fugue
with additional subject entries, episodes, stretti, and the like. These demonstrations aim to
recreate possibilities that an advanced partimento player would recognize, realizing in a
stylistically appropriate way some of the possibilities implicit in a partimento’s raw material.
Part I

Features of Partimenti

Thoroughbass, or *basso continuo*, is undeniably the foundational element in music of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—as summarized in a memorable phrase of Johann Sebastian Bach, “*das vollkommste Fundament der Musik.*”\(^1\) Anyone seeking to perform, arrange, study, or teach the music of the time therefore confronts matters relating to thoroughbass as a matter of course. Originating in Italy as a notational innovation for the instrumental accompaniment of vocal polyphony around 1600, the *basso continuo* method spread across Europe and became “the age’s most long-lived technical legacy.”\(^2\) Owing to the pan-European dissemination of the *basso continuo*, thoroughbass traditions diverged as local and regional variants emerged across the generations. In one especially influential tradition, Italian maestros, especially those from Neapolitan conservatories, developed an ingenious device from the shorthand notation for thoroughbass practices, called *partimento*. Although this partimento tradition has been credited exclusively to Italian musicians, the tradition influenced a wide range of eighteenth-century music and has continued as a living tradition until today, as I will explore in what follows.

\(^2\) Lester (1992), 49.
In the two chapters that comprise Part I of this dissertation, I will provide first a
description and reception history of partimento, from its origins as a performance practice to the
recent wave of scholarly research devoted to this important tradition. From there I will realize
and analyze several partimenti, those of the simple kind (partimenti semplici) in Chapter 1, the
more complicated imitative type (partimenti imitati) in Chapter 2.
Chapter 1. *Partimenti Semplici*

1.1. Introduction to Partimento

Partimento is a difficult term to define exactly. It is founded on thoroughbass or *basso continuo*, but no longer conceived in the role of accompaniment. Aside from its clear Italian provenance, the origin of the term is vague and untraceable, since it is hard to find an adequate explanation of partimento recorded in the sources. This lack of precise written definition may be attributed to the Italian maestros themselves, who preferred to teach their students with a “nonverbal theory” and hardly published treatises or rule books.\(^{13}\) Taught orally and learned at the keyboard, handed from master to pupil, the partimenti were then passed down to the students of the students in a chain of oral transmission. As a consequence, most of the historical sources of partimenti are filled with scores and little accompanying text.\(^{14}\)

---

\(^{13}\) Sanguinetti (2012), 9–11. The paucity of printed sources is not limited to the case of partimento. Manuscripts were the main mode of dissemination in Italy—the southern part of Italian peninsula—particularly because a modern publishing industry did not develop until early nineteenth century. Besides, printing music was very expensive: many Italian musicians found copying scores by hand much more convenient than buying printed editions.

\(^{14}\) Ibid., 47–54. Sanguinetti categorizes the types of partimento source into three types: 1) collections of *partimenti* themselves, usually without any accompanying texts; 2) *regole* or *principi* or, less frequently, *istruzioni*, meaning a series of the rules dealing with ways to harmonize an unfigured bass; and 3) written-out realizations, either in *intavolatura* (two-stave system for keyboard) or in *disposizione* (multi-staves). Some texts can be found in the second category, though the written *regole* (rules) are extremely concise and followed by short *partimenti* that illustrates the rules.
In the overall absence of written sources, the earliest known use of the term partimento traces back to 1634, when it appeared in a short treatise by Giovanni Filippo Cavalliere:

This scale is useful to all beginners who wish to learn how to play from the [bass] part. They have to know and memorize it very well, so that if some difficulty arises in performance they know right away all the accidentals that might occur in the partimento, both on the sharp and on the flat side.\textsuperscript{15}

For two centuries after Cavalliere, authors referred continually to partimento as a bass to realize, in those rare cases where Italian sources contain the term.\textsuperscript{16} For instance, Fedele Fenaroli (1730–1818) used the term partimento as a synonym for a bass when explaining bass motions in his celebrated treatise, \textit{Regole musicale per i principianti di Cembalo}. Pietro Lichtenthal (1780–1853) defines partimento as “Exercises on a bass, either figured or unfigured, for the study of harmony and accompaniment” in his \textit{Dizionario e Bibliografia della Musica} (1826).\textsuperscript{17}

While the written sources identify partimento as a bass part well into the nineteenth century, partimenti were not always limited to the bass part in practice. Simple partimenti do usually stay with the bass clef, but a number of partimenti at advanced levels display frequent clef changes throughout the piece. These partimenti with clef changes evince a strong affinity with the Italian notational practice called \textit{basso seguente}.\textsuperscript{18} The \textit{basso seguente} is a term first...

\textsuperscript{15} Giovanni Fillippo Cavalliere (1634), 35. This source was first brought up by Rosa Cafiero (1993), 551. “Questa scala servìrà per li principianti, quali vorranno imparare à suonare su la parte, dalli quali si deverà sapere, e tenere molto bene à memoria, accioche poi occorrendoli qualche difficoltà nel sonare sappiano prontamente tutti li accidenti tanto delli diesis, quanto delli b molli, che occorrer li potranno nel partimento.” My thanks to Stefano Mengozzi for help with this translation.

\textsuperscript{16} These historical sources are listed in Sanguinetti (2012), 10–11.

\textsuperscript{17} Lichtenthal (1826),112. “PARTIMENTI, s.m. pl. Esercizj sul Basso cifrato e non cifrato, per lo studio dell’armonia e dell’accompagnamento.” Pietro [Peter] Lichtenthal was an Austrian writer on music and composer. Having earned his doctoral degree in medicine in Vienna, he settled in Milan as a censor for the government. His \textit{Dizionario e Bibliografia della Musica} is regarded as a momentous work, for its systematic and bibliographic method, despite its many factual errors.

\textsuperscript{18} Sanguinetti (2012), 11. \textit{Bassetto (Bassetgen in German)} was also used as a synonym of \textit{basso seguente}. 
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used by Adriano Banchieri (1568–1634) to describe the *basso continuo* part of a piece;¹⁹ but this single-staffed notation, used for an accompaniment of an ensemble,²⁰ actually differs from the *basso continuo* bass as it describes whichever part that is played *lowest*, not the bass part exclusively. According to Peter van Tour, partimento may have originated from this *basso seguente*, since the term “partimento” is repeatedly used for the *basso seguente* part in the titles of Italian sacred music printed in the seventeenth century.²¹ Nevertheless, this affinity does not truly explain what a partimento is, because in contrast to the *basso seguente*, what is notated in a partimento does not need to be the lowest part. Another crucial difference between *basso seguente* and partimento is the presence of the realization: *basso seguente* is an abbreviated summary of an existing composition, while partimento is a draft for a yet-to-be-realized composition.²²

As mentioned above, partimento did not remain merely a notational device for the practice of accompaniment but continued to progress to a highly evolved pedagogical device. Bernardo Pasquini (1637–1710) of Rome²³ and Alessandro Scarlatti (1660–1725) of Naples composed many figured-bass exercises for their students under the name of partimenti.²⁴ These early partimenti as “instructional bass[es] . . . written for a pedagogical purpose”²⁵ were introduced and developed greatly in the following years, most prominently in four Neapolitan

---

¹⁹ Adriano Banchieri, *Ecclesiatische sinfonie... per sonare et cantare et sopra un basso seguente* op. 16 (Venice, 1607).
²⁰ This ensemble was often a choral fugue, according to van Tour (2015), 214.
²¹ Ibid., 214–15. In these pages, van Tour offers a list of seventeenth-century church music sources in which the word “partimento”; the list can be found in footnote 15. He also lists 20 bassi seguenti that he newly identified, along with their corresponding full score versions, in his appendix III, pp. 278–297.
²² Sanguinetti (2012), 11.
²³ Bernardo Pasquini, famous in his time as a keyboard player and composer, is known to be the first musician who composed partimenti. Sanguinetti asserts that Pasquini’s contribution to the partimento tradition is not to be disregarded in spite of his non-Neapolitan sphere of activity. See Sanguinetti (2012), 58–60.
²⁴ Sanguinetti (2012), 12.
conservatories: Santa Maria di Loreto, Santa Maria della Pietà dei Turchini, Sant’Onofrio, and I Poveri di Gesù Cristo.\textsuperscript{26}

The reasons why partimento traditions flourished at these Neapolitan conservatories can be found in the history and environment of those institutions. The earliest Italian conservatories were established in the sixteenth century to shelter orphans and foundlings, not to conserve music as conservatories do today,\textsuperscript{27} with the major Italian port cities, such as Venice and Naples, featuring the greatest number of charitable religious institutions serving those needy, deprived children.\textsuperscript{28} Some of these institutions started to teach music in the mid-sixteenth century, to offer the orphans a practical and viable skill that would enable them to carve out a career without social status or family support. The Neapolitan maestros needed “practical, musically worthy teaching material that would slowly but surely transform [these] boys into professional musicians.”\textsuperscript{29} Partimenti were effective for this purpose, as the boys needed to acquire a high level of fluency in order to compose and perform at churches, courts, and theaters. Once the students learned the basic \textit{regole} (the rules) of realization, they were given a number of partimenti to work with. Recognizing the musical patterns, or \textit{schemata}, that are shared and repeated in partimenti, and through intense, rote learning of \textit{regole} and schemata, the students could learn how to adapt them to new contexts.\textsuperscript{30} Progressing from the very simple to the most difficult partimenti, they could gradually “build up the rich nonverbal knowledge of

\textsuperscript{26} Although Alessandro Scarlatti did teach at the Neapolitan conservatory of Santa Maria di Loreto in the late seventeenth century, it is hard to conclude that Scarlatti introduced partimenti to the Neapolitans as his periods of employment there were extremely short.
\textsuperscript{27} These early conservatoires trained the children in reading, religion, and a trade, usually of the manufacturing type. See Rosa Cafiero (2005), 16–18.
\textsuperscript{28} While Venice had institutions called \textit{ospedali}, which provided musical training for girls, Naples had conservatori that trained only boys aged seven years and older. See Gjerdingen (2007c), 135–36.
\textsuperscript{29} Gjerdingen (2007b), 479.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 24–30.
improvisation, large-scale form, and motivic coherence” and acquire a complex understanding of the musical styles of the time.\(^{31}\)

These well-trained students contributed to the widening success of the partimento tradition in the eighteenth century, as they could earn income for the conservatories by being hired out to play in churches and theaters.\(^{32}\) With these extra earnings the Neapolitan conservatories could recruit more and more eminent maestros, in turn attracting gifted students and teachers from all over Europe. The European dominance by the Italian musicians trained with partimenti at those conservatories in the eighteenth century, however, is also in virtue of the partimento tradition itself. Partimento no longer consisted of a notational shorthand for accompaniment such as *basso seguente*, or mere figured bass exercises to be realized on the keyboard; it evolved into a unique pedagogical system that provides not only an understanding of a harmonic structure to be unfolded but also skills in imitation and strict counterpoint for the composers-to-be. The Neapolitan training system of these conservatories became the model for many European institutions later established in the first decades of the nineteenth century.\(^{33}\)

Despite the superiority of partimento for training generations of successful composers, followers of the partimento tradition gradually dwindled as the ideas of the Enlightenment began to flourish in the nineteenth century. Instruction in theories of harmony, advanced by Jean-Philippe Rameau and his successors, was in some ways better attuned to the Age of Reason: harmonic theories could be systematically explained, and the knowledge was equally open to anyone who could read. By contrast, the partimento tradition continued to be transmitted orally from maestros to their initiates, and the treatises, such as they were, were mainly filled with

\(^{31}\) Ibid., 479.
\(^{32}\) See Gjerdingen (2007c), 135–36.
\(^{33}\) The influence of the Neapolitan partimento tradition to French music and French institutions are discussed in detail in Rosa Cafiero (2007), 137–59.
music and little fragmentary rules implicitly shared with “insiders.” As a result, what came to be known as the Harmonielehre tradition could take a preeminent position in music history and the history of music theory. The partimento tradition, meanwhile, was considered to have “[fallen] outside the concept of theory” and “pure practice” by nineteenth-century music theorists, eluding the attention of music scholars until recently.

If partimento seems to have been consigned to scholarly oblivion until the last decade or so, it continued as a pedagogical practice in modern European institutions, albeit in somewhat diminished form. In Italy, the home country of the tradition, partimenti, mostly by Fedele Fenaroli (1730–1818) or Niccolò Zingarelli (1752–1837), have been retained in classes where basso continuo and improvisation are taught. Outside Italy, Nadia Boulanger (1887–1979) is another example of this living tradition. This grande dame of French teachers inherited the tradition from her father and her grandfather, whose training can be traced back to the first years of the Paris Conservatory in the 1790s. As is well known, Boulanger taught many leading musicians of the twentieth century, including Aaron Copland, Elliott Carter, Philip Glass, Ross Lee Finney, and Walter Piston. Piston (1894–1976), an American composer and theorist, is worth noting here, as Boulanger assigned him partimenti by Fedele Fenaroli. Piston’s fugue for

---

34 Sanguinetti (2012), 10.
36 Ibid., 6.
37 Sanguinetti (2012), 92. A few Italian maestros kept composing partimenti beyond the nineteenth century: Daniele Napoletano (1872–1943) is one of them, presumably the last partimento composer who consider himself a Leista (a follower of Leonardo Leo).
38 In some religious music institutions, the Pontificio Istituto di Musica Sacra of Rome for example, basic training with partimenti is mandatory for all majors, including those students who are not keyboard majors.
40 Rosenstiel (1998), 188, 231, and 251.
41 Walter Piston was also an author of harmony textbook, Harmony (New York: W. W. Norton, 1941).
quartet on a subject by Fenaroli\textsuperscript{43} is further evidence of the enduring effect of the partimento tradition, its influence extending even to the North American continent.\textsuperscript{44}

In the musicological and theoretical literature, however, the partimento tradition is scarcely a factor in the twentieth century, although an extensive literature has arisen surrounding other improvisation-based forms and genres. The first anthology of partimenti published in the twentieth century is the one by Camillo De Nardis (1857–1951),\textsuperscript{45} published by Ricordi in 1933.\textsuperscript{46} This Italian anthology is still a valuable source for “outsiders” to the partimento tradition even eighty-five years after its publication, as it comprises about 120 partimenti by Neapolitan maestros, including De Nardis himself. Not only does the book offer an expeditious approach to the tradition, encompassing all the generations and schools in one place, it also serves as a modern textbook of partimento training, arranging the partimenti by difficulty and complexity.\textsuperscript{47}

While De Nardis’s 1933 anthology deviates little from the “nonverbal” tradition, an Italian harmony treatise published five years later exhibits a nice mixture of theoretical texts and partimento exercises. The \textit{Elementi Fondamentali di Armonia},\textsuperscript{48} written by Neapolitan composer Gennaro Napoli (1881–1943), a student of De Nardis, begins each section with an explanation of

---


\textsuperscript{44} Although it is hard to specify exactly the relation to the partimento tradition, as he does not use the term partimento, Allen Forte seems to acknowledge and appreciate the pedagogical virtues of partimento. His harmony textbook, \textit{Tonal Harmony in Concept and Practice} (1962 and 1974), used for many years as a textbook at Forte’s institution, Yale University, draws on partimento basses by Italian maestros, such as Giovanni Battista Pergolesi, Arcangelo Corelli and Padre Stanisla Mattei as exercises.

\textsuperscript{45} De Nardis was Italian composer, conductor and pedagogue who taught at the \textit{Conservatorio di Musica San Pietro a Majella} in Naples. He is also the author of a short treatise on harmony, \textit{Corso Teorico-Pratico di Armonia} (1921).

\textsuperscript{46} De Nardis (1933).

\textsuperscript{47} Each partimento of the \textit{Secondo Corso} (the second course) in this anthology is paired with examples of suspensions, so a student may try adding suspensions when realizing the following partimento. This book is still used as one of the textbooks in continuo and improvisation courses in many Italian conservatories. This anthology will be explored more in the following Chapters 2 and 3.

\textsuperscript{48} Gennaro Napoli (1938).
elements of harmony, followed by one or more partimento basses as exercises. Moreover, Napoli appends forty partimento basses to the end of the treatise, basses likely composed by the author himself.\textsuperscript{49} Although Napoli does not use the term partimento for his exercises, it seems reasonable to assume that those basses are indeed partimenti as they retain a strong affinity with exercises so named by earlier Neapolitan maestros.

The second and the last anthology of \textit{partimenti} published in the twentieth century is the one by Jacopo Napoli (1911–1994), the student and son of Gennaro Napoli.\textsuperscript{50} Napoli’s anthology,\textsuperscript{51} as “the last witness of the living, direct tradition,”\textsuperscript{52} also embraces most of the important composers of Neapolitan partimenti from Alessandro Scarlatti to the author’s father, Gennaro Napoli.\textsuperscript{53} In contrast to the De Nardis anthology, which begins with the simplest \textit{partimenti}, Napoli’s collection contains those at a more advanced level: the second partimento by Nicola Sala in Napoli’s anthology\textsuperscript{54} appears as the first one of the \textit{Quarto Corso} (the fourth and the last course, which gives prominence to \textit{partimenti imitati}) of De Nardis’s anthology.\textsuperscript{55} Napoli’s collection contains only twenty-five partimenti, dealing with those of greater length and complexity. One

\textsuperscript{49} These basses under the heading “\textit{Bassi} (basses)” do not specify their composer. It is highly probable that Gennaro Napoli used his own basses for the treatise, as he published a book of 100 basses for the study of composition about two decades later. This book, the first volume of \textit{Bassi-Melodie-Temi: per lo Studio della Composizione} (1961) is also currently used in Italian conservatories for assignments in composition courses.

\textsuperscript{50} Jacopo Napoli studied composition with his father, Gennaro Napoli at \textit{Conservatorio di Musica San Pietro a Majella}, along with organ and piano. After graduation, he taught at the same conservatory, as well as the one in Cagliari in Sardegna. He served later as the director of many important Italian conservatories: of Naples (1954–62; 1976–78), Milan (1962–72) and Rome (1972–76).

\textsuperscript{51} Napoli (1959).

\textsuperscript{52} Sanguinetti (2012), 92.

\textsuperscript{53} The partimenti composers featured in Napoli’s anthology are roughly in chronological order: Alessandro Scarlatti (1660–1725; No. 1); Nicola Sala (1713–1801; No. 2); Leonardo Leo (1694–1744; No. 3); Francesco Durante (1684–1755; Nos. 4–7); Carlo Cotumacci (1709–1785; Nos. 8–9); Niccolò Zingarelli (1752–1837; Nos. 10–12); Fedele Fenaroli (1730–1818; No. 13); Giovanni Paisiello (1740–1816; Nos. 15–20); Pietro Platania (1828–1907; Nos. 21–22); Camillo De Nardis (1857–1951; No. 23); and Gennaro Napoli (1881–1943; Nos. 24–25).

\textsuperscript{54} Napoli (1959), 3.

\textsuperscript{55} De Nardis (1933), 74.
feature of this anthology is especially striking: in the second part of the book, eight of the twenty-five partimenti are fully realized, thus providing a glimpse of a largely hidden tradition.\(^{56}\)

Earlier in the century, around the same time\(^{57}\) that De Nardis’s anthology was published, the German musicologist Karl Gustav Fellerer (1902–1984) “rediscovered” some partimento manuscripts in the Santini collection in Münster, Germany.\(^{58}\) Except for the last generation of the Neapolitan school mentioned above, Fellerer was the only one to study and appreciate the partimento tradition before the recent “second wave of rediscovery.” In his first essay on partimento (1934), Fellerer draws attention to the dual nature of partimento; partimenti were not merely thoroughbass exercises for students but also pieces that were close to being completely written out.\(^{59}\) Some years later, Fellerer published a small anthology Der Partimentospieler (1940), which contains fifteen partimenti mainly from the Santini collection he had discovered in Münster. In the introduction to this anthology he emphasizes the usefulness of partimento playing to improvisation, stressing that “guided improvisation” of partimento provides a crucial preparation for improvisation of a freer type:

This improvisational design for partimento playing is of the utmost importance to training in free improvisation. Partimento playing is guided improvisation. The thematic content and the form are given, but the final

---

\(^{56}\) Partimenti by G. Paisiello (Nos. 16–18), F. Durante (No. 5), N. Zingarelli (Nos. 11–12), L. Leo (No. 3), C. Cotumacci (No. 8). The ordering of the second part seems to be random, but the last one from Paisiello (No. 16 of the first part) is very close to a finished piece.

\(^{57}\) Though published around the same time, the works by Fellerer and the ones by the last generation of the Neapolitan partimento school are not connected in any way.

\(^{58}\) Sanguinetti (2012), 12–14, 26. Sanguinetti speculates that the manuscript Fellerer used for his anthology is Elementi per ben accompagnare sul cembalo e organo by Luigi Antonio Sabbatini (1939–1809), a Franciscan monk who studied in Bologna with Padre Martini and later in Padua with Francesco Antonio Vallotti.

arrangement of the piece on that basis is left to the performer’s imagination.⁶⁰

Fellerer’s anthology starts with short preliminary exercises (Vorübungen) by Francesco Durante (1684–1755), which are essentially figured bass exercises featuring various sequences with suspensions; at the end of the anthology, one realization of a partimento given earlier, No. 3 in D minor, is presented.⁶¹ Fellerer’s insightful attempt to study the partimento tradition was preempted, unfortunately, by the outbreak of World War II,⁶² and partimento missed an opportunity to be explored by music scholars, despite the increasing research into the historical performance of Baroque music after the war.

Several decades would pass before the term partimento began to rise quietly to the surface of music scholarship, a trend spurred in part by growing interest in the historically informed performance of Baroque music. Music scholars began to study and produce editions of important partimento manuscripts.⁶³ Of these scholars, the first in North America to pay scholarly attention to the partimento tradition seems to have been Tharald Borgir. In a dissertation on basso continuo (1971)⁶⁴ and later in his book The Performance of the Basso Continuo in Italian Baroque Music,⁶⁵ Borgir discussed the Neapolitan partimento tradition as it related to continuo practice. He also explored how and why the partimento tradition was neglected by scholars after


⁶¹ This realized partimento is indicated as one by Luigi Antonio Sabbatini, but Sanguinetti considers the attribution to Sabbatini likely a misreading of the manuscript. Sanguinetti notes that at least the following partimento (No. 4 in C major) is composed by Leonardo Leo, not Sabbatini. See Sanguinetti (2012), 26.

⁶² Gjerdingen (2007b), 480.

⁶³ Gjerdingen (2007a), 87.

⁶⁴ Borgir, Basso Continuo in Italy during the Seventeenth Century (1971).

⁶⁵ Borgir (2010), 141–47.
the nineteenth century, regretting the absence of the term partimento even in the renowned volumes of F. T. Arnold. Although Borgir defines partimento as “a bass part that calls for a realization in the treble” and his discussion is mainly focused on the Durante school, he does acknowledge the significance of partimento training:

[Gaetano Greco (ca. 1657–ca. 1728)’s] pedagogical ideas were developed and refined by Francesco Durance into a method that remained the model for Neapolitan teachers until the end of the century. Fenaroli’s highly successful partimento manual, reissued time and again and held in high esteem far into the nineteenth century, follows the format established by Durante. . . . [His] work . . . surely remains the most comprehensive treatment of the subject . . . [and his] teaching method is surely one of the significant documents in the history of continuo practice. Not only does it provide a solid grounding in fundamentals but it also helps develop specialized skills such as improvising a florid line above the bass.

As Robert Gjerdingen has noted, “the pace of research accelerated” in the 1990s. David Ledbetter’s widely recognized 1990 book on George Frederic Handel’s figured bass exercises for Princess Anne reveals the similarity of Handel’s approach to the stages of partimento training: starting from the simplest basses, the exercises advance to realizing fugues. Even though Ledbetter does not use the term partimento in this book, it may be safely said that these exercises

---

66 Ibid., 141. Borgir is referring The Art of Accompaniment from a Thorough-Bass as Practiced in the XVIIth and XVIIIth Centuries by Frank Thomas Arnold.
67 Ibid., 141.
68 Ibid., 142 and 147.
69 Gjerdingen (2007a), 88.
70 David Ledbetter, Continuo Playing according to Handel (1990).
are indeed partimenti, as it is a well-known fact that Handel was taught by an Italian composer, Nicola Porpora (1686–1768). Though to an extent superseded by the more extensively commented and illustrated edition of Handel’s exercises, edited by Ludwig Holtmeier, Johannes Menke, and Felix Diergarten (2008), Ledbetter’s book helped inaugurate the new wave of partimento studies.

Returning to the English-language literature, Thomas Christensen, in a 1992 article, offers useful insights on the “Rule of the Octave,” which is a set of rules governing how each scale degree of ascending and descending scales can be realized and usually the first topic introduced in a partimento manuscript. William Renwick focused his attention on complexities of imitative partimenti, noting in his book Analyzing Fugue: a Schenkerian Approach (1995) that partimento fugues can form a link between an exercise and a fully composed fugue. Renwick carried over this observation to the publication of a modern edition of the Langloz manuscript (2001), which contains German partimento fugues attributed to J. S. Bach.

Partimento starts to reappear in publications in Italy as well. Federico Del Sordo, an Italian organist, continuo player, and musicologist, treats partimenti as a part of thoroughbass practice in his book, Il Basso Continuo (1996). Comprising multi-national sources that are both historical and contemporary, Del Sordo divides basso continuo pedagogy into three categories, according to the presence of texts and musical examples: 1) Trattatistica (treatises); 2)

---

72 The partimenti in the Langloz Manuscript (Mus. ms. Bach P 296) are presumed to be composed from the circle of J. S. Bach, not entirely by Bach himself. Confusion about the authorship resulted from the inscription of Bach’s name on the title page of the manuscript.
Metodistica (methodical); and 3) Mista (mixed). Del Sordo assigns partimenti to the second category, in which “the author does not elaborate too much on the theoretical rules but tends more toward providing practical training”; that is, partimenti offer a “methodical” approach in which students learn how to deal with performing on the keyboard. He ventures to call the training “muscular,” in order to emphasize the practical side of partimento training, in which students are expected to learn music with their fingers moving, activating their muscle memory. Other discussions that focus more on partimento-specific topics in the 1990s include those by Rosa Cafiero and Giorgio Sanguinetti. Cafiero (1993) describes partimento training at the Neapolitan conservatories of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries, surveying the archival sources relating to partimento. Sanguinetti (1997) observes how the partimento tradition continued in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Italy.

Two pioneering partimento scholars, Sanguinetti—already cited several times in this chapter—and Robert Gjerdingen have become leaders in “the second stage of rediscovery” in the twenty-first century. In his celebrated book The Art of Partimento: History, Theory and Practice (2012), Sanguinetti guides modern readers through the length and breadth of the partimento tradition, from the flourishing of that tradition in eighteenth-century Naples to its decline in the course of the nineteenth century. Not only does Sanguinetti present a chronicled history of partimento, but he reconstructs the “rules” of partimento realization in a compendium

---

74 Ibid., 23–29. According to Del Sordo, many well-known English treatises on thoroughbass—such as F. T. Arnold’s The Art of Accompaniment from a Thorough-Bass as Practised in the XVIIth and XVIIIth centuries (1931); Hans Keller’s Thoroughbass Method (1965); Peter Williams’s Figured Bass Accompaniment (1970) fall into the first category, as do German treatises, such as Walter Kolneder’s Schule des Generalbaßspiels (1983) and Jesper Boje Christensen’s Die Grundlagen des Generalbaßspiels im 18. Jahrhundert (1992).

75 Ibid., 25. “Nella metodistica... l’autore non si dilunga molto sulle regole teoriche ma tende più a dare un’educazione pratica, direi muscolare.”

76 Cafiero (1993), 549–79.


78 Gjerdingen (2017b), 480.
based on sources scattered throughout thousands of pages of manuscripts. Sanguinetti offers, moreover, “a practical guide to the use of partimenti as living teaching tools,”\(^{79}\) introducing realization techniques and a few sample realizations, as well as diverse styles of partimento repertoire. Thus, he invites “outsiders” into the partimento tradition, leading them to understand this esoteric, once-forgotten art.

Gjerdingen, on the other hand, addresses partimento more from the cognitive and pedagogical point of view. His *Music in the Galant Style* (2007) and subsequent articles focus on the concept of musical *schema*. He defines schemata as the “stock musical phrases employed in conventional sequences.”\(^{80}\) These schemata are “well-learned exemplar[s]”\(^{81}\) that the students acquire as idioms, a kind of vocabulary, to use in partimento, which can be explained as:

- a bass to a virtual ensemble that played in the mind of the student and
- became sound through realization at the keyboard. In behavioral terms, the
- partimento, which often changed clefs temporarily to become any voice in
- the virtual ensemble, provided a series of stimuli to a series of schemata,
- and the learned responses of the student resulted in the multi-voice fabric of
- a series of phrases and cadences.\(^{82}\)

In the later part of his book, Gjerdingen takes an Italian term “*il filo*” (the thread) as a musical concept that “guides the listener through a musical work.”\(^{83}\) In Gjerdingen’s view, a partimento is similar to a “continuity draft” for a composer, which is a single-staff notational

---

\(^{79}\) Sanguinetti (2012), viii.
\(^{80}\) Ibid., 6.
\(^{81}\) Ibid., 11.
\(^{82}\) Ibid., 25.
\(^{83}\) Ibid., 11.
shorthand for entire works or sections of works as the proper embodiment of *il filo*. He also sees the power of partimento system laying:

in its simple method of integrating the craft knowledge of small harmonic-contrapuntal schemata into the aesthetic, performative experience of a complete musical movement. It was wonderful training for composers and improvisers, who learned how to create a total fabric from a single thread.\(^8^4\)

Sanguinetti picks up this thread and compares the partimento to the “continuity draft,” familiar to students of composers’ sketches and drafts. Despite the similarity, the “continuity draft” is an intermediate stage toward the written composition, which might be the result of an act of improvisation, whereas partimento aims at composition through improvisation.

The outstanding work of Gjerdingen and Sanguinetti has inspired other musicologists and music theorists to join the partimento renaissance. For example, several recent studies have reexamined valuable historical manuscript sources, as these rarities, formerly accessible only in archives, have become available to musicians worldwide. In addition to Gjerdingen’s website *Monuments of Partimenti*,\(^8^5\) which was the first to make partimento collections accessible online, the *Uppsala Partimento Database*\(^8^6\) by Peter van Tour offers a massive online database for Italian partimento repertoire, searchable in several ways. Modern reproductions of partimento sources are coming into print as well. The *Bassi e Fughe* of Francesco Durante (1684–1755), which had remained unpublished, became available in a modern edition for the first time in 2003, compiled by Giuseppe A. Pastore.\(^8^7\) Most recently, a complete edition of 189 partimenti\(^8^8\)

\(^8^4\) Gjerdingen (2007a), 126.
\(^8^7\) Francesco Durante, (2003).
\(^8^8\) Nicola Sala, *The 189 Partimenti of Nicola Sala*, edited by Peter van Tour (2017).
by Nicola Sala (1713–1801) was published with van Tour’s insightful commentaries. In addition, van Tour’s *Counterpoint and Partimento* \(^{89}\) presents a critical historiography of the partimento tradition and its pedagogy, examining eighteenth-century primary sources that he regards as having been misunderstood or misattributed. And new light has been shed on Neapolitan partimento maestros by Italian scholars as well. A collection of articles presented at a national conference held in Fedele Fenaroli’s birthplace Lanciano, Chieti\(^{90}\) was published in 2011;\(^{91}\) and a 2015 monograph by Fabio Dell’Aversana presents a useful discussion of keyboard pieces by two eminent Italian maestros, Fedele Fenaroli and Domenico Cimarosa (1749–1801).\(^{92}\)

With this burgeoning of scholarship in partimento, some trends have begun to emerge, with partimento’s main function as a pedagogical device naturally receiving the lion’s share of attention. As mentioned above, Gjerdingen maintains his focus on the empirical learning of schemata by means of partimento training, a focus evident in his articles since the publication of *Music in the Galant Style*. David Lodewyckx and Pieter Bergé (2014) survey the current state of partimento education in eight different European countries.\(^{93}\) Meanwhile, in the United States, Gilad Rabinovitch and Johnandrew Slominski, working with Gjerdingen’s schemata theory, have begun developing a pedagogical approach for teaching modern-day students through experimental workshops they have been conducting at the Eastman School of Music.\(^{94}\) *Harmony, Counterpoint, Partimento* by Job IJzerman, forthcoming in 2018, promises a similar approach and intends to offer an alternative textbook for undergraduate students, integrating three

---

\(^{90}\) Atti del Convegno Nazionale, Lanciano, November 2008.  
\(^{91}\) Miscia, *Fedele Fenaroli il didatta e il compositore* (2011).  
\(^{92}\) Fabio Dell’Aversana, (2015).  
\(^{93}\) Lodewycks and Bergé (2014), 146–69.  
\(^{94}\) Rabinovitch and Slominski (2015).
elements—harmony, counterpoint, and partimento, which are usually taught separately—into one volume.95 It remains to be seen whether these trends in education lead to a wholesale revision of modern curricula for the general music student, many of whom lack even basic keyboard skills, but trend lines are starting to emerge.

For musicians already skilled at the keyboard but seeking to develop their powers of improvisation, partimento training continues to offer advantages, as Fellerer already observed in the mid-twentieth century. In Sanguinetti’s words, the “main purpose [of partimento] is to be a guide for improvisation of a composition at the keyboard.”96 New publications devoted to improvisation specifically include those by Edoardo Bellotti, who analyzes Adriano Banchieri’s Organo Suonario, and by Spiridionis a Monte Carmelo, the Nova Instructio: pro Pulsandis Organis; both indicate how to improvise and compose at the keyboard.97 Michael Callahan illustrates how the improvisational learning process of partimenti is applied to present day classrooms, based on his own teaching experience.98

In addition to pedagogy and keyboard improvisation, the multi-faceted character of partimento allows for other perspectives as well, including those oriented more toward written counterpoint, where the focus shifts to integrating a variety of musical elements. In the aforementioned Counterpoint and Partimento (2015),99 van Tour links partimento directly to counterpoint, an aspect which had received less attention in partimento scholarship. This shift is already noticeable in van Tour’s definition of partimento:

---

95 Cited from Job IJzerman’s abstract for his article “Harmony, Counterpoint, Partimento: A New Method Inspired by Old Masters” presented at the 9th European Music Analysis conference (EUROMAC 9, 2017).
97 Bellotti (2017), 115–130.
98 Callahan (2017), 185–203.
a notational device, commonly written on a single staff in the F clef, either figured or unfigured, applied both in playing and in writing activities, and used for developing skills in the art of accompaniment, improvisation, diminution, and counterpoint.\(^\text{100}\)

Striking in van Tour’s definition is that partimento can be “applied both in playing and in writing activities.” In contrast to some previous studies which emphasized keyboard improvisation as the strongest benefit of studying partimento, van Tour asserts that partimento was not used for keyboard playing alone. This view connects nicely with the definition of partimento that Sanguinetti proposes in a later chapter of his book, partimento as a “potential musical work.” That is, while a partimento is most often a bass line, it also contains complex implications for voice leading, melody, and even imitation.\(^\text{101}\)

It is this perspective—that a partimento may be viewed as a potential musical work—that this dissertation takes as its point of departure. That is, a well-composed partimento need not be treated only as exercise in keyboard playing or improvisation; it is more a set of compositional potentialities, which can be taken much further, from a simple realization to a finished work. A few scholars have already begun laying the foundation for this kind of approach: van Tour analyzes and presents the workbooks of partimento students in the eighteenth century; Vasili Byros attempts to compose his own prelude from a partimento in the Langloz Manuscript;\(^\text{102}\) and Sanguinetti treats a partimento by Giacomo Tritto (1733–1824) to a realization in sonata form (2017).\(^\text{103}\) This more compositionally oriented approach to partimento

\(^{100}\) Ibid., 35.
\(^{101}\) Sanguinetti (2012), 167 and 11.
\(^{103}\) Sanguinetti (2017), 149–71.
is the one that the rest of this dissertation will pursue, beginning with a survey of some key compositional techniques that even simple partimenti teach.

1.2. Partimenti Semplici

The rest of this chapter will examine three simple partimenti from Primo Corso (the first course) of De Nardis’s anthology, chosen to represent a range of features shared among works in the Neapolitan partimento tradition. The first course comprises twenty-four simple, mostly unfigured partimenti chosen from the first books in collections by Fedele Fenaroli (1730–1818) and Niccolò Zingarelli (1752–1837). Ordered progressively by difficulty and complexity, these partimenti are provided in every major and minor key according to the circle of fifths, allowing students to gain facility with every tonality. Tempi and time signatures are also varied, for the sake of diversity, and with few exceptions the length of each partimento and number of measures gradually increase.

Though a few intermittent figures are given in the partimenti of De Nardis's Primo Corso, most of the works are unfigured, meaning that the basses tend to follow standard and predictable patterns that imply the predominant use of consonant chords. For the beginner a knowledge of cadences and the Rule of the Octave would suffice; yet more advanced students could also

---

104 The anthology consists of four courses. Secondo Corso (the second course) includes twenty-five partimenti of moderate difficulty by Fedele Fenaroli and De Nardis himself, each introduced by a set of musical examples using various suspensions. Terzo Corso (the third course) offers about fifty partimenti—that are relatively long and complex—composed by Neapolitan maestros, such as Giacomo Tritto, Francesco Durante, Nicola Sala, Leonardo Leo, Padre Stanislao Mattei, and Carlo Cotumacci. Quarto Corso (the fourth course) is dedicated to about twenty partimenti imitati by several Neapolitan maestros.

105 The exceptions are no. 5 of fifty-five measures and no. 16 of sixteen measures.
benefit from these simple partimenti, developing experience in melodic construction and in the incorporation of motives presented in the bass. In what follows I will present each partimento in its original unfigured form (as transmitted by De Nardis), followed by my own realization, with the implied figures added below the bass tones. For the sake of clarity, I occasionally include figures (such as $\frac{3}{4}$) that would ordinarily be omitted were the bass originally figured. The discussion will focus on formal features typical of these works and shared among many pieces of this type. Each presents its own simple compositional design.

1.2.1. Partimento in A minor (Zingarelli)

Example 1.1. Simple partimento in A minor

\[\text{Example 1.1. Simple partimento in A minor}^{106}\]

---

\[^{106}\text{As reproduced in De Nardis (1933), 1.}\]
Example 1.2. Realization of partimento in A minor

This A-minor partimento by Niccolò Zingarelli (1752–1837) occupies a prominent place on the very first page of De Nardis’s anthology. The partimento takes the minimal shape that a *partimento semplice* might take, but the pedagogic purpose of it is apparent from the opening
theme. The theme (mm. 1–4) is so simple that it may be realized with only I and V chords, yet it covers all the inversions of the V chord that resolve to the I chord (Example 1.3).

Example 1.3. Theme of the partimento, realized only with I and V (mm. 1–4)

The opening theme (mm. 1–4) is repeated in its relative major key (mm. 6–9) and returns to the home key (mm. 13–16), as most partimenti in minor keys do. This final statement is marked by short solo scale with eighth notes in m. 12. Between the first and the second statement, another V–I resolution is practiced with a simple fonte sequence, an essential progression that can take any theme to any key (Example 1.4).

Example 1.4. Fonte sequence preparing the second statement in C major

Before the recapitulation of the theme in m. 13, the intention of the composer seems obvious, as he keeps utilizing different inversions of I and V exclusively (mm. 9–12), in order to return to
the home key. After the last statement of the theme (mm. 9–13), the second half of the theme is repeated in the subdominant key (D minor) to prepare the final cadence (Example 1.5).

**Example 1.5.** The final statement in the home key and part of it repeated in the subdominant key (mm. 13–18)

As illustrated in the first system of Example 1.6, the rest of the partimento could be simply realized with simple IV–V–I cadence, according to the original figures given (♮–♯3). However, this A-minor partimento is not limited only to I and V chords but could be realized with other appropriate chords, such as the chord of the augmented sixth or the cadenza doppia, as shown in the second system of Example 1.6.
Example 1.6. Two different realizations of the last cadence (mm. 18–20)

In spite of its simplicity, one can observe how instructive this A-minor partimento is, and how solid its foundation as a very basic, elementary sketch of a piece. The features discussed above—the theme that travels through closely related keys with connections by a sequential continuation, and the big dominant area before the recapitulation in the home key, and the subdominant area preparing the final cadence—are an undeniably useful basis for composition. They can be found in a great many partimenti.
1.2.2. Partimento in A major (Fenaroli)

Example 1.7. Unfigured simple partimento in A major\textsuperscript{107}

\textsuperscript{107} As reproduced in De Nardis (1933), 2, with measure numbers added. This partimento was originally no. 3 of Fenaroli’s \textit{Libro Primo} (Book One: the first of the six books of partimenti).
Example 1.8. Realization of partimento in A major
The opening theme of this partimento (mm. 1–4) is repeated in its dominant key (mm. 6–9) with slight changes in the second and third measures (Example 1.9). Sequential continuations prepare a return to the home key where the opening theme is recapitulated, this final statement, presented in mm. 16–19, back firmly in the tonic key.

Example 1.9. Theme of the partimento, in the tonic key (mm. 1–4) and restatement in the dominant key (mm. 6–9)

Connecting the first statement of the theme (mm. 1–4) to the second statement in the dominant key (mm. 6–9), two measures (mm. 4–5) form a modulatory bridge. As illustrated in Example 1.10, this short bridge can be divided into two parts: a downward stepwise bass motion from A to E, and a cadential gesture with an octave leap on B. The stepwise motion, which a student could realize using part of the Rule of the Octave, is often found in partimenti for modulations down by a fourth or up a fifth; in this case it allows for a direct connection between the chords of the home scale and temporary keys within the partimento as a whole. Fenaroli could have launched the second statement of the theme right away at the downbeat of m. 5, but instead he adds one

108 For the exact repetition, the G♯ at the second beat of measure 8 should be high E. But it seems that Fenaroli did not want to have such a high note for his bass, or that he wanted to end the restatement in the dominant with 1-3-4-5 bass movement. This bass movement is very common in partimenti by Neapolitan maestros.
more measure of cadential bass, which can be realized with *cadenza composta* (4–3 suspension), confirming the dominant key, E major. Bridges like this one are highly instructive for a variety of compositional situations, as they teach students how to connect the subject and its answer with a modulatory link.

![Example 1.10. Modulatory Bridge, mm. 4–5](image-url)

Following the second statement of the theme in the dominant key, a series of sequences built on the head motive (m. 1–2) forms a long continuation (mm. 9–15). As shown in Example 1.11, the music modulates from the dominant key (E major) to a tone higher (F# minor) through the chromatic bass ascent (E-E#-F#, mm. 9–10). That is, the tonic of the established key rises a semitone and the bass becomes the leading tone of the new key, which of course will rise again to the tonic of the new key by a semitone. This, too, is a common feature of partimenti, and Fenaroli uses the connection to a new tonic from its leading tone as means of moving rapidly
into new keys he wants to establish. In other words, students will learn that 7-I of the *fonte* sequence grants an ease of mobility to any key.

Example 1.11. Modulating *fonte* sequences, mm. 9–16

The arresting of eighth-note motion and lengthening to a whole note of the bass E at the penultimate measure (m. 20) suggests a *cadenza doppia*, even though the partimento is entirely unfigured (Example 1.12). The presence of the *cadenza doppia* is also common and highly idiomatic, especially for the simple partimenti; indeed, of the twenty-four partimenti in the first course of De Nardis, twenty-one (except nos. 13, 15, and 21—all coincidentally in triple meter) employ the *cadenza doppia* at the end.
One can see how instructive such a simple and elegant design would be. The idiomatic opening gambit (the tonic theme and dominant answer, connected by a bridge), sequential continuation through closely related keys, return to the home key marked by a reprise of the opening subject, and a final extended cadence—all these have direct applications to composition generally, including to pieces written in more complex genres like fugue.

Example 1.12. *Cadenza doppia*, mm. 19–21
1.2.3. Partimento in C minor (Fenaroli)

Example 1.13. Simple partimento in C minor\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{109} As reproduced in De Nardis (1933), 6, with measure numbers added. This partimento was originally no. 8 of Fenaroli’s Libro Primo.
Example 1.14. Realization of Partimento in C minor, mm. 1–32
Also by Fenaroli, this partly figured partimento in C minor is longer than the partimento in A major just discussed, as it has five statements of the theme rather than just three. As in the shorter A-major partimento, the opening theme (mm. 1–5) is restated; but now the restatement appears in the relative major, E♭ major (mm. 9–13), as do most such restatements in minor-key partimenti. The theme is repeated soon in F minor (the subdominant key, mm. 15–19) and in G minor (dominant minor key, mm. 21–25), with the final statement back in the tonic key occurring much later, just before the end (mm. 43–47). Between the first statement of the theme (mm. 1–5) and the second statement in the dominant key (mm. 9–13), there are four measures (mm. 5–8) of a modulatory bridge. Rather than being based on the Rule of the Octave, this bridge consists of descending fonte sequence (suggested by the given figure; see m. 6 in Example 1.13) and cadential bass motion of 4-2-5-1 (Example 1.15).
Example 1.15. Modulatory bridge between first two statements, mm. 5–9

Following the second statement in the relative major (E♭ major) the music modulates by chromatic bass ascent (E–E♭–F, mm. 13–15) to the F minor statement, continuing to the G minor statement again by bass ascent (F–F♯–G, mm. 19–21). As we observed in the modulations of the A-major partimento, such chromatic bass ascents are easily found in partimenti realizations; accompanied by a soprano descent with contrary motion (boxed in Example 1.16), they make an especially smooth shift to the new key.

Example 1.16. Chromatic bass ascents for modulation, mm. 13–21
Unlike the previous partimento in A major, this partimento carries occasional figures: on the repeated dominant G (mm. 30–33) and tonic C (mm. 38–41, Example 1.13). These figures—especially 4 of m. 31 and m. 39—suggest two couplets of four measures (mm. 26–29 and mm. 30–33 / mm. 34–37 and mm. 38–42). Namely, mm. 26–29 and mm. 30–33 could be harmonized with V-i-V-i, and in the same way, mm. 34–37 and mm. 38–42 could be harmonized with V-i-V-I in iv. The alternating harmonies also induce triple counterpoint, as demonstrated in Example 1.17. This idea of possible inverted counterpoint suggested by given figures is another beneficial feature of partimenti, one that proves highly useful for the study of imitative works.

Example 1.17. Triple counterpoint, mm. 25–41

Fenaroli’s handling of the partimento's close is also instructive, as it shows extension techniques not encountered in the first partimento examined here. The use of the subdominant with the tonic pedal point in mm. 34–41 shows one point of extension: One might attach the last
statement of the theme (mm. 43–47) as soon as the music arrives on the tonic chord (C minor) at m. 33, but Fenaroli expands the piece by eight measures going to the subdominant with the tonic pedal, as if perhaps to pass through the tonic on the way to the subdominant. Fenaroli also appends two additional measures to the piece (mm. 48–49), repeating the final two cadential measures after the last statement of the theme. Such repeated cadences are also commonly found in partimenti, as a means for extending a piece and reinforcing its close.

Though broadly similar in idiom to the A-minor partimento and A-major partimento, this longer C-minor partimento shows additional techniques of composition. The modulating fonte sequence to bridge from the subject to the answer, the use of the mediant answer in a minor-mode piece, the orderly progression through subdominant to dominant thematicized by transpositions of the main subject, the marking of the dominant arrival by a pedal point answered by a tonic pedal point inflecting the music toward the subdominant, and the repetition of cadences to enlarge the ending and strengthen closure—all these could only benefit the attentive student learning how phrases combine with theme and tonal progression to form a complete piece. And by incorporating simple forms of invertible counterpoint, a partimento like this one can only heighten a musician's alertness to the possibilities for passing a theme and its counterpoints from one voice to another. That is a key ingredient of imitative writing, which will be the topic of the next chapter.
Chapter 2. Partimenti Imitati Fugati

This chapter will examine another two partimenti, both at a more advanced level: 1) a partimento imitato from the Quarto Corso (fourth course) of the De Nardis anthology; 2) a partimento fugue from the Langloz manuscript. The first of these differs from the partimenti previously discussed, chiefly by the introduction of fugato techniques, without yet being a full-fledged fugue. The second stands a step closer to a genuine fugue, with a complete exposition and various episodes; as such it invites realizations of greater complexity and thematic integration. Without representing a radical shift from the techniques practiced in simpler pieces, this Langloz partimento fugue brings us closer to the kinds of piece that J. S. Bach wrote for his students and adapted for inclusion in the Well-Tempered Clavier.

2.1. Partimento Imitato in C minor (Fenaroli)

This partimento in C minor is from the fourth course of De Nardis’s anthology, which is composed of partimenti imitati by Neapolitan maestros.\(^\text{110}\) Most of these partimenti imitati

\(^{110}\) By Nicola Sala (1713–1801), Fedele Fenaroli (1730–1818), Leonardo Leo (1694–1744), Alessandro Scarlatti (1660–1725), and even as modern as Pietro Platania (1828–1907).
employ “Bassi imitati fugati” (imitated fugal basses), a type of an exercise developed for the study of fugue in the nineteenth century, and still in use in Italian conservatories for composition lessons. As Alfredo de Ninno (1894–1965) points out in the last chapter of his harmony treatise, which is dedicated to this kind of fugal bass exercise, “this type of piece has not been taken into consideration by any theorist so far in spite of its great importance” and usefulness.\textsuperscript{111} Pieces with this style of imitated bass, though having all the features of the fugue, do not have a rigid construction, just as a partimento semplice was more of a primary sketch of a potential piece. The elements of the fugue—subject, answer, countersubject, episodes, stretto, pedal, and so forth—are the same, but they are used with greater freedom.\textsuperscript{112} The partimento imitato with imitated bass can be understood as a transformed form of the partimento fugue, which usually gives the first phrase as a subject and the second phrase as an answer in a short fugato exercise.\textsuperscript{113}

As Emanuele Imbimbo\textsuperscript{114} (1756–1839) mentions in his introduction to the second volume of Fenaroli’s Partimenti, the purpose of bassi fugati was to challenge the students and to facilitate their becoming distinguished composers.\textsuperscript{115} Nevertheless, these are steps toward the ultimate stage of long partimento training, as they require “the polyphonic figuration of schemata internalized by partimento students.”\textsuperscript{116} William Renwick also explains that they reflect “a

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., 310. “Il basso di stile fugato pur avendo tutti I caratteri della fuga, non ne ha, tuttavia, a rigida costruzione; gli elementi (soggetto, risposta, contrasoggetto, divertimenti, stretto, pedale, ecc.) sono gli stessi, ma vengono impiegati con una maggiore libertà.”
\textsuperscript{113} De Ninno argues that the subject may appear later and even in a key that is not the initial key, and likewise, the countersubject may also appear in the most unexpected points of the bass. “Nei bassi di stile fugato, invece, il soggetto può presentarsi anche più tardi e in un tonalità che non è quella iniziale e analogamente, anche il contrasoggetto può fare la sua apparizione nei punti più impensati del basso.”
\textsuperscript{114} Emanuele Imbimbo (1756–1839) published the first annotated edition of Fenaroli’s theoretical work and partimenti in Paris in 1814.
\textsuperscript{115} Cafiero (2007), 146.
\textsuperscript{116} Diergarten (2011), 61.
method of conceptualizing fugal composition and improvisation as an extension and refinement of thoroughbass.\textsuperscript{117}

Following are examples of a partimento imitato by Fenaroli, as reproduced in De Nardis’s anthology (Example 2.1) and its realization (Example 2.2).

\textsuperscript{117} Renwick (2001), 6.
Example 2.1. *Partimento imitato* in C minor

As reproduced in De Nardis (1933), 78, with measure numbers added. This partimento is originally included as no. 40 of Fenaroli’s *Libro Quarto* (Book Four: the fourth of the six books of partimenti).
Example 2.2. Realization of *Partimento Imitato* in C minor, mm. 1–20
Example 2.2. Realization of *Partimento Imitato* in C minor, mm. 21–48 [Cont’d]
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As illustrated in **Example 2.3**, the figures given in mm. 4–6 suggest a real answer, starting with a leap from G (5 above the bass note C) to Eb (3 above the bass note C an octave higher). The figures also imply invertible counterpoint. That is, the subject (mm. 1–4) will be placed on top in mm. 4–6, transposed to dominant minor key (G minor), and the bass given in mm. 4–6 will be the counteranswer. This realization supposes that the final figure in m. 5, given as "8" by De Nardis, is a misreading of a "5" in Fenaroli's original.

![Example 2.3. Subject and countersubject, mm. 1–7](image)

As can be seen in the realization given in **Example 2.2**, the *partimenti imitati* from the fourth course of the De Nardis book are not yet to be considered full-fledged fugues, since they lack, among other things, an opening exposition beyond the kind of statement-answer pattern typically found in non-imitative partimenti. Still, these are far more extended and elaborated than the partimenti of the first course that we examined earlier: the themes are stated several times, not just in their tonic-dominant (or relative)-tonic way, but freely exploring their closely related keys; and the spaces between the themes are filled with even longer modulating sequences.

After the opening statements of the subject and the answer (mm. 1–7: **Example 2.3**), this C minor partimento does not give any other subject entry until m. 20. Instead, two episodes are
presented. For the first episode, as shown in *Example 2.4*, the music modulates from G minor to C minor (mm. 8–11), and from C minor to F minor (mm. 11–14), using a technique similar to the modulations we saw earlier by segments of the Rule of the Octave. To preserve the spirit of the *partimento imitato*, the given figures 4–3 arouse close imitations at the distance of one measure in the upper part, creating a quasi-stretto against the bass.

![Example 2.4. Episode 1, mm. 8–14](image)

The following episode 2, on the other hand, makes its way back to G minor by descending-fifths sequence. As can be seen in *Example 2.5*, the figures given in m. 17 again invite the player to imitate the bass line, as the first three measures (mm. 14–16) fit the top line of the second three measures (mm. 17–19). Here again the modulatory techniques are inherited from simpler partimenti, but a significant new textural requirement has been added, the requirement for imitative realization.

![Example 2.5. Episode 2, mm. 14–19](image)
At the end of the second episode, the music arrives at V/V of C minor (the D-major harmony in m. 19). A resolution to a G-minor triad would allow the subject, by now a bit overdue, to enter on the downbeat of the following measure (m. 20), the bass note G serving as $\hat{1}$ of G minor and the first note of the subject; a leap rising to $E_b$ would come next, with the rest of the subject to follow in G minor. But Fenaroli proceeds differently. In m. 20, the measure following the V of G minor, the subject enters unannounced, starting on its second note, $E_b$—that is, without the first note in the bass (or, one could say, with the first note of the subject changed from G to D). In fact, the second note of the subject $E_b$ is even shifted to the downbeat, resulting from a deceptive cadence (see **Example 2.6**). One effect of this procedure is to allow the subject to enter surreptitiously, so that the listener does not realize the subject is present until it is well underway. And from a tonal perspective, the composer delays until m. 22 the arrival of a root-position G minor harmony, which arrives only at the end of the subject (m. 22). The alert student will learn a great deal about fugal composition from this; not just that the first note of the subject may be changed, but that the subject can be woven seamlessly and almost unnoticed into the fugal texture.

**Example 2.6.** Deceptive cadence and delayed G minor arrival, mm. 19–22
This G-minor entry of the subject in the bass actually proves, in a sense, to be the answer rather than the subject, as the subject soon enters at its original pitch, in the tonic key, in the top voice above countersubject in the bass (mm. 24–27), after a brief modulating link from G minor to the home key C minor (see Example 2.7). Shown thus is the highly useful reversal of the pattern Subject-Answer by Answer-Subject. This pair of entries might appear to signal the beginning of this imitative partimento's ending, but Fenaroli has a different idea in mind. As can be seen in m. 27 (Example 2.7), the last note of the subject (C on the top) is harmonized with A♭ major harmony, creating another deceptive cadence, this time in the tonic key. Namely, the music drifts in a new direction, as if to pass through C minor, modulating to E♭ major (the relative major key), even arriving there quite firmly with the cadenza doppia in mm. 30–31. Whereas the cadenza doppia seemed rather obligatory to end a partimento in the first course (21 out of 24), there are fewer partimenti in the fourth course (six of 22) that end with this particular cadence formula. This is presumably because these advanced partimenti from the fourth course have other, still fancier ways of ending, such as long pedal points, codas, and stretti. In the present case, the cadenza doppia in E♭ major avoids a close in the home key C minor but makes a firm enough arrival to justify a pause to prepare a set of entries in stretto.

---

119 The figures given in measure 24 (6—3—) suggest the entry of subject on the top: C (6 above the bass note E♭) and A♭ (above the bass note F), as it was in the beginning in mm. 4–6.

120 nos. 7, 8, 13, 15, 16, and 17.
Example 2.7. Answer-Subject entries in mm. 20–27

The uses of stretti are expected at the end of *partimenti imitati*, due to the resemblance of these partimenti to real fugues. As shown in Example 2.8, in m. 31, the place to deploy the stretto is indicated explicitly. After the perfect cadence in E♭ major with fermata (𝄞) at m. 31, an empty measure is given, with the word “Soggetto” (subject) above it. This indicates that the subject could start on that measure, without the bass, in any of upper voices. The pitch level of the subject is given by figures in the following measure (m. 33, 5-6-6-5-6-7-7-6), indicating that the second measure of the subject in C minor needs to appear, hence creating a stretto at a distance of one measure.

Example 2.8. Indication of a stretto: mm. 1–9 and mm. 29–34
After five bars of stretto (mm. 32–36), the subject enters a third time, this time in the top voice. It does not give the full presentation, however, but rather directs the music toward the subdominant in mm. 38–39, launching a new sequence with eighth-note material and drawing that material from the sequences in one of the earlier episodes (mm. 14–16). Even though the music arrives in the tonic at m. 43, that arrival is reached sequentially, without an appropriate cadence, so Fenaroli extends the piece once more with sequences (mm. 43–46), only then finishing the piece with a *cadenza doppia* (mm. 47–48). This sort of extending technique is related to the repeated cadences that are often found in simple partimenti. It also creates a satisfying balance among the parts of this imitative partimento.

From this example one can see routines that draw directly from the *partimenti semplici*. Such features would include the opening gambit, modulating links, sequential continuations through various keys, and a recapitulatory statement of the subject (in this case, a reversed reprise of the subject-answer pair), as well as various techniques to extend a piece and allow it to continue. But now far greater attention is given to making the realization more thematic, as the sequences call for imitative dialogue and the subject is consistently paired in double counterpoint with a countersubject. The closure of the piece is also thematized, as the subject assumes the duty of bringing the piece to a culminating contrapuntal combination (the stretto) that creates a satisfying rhetorical climax to the piece. If some of the simpler partimenti seem less satisfying, it is perhaps that they sometimes appear simply to end rather than really to finish. The *partimenti imitati*, like the one in C minor just discussed, begin to address these matters of closure on a large scale, showing how a more finished, effective piece can result.
2.2. Partimento Fugue in D major (Langloz No. 46)

Example 2.9. Partimento Fugue from Prelude and Fugue No. 46 in D major

This partimento fugue in D major is not from the Neapolitan partimento tradition, but from the Langloz manuscript (Mus. ms. Bach P 296, Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin-Preussischer

---

121 As reproduced in Renwick (2001), 84–85, with measure numbers added.
Kulturbezitz). The Langloz manuscript, which takes its name from its scribe, is one of the largest extant collections of partimento fugues. It bears an attribution to Johann Sebastian Bach, yet there is no direct evidence that any of the content is from actually from him. However, its vast collection of partimento fugues certainly represents the music of the time. Also, comparing one fugue from this manuscript with the Neapolitan partimenti discussed above will allow us to find points of similarity between the works of J. S. Bach and partimenti that originated from a distant part of Europe.

Whereas we could infer the countersubject from the given figures in specific places in partimenti imitati, the countersubjects are written-out in this partimento fugue in D major: as can be seen in Example 2.9, the first countersubject for when the subject is beneath (mm. 3–6), and the second countersubject for when the subject is above the countersubject (mm. 20–23).

Another difference between partimenti imitati and partimento fugues can be seen in the clef changes. When a theme enters in a different voice, the preexisting voice is interrupted; since partimento notation uses a single staff, the clef changes are necessary to present all the entries. As shown in Example 2.10, our D-major partimento fugue features a full exposition, as the subject entries appear in all voices. This presence of the full exposition is hard to find in partimenti imitati, in which the subject and the countersubject are usually given in the bass part.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mm.</th>
<th>Exposition</th>
<th>Episode</th>
<th>Coda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A major</td>
<td>CS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example 2.10.** Chart of entries, expositions, and episodes of the D-major partimento fugue
The subject starts with 5-1, suggesting the corresponding answer will have the tonal adjustment to 1-5 at its head. Except for this tonal adjustment to 1-5, the rest of the answer continues as if it is a real answer. As illustrated in Example 2.11, the descending feature of the subject suggests the presence of the schema termed by Gjerdingen the Prinner; recognizing this schema could be useful for a realization.

Example 2.11. Suggested Prinner in subject, mm. 0–3

The 7-6 suspension occupies a major part of the harmonic progression in realizing this subject, along with the parallel thirds of the Prinner. Using the 7-6 suspension series as a basis, the descending and sequential feature of the subject enables the player to accompany the subject easily with complete chords and stepwise part writing, as can be seen in the simple realization shown Example 2.12.
Example 2.12. Simple realization, Partimento fugue in D major, mm. 0–16
Example 2.1. Simple realization, Partimento fugue in D major, mm. 17–28

This simple realization presented in Example 2.12, which is faithful to the given figures, could then be elaborated into a more intricate version. Example 2.13 shows how the subject could be realized, and decorated in the third entry of the subject (mm. 6–9), where a three-voice setting is required (the fourth voice has not entered yet). As can be seen from the first system of Example 2.13, the countersubject alternates between the third and the root of the chord, while the subject in the tenor alternates the root and the third of the chord. That is, the requisite notes for a chord are already occupied by the subject and the countersubject and the remaining fifth of
the chord has to find its way around the leaping bass. In the third system of Example 2.13, the top voice is decorated with imitations.

Example 2.13. Realizations of mm. 6–9

Example 2.14 shows the four-part realization of the answer, given in the bass (mm. 9–12). The upper system is a simple realization according to the figures given. The second system is a more intricate version, florid with imitations and with suspensions added to the top voice. The music in the third system takes a further step: Having a broader registral space with the four-
voice-setting, another layer of decoration could be added to the alto, which forms parallel tenths with the bass. Besides, the third beat of m. 10 is changed from the root position F# minor chord (first system) to the 7–6 suspensions (lower two systems), so one may apply and start imitating the motive earlier in m. 10. This 7–6 suspension pattern is then extended to the downbeat of m. 12. In this case the departures from the given figures are justified by the added figurations. Thus, one may devise a more intricate version of this partimento fugue realization, such as the one in Example 2.15.

Example 2.15. Realization of the answer in four voices, mm. 9–12
Example 2.15. Florid realization of D-major partimento fugue, mm. 0–16
Example 2.15. Florid realization of D-major partimento fugue, mm. 17–28 [Cont’d]

An important difference between partimenti imitati and partimento fugue is that the latter gives a full exposition, in this case all four entries of the subject without interruption. As we saw in the case of the former, the subject is usually repeated twice, before it proceeds to the first episodic area. The plan of a full exposition, like the one provided here, makes the partimento fugue resemble more closely a finished fugal piece.

After the exposition (mm. 0–12), the bass modulates to B minor (vi), where a PAC occurs in m. 14. After the cadence, the music modulates back to the dominant key (A major) so the subject can launch at the fourth beat of m. 16. Even though this partimento fugue offers its theme
only in the tonic and dominant keys, the modulation with PAC to B minor makes the fugue susceptible to extension. As illustrated in Example 2.16, one may extend this partimento fugue right after the PAC (m. 14), just transposing the last (fourth) entry of the theme in the exposition (mm. 9–12) into B minor from the third beat of m. 14.

Example 2.16. Possible extension with theme in B minor

A further opportunity for extension can be found at m. 20, where the composer inserts a one-measure space that ends with half cadence, following the subject statement in the bass (mm. 16–19). One may easily develop this half cadence into a dominant pedal point. This is also a good place for the pedal point, because the subject enters in the top voice again upon the half cadence: this is the only case where the theme is above the countersubject, which is now a new written-out countersubject provided in the alto (mm. 20–23). The new countersubject gives another possibility to the realization of the subject (Example 2.17). This changes the harmonization from a 7-6 suspension series to a series of 5-6 alternations. One may reduce the texture to three voices with this part (mm. 20–23 in the simple realization, Example 2.12) or set
this entry of the subject with a new countersubject more fully elaborated in four voices, as shown in the florid version (Example 2.15).

Example 2.17. Realizations of the subject with the second countersubject

This partimento fugue in D major does not end with the repeated cadences that are commonly found in Neapolitan partimenti, showing instead a chromatic approach to the final V
chord (mm. 26–27), a technique not addressed in discussing the *partimenti semplici* in Chapter 1.

Such chromaticism to the dominant is usually found in much longer partimenti: Example 2.18 is a part of *partimento imitato*\(^{122}\) by Alessandro Scarlatti (1660–1725), which shows both the chromatic bass line to the dominant (boxed in the example) and the repeated cadences. Thus, one can certainly bring a partimento fugue to a satisfactory close, combining these various extending techniques.

**Example 2.18.** Chromatic approach to V and the repeated cadences in A. Scarlatti’s *partimento imitato*, mm. 74–95

If these realizations of the D-major partimento fugue from the Langloz manuscript have been convincing, they should show, when considered in the context of simpler partimento realizations, that many of the techniques of simple counterpoint and of overall tonal design continue to operate in a fugal context, but with the added considerations of setting the subject in four real parts, some of which are given strong thematic profiles. In the following chapters, I will examine J. S. Bach’s processes of revision to preludes and fugues from Book II of the Well-

\(^{122}\) De Nardis (1933), 81: This partimento is no. 10 of the fourth course.
Tempered Clavier to show a link between the partimento tradition and Bach; the early versions of the pieces are analogous to the realizations of partimenti, and the techniques Bach uses for revision of these early versions reflect how partimenti may be transformed into finished pieces.
Part II

The Revising Process in J. S. Bach, *Well-Tempered Clavier, Book II*

Part II of this dissertation will compare versions of four pieces drawn from J. S. Bach’s *Well-Tempered Clavier, Book II*, searching for a bridge between partimento, as a primary sketch of a piece, and a finished work of Bach. As written on the title page of Book I, Bach composed the WTC “for the use and profit of the musical youth desirous of learning as well as for the pastime of those already skilled in this study,” and the collections were cherished and thoroughly studied and performed by his protégés, not to mention by generations of influential musicians, such as Mozart, Beethoven, and many others. And to this day, these books have remained for many serious musicians an essential part of their education. For our purposes here, studying some of the preludes and fugues that exist in multiple versions will allow us to explore how Bach took relatively simple, partimento-like pieces, adding extensions, complexities, and refinements of various kinds to produce works that assumed their final, canonic forms.

The revisions that Bach made, particularly for the second book of the WTC, are worth noting, as it took twenty years to compile the collection and roughly one fourth of the works are revisions of his earlier pieces. As just noted, many of these pieces in their early forms are close to *partimento* realizations, and comparisons of the versions will show the compositional process by which a simple piece can be developed into one that is more complicated and finished.
Early versions of some of the preludes and fugues in the WTC II originated in the early 1720s, even before the first book (WTC I) was compiled in 1722. Bach scholar Yo Tomita lists and classifies the early models for the pieces in WTC II into two stages—which he terms "embryonic" and "pupal"—according to the approximate date of the manuscripts. Tomita also infers that the earliest versions of an “embryonic stage” might have served as teaching materials in Bach’s early Leipzig period (1723–1730), for his less advanced students. All the pieces in this stage are quite short, structurally simple, and modest in their technical demands.

According to Tomita, there are thirteen extant manuscript sources for WTC II. A few manuscript copies are considered to be more valuable than others as they are the ones most closely connected to Bach: 1) P 804 and P 1089 from “embryonic stages,” which Tomita dates to ca. 1725–1730; 2) P 595 and P 226 from “pupal stages,” both ca. 1738. These sources are not holographs by Bach, but they are the most authentic copies that are considered to derive directly from the lost autographs.

P 804, also called Kellner’s miscellaneous volume after the name of the main scribe, Johann Peter Kellner (1705–1782), is a huge volume composed of 396 pages in 57 fascicles, which contain mainly J. S. Bach’s keyboard music. P 1089, on the other hand, is a relatively small volume with just two fascicles. The scribe of this manuscript is Johann Caspar Vogler (1696–1763), who studied composition and keyboard playing with Bach from 1706. The two manuscripts overlap considerably, yet the smaller volume P 1089 features five preludes and
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123 Brokaw (1986), 310.
124 Tomita (1990), 7–8.
125 D-B Mus.ms. Bach P 804.
126 D-B Mus.ms. Bach P 1089.
127 D-B Mus.ms. Bach P 595, a copy by Johannes Ringk (1717–1778).
129 Ibid., 7.
130 Ibid., 8–9.
fughettas in five common tonalities from C to G, inclusive, as an ordered sequence: C major (BWV 870a), D minor (BWV899), E minor (BWV 900), F major (BWV 901), and G major (BWV 902).  

The other two manuscript sources, P 595 and P 226, are from a “pupal stage,” presenting a stage of completion very close to what we find in the final compilation of WTC II in 1742. Fascicle 5 of P 595 is the only one related to WTC II among its ten fascicles. It contains four fughettas copied by Johann Friedrich Agricola (1720–1774), another student of Bach, who studied with him from 1738 to 1741. It seems Agricola was learning these fughettas, since all of them are fairly short and simple, and written in common-time. P 226, or the “Bückeburger Bach Manuscript” is composed of 68 pages, and the copyists are identified to be many, including J. S. Bach himself and his second wife Anna Magdalena Bach.  

The autograph of WTC II was considered lost for many years. Formerly in the possession of Muzio Clementi (1752–1832), this autograph came to light in the British Museum in London in 1896. This so-called London Autograph is, however, neither a complete package of WTC II, nor the final version of the collection. The Preludes and Fugues in C# minor, D major, and F minor are missing, probably because Bach himself never bound the pieces of WTC II into a single volume, and also because he did not give them a collective title. The London Autograph is highly valued, however, not only because it can help clarify discrepancies among earlier versions, but also because it shows stages of revisions by the composer. The five manuscript

\[\text{131} P \ 804 \text{ contains only C major (BWV 870a), D minor (BWV 899), E minor (BWV 900), and G major (BWV 902).}\]
\[\text{132} \text{Tomita (1990), 32–33. (1) D minor (BWV 875a, 2) as the oldest known sketch; (2) C major (BWV 872b, 2) will be transposed to C# major in WTC II; (3) C minor (BWV 871, 2) as the only known early version of the piece; (4) D major (BWV 876, 2) will be transposed to Eb major in WTC II. The selection of the four keys, D minor, C major, C minor, and D major can be grouped as two tonic major/minor pairs, recalling the WTC compilation.}\]
\[\text{133} \text{Ibid., 35.}\]
\[\text{134} \text{Keller (1976), 133.}\]
sources mentioned above will be used in this study, in order to compare and verify the stages of revisions and expansions by the maestro.
Chapter 3. Bach Preludes

3.1. Prelude in D minor, BWV 875

The early versions of this D-minor Prelude exist in several stages: the earliest known manuscript is in Fascicle 1 of P 1089,\textsuperscript{135} consisting of forty-three measures only. The intermediate stages are expanded to fifty-three measures and found in P 226\textsuperscript{136} and the London Autograph\textsuperscript{137}, both copied by Anna Magdalena Bach. The final version is by Bach himself on the London Autograph, creating a sixty-three-measure version. Despite all these stages of revision and expansion, the reductions of all versions (shown in Example 3.1.2 and 3.1.3) present a simple and strong harmonic foundation, which resembles the realization of a partimento.

\textsuperscript{135} The manuscript used here is copied in 1729 by Johann Caspar Vogler (1696–1763), who was one of J. S. Bach’s student. This manuscript, D-B Mus.ms. Bach P 1089, is available at https://www.bach-digital.de/rsc/viewer/BachDigitalSource_derivate_00067798/00000018.jpg. Accessed on February 21, 2018. This P 1089 is the same manuscript source where the earliest version of the C major prelude and fugue, which will be examined later in this study, is found.


Example 3.1.1. Prelude in D minor in P 1089, P 226, and the final version (mm. 1–8)
Example 3.1.1. Prelude in D minor in P 1089, P 226, and the final version (mm. 9–16) [Cont’d]
Example 3.1.1. Prelude in D minor in P 1089, P 226, and the final version (mm. 17–24) [Cont’d]
Example 3.1.1. Prelude in D minor in P 1089, P 226, and the final version (mm. 25–32) [Cont’d]
Example 3.1.1. Prelude in D minor in P 1089, P 226, and the final version (mm. 33–40) [Cont’d]
Example 3.1.1. Prelude in D minor in P 1089, P 226, and the final version (mm. 41–48) [Cont’d]
Example 3.1.1. Prelude in D minor in P 1089, P 226, and the final version (mm. 49–56) [Cont’d]
Example 3.1.1. Prelude in D minor in P 1089, P 226, and the final version (mm. 57–61) [Cont’d]
Example 3.1.2. Chordal Reduction of the Prelude, in P 1089
Example 3.1.3. Chordal Reduction of the Prelude, in final (mm. 1–40)
Example 3.1.3. Chordal Reduction of the Prelude, in final (mm. 41–61) [Cont’d]
Example 3.1.4. Repeated theme of D minor prelude, BWV 875, mm. 1–8

In the first stage of his revision, Bach added second statements of his theme (mm. 1–4) in inversion (mm. 5–9), as shown in Example 3.1.4. The theme statement at the dominant minor (P1089 mm. 15–19 / final mm. 26–29) is also repeated with an additional, varied four measures (mm. 30–33 in the final version). This double counterpoint reminds one of similar features in partimenti imitati such as that in Example 2.2, discussed earlier in Chapter 2. In the second stage, Bach composed a transitional part, which is the biggest insertion in the whole revising process (See Example 3.1.5). After the second statement of the theme in inversion (mm. 5–8)
arrives at m. 9 with tonic confirmation, P 226 takes V/iv – iv (–vii6) to prepare the arrival of V in m. 12. In the final version, however, Bach elaborates the descending scale motive of m. 1 and the broken chord motive into two stretto groups, mm. 9–12 and mm. 13–17. These two stretto imitations smoothly induce a motion to the dominant at m. 18. Another instance that shows Bach’s attentiveness to the preparation of V at m. 18 is the Neapolitan sixth chord he used at m. 17 in the final version. In contrast to this, Bach had kept to the diatonic collection of D minor, both in the earliest version (P 1089, m. 6, iv–ii6–V) and in the intermediate version (P 226, m.11, iv–vii6).

Example 3.1.5. Transitional added part before the arrival of V at m. 18 (in final; m. 12 in P 226)

In the final stage, mm. 37–38 were inserted in preparing another big dominant pedal point at m. 43 (final). Example 3.1.6 demonstrates the reductions of the earliest version (mm. 19–26 in
P 1089) and the final version (mm. 34–43).\(^{138}\) The reason for the short insertion of these two measures seems to be to add emphasis and preparation for the rising chromaticism in mm. 40–41 (mm. 23–24 in P 1089). As shown in the last system of the Example 3.1.6, Bach could develop a more connected effect to this quite frightening rising chromaticism in the final version, working with a hidden descending scale (which is thematic as well) in the preceding measures. Moreover, smaller contrary motion in the inserted m. 37 (E–F–G to C–B–B♭) foreshadows the forthcoming chromatic passage in mm. 40–41.

Example 3.1.6. Reductions mm. 34–43 in the final, and the corresponding measures of P 1089 (mm. 19–26)

The final insertion is at m. 50 of the final version (and at m. 42 of P 226), shown in Example 3.1.7. With this one-measure insertion, Bach gives a kind of accent to this m. 50, with a thematic arpeggio in the tonic D minor key. Besides improving the melodic profile between P 1089 and the two later versions, the revision demonstrates that Bach was careful about this measure: The pattern shown in the first system of Example 3.1.7, of P 1089 is the one associated

\(^{138}\) P 226 is excluded, as the measures in question here coincide in P 1089 and P 226.
more with continuo playing, which was also taught as the basis of improvisation. With the amendments in the later versions, such as the added note B♭ as an upper neighbor (Example 3.1.7, circled, mm. 47–48 in the final version) and syncopating ties (boxed, mm. 47–48), Bach makes these simple two-voiced broken chords into a full and rich sounding prelude.
Example 3.1.7. Enrichment of the figuration (mm. 30–33 in 1089; mm. 39–43 in P 226; and mm. 47–51 in the final)
This Prelude in D minor is one of the earliest conceived pieces from WTC II and shows through its several stages and versions a high degree of revision and expansion. Bach’s interpolations in this prelude emphasize the important events of the piece, such as thematic repetition, modulation to the dominant, and arrival of that new key area. Moreover, it seems that Bach tries to establish a large four-measure rhythm with his revisions: the first insertion was the four-measure restatement of the theme (mm. 5–8 and mm. 30–33), the second produced eight measures of transitional music that prepares the dominant at m. 18. The later two are somewhat ambiguous, but still seem to create a four-measure rhythm.

3.2. Prelude in C major, BWV 870

The early versions of this Prelude in C Major are found in P804\textsuperscript{139} and P 1089,\textsuperscript{140} along with the accompanying C-major fugue to be discussed in the next chapter. For all the density in the texture that Bach created with dissonances and suspensions, the reductions show relatively simple four-part writing. The reductions also reveal authentic cadences diluted with inversions and suspensions that promote the flow and continuity throughout the prelude.

\textsuperscript{139} This manuscript, D-B Mus.ms. Bach P 804 is copied by Johann Peter Kellner (1705–1772) in 1727. Available at \url{https://www.bach-digital.de/receive/BachDigitalSource_source_00001834}. Accessed on February 22, 2018.

Example 3.2.1. Prelude in C major, the early version and the final version (mm. 1–6)
Example 3.2.1. Prelude in C major, early version (mm. 7–14) and final version (mm. 7–15)

[Cont’d]
Example 3.2.1. Prelude in C major, the early version and the final version (mm. 16–24) [Cont’d]
Example 3.2.1. Prelude in C major, early version (mm. 15–17) and final version (mm. 25–34)

[Cont’d]
Example 3.2.2. Chordal reduction of P804 version
Example 3.2.3. Chordal reduction of the final version
The revision process in this prelude becomes a good deal more complex than in the D-minor Prelude just discussed, more complex indeed than in the two fugues to be discussed later in Chapter 4. Doubled by two interpolations, the overall length increases from seventeen measures (P 804/P 1089) to thirty-four measures (final version). During the process, Bach divided the earlier version into two parts as fourteen and three measures. The first fourteen measures are much the same in both versions, with some minor alterations. As one can see in Example 3.3.4, the melodic line is changed from straight sixteenth notes to incorporate the ornamental thirty-second notes (mm. 1, 2, 3, 9: circled in Example 3.2.4), and with the descending broken-chord (mm. 1, 5: boxed in Example 3.2.4). Bach also added the lower octave C at the very beginning (mm. 1–3), reinforcing the opening pedal point on the tonic. The thirty-seconds are also used for a written-out mordent (ms. 6 and 11).
Example 3.2.4. The ornamental thirty-second notes and the descending broken-chord added in the final version (mm. 1–6)

Another noticeable change can be found at m. 11, as illustrated in Example 3.2.5. Bach changes E₄ to E♭ at the third beat at m. 11, which changes a rather plain ii₆ chord to the Neapolitan sixth chord in D minor, which inspires the chromatic passage that follows at m. 12. This chromatic descent in the tenor and the rhythmic changes with dotted eighth notes prepare the expansion with newly composed part that Bach inserts at m. 14.
Example 3.2.5. Alterations made in mm. 11–14

This newly composed and inserted part (mm. 14–29) creates a wholesale revision of the form, complete with a subdominant recapitulation of the opening, a reprise whose continuation joins much later to the early version of the prelude’s ending. The revising process in the London Autograph shows the special care Bach took to prepare the reprise in the subdominant (mm. 20–29). Interesting to notice is that the lower two systems (after m. 14) are crossed out in the London Autograph, as Bach decided to come back to this manuscript and to revise the prelude once again.\footnote{This digitized manuscript of the London Autograph (MS35021) is from archives in British Library’s collections, available at http://www.bl.uk/manuscripts/Viewer.aspx?ref=add_ms_35021_f001r, Accessed on January 25, 2018.} This revised reading of the transition (mm. 14–19) is added on the blank systems on the right-hand side of the manuscript. (Example 3.2.6). Moreover, after the weak cadence in A minor (m. 14), Bach introduces B♭ in the bass (the highest bass note in the piece), which induces the cadence in F major (IV, m. 16). The B♭ in the bass on the downbeat of m. 15 gradually descends to the low F at m. 20, where the transposed restatement of mm. 5–14 begins (see Example 3.2.7). Thus, Bach improves this passage to create something more fluid, as the harmonic progressions become more chromatic and the contrapuntal motion becomes more focused.
Example 3.2.6. Traces of revisions in the London Autograph
Example 3.2.7. BWV 870, 1, mm. 14–20 in final version

Bach’s successive revisions, illustrated in Example 3.2.8, show the attention Bach devoted to increasing the density of the music in mm. 17–19. Compared to the crossed-out part in the London Autograph, the reworked part features a chromatic descending line in the top voice, breaks the smooth tenor line, and adds strong, dissonant chromatic steps to the alto. The final version changes the bass from the somewhat conventional circle-of-fifths line to the unexpected line involving dissonant leaps. All of these elaborations aim to focus the composition toward the arrival of that low F and the beginning of the restatement in the subdominant key at m. 20. The restatement of a theme in closely related keys for the expansion and its preparation with chromaticism and sequences are features frequently encountered in partimenti, though rarely if ever requiring this level of compositional ingenuity and finesse.
Example 3.2.8. Successive revisions in the London Autograph and final version (mm. 17–20)
The ending starts with the tonic arrival at m. 30, as Bach joins his vast expansion to the final few measures of the early version: The *cadenza doppia* (mm. 30–32) is still presented in the final version. In the early version, though, the C major arrival was not on the downbeat but on the second beat, making for a rather weaker arrival. In the final version B♭ is added in the second beat of m. 30, along with descending broken-chord motion in the bass (a motivic idea, also found imitated in m. 31 and m. 32).

To finish the prelude, Bach added a three-measure coda with pedal point on the tonic in mm. 17–19. This creates a kind of framing effect to the piece, as the *quiescenza* idea presented with a tonic pedal at the beginning (mm. 1–3) returns with the same three-measure *quiescenza* at the end (Example 3.2.9). In this use of the *quiescenza* for a framing effect, Bach reuses a technique he had used in the C-minor Prelude from WTC Book I. But in the C-major Prelude it both forecasts and summarizes the subdominant emphasis shared by the piece as a whole. That is, Bach uses part of the prelude’s conventional opening—its tonicization of IV—as a basis for a large-scale event in the final version of the piece, and the final statement of the *quiescenza* progression can become both frame and summary at the end.
Example 3.2.9. Beginning and ending three measures of BWV 870, 1, mm. 1–3 and mm. 28–30

Bach’s revision process for this C-major prelude is the most complex of those to be discussed in this dissertation, more complex even than those in the two fugues to be discussed in the next chapter. These revisions reveal some of Bach’s insight into the potential of his musical ideas, especially with the new formal plan, the smooth arrival on the reprise in the subdominant key (m. 20) with its highly elaborated contrapuntal preparation, and the summary effects produced by the framing three-measure coda on the tonic pedal point.
Chapter 4. Bach Fugues

4.1. Fugue in G major, BWV 884

The Prelude and Fugue in G major, BWV 884, is unusual for WTC II, as the fugue finds its early versions again in P 804\textsuperscript{142} and P 1089\textsuperscript{143} with different BWV number 902 and with different preludes attached. The early version of the fugue in BWV 902 is one of 74 minor clavier pieces (BWV 894–962), most of which are considered to be composed by the young Bach before 1720.\textsuperscript{144} The final prelude and fugue pairing in WTC II seems to join together two of the simpler works among the entire 48 pieces of the WTC collection; indeed, this G-major pair appears as the very first one in Béla Bartók’s 1908 edition, in which Bartók rearranged the whole 48 in order of technical difficulty and compositional complexity.\textsuperscript{145}

In both P 804 and P 1089, the accompanying Praeludien—BWV 902a in P 804 and BWV 902,1 in P 1089—to the early versions of this G major Fughetta are eventually discarded when Bach makes a new prelude (BWV 884,1) for WTC II (Example 4.1.1). The earlier versions of

\textsuperscript{144} Gustafson (1967), 17. He argues that most of these small pieces are very short and freely constructed, and the designs of many fugues are monothematic, lacking musical interest.
\textsuperscript{145} Béla Bartók, \textit{The Well-Tempered Clavier}. Budapest: Editio Musica, 1908.
the fugue, however, do not show any significant difference between P 804 and P 1089.

According to Hermann Keller, BWV 902a was probably too simple and BWV 902,1 too intricate to form an effective prelude pairing to such a short and simple fugue; the final prelude, BWV 884, represents an intermediate, and more fitting level of complexity.\(^{146}\)

**Example 4.1.1.** Three accompanying different preludes of the Fugue in G major, BWV 884

The following **Example 4.1.2** presents both versions (P 804 and the final) of this fugue, aligned for comparison. **Examples 4.1.3** and **4.1.4** present chordal reductions of both versions.

---

\(^{146}\) Keller (1976), 174–175.
Example 4.1.2. Fugue in G major, in P 804 and in the final, mm. 1–12
Example 4.1.2. Fugue in G major, in P 804 and in the final, mm. 13–24 [Cont’d]
Example 4.1.2. Fugue in G major, in P 804 and in the final, mm. 25–36 [Cont’d]
Example 4.1.2. Fugue in G major, in P 804 and in the final, mm. 37–48 [Cont’d]
Example 4.1.2. Fugue in G major, in P 804 and in the final, mm. 49–60 [Cont’d]
Example 4.1.2. Fugue in G major, in P 804 and in the final, mm. 61–72 [Cont’d]
Example 4.1.3. Chordal reduction of P 804 version, mm. 1–40
Example 4.1.3. Chordal reduction of P 804 version, mm. 41–60 [Cont’d]

Example 4.1.4. Chordal reduction, BWV844 (final version), mm. 1–20
Example 4.1.4. Chordal reduction, BWV844 (final version), mm. 21–72 [Cont’d]
Even without the benefit of a reduction, the early version by itself resembles the realization of a simple partimento fugue, like those discussed in Chapter 2. As can be observed in Example 4.1.6, the early version may be sketched into a partimento fugue without too much difficulty. This easy conversion is due to the simplicity of the G-major fugue. Not only does it have a simple, common subject (5-6-5-4-3) that implies the use of a Prinner (Example 4.1.5), but also its structure bears an affinity with partimento fugues: the theme enters in each voice with a descending order, presenting a full exposition; sequential phrases connect theme statements; the second countersubject is introduced when the subject is presented on the top voice; a short cadence after the final statement of theme.

Example 4.1.5. The subject of the Fugue in G major, BWV 884/BWV 902, mm. 1–6
Example 4.1.6. Early version of the Fugue in G major (P 804) in partimento notation
In the revision, the basic formal structure of the fugue, as well as of the subject, are preserved until the final revision: both have six subject entries, and these are in the same voices, except the last entry. The biggest change between the early version and the final version involves the texture. In the early versions, the music alternates between three-part polyphony and a more homophonic, continuo-like texture with four-part writing. In the final version, on the other hand, Bach extracted two solid countersubjects from the chordal, continuo-like texture of the early version (see Example 4.1.7). With but a few exceptions he maintained a well-stratified three-part texture of subject and two countersubjects throughout the piece. Even though Bach reduced the number of parts from four to three, the fourth voice in the right hand is implied in the figuration of the countersubject (Example 4.1.7).

Example 4.1.7. Changes in texture between BWV 902 and BWV 884, mm. 32–39

Contrary to the freer voice leading of the early version, Bach also created a more grammatical voice leading with the new texture (Example 4.1.8): 1) all the suspensions are tied

---

147 The countersubjects are inverted only when they are stated for the third time at m. 40.
to their preparations; 2) inner-voice suspensions are moved to the downbeat of the measure (mm. 25, 27).

Example 4.1.8. Voice-leading changes in new texture, mm. 24–29

A newly composed section (mm. 53–64) appears in the final version as well, expanding the presence of the dominant. In P 804 (Example 4.1.9), Bach suddenly reduces the number of voices from four to two at the end of the fourth entry of the subject at m. 39, and keeps the two-part texture throughout the fifth entry (mm. 40–44)\(^\text{148}\) and the following episode (mm. 45–51). When he arrives on the dominant at m. 51, he even reduces the number of voices to one, inducing the sixth entry of the subject in the lowest voice (m. 53). In the final version, by contrast, Bach retains the downward sequence (mm. 49–52) but keeps all three voices active (shown in Example 4.1.10). After the music arrives at the dominant pedal point at a low D (m. 56), Bach causes the collapse of the contrapuntal three-part texture which he had maintained during the initial descent (mm. 45–53). The four-part chords in the left hand at m. 60 emphasize

\(^{148}\) This fifth entry (mm. 40–44) in P 804, is accompanied by a new countersubject, as it is the first and the only time the subject is presented in the top voice.
the abandonment of the contrapuntal texture. As the pedal point concludes, the virtuosic toccata-like, thirty-second-note runs both signal the final breakdown of strict fugal texture and induce the final entry of the subject, which is shifted from the bass (P 804) to the alto (final) at m. 65.

Furthermore, Bach changes the ending after the final subject entry, in the final version, expanding the registral space by ascending arpeggio (m. 69) and concluding the piece with the brilliant descending G major scale in thirty-second-note runs in the right hand (mm. 70–71), ending with a 4–3 appoggiatura.

Example 4.1.9. Fugue in G major, BWV 902 in P 804, mm. 37–54
During the revision process, Bach thus reworked this G-major fugue in two main areas. First, with texture, he used stricter part-writing with additional melodies and contrapuntal activity. This more rigorous treatment of the texture resulted in a stricter adherence to three voices as well. And second, by inserting the episode (mm. 53–64) and using it to delay the final entry of the subject, Bach lent greater rhetorical force to that final entry. From a harmonic standpoint, the inserted part greatly expands and intensifies the dominant, providing more
grounding to the tonic arrival in m. 65. The flourish toward the end with thirty-second notes creates a more satisfying conclusion as well.

4.2. Fugue in C major, BWV 870

The earliest version of the C-major fugue is found in Fascicle 38 of P 804, among the informal group of preludes and fughettas (BWV 870a, 899–902) that Bach allowed students to copy long before he assembled the WTC II. This earliest version differs only in minor details from the other early versions, so it will be used for comparison to the version in WTC II. The presence of the C-major pair and the G-major fugue (BWV 902, discussed above) in this group that survived to the compilation of WTC II suggests another analogy with partimenti in their pedagogical function.

This fugue in C major features a simple subject which can be reduced into the same schema as the above-mentioned G-major fugue: \(5-6-5-4-3\) and its tonal answer \(1-3-2-1-7\) (Example 4.2.1). The whole fugue can be reduced into simple, steady three-part texture, where the Prinner can reveal itself with little difficulty.

---

Example 4.2.1. Subject and countersubject of the Fugue in C major, BWV 870

Example 4.2.2. Fugue in C major, in P 804 (mm. 1–6) and in the final version (mm. 1–12)
Example 4.2.2. Fugue in C major, in P 804 (mm. 7–15) and in the final version (mm. 13–30)
[Cont’d]
Example 4.2.2. Fugue in C major, in P 804 (mm. 16–24) and in the final version (mm. 31–48)
[Cont’d]
Example 4.2.2. Fugue in C major, in P 804 (mm. 25–33) and in the final version (mm. 49–66)

[Cont’d]
Example 4.2.2. Fugue in C major, in P 804 (m. 34) and in the final version (mm. 67–83)

[Cont’d]
Example 4.2.3. Fugue in C major, chordal reduction in P 804
Example 4.2.4. Fugue in C major, chordal reduction of the coda (mm. 65–83) in the final version

In the process of revising, Bach changes the metric notation from $\frac{3}{8}$ (P 804/P 1089) to a fast-moving $\frac{2}{4}$ meter (London Autograph and final). That is, the early versions had thirty-four measures in total, while the later versions double the number of measures to sixty-eight, as Bach cut each measure in half. Apart from the added coda section (mm. 68–83), Bach kept the model mostly unchanged. A few changes were made, in order to keep the imitative motion (m. 17)\(^{150}\) or

\(^{150}\) Bach replaced a half note E in the alto with descending quarter notes (E-D), to keep imitating subject motions between two upper voices.
to provide effective markers for important events (mm. 53–54). The time signature change could have been a reason for Bach to extend the piece, as the final tonic chord is placed on the third beat of the last measure (m. 34) in the early versions. Also, it seems that Bach decided to add a coda of sixteen measures only after he finished copying the early version: despite the erasure in the London Autograph, the original authentic cadence in C can be seen beneath the deceptive cadence at m. 68 (Example 4.2.5).

\[ \text{Example 4.2.5} \]

151 Bach cut the pedal point on G earlier (m. 53) and changed the alto G to a syncopated rhythm (m. 54), in order to emphasize the ending of the last subject entry (the IAC in G major).

\[ \text{Example 4.2.5} \]

152 Brokaw (1986), 188.
The first eight measures of coda (mm. 68–75, Example 4.2.6) are composed of two four-measure units, which are repeated twice: instead of a complete presentation of the subject, Bach gives only the head motif of the subject and just some part of the subject rhythmically paired with the head motif in the bass (Example 4.2.7). After the long episode (mm. 55–68), this subject-like theme finally emerges from the lowest part: first in the bottom voice (mm. 68–71), secondly in the middle voice (mm. 72–75), and finally in the top voice (mm. 76–79). The accompanying sixteenth-notes, and the pedal point on C are repeated in different voices changing their positions. In the second half of the coda (mm. 76–83), the bass goes wild with octave leaps and bold scalar motion, celebrating the elevation of the subject which is finally on top. Bach also extends registral space down to low C with the bass, a note he couldn’t otherwise reach with this simple three-voice fugue. The lowest note in the fugue, this C appears for the first time at the
very end. Incidentally, this low C is also the note Bach adds to the earliest version of accompanying prelude in the beginning. Despite all the activity in these last sixteen measures, Bach simply concludes this fugue on a sustained tonic harmony—also without any complex techniques such as stretto or inversion, until it gets to the final PAC in m. 82.

Example 4.2.6. Added coda of Fugue in C major, BWV 870: mm. 68–75
Example 4.2.7. Subject presentation in the coda

The use of block chords in the last four measures (mm. 80–83) reminds one of the simple realization techniques of partimenti, especially when the simple cadences repeat in various inversions once the music arrives on the tonic. The chromatic inflection of the subdominant (with Ab in mm. 80–81) intensifies the sound, and might be heard as binding together the endings of the prelude and fugue.

Bach’s revisions to this fugue seem above all to affect the completeness of the work: his change in metric notation (C to C major) gives more liveliness to this jubilant piece, lending the original one double accents in each measure. The new coda (mm. 68–83) added to the end, substituting a deceptive cadence at the place where a rather weaker cadence in the tonic (C major) had been, makes this fugue a more finished, effective piece. Not only does Bach show mastery in devising a formal plan that prolongs the motion to the final cadence, he also intensifies the spirit of the fugue with the vigorous bass motion and the use of lower register in the bass.

Having discussed the revision processes J. S. Bach applied to early versions of WTC II in relation to features of partimenti, we will now proceed to explore similar processes in the music of Bach’s son, Carl Philipp Emanuel.
Part III

Early Keyboard Pieces of C.P.E. Bach

J. S. Bach, the composer whose revisions we examined in Chapters 3 and 4, was not only the greatest composer in Germany during the first half of the eighteenth century. He was also an important teacher. Of his many pupils, the most distinguished were his sons, of whom the second, Carl Philipp Emanuel (1714–1788), became a leading figure in north-German musical life from the time he assumed a post in 1738 as chief cembalist to the Prussian King Frederick II to his second career as composer for the major churches in Hamburg (1768–1788). Having had “no teacher other than my father” in keyboard playing and composition,¹⁵³ C.P.E. Bach would have been raised on his father’s instructional works and been taught composition in a variety of mediums, especially solo keyboard works, founded on a mastery of that “Fundament der Composition,” thoroughbass.

An important aspect the elder Bach’s instruction appears to have been learning to convert thoroughbass progressions into compositions in various genres, as well as revising compositions to improve them. Like his father, C.P.E. Bach became an inveterate arranger and improver of his own music, undertaking in the 1740s a number of revisions, or “updates,” to works written probably under his father’s tutelage in the 1730s. These early works and their revisions form the subject matter of Chapters 5–7 of this dissertation.

¹⁵³ Newman (1965), 366.
The series of analyses in Part III of this dissertation will read somewhat differently than analyses aimed toward a comprehensive study of C.P.E. Bach’s revising process. The somewhat piecemeal approach taken here was partly dictated by the nature of Bach’s revisions, which vary greatly as to type and extent, and must simply be taken as they come, for each particular movement. The approach is driven as well by the *ad hoc* nature of these chapters, serving as they do the specific purpose of establishing further models, in addition to those already seen in the preludes and fugues of J. S. Bach, for the types of revision that might be applied to change a simple piece to a finished work. Thus the focus of these chapters will be chiefly to prepare the ground for the compositional work to be undertaken in the final two chapters of this dissertation, although my hope is that Bach’s juvenilia and the revisions he undertook as a mature composer will be found to be inherently interesting as well.
Chapter 5. Simple revisions by C.P.E. Bach

5.1. Sonata in D minor, Wq. 65/3, mov. 3: Allegro assai

This D-minor sonata is one of the early keyboard sonatas from C.P.E. Bach’s Leipzig period (1731–1734)\textsuperscript{154} that he revised during the following decade while a court musician in Berlin. In this case the early version was written in 1732 then revised along with other early works in 1743. The early\textsuperscript{155} and later\textsuperscript{156} versions are reproduced in the important 1985 collection of facsimile reproductions of C.P.E. Bach manuscripts and first editions, edited by Darrell Berg (1985).

While the revisions to the first movement include substantial changes that involve the addition and subtraction of measures to expand or contract phrases, the changes made to this third movement consist mostly in minor variants and embellishments that have no effect on the movement’s underlying structure. It is included here not as an example of revision, therefore, but rather for its close resemblance to the partimenti imitati examined in Chapter 2.

\textsuperscript{154} The extant keyboard works from Bach’s Leipzig period are the sonatas Wq. 65/1 and Wq. 65/1–3, the suite Wq. 65/4, the six sonatinas Wq. 64 1/6, the “Menuett mit überschlagen – den Händen” Wq. 111. See CPEBCW III/9.1, xi.


Several authors have taken the first movement of this D-minor sonata as an example of the influence of J. S. Bach on C.P.E. Bach. Darrell Berg and David Schulenberg, for example, describe the movement as one of works that are “in perpetual motion,” a continuous texture that can readily be found in works of the father and the son.\footnote{Berg (1975), 190; Schulenberg (1984), 49. Wolfgang Horn (1988, 176) attributes this lack of revision to the gigue type that, for him, this movement represents. He observes that movements like the first movement of this D minor sonata, of the “Diskantsolosatz” type, lent themselves more readily to alteration. Horn’s general approach to Bach’s early keyboard sonatas, based on Koch’s “interpunktischer Form,” is similar to my own in that it emphasizes phrase structure and cadence plans, although Horn favors eighteenth-century terminology that is not necessary for our purposes here.} Wayne Petty demonstrates how the opening of the first movement of this D-minor sonata appears to have been based explicitly on the opening of the D-minor Prelude from Book I of the Well-Tempered Clavier, and how C.P.E. Bach uses chromaticism and phrase expansions to conceal that relationship.\footnote{Petty (1995), 98–106.} The movement to be considered here, the third movement, has received comparatively little attention, however, although it also sheds light on the relationship of thoroughbass to finished compositions, as well as a possible modeling, to some degree, from a keyboard piece by J. S. Bach to one of his son’s.

As mentioned above, the changes made in the Berlin revision to this third movement of the D-minor Sonata are limited to a few embellishments (mostly trills).\footnote{The two manuscript versions used in the comparison are those reproduced in Berg (1985), 3:118–119 for the early version and 3:126–127 for the later version.} The movement is worth studying, however, as it resembles the partimenti imitati we considered in Chapter 2. As one can see in Example 5.1.1, the opening four measures are written in double counterpoint, just as we saw in those imitative partimenti, with the double counterpoint continued even in the following sequential transitional phrase (mm. 5–8). This imitative texture on the simple harmony, according to Berg, is one feature of C.P.E. Bach’s “marked dependence upon the past.”\footnote{Berg (1975), 185.} The continuous running eighth notes in $\frac{8}{8}$ meter also fit her description of “perpetual
motion,” which she considers to be another conservative feature of C.P.E. Bach’s approach to composition.\textsuperscript{161}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure.png}
\caption{Example 5.1.1. The opening measures of the Sonata in D minor, Wq. 65/3, mov. 3}
\end{figure}

Instead of the early version of this movement, which hardly differs from the later version, I propose that J. S. Bach’s D-minor Invention, BWV 775, might serve as the primary sketch for the movement. There is no documentary evidence that C.P.E. Bach used the D-minor Invention as a basis for the movement, but the earliest extant copy of this very invention was already included in the \textit{Clavierb"uchlein} for Wilhelm Friedemann Bach,\textsuperscript{162} which is a collection of keyboard works by J. S. Bach composed specifically for instruction. This collection for his first son, along with the collection for his wife Anna Magdalena and the English Suites, became J. S. Bach’s standard teaching material during the first half of 1720s.\textsuperscript{163} As C.P.E. Bach writes about these collections in a letter to Johann Nikolaus Forkel, “since [Bach] himself had composed the most instructive pieces for the clavier . . . he brought up his pupils on them.”\textsuperscript{164} Hence it seems possible that C.P.E. Bach, having access to such an exemplary work as the D-minor Invention, might have tried his own composition based on it.

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., 190.
\textsuperscript{162} It is first dedicated to nine-year-old Wilhelm Friedemann, on January 22, 1720.
\textsuperscript{163} Jones (1997), 143–144.
\textsuperscript{164} In the letter to Forkel of 13 January 1775, BDok 3:289.
\end{footnotesize}
It is not hard to detect points of similarity between the D-minor Invention and the D-minor movement of C.P.E. Bach, especially in the openings. As shown in Example 5.1.2, the double counterpoint between the two voices immediately meets the eye, even if the theme in the invention starts alone in the first two measures. The harmonic feature of the theme, i – suspension – V (shown in the lower systems of Example 5.1.2 and Example 5.1.3) is similar as well.

Example 5.1.2. The opening measures of D-minor Invention, BWV 775, mm. 1–6
Example 5.1.3. The opening measures of the D-minor Sonata, Wq. 65/3, mov. 3, mm. 1–4

The modulating continuations in each piece follow almost in parallel as well. The transition to the relative major key, F major, follows a similar path, by descending-fifths sequence. The sequence in the D-minor Invention (shown and reduced in the upper two systems of Example 5.1.4, mm. 7–14) is concealed in the C.P.E. Bach movement, however, as a fonte sequence (shown and reduced in the lower two systems of Example 5.1.4, mm. 5–9) produces chromatic voice leadings generated from applied chords. That is, the fundamental chords used for both sequences are the same in the first four measures of each (mm. 7–10 of the invention and mm. 59 of the finale); but J. S. Bach enlarges the sequence, completing the full circle of fifths until he arrives at the tonic again at m. 14, while C.P.E. takes the D minor seventh chord from the F major chord he got at m. 8. The reason for the shorter—yet sufficient—sequence seems to be the four-measure phrase rhythm that C.P.E. established in the opening phrase (mm. 1–4), which allowed him to compose four-measure units for each phrase of the exposition section: opening (mm. 1–4), transition (mm. 5–8), and closing (mm. 9–12). On the other hand, J.
S. gave his opening phrase a length of six measures (as he had a two-measure right-hand solo before the double counterpoint) and keeps the six-measure unit likewise for the each phrase: opening (mm. 1–6), transition (mm. 7–12), and closing (mm. 13–18), again suggesting a resemblance between the two works. It may be a coincidence to posit yet another relation to the D-minor invention, but the themes presented in the excursion part are inverted (mm. 26–30 and 38–41), as shown in Example 5.1.5. Accordingly, the relation between these two D-minor works seems close enough, especially in the opening sections, to imagine that the invention did serve as a possible model for the sonata movement.

After that, being a freer genre, the D-minor Invention takes its perpetual motion in motivic-contrapuntal style, after the restatement of the theme in F major (mm. 18–19), which is followed by a simple *fonte* sequence on the inverted theme (mm 22–25). In the finale of C.P.E. Bach’s D-minor sonata, by contrast, each section can be divided into three-part phrases, and features clear key areas, such as the subdominant or return of the tonic. Thus the two pieces begin to diverge after their openings.
Example 5.1.4. Transitions and the closings in the relative major (mm. 7–18 of BWV 775 and mm. 5–12 of Wq. 65/3, mov. 3)
Example 5.1.5. The use of the inverted themes (mm. 14–21 of BWV 775 and mm. 26–30 of Wq. 65/3, mov.3)

This comparison of the D-minor Invention (BWV 775) to the finale of the D-minor Sonata Wq. 65/3 suggests how the invention could have served as a sketch for the longer movement of a sonata in fugato style. As C.P.E. Bach informs us that “in teaching fugues, [Bach] began with two-part ones, and so on,” the D-minor Invention could be a more advanced stage than an imitative partimento bass. Just as the two-part inventions of J. S. Bach functioned as the preliminaries to the study of fugue, followed by the three-part sinfonias, eventually paving the way for the Well-Tempered Clavier, the following observations on other early keyboard pieces of C.P.E. Bach will shed light on tracing compositional process in various stages.

165 BDok 3:289.
166 Jones (1997), 143–144.
5.2. Echo from Suite in E minor, (Wq. 65/4, H6)

The Suite in E minor is one of just two suites appearing in the lists of works documented in the C.P.E. Bach catalogues known as Clavierwerke-Verzeichnis (hereafter CV 1772) and Nachlaß-Verzeichnis (hereafter NV 1790).\(^\text{167}\) Composed in 1733 in Leipzig while the young C.P.E. Bach was still a student of his father, it was later revised in 1744 in Berlin. The early version of the piece was long considered lost, but while preparing the volume of Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: The Complete Works (hereafter CPEBCW) that includes the suite, the editors found a little-known manuscript\(^\text{168}\) that contains a significantly different version. According to Peter Wollny, the editor of the volume which includes the suite, it is likely that this version from the manuscript transmits the original 1733 form of the piece.\(^\text{169}\) For this study, I will use the two versions from CPEBCW I/8.2: the later version (no. 59a, pp. 95–96) and the early version (no. 59b, pp. 102–103).

The suite consists of five movements: Prelude, Allemande, Cantabile (renovated to Adagio non molto in the later version), Echo, and Gigue. The revisions for Prelude, Allemande, and Gigue are limited mostly to melodic embellishment and modest improvements to voice

---

\(^{167}\) NV 1790, p. 1, no. 5. Bach’s Clavierwerke-Verzeichnis (CV 1772) and its discovery among the holdings of the Berlin Sing-Akademie library are described in Berg 2006. A fascimile edition of NV 1790 appears in Wade 1981. The other suite, Wq. 62/12 (NV 1790, p.10, no. 65) was composed much later in 1751 and it was published in 1760.

\(^{168}\) D-LEm, Ms. 2a, source B16. This is a copy partly in the hand of Bach’s Hamburg scribe Michel.

\(^{169}\) CPEBCW I/8.2 p. xx. If this version is the original from 1733, this suite is the only substantial keyboard work from C.P.E. Bach’s Leipzig years transmitted in its original version, apart from the Minuet Wq. 111 and the juvenilia that are included in the same volume.
leading. More substantial changes appear in remaining two movement of the suite, the Cantabile and Echo; those will be discussed here—the Echo presently, and the Cantabile in Chapter 7.

The Echo is the fourth movement of the suite, followed by just a very short last movement, Gigue (of sixteen measures). Schulenberg claims that the movement obviously reflects the Echo that closes J. S. Bach’s B-minor Partita BWV 831, or its early version in C minor, BWV 831a. As one might expect, as C.P.E. Bach was trying to learn through his father’s works, some of the early versions of his compositions betray a certain awkwardness in the handling of phrasing and voice leading. But those very imperfections let us see how the younger Bach enhances a piece when revising it.

**Example 5.2.1** presents a partimento bass reduction of the early version. Measure numbers are retained in the example, but the movement of the bass line is a bit simplified. One result of this reduction is to reveal a bass line closely akin to that of a *partimento semplice*, something that would not be out of place in a Neapolitan partimento. The opening theme is presented in the home key (E minor, mm. 0–6), then later in the relative major (G major, mm. 18–24), with a later reprise of just part of the theme in the home key (mm. 34–37). The last statement of the opening theme is combined with a closing *crux* (†), mm. 39–42, “crux” being the term for the point at which music that closes the first main section (typically an exposition) starts being transposed to the home key in the final section. Just as we saw earlier in

---

170 Bach rewrote the closing part of the exposition of the first movement Prelude in the later version (mm. 17–23). Also by inserting a measure to the last cadence of the exposition, he kept the six-measure phrase rhythm throughout the exposition section. I am not discussing this in detail, as we will have a chance to discuss similar features in other pieces.

171 Schulenberg (2014), 27. The early version in C minor is the one copied by Anna Magdalena Bach around 1730 in P 226.

172 The term *crux* derives from the work of Ralph Kirkpatrick, who describes the *crux* as “the meeting point in each half of the thematic material which is stated in parallel fashion at the end of both halves with the establishment of the closing tonality.” (Kirkpatrick 1968, 255)
partimenti semplici, statements of the theme are connected with sequential areas, which are recognizable as a scale segment in stepwise motion (mm. 12–15), and a chromatic ascending *monte* (mm. 30–33).

Example 5.2.1. The partimento reduction of the Echo from E-minor Suite, Wq. 65/4 (early version)

With this in mind, we can consider Example 5.2.2, the actual piece by C.P.E. Bach, with the early and later versions aligned.
Example 5.2.2. Echo in E minor, early and later version (mm. 1–10)\textsuperscript{173}

\textsuperscript{173} CPEBCW I/8.2: the later version (no. 59a, pp. 95–96) and the early version (no. 59b, pp. 102–103).
Example 5.2.2. Echo in E minor, early and later version (mm. 11–26) [Cont’d]
Example 5.2.2. Echo in E minor, early and later version (mm. 27–37) [Cont’d]
Example 5.2.2. Echo in E minor, early and later version (mm. 38–48) [Cont’d]

When the composer revised this Echo, he kept the exposition section (mm. 0–18) pretty much the same. A notable change is in the first sequential area before the closing in measures 12–13: he puts the third voice in the middle, making explicit the ascending 5–6 sequence, while also preparing the closing in the dominant key in m. 15. (Example 5.2.3)
Example 5.2.3. Ascending 5-6 sequence in the later version

The excursion section (mm. 18–38 in the later version) starts with a full restatement of the opening six measures in G major (mm. 18–24), the relative major key. As shown in Example 5.2.4, Bach again revises a sequential area, this time to prepare the recapitulation. When the music arrives in the subdominant key—without any theme presented—in m. 30, he doubles the length of the rising sequence (mm. 30–32 in the early version) by adding arpeggios (mm. 30–35). This extension gives a better balance to the phrasing as well; the six-measure theme (mm. 18–24) is continued with six-measure transition that modulates to A minor (mm. 25–30), and then also with six-measure sequences (mm.30–35), which arrive on the dominant pedal. Bach also triples the length of m. 33 of the early version, so the dominant before the recapitulation at m. 39 can be emphasized. Measure 33 is extended not only in length, but also in register with contrary motion between the hands.
Example 5.2.4. Expansion before the recapitulation (mm. 29–39 in later version)

Another expansion can be found in the recapitulation, also to preserve the six-measure rhythm before the crux (†) at m. 45 in the later version. That is, as illustrated in Example 5.2.5, the final, partial statement in the home key E minor (mm. 33–36 in the early version) is lengthened to a closing phrase with a six-measure length in the later version, rather than the irregular five-measure phrase of the early version.
Example 5.2.5. The final statement, mm. 39–44 in the later version

The early version of this E-minor Echo from the Suite Wq. 65/4 seems close to the way a partimento semplice would be realized and elaborated into a two-part invention-like piece. Bach made few revisions when he returned to the suite about ten years after its original composition, but the reasons behind the changes seem evident. Those extensions and changes occur in the important events of the piece, such as arrival at the dominant or the preparation for the
recapitulation, and they occasionally change the pacing and proportions to allow progressions sufficient time to perform their work.

More extensive revisions will appear in other C.P.E. Bach movements from this period. Those are the focus of the next two chapters.
Chapter 6. C.P.E. Bach’s Revisions in Form

6.1. Sonata in G Major, Wq. 65/6, mov. 3, Allegro

C.P.E. Bach composed the G-major Sonata Wq. 65/6 in 1736 at Frankfurt (Oder) where he was a law student at the Viadrina University. Bach’s activities during his four years at Frankfurt remain somewhat obscure, but these years should have been important for him as a musician. The young Bach who arrived at Frankfurt, fresh from his father’s training, left the city after those four years an experienced musician, soon to serve the future King Frederick.

As with the Leipzig works, a few of Bach’s Frankfurt compositions have survived to the present day. Most of them are extant only in later versions, and some of the pieces underwent substantial changes even after their Berlin “renovations.” The G-major Sonata Wq. 65/6 is one of those pieces with several changes. According to NV 1790, the earliest surviving catalogue that offers information about Bach’s revisions, the piece was once revised in 1743 at Berlin. Yet there is evidence of an additional revision. A letter dated August 1791 from Bach’s widow Johanna Maria Bach to Johann Jacob Heinrich Westphal (1756–1825), the Schwerin organist

---

174 The surviving few keyboard works by C.P.E. Bach from the Frankfurt (Oder) period (1735–1738) are: the Minuet by Locatelli with 21 Variations, Wq. 118/7, and the sonatas Wq. 65/5–10. See CPEBCW III 9/1, xi.
175 Schulenberg (2014), 38.
who collected Bach’s works and compiled another catalogue around 1810, suggests that the
revision may have been made during Bach’s last years at Hamburg. In that letter Johanna Maria
discusses a shipment of manuscripts to Westphal and the need to emend his collection:

The 14th of the seven sonatas\textsuperscript{176} had to be copied on account of the many
alterations. . . . Everything was meticulously looked over and carefully
altered . . .\textsuperscript{177}

Revisions appear throughout the piece; the closing phrases of the exposition and recapitulation
are changed in the first movement; and the second movement seems to be substituted or
borrowed from another piece as the earliest version and the earlier version share no features but
the G major key.\textsuperscript{178} The most of the “many alterations” to which Bach’s widow refers in the
letter are in the last movement of the sonata, however—the Allegro,\textsuperscript{179} which will be discussed
below.

The version of “the 14th” sonata that Johanna Maria Bach mentions in the letter cited
above is in the Brussels manuscript (B-Bc 5883) copied in the hand of the composer’s trusted
scribe Michel. The latest version of the movement is the one that includes Bach’s autograph
erasures, corrections and additions made over the earlier Michel copy. This Michel copy,
however, is not the earliest version, as it is an already revised version from the 1740s in Michel’s
early hand. These two versions in one manuscript, reproduced in Berg (1985),\textsuperscript{180} were believed

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{176} “The 14th” is the number assigned in NV 1790 for the G-major sonata, Wq. 65/6.
\textsuperscript{177} Letter of August 1791 in the collection from Bach’s widow and daughter to Westphal: “Von den 7 Sonaten hat
die 14te der vielen Veränderungen wegen ganz müssen abgeschrieben warden. . . . Alles übrige ist scharf
durchgesehen und genau geändert worden…” Berg (1988), 134. Translation by Berg in
http://4hlxx40786q1osp7b1b814j8co.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/david-
October 24, 2017.
\textsuperscript{178} The Adagio of the earliest version (CPEBCW I 6/2 p. 16) is changed into the Adagio molto of the earlier and later
version (CPEBCW I 6/2 p. 10 and p. 4).
\textsuperscript{179} Ibid., 136.
\end{flushright}
to be a sole source for the later version of the sonata; however, I was fortunate to encounter the earliest version of this movement, which is yet to be published in *Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach: The Complete Works* (CPEBCW) I/6.2. Even though this earliest version is posted to the website for CPEBCW only as a draft, it shows differences particularly in expansion, and by comparing and aligning all three versions we will have a better idea about Bach’s expansion techniques. The following **Example 6.1.1**, is the earliest version from CPEBCW I/6.2, pp. 17–18, the earlier and later versions reproduced in Berg (1985) from P 772 aligned vertically and chronologically from the top system.

![Example 6.1.1. Sonata in G major, Wq. 65/6, mov. 3, earliest, earlier and later version (mm. 0–6)](image)

**Example 6.1.1.** Sonata in G major, Wq. 65/6, mov. 3, earliest, earlier and later version (mm. 0–6)

---


Example 6.1.1. Sonata in G major, Wq. 65/6, mov. 3, earliest, earlier and later version (mm. 7–17) [Cont’d]
Example 6.1.1. Sonata in G major, Wq. 65/6, mov. 3, earliest, earlier and later version (mm. 18–28) [Cont’d]
Example 6.1.1. Sonata in G major, Wq. 65/6, mov. 3, earliest, earlier and later version (mm. 29–38) [Cont’d]
Example 6.1.1. Sonata in G major, Wq. 65/6, mov. 3, earliest, earlier and later version (mm. 39–46) [Cont’d]
Example 6.1.1. Sonata in G major, Wq. 65/6, mov. 3, earliest, earlier and later version (mm. 47–56) [Cont’d]
Example 6.1.1. Sonata in G major, Wq. 65/6, mov. 3, earliest, earlier and later version (mm. 57–68) [Cont’d]
Bach’s successive revisions to the opening phrase (shown in Example 6.1.2, mm. 0–8) show how he transforms an elementary partimento-like realization into a flowing keyboard piece. As can be seen in Example 6.1.3, which presents the opening phrase of the earliest version aligned with the reduction on the lower system, the harmony used in this eight-measure phrase is kept very simple; except for m. 2 with its 7-6 suspension on ii₆, everything else is formed of repeated pairings of the tonic and dominant. The bass is just walking in quarter notes in the earliest version, and those of mm. 3–4 recur in mm. 5–6 right away. Bach ameliorates these measures in the earlier version by splitting m. 5 into eighth notes. In the later version, as shown in Example 6.1.2, he retouches the bass line; Bach makes the phrase rhythmically more
interesting by inserting an eighth rest on the downbeat of each measure (mm. 1–4). The eighth rests in turn emphasize the syncopation of the right-hand as well. Bach changes the bass of m. 5 again; the new half note C allows ii₂₆ harmony to emerge, a harmony absent in the earlier versions, and the descending scale of the right-hand part then connects smoothly into a cadential ⁴₆ at m. 7. By these running sixteenth notes (mm. 5–7), Bach also lends the piece a more idiomatic keyboard character.

Example 6.1.2. The opening phrase of the last movement, Sonata in G major, Wq. 65/6, mm. 0–8
Example 6.1.3. The opening phrase of the earliest version and its reduction, mm. 0–8

Bach keeps the transitional phrase (mm. 8–16) the same in all versions. For the following closing phrase, however, he greatly expands m. 17 of the earliest and the earlier version, so the closing phrase of the later version can acquire the eight-measure length of the preceding phrases in the exposition (see Example 6.1.4). In addition to extending the V of D major, the dominant key, by chordal leaps (mm. 18–20 of the later version), Bach inserts a cadential gesture in m. 21 of the later version, so the deceptive cadence at m. 18 of the earlier versions can function more effectively to prepare the PAC in D major at m. 24.
Example 6.1.4. The closing phrase of the exposition, the earliest, the earlier, and the later versions (mm. 16–24)

The opening phrase of the excursion part starts with D minor, and only the beginning of theme (5–1–2–3) is traceable behind the varied rhythm in the earliest and the earlier versions. In the later version, Bach changes the theme again, so only the incipit of the theme (5–1) remains (Example 6.1.5). By doing this, however, Bach manages to turn the opening phrase into two sequential four-measure phrases, moving up by fifths. This seems to be more stable manner to approach the B minor key; in the earliest and earlier version Bach had those two four-measure phrases, the first moving from D minor to A minor, but the other reaches B minor through the bass A♯ at m. 25. Furthermore, Bach gets to remove the awkward augmented leaps of mm. 23 and 27 of the earliest version, abandoning the syncopated rhythm and filling the bass with

---

183 These augmented intervals are revised similarly in the later version of the Cantabile from the E-minor Suite Wq. 65/4.
chordal leaps. This is a case where variation in the original version is replaced with a more conventional repetition.

Example 6.1.5. The opening phrase of the excursion, the earliest, the earlier, and the later versions (mm. 24–32)

After this opening phrase of the excursion part, Bach rewrites the transitional phrases of the earliest version, which employ rather impotent modulations. That is, as shown in Example 6.1.6, the first transitional phrase starts on the B minor which ended the opening phrase (m. 28), and modulates to E minor through a somewhat static descending sequence in A minor (mm. 29-32). Another sequential eight-measure phrase follows, which modulates to A minor at m. 40 and again back to B minor at m. 44. This B minor key is even confirmed with four additional measures (mm. 45–48), an extension that concludes the excursion part.

In the later versions, on the other hand, the functions of the transitional phrases are made more transparent than in the earliest version (Example 6.1.7). The first transitional eight-
measure phrase (mm. 32–39) begins with the same B minor key but arrives to the tonic key at m. 40 by the means of a descending-fifths sequence. Another descending sequence follows, this retransition ending with five measures of dominant pedal (mm. 46–50) to prepare the recapitulation at m. 50. This rewritten transitional phrase shows a further development toward a keyboard piece, beyond a realization of a bass: the texture is denser with sixteenth-note triplets, which fill the tritone gaps from the earliest version; the bass line is livelier, contrasted to the sedentary quarter-note bass of the earliest version.

Example 6.1.6. Transitional phrases of the earliest version, mm. 28–48
Example 6.1.7. Transitional phrases of the later version, mm. 32–51
6.2. Sonata in Eb Major, Wq. 65/7, mov. 1, Allegro moderato

Another of the composer’s earliest surviving keyboard pieces, this Sonata in Eb Major (Wq. 65/7) underwent greater revision than the pieces discussed to this point.\textsuperscript{184} The first two movements show significant changes from their early versions, while the third movement was sparsely revised, which Berg claims to be “typical of the alterations” in many other Bach revisions.\textsuperscript{185}

According to the NV 1790, the posthumously published catalog of Bach’s estate, the sonata was composed in 1736 at Frankfurt (Oder) and revised in 1744 at Berlin. But the surviving sources have a complicated history,\textsuperscript{186} and the actual date of the composition could be earlier, as an early version of the first movement is found in the second book of Notenbüchlein der Anna Magdalena Bach (Little Keyboard Book of Anna Magdalena Bach, 1725). Since there are many sources of this sonata and it is unknown to which the NV 1790 refers, I will be using the two manuscript versions of the sonata reproduced in Berg (1985), vol. 3, pp. 196–198 for the early version\textsuperscript{187} and pp. 201–203 for the later version\textsuperscript{188} in this discussion.

Only the first movement of the sonata is included in the second book of the Notenbüchlein der A. M. Bach (Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Mus. Ms. Bach P 225), with the title

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{184} The surviving few keyboard works by C.P.E. Bach from the Frankfurt period (1735–1738) are: the Minuet by Locatelli with 21 Variations, Wq. 118/7 and the sonatas Wq. 65/5-10. CPEBCW III 9/1, xi.
  \item \textsuperscript{185} Berg (1988): 139.
  \item \textsuperscript{186} Ibid., 160.
  \item \textsuperscript{187} D-brd-B P 368, pp. 106–108, copied by Gottfried August Homilius (1714–1785).
  \item \textsuperscript{188} D-brd-B P 775, pp. 107–109, copied by Johann Heinrich Michel and reviewed by C.P.E. Bach.
\end{itemize}
Solo per il cembalo (BWV Anh 129). The term solo was often used in the eighteenth century to refer to a piece of music for a keyboard or for a melody instrument accompanied by basso continuo, and it was practically equivalent to “solo sonata.” Schulenberg assumes that the use of the term solo as the title of the piece might mean that the piece was extracted from a multi-movement work and this first movement might be another Leipzig composition. So the NV 1790’s date of composition (1736) is either that of a subsequent revision, or of the sonata’s assembly from individual movements composed separately before.\textsuperscript{189}

Even if the sonata was composed later, the changes made to the piece deserve close attention, as we can follow the compositional decisions when Bach revised it. Most of all, Bach expanded the early version of this first movement in $E_b$ from sixty-four measures to eighty-two measures, as shown in Example 6.2.1. The early version is on the upper two staves (P 368) and the later version is on the lower two staves (P 775).

\textsuperscript{189} Schulenberg (2014), 28.
Example 6.2.1. Sonata in Eb major, mov. 1, early and later version (mm. 1–17)
Example 6.2.1. Sonata in Eb major, mov. 1, early and later version (mm. 18–34) [Cont’d]
Example 6.2.1. Sonata in Eb major, mov. 1, early and later version (mm. 35–49) [Cont’d]
Example 6.2.1. Sonata in Eb major, mov. 1, early and later version (mm. 50–67) [Cont’d]
Example 6.2.1. Sonata in Eb major, mov. 1, early and later version (mm. 68–82) [Cont’d]
The first difference to notice in comparing the two versions of this movement is the incipit of four-measure theme (mm. 0–4). As illustrated in Example 6.2.2, Bach changed from an arpeggio of the tonic chord to a descending run in thirty-second notes, allowing the downbeat at m. 1 to be accented more effectively. The third voice added at the downbeat of m. 2 (G in the left hand, boxed in Example 6.2.2) offers a full chord on vi.¹⁹⁰

Example 6.2.2. The opening measures of the first movement, in early and later version (mm. 0–6)

The theme leads to a two-measure continuation that echoes the PAC in the tonic (mm. 4–6) then to a transitional passage in the dominant key, B♭ major (mm. 7–10). Bach also makes some changes to this passage; by adding a third voice earlier at the end of m. 6, and omitting the rest on the downbeat of m. 7, Bach draws a sharper distinction between the opening phrase and the transitional phrase (see Example 6.2.3). Also, by changing the 4–3 suspension of m. 10 to a plain IAC and filling the measure with sixteenth-note triplets, he lends the piece an effect of moving forward rather than resting on B♭.

¹⁹⁰ This third voice at measure 2, however, was already in the Anna Magdalena copy (P 225). It is unclear whether its omission was a mistake by the copyist Homilius.
Example 6.2.3. Transitional area in the dominant key, in early and later version (mm. 6–10)

In the following sequential measures, Bach doubles the length of the descending sequence, once again balancing phrase lengths to maintain a four-measure phrase rhythm (mm. 11–14 in later version, Example 6.2.4). In the closing of the exposition (also shown in Example 6.2.4), the changes Bach made in mm. 17–18 of the early version create not only a better voice leading and resolution of the seventh, but also the emphasis on vii°7/F resulting from a full chord. The second beat of the m. 19 of the early version is also changed, so the later version can have the pre-dominant ii6 chord before the PAC in B♭ at the end of the exposition.
Example 6.2.4. The sequence and the closing section, in early and later version

The excursion section of this movement is where Bach introduces the greatest expansions. As shown in Example 6.2.5, the theme is restated (mm. 20–24 in the early version) in the dominant key (B♭ major) with a slightly varied continuation (mm. 24–26). The following transitional area touches the submediant key (C minor) in mm. 27–31 but quickly returns to B♭ major at m. 34. After this, Bach rather hurries to close the section, modulating to the relative minor, the G minor key.
Example 6.2.5. The excursion section of the early version, mm. 22–43

In the later version, on the other hand, Bach inserts two new passages after the first transition modulates back in B♭ major at m. 36 (m. 34 in early version). As one can see in Example 6.2.6, the first part of the passage (mm. 36–41) is a descending-fifth sequence, which
was absent in the early version, and naturally connected to the dominant pedal on D (V of G minor, mm. 42–46). No longer hurrying to the G-minor cadence of m. 42, another, new chromatically descending sequence (mm. 46–48) elicits the climax of the movement; a Neapolitan sixth and the dominant ninth chord are here stretched out (mm. 48–50). Changes like these show not only a continued attention to phrase proportions but also a sensitivity to well-textured chromaticism as an agent of rhetorical climax. Later we will see that just such revisions can go a long way toward changing a simple partimento to a more effective piece.

Example 6.2.6. The first insertion in the excursion section (mm. 36–52 in the later version)

After the PAC in G minor at m. 52, Bach inserts another descending sequence (mm. 52–56), a retransition which prepares the recapitulation. The falling runs in thirty-second notes at
mm. 52 and 54 then anticipate the revised incipit of the theme discussed earlier. This insertion of the sequence eliminates the direct juxtaposition of the G minor cadence with the restatement of the theme in Eb major in the early version as well (Example 6.2.7). This shows that retransitions were considered optional, as the piece makes sense with or without such a connecting passage, and that the decision whether to include such an optional passage was one necessarily contemplated for any movement that contained a recapitulation.

Example 6.2.7. Descending sequence inserted before the recapitulation (mm. 41–44 in the early version and mm. 51–58 in the later version)

In the recapitulation section of the early version, the left-hand part of the theme is varied, losing its Romanesca bass. The tail of the theme is also altered, and suddenly goes to the subdominant key (Ab major), which had not previously been touched on (mm. 42–46). As shown in Example 6.2.8, Bach revises this passage in the later version to a full restatement of the theme in the home key (Eb major), and inserts a four-measure passage (mm. 61–63) allowing a smoother transition to the subdominant key.
Example 6.2.8. Restatement of the theme in the recapitulation and following transition to the subdominant key (mm. 42–46 in the early version and mm. 56–64 in the later version)

As can be seen in Example 6.2.9, the theme with the varied left-hand part is presented in a distant key of F Major in the early version, abandoning the subdominant key (Ab Major) right away (mm. 46–50). What the young Bach seems to have intended here was a sequential treatment of the theme itself; with an altered theme that modulates a fourth higher, he can arrive to the dominant key (Bb major) in an eight-measure space. The subsequent measures (mm. 51–56) after the two varied statements also show that Bach is trying to find a way to the dominant, or to place an adequate dominant area before the closing section. It is unknown if the two-measure deletion between measures 53 and 54 in P 368 is by Bach himself or an error made by Homilius in the copying process, but these repeating two measures with I – V⁵ seem to reflect a struggle for a better transition to the closing section.
Example 6.2.9. Theme restatements in the recapitulation and the transition in the early version (mm. 42–56)

Such weak points as these in the recapitulation are highly instructive as we can see how Bach addresses them in the later version. As discussed above, the theme is fully stated in the home key of E♭ major, the transition takes the piece to the subdominant key at m. 64. As shown in Example 6.2.10, the restatement in F major (mm. 46–50 in the early version) is omitted and reborn as a new passage with 7-6 suspensions and vii°7 chord, which had previously been featured at various points earlier in the piece. This revision keeps the left-hand part of the varied theme, but with the new right-hand part, it allows the bass line to move upward chromatically, and the tension of that rising bass is resolved with a more satisfactory cadence in B♭ major in mm. 69–70. The rest of the piece takes almost the same closing from the exposition section, transposed to the home key.
Example 6.2.10. The better transition to the dominant key in the later version (mm. 64–70), in comparison with the early version (mm. 46–52)

In this Eb major Sonata, revisions to phrase lengths and proportions, the modifications to sequences and transitions, and the use of texture and chromaticism to create suitable points of emphasis, as well as the refinements of a smaller scale—these all bear directly on ways to improve simple pieces, as we shall apply them in this dissertation’s final two chapters. First, however, we can complete our survey of techniques with few revisions of an even more substantial nature that C.P.E. Bach occasionally undertook.
Chapter 7. Further Revisions by C.P.E. Bach: Figuration, Change of Expression and Genre

7.1. Sonata in Eb Major, Wq. 65/7, mov. 2

C.P.E. Bach heavily revised the second movement of the Sonata in Eb Major, Wq. 65/7, so the early version, *Siciliano* is hard to recognize immediately in the later version. He renamed the movement *Andante*, as he abandoned the lilting rhythm of dotted eighth notes and filled the spaces with highly decorative sixteenth notes. This type of approach to revising a slow movement is similar to what we saw in the third movement of the Suite in E minor, Wq. 65/4; the title is changed from an Italian name (*Cantabile*) to a tempo marking (*Adagio non molto*); and the embellishment is made by splitting the longer notes to shorter ones like running sixteenths. The employment of these sixteenth notes changes the texture from a two-voice counterpoint to a freer one, and makes the theme reach to the highest register in an instant (m. 1), whereas the register of the earlier version comfortably stays in two octaves. In what follows I will term the earlier version the *Siciliano*, the later version the *Andante*; those versions that I will be using for the analysis are from the manuscript reproduced in Berg (1985).\(^{191}\)

---

As one can see in Example 7.1.1, which aligns the Siciliano (on the upper two staves, P 368) and the Andante (on the lower two staves, P 775), Bach extended the movement greatly in length from twenty-one measures to thirty-two measures. Like the other works discussed above, the most notable points of the expansion are made at the end of sections. Unlike the Adagio non molto of the E-minor Suite that kept only the underlying harmony of the first sixteen measures of the early Cantabile (a movement discussed later in this chapter), Bach kept most of the harmonic frame in the Siciliano regardless of how much new music he inserted into the Andante.
Example 7.1.1. Sonata in Eb major, mov. 2, early and later version (mm. 1–12)
Example 7.1. Sonata in Eb major, mov. 2, early and later version (mm. 13–24) [Cont’d]
Once again the motivation for a major revision appears to be an important event in the piece, such as the arrival of the dominant key. As illustrated in Example 7.1.2, Bach extends mm. 5–6 of the Siciliano into four measures (mm. 5–8 of the Andante), and omits mm. 7–8 of the Siciliano, which had formed an IAC to B♭ major (V). This emendation delays the B♭ cadence
until m. 12, making it the first cadence in the dominant key. This cadence in B♭ is also the first point that Bach amplifies greatly.

Example 7.1.2. Delay of the dominant arrival, mm. 5–12

As shown in Example 7.1.3, mm. 12–13 of the Siciliano, which abandon the dominant key so easily and move to the home key right away, are expanded to nine measures in the Andante (mm. 12–20). That is, Bach prolongs the dominant area with ascending *monte* sequence
(mm. 13–15) and a pianissimo passage in parallel sixths of m. 16. This passage presents some sort of orchestral echo effect, as well as a dynamic contrast. It also gives a boost to the next four-measure phrase (mm. 17–20), which Bach extends from just one measure (m.13 of the Siciliano). One can also see how m. 13 of the Siciliano is expanded to four measures (mm. 17–20) using materials from earlier in the exposition. Furthermore, the dominant of the m. 20 of the Andante is approached once again with a chromatic ascent in the bass, so the recapitulation (mm. 21–22 of the Andante) which was absent in the Siciliano may be emphasized.

Example 7.1.3. The extension of the dominant area, mm. 13–20
7.2. Cantabile – Adagio non molto from Suite in E minor, Wq. 65/4

This is the third movement of the Suite in E minor, Wq. 65/4, discussed earlier in Chapter 5.\(^{192}\) When C.P.E. Bach decided to revise the suite in 1744, he rewrote the third movement, changing it from a simple bipartite Cantabile into a highly expressive and richly embellished Adagio non molto, thus further emphasizing the stylistic contrast between the movements. In what follows I will term the earlier version the Cantabile, the later version the Adagio non molto. As one might expect from the change of the title, Bach changes the whole character of the piece; indeed, the Cantabile (shown in Example 7.2.1) does not seem to be appropriately titled, as the piece is more of a speaking character than a “singing” one.\(^{193}\) Also, this version is more of an elementary sketch for a piece, as the harmony and melody are rather incomplete and sometimes not quite coherent.

\(^{192}\) See section 5.1.2.

\(^{193}\) Schulenberg (2014), 27.
Example 7.2.1. Cantabile of the Suite in E minor, mm. 1–12\textsuperscript{194}

\textsuperscript{194} As reproduced in CPEBCW I/8.2, no. 59b: 100–01.
Example 7.2.1. Cantabile of the Suite in E minor, mm. 13–33 [Cont’d]

On the other hand, the Adagio non molto, shown in Example 7.2.2, would seem to result from re-thinking the possibilities for turning the sparse sketch into a finished piece. Similar to an added double variation movement of a sarabande in J. S. Bach’s English Suites, the Adagio non molto seems to be an entirely new piece, though the new version does tag along with the harmonic outline of the Cantabile for the first sixteen measures.
Example 7.2.2. Adagio non molto of the Suite in E minor, mm. 1–18
Example 7.2.2. Adagio non molto of the Suite in E minor, mm. 19–23 [Cont’d]

David Schulenberg assumes that the Cantabile was likely performed with notes that are not written, such as impromptu embellishments and inner-voices.\textsuperscript{196} The striking, falling leap of a diminished seventh in the first measure of the Cantabile, which is followed by a bare Neapolitan sixth, is filled with embellishments in the Adagio non molto, as illustrated in

Example 7.2.3. Another diminished seventh chord presented in the Cantabile with protruding augmented-fourth leaps in the upper voice, is rewritten to a smoother texture as shown in

Example 7.2.4.

\textsuperscript{195} As reproduced in CPEBCW I/8.2, no. 59a: 93–94.
\textsuperscript{196} Ibid., Supplement 3.3, http://4hlxx40786q1osp7b1b814j8co.wpengine.netdna-cdn.com/david-schulenberg/files/2014/06/cpeb_supplement_3_03r.pdf
Example 7.2.3. The opening measures of the Cantabile (mm. 1–4) and the Adagio non molto (mm. 1–3)

Example 7.2.4. A better expression of a diminished seventh chord (mm. 8–9 in Cantabile)

Bach also excises unnecessary repetitions from the Cantabile, such as omitting m. 3 from the Adagio, in the opening measures shown in Example 7.2.3. Hence, the Adagio non molto is actually ten measures shorter than the Cantabile, with the omission of two repeats at the end of each section (mm. 12 and 33 of the Cantabile) as well. Bearing in mind that Bach heavily
embellishes the Cantabile with sixteenth notes, the actual duration of a performance would not change too much. However, this is different from other revisions of his works, as Bach’s revisions usually increase the length rather than abbreviating it. In the present case, the content still increases, in a sense, as each measure is lavishly supplied with diminution.

Both of the movements discussed in this chapter could be discussed in greater detail, but such an extensive treatment is not necessary for the immediate purposes of this dissertation. They are included here only to show how radically a piece might change in the process of revision.

Through the foregoing analyses and comparisons of C.P.E. Bach’s early keyboard pieces from his Leipzig and Frankfurt years, we have seen how these pieces are close to figured partimento realizations, and how they show some imprints of J. S. Bach’s influence. The simplicity, as well as some of the imperfections, of those early versions certainly concur with partimenti, and C.P.E. Bach’s efforts to enhance these pieces will guide us to inquire about the intermediate stages to a finished piece. The following chapters will draw together the various kinds of information gained from the preceding chapters, from partimento realization to the various kinds of revision that we have seen in keyboard music by J. S. and C.P.E. Bach, using my own compositions to demonstrate the process from partimento to finished piece.
Part IV

From Partimento to Prelude and Fugue

The preceding chapters have considered the features of partimenti semplici and imitati, and the compositional techniques that the two Bachs used to revise and expand their early works. It remains for the final two chapters, comprising Part IV of this dissertation, to demonstrate how the means explored so far can develop the potentialities of partimenti into real pieces of music.¹⁹⁷

Before undertaking this task, it should be noted that my approaches will be limited to certain styles and genres, in order to provide a synthesis of the previous chapters and further evidence of our hypothesis. The partimento realizations and their development into the finished pieces presented in these final chapters are, after all, just illustrations for purposes of demonstration. As discussed earlier, no single, definitive solution exists for the realization of any given partimento; indeed, not only did the style of realization differ from one maestro to the next, from one school to the next, but students were encouraged by their partimento maestros to try “virtually countless solutions to any single partimento.”¹⁹⁸ Although I endeavored to write in a Bachian style in the compositions presented here, I cannot claim that my realizations and compositions are necessarily the optimal ways to deal with those two partimenti or that they would be on par with any of Bach’s music, as they are original works based on my own training in partimenti and tonal composition.

¹⁹⁷ Transformation of a partimento to a finished piece has been already attempted in Vasili Byros’ article (2015), in which he attempted to present his own prelude based on Prelude No. 48 in D minor from Langloz manuscript. ¹⁹⁸ Sanguinetti (2012), 242.
The possibilities for realizing a partimento may be limitless, but for the purposes of this dissertation, I will limit the genres to prelude and fugue, as those genres connect most directly to the earlier discussions in Parts I and II. Thus, the following Chapters 8 and 9 will attempt to clarify the compositional processes in my own compositions for keyboard, based on selected partimenti: a prelude from a *partimento semplice*, and a fugue from a *partimento imitato*. 
Chapter 8. Prelude in C minor on a Partimento by Fenaroli

The material for my own prelude for keyboard will be a simple partimento in C minor\textsuperscript{199} by Fenaroli, discussed earlier in Chapter 1. This C-minor partimento is simple enough to be included in the \textit{Primo Corso} of the De Nardis anthology, yet it offers several opportunities for further elaboration. Aligned vertically, \textbf{Example 8.1} shows my realization of the Fenaroli C-minor partimento with block chords and the first sketch\textsuperscript{200} of the prelude.\textsuperscript{201} In this first sketch, compositional actions are limited to the upper part, figurating the realization with sixteenth notes, while the original partimento bass is kept intact.

\textsuperscript{199} De Nardis (1933), 6; originally no. 8 of Fenaroli’s \textit{Libro primo}.
\textsuperscript{200} An experienced partimenti player may realize the partimento in a version similar to this first sketch without going through a chordal realization.
\textsuperscript{201} As noted earlier, this realization is not sole solution to this partimento. Sanguinetti realizes every single eighth note of the bass of the same partimento with striking Italian sixth chord at the end of measure 2. See Section 1.2 for further discussion.
Example 8.1. Simple realization of Fenaroli’s C-minor partimento and the first version of prelude (mm. 1–12)
Example 8.1. Simple realization of Fenaroli’s C-minor partimento and the first version of prelude (mm. 13–30) [Cont’d]
Example 8.1. Simple realization of Fenaroli’s C-minor partimento and the first version of prelude (mm. 31–49) [Cont’d]
The first version of the prelude, shown in the lower system of **Example 8.1**, is more a simple two-part invention than an elaborated prelude. Being faithful to its original partimento bass, this version could be generated fairly easily by a student who had studied partimenti for some time. For the next step in developing this simple version, we will start with the most obvious areas that suggest opportunities for revision. As discussed earlier, bridges from one theme statement to another are ideal places for adding expansions. In Fenaroli’s partimento bass, the composer allotted just a single measure, raising the bass a half step from E♭ to E♭½, to the space between the second theme statement in the relative major key (E♭ major) and the third statement in the subdominant key (F minor). This same technique was used again to connect the third statement (F minor) to the fourth statement in the dominant minor (G minor). **Example 8.2** illustrates six extra measures with a descending-fifths sequence, inserted between the E♭ major theme statement and the F minor one. As one can see, the end of the E♭ major statement is changed to a deceptive cadence at m. 13, which initiates the sequence that delays the arrival of E♭ (at m. 19). In addition, the sequence takes its motive from the tail of the theme, so the extension may blend in naturally.

**Example 8.2.** Descending-fifth sequence between two theme statements (from relative major to the subdominant)
The second sequence for an expansion, this time between the subdominant (F minor) and the dominant minor (G minor) theme statements, is shown in Example 8.3. Keeping in mind the chromatic ascent in Fenaroli’s original bass to approach the theme statement in the new key, a *monte* sequence is another choice, as the *monte* is available for an expansion whenever the key is raised by a whole tone. The use and the expansion of a *monte* sequence is commonly found in C.P.E. Bach’s revisions, especially when he wants to move from the subdominant key to the dominant; mm. 30–35 of the Echo in E minor (Wq. 65/4) would be an example.\textsuperscript{202}

**Example 8.3.** *Monte* sequence between two theme statements (from the subdominant to the dominant minor)

The repetition of the cadence at the end of a piece, as was noted earlier in Chapter 1, is a very common feature of partimenti. Not only do such repetitions reinforce the closure of the piece, they also prefigure a feasible extension. In this C-minor partimento, Fenaroli simply appended two repetitive measures, changing the tonic arrival C to leap up from the dominant, rather than down, in the last statement of the theme. As we saw earlier, however, a deceptive

\textsuperscript{202} Example 5.2.4 in Chapter 5.
cadence is another effective and customary means for a composer to change the bass and initiate a coda. Recall that J. S. Bach availed himself of just such a deceptive cadence at the end of C-major fugue (BWV 870), to launch a newly composed sixteen-measure coda. Example 8.4 shows a first extension of Fenaroli’s C-minor partimento ending, still preserving the composer’s original bass. The repeated two-measure cadences (mm. 46–47 and 48–49 of the first version) are separated by newly composed measures (mm. 59–64), which employ a Neapolitan sixth chord to increase the tension before the last cadence. Recall the good effect that the Neapolitan made in C.P.E. Bach’s Sonata in Eb major (Example 6.2.6).

Example 8.4. Extended coda with a deceptive cadence

Incorporating these three interpolations produces Example 8.5, the second version of our C-minor prelude. In general, one might term this second version more an invention with two voices.

---

203 At m. 68 of Example 4.2.5 in Chapter 4.
Example 8.5. The second version of the prelude, mm. 1–30
Example 8.5. The second version of the prelude, mm. 31–66 [Cont’d]
However, improvements can still be made in several places, since the bass line of this second version hews closely to the original partimento. In addition to emending the bass line of the original partimento, a few more changes will improve the second version to a more elaborated one: extension of the tonic key area at the beginning, refinements to the contrapuntal texture, continuation of the composite rhythm with sixteenth notes, and the extension of the coda. This final set of changes will produce our final, most polished version of the piece.

First of all, the theme can be improved with some nonharmonic tones, as can be observed in Example 8.6. While the beginning of the theme in the first version that carried the chordal realization of the C-minor partimento had a static C on the top, passing and neighboring notes are used in the final version. This emended version of the theme can be inverted and added as the second statement of the theme; such a technique was mentioned in Chapter 3 as the means of extension that Bach employed in the D-minor Prelude (BWV 875). Repeating the theme statement, we can reconfirm the tonic key rather than abandoning it and hastening to modulate. The inversion of the theme will resonate nicely with the later inverted counterpoint on the dominant and the tonic that Fenaroli had already implanted in the original partimento.

\[204\text{ mm. 1–9 of Example 3.1.4 in Chapter 3.}\]
Example 8.6. Theme statement in the tonic key and its repetition in inversion (mm. 1–9 of the final version)

The modulatory bridge with a descending fonte sequence between the first statement of the theme in the tonic (C minor) and the second statement in the relative major (Eb) can be expanded as shown in Example 8.7. Although the urgent syncopations in the chordal realization are diluted with sixteenth notes, the modulation still seems hurried. Hence, the fonte sequence is expanded to have a chord per measure, except for m. 16 that has cadential bass motion (2–5).

Furthermore, this expansion balances the lengths of phrases, preserving the eight-measure pacing established by two tonic statements (mm. 1–8). Similar ways of lengthening short sequences were noted earlier in some of C.P.E. Bach’s keyboard pieces (including the Echo from Suite in E minor Wq. 65/4205 and the first movement of E- Sonata Wq. 65/7206).

---

205 See Example 5.2.4. in section 5.2.
206 See Example 6.2.4. in section 6.2.
Example 8.7. Expansion of the modulatory bridge (mm. 9–17 of the final version)

The other two modulatory expansions between theme statements (mentioned in Example 8.2 and 8.3) can also be revised into something more intricate. As shown in the lower system of Example 8.8, the bass line of the interpolated descending-fifths sequence between the relative major key (E♭ major) and the subdominant key (F minor) can be changed to incorporate sixteenth notes that move stepwise. With this revision not is only continuous movement in a composite rhythm of sixteenth notes attained, but the two parts can correspond with each other.

Example 8.8. Simple and intricate version of the sequence between E♭ major and F minor theme statements.
Similarly, the other interpolated sequence, the one that moves from the subdominant to the dominant key, can be revised. The bass line may be diversified with sixteenth notes and octave leaps, so the rhythms in the monte sequence (mm. 36–44 of the final version, shown in the lower system of Example 8.9) can be interchanged with each other. Furthermore, the repetitive content of mm. 26–27 and 30–31 (upper system of Example 8.9) is varied by means of a deceptive cadence at m. 33.

Example 8.9. Simple and intricate version of the sequence between F minor and G minor theme statements.

When the piece arrives to its dominant minor key (G minor), another inverted theme statement is added (mm. 41–44). This inverted statement need not be illustrated separately as it uses the same technique used to expand the C-minor statement that began the piece, except to note that the inverted statement precedes the original one this time, as often happened in the pieces discussed earlier, such as the last movement of C.P.E. Bach’s D-minor sonata (Wq. 65/3). In the D-minor sonata the doubling of theme statement with its inversion occurs at the

---

207 mm. 26–30 of the third movement of D-minor sonata (Wq. 65/3), and mm. 26–33 of D-minor prelude (BWV 875).
relative major key (F major), where it could mark an important event or change of the piece. This second iteration of inverted theme statements on G minor seems appropriate, not only since it is the penultimate statement of the theme but also because the couplets of four measures with double counterpoint follow right after these G minor statements. Retaining Fenaroli’s original bass line and having only two voices at my disposal, it was not possible to apply strict double counterpoint in the first and the second versions of this C-minor prelude; but as shown in Example 8.10, the added resources of double counterpoint applied to these measures remove the sedentary bass lines of mm. 30–33 and 38–41 and enliven both parts.  

\[208\]

---

208 The realization with triple counterpoint based on Fenaroli’s figure is demonstrated in Example 1.17.
Example 8.10. Double counterpoint (mm. 49–65 of the final version)

Fenaroli again rushes back to the tonic statement in the original partimento, with one measure (V of C minor; m. 42), regardless of how long those repetitive measures with inverted counterpoint had been (sixteen measures; roughly one third of the partimento). Apparently, this is another suitable place for an expansion, as is typically the case when preparing a recapitulation, which we observed in many of the C.P.E. Bach pieces discussed in earlier chapters. As presented in Example 8.11, once the descending-fifths sequence (mm. 65–70) with
4-3 suspensions makes an arrival on the dominant at m. 70, the descending scales induce a diminished seventh chord on raised $\tilde{4}$ ($F\#$) in mm. 72–73, which resolves into the dominant pedal (mm. 74–76).

**Example 8.11.** Preparation for the return of tonic key (mm. 65–77 of the final version)

Further revisions can be made to the new coda we had in the second version. As shown in **Example 8.12**, the nine-measure coda that was expanded from two-measure appended cadence is enlarged again, this time to fourteen measures. The basic harmonic structure remains identical to the second version, but the measures following the Neapolitan sixth chord (mm. 63–65 of the second version) are doubled to six measures (mm. 85–90 in the final version). This augmentation enables us to broaden the register (to the highest register C6) and to postpone the final cadence. The simple bass line of the original partimento is revised once again by adding actively moving sixteenth notes. And finally, four measures over a tonic pedal are appended after the piece finally arrives to the tonic at measure 91 of the final version. The opening two measures of the theme are placed upon the tonic pedal in mm. 91–92, which is connected to the tail of the theme in the tenor at m. 93. The structure of this ending is reminiscent of the C-major prelude (BWV 870),
which also added a similar recall of the opening schema at the end in the revision process.

Structurally analogous to each other, these two endings share a few additional features, such as the framing effect of the beginning and the ending and the addition of supplementary voices in thirds for a fuller sound in the penultimate measure.

Example 8.1. Final expansion of the coda

Example 3.2.9 in Chapter 3
Having provided all these processes of expanding a simple partimento, Example 8.13 shows the final version of our C-minor prelude in its entirety, placed in the lowest system. The chordal realization of Fenaroli’s C-minor partimento, and the second version of the prelude are aligned together for comparison.

Example 8.13. Chordal realization of Fenaroli’s C-minor partimento, the second and the final version of C minor prelude (mm. 1–16)
**Example 8.13.** Chordal realization of Fenaroli’s C-minor partimento, the second and the final version of C minor prelude (mm. 17–32) [Cont’d]
Example 8.13. Chordal realization of Fenaroli’s C-minor partimento, the second and the final version of C minor prelude (mm. 33–48) [Cont’d]
Example 8.13. Chordal realization of Fenaroli’s C-minor partimento, the second and the final version of C minor prelude (mm. 49–64) [Cont’d]
Example 8.13. Chordal realization of Fenaroli’s C-minor partimento, the second and the final version of C minor prelude (mm. 65–80) [Cont’d]
Example 8.13. Choral realization of Fenaroli’s C-minor partimento, the second and the final version of C minor prelude (mm. 81–94) [Cont’d]
The foregoing analyses and observations have helped validate the claim that partimenti could serve as an elementary sketch of a real piece. Even simple partimenti like this Fenaroli C-minor are outfitted with points that await further elaboration, such as short bridges between the theme statements and a repeated cadence at the end. For the revisions presented here, the compositional techniques that the two Bachs used in their revision processes—treating sequences, appending a coda, balancing the phrase rhythm, and so on—will, I hope, testify to the appropriateness of my own revisions. In the next chapter, a similar approach will be taken to a work of even greater complexity, a partimento fugue.
Chapter 9. Fugue in A minor on Langloz No. 30

Partimento fugue, as the name suggests, lies between partimento and fugue; it provides “the essential link between a basic harmonic framework” of partimento and “an elaborative contrapuntal texture” of fugue.\(^{210}\) Originating from sketching a fugue in partimento notation,\(^{211}\) it is, as van Tour observes, not only an outline of an improvised fugue, but also a compositional method that facilitates materialization of a theme and countersubject.\(^{212}\) Despite its resemblance to a fugue, as has been noted in Chapter 2, the realization of a partimento fugue is still a few steps of elaboration away. Imagining those steps, and illustrating them, will be the topic of this final chapter. The discussion will center around a presentation of my own four-voice fugue, constructed and expanded from a partimento fugue.

The partimento fugue selected for this attempt is one in A-minor from the Langloz manuscript,\(^ {213}\) which was not discussed in the previous chapters owing to its complexity.\(^ {214}\) According to Renwick’s comment on this particular fugue, it is deemed to be one of the few pieces that have the dignified beauty of J. S. Bach’s craftsmanship.\(^ {215}\) Besides its complicated

---

\(^{211}\) See a quotation about Girolamo Chiti, in Sanguinetti (2012), 23.
\(^{212}\) Van Tour (2015), 220.
\(^{213}\) The German provenance of the Langloz manuscript would verify once again the connection between Neapolitan partimento tradition and Bach.
\(^{214}\) No. 30 in Mus.ms. Bach P 296, p. 29.
\(^{215}\) Renwick (2001), p.63. Renwick claims the subject of this partimento fugue conjures up the unaccompanied cello or violin preludes of J. S. Bach.
subject, this fugue harbors several latent devices, such as a second countersubject, strettos, and a juxtaposition of subject and answer that prefigure many different folds of elaboration. Realizing a partimento fugue demands a greater number of techniques, and more sophisticated techniques, than other kinds of realization, not only because it occupies the ultimate stage of the partimento tradition but also because a well-constructed fugue requires an aggregation of musical skills. The discussion of my A-minor fugue, however, will be inclined more toward what one can expect from partimento training than to techniques of written counterpoint, the aim being to demonstrate the generative process from a partimento fugue.

Following a structural analysis of the A-minor partimento fugue, a simple version will be revised to an intricate one that supplies the missing fugal elements typical of an ordinary fugue. Most of the information relevant to this series demonstrations will be contained in the examples, but I will provide enough prose commentary to explain the overall thought process behind each of the revisions and expansions.

**Example 9.1** is the transcription of the partimento fugue, as reproduced in Renwick’s book (2001). As observed earlier in Chapter 2, such a piece is notated on a single staff and the subject is restated in various registers; the countersubjects can be found where the piece becomes two-voiced, in mm. 4–8. A structural analysis of the subject entries is presented on a chart in the following **Example 9.2**. As is typical of partimento fugues, the entries are given in descending order, which not only allows upper parts to move freely, but also facilitates realization. To put it differently, a player of the partimento fugue does not need to worry about how to harmonize each statement of the subject, having the subject in the lowest voice all the time. In the sole case where the subject enters in the top voice (mm. 14–16), the second countersubject (labeled as CS2 in **Example 9.2**) is given to accompany the subject from below.
Example 9.1. Partimento fugue No. 30 in A minor

Example 9.2. Structural analysis of the partimento fugue in A minor

As can be seen in Examples 9.1 and 9.2, and as is the case in the D-major partimento fugue realized in Chapter 2, all the entries of the subject and answer are in the tonic and the dominant minor key. No entries in other keys appear; but such entries could certainly be added at

---

216 As reproduced in Renwick (2001), 63.
217 Example 2.12, in Chapter 2.
some point, as the cadences in the closely related keys after the exposition—in this case the relative major (C major at m. 14) and the subdominant (D minor at m. 23)—suggest prospective interpolations in those keys. Although much the same can be said of most partimento fugues in the Langloz manuscript, some partimento fugues do have subject entries in close keys.\footnote{For instance, Fugue no. 36 in B minor has an entry in its relative major key (D major) and Fugue no. 52 in E flat major has an entry in its submediant key (C minor).} In the present case, the key of the fifth theme entry (mm. 14–16) is actually slightly ambiguous. On one hand, the theme itself is same as the subject in the tonic key (A minor); yet its circumstances lead us to interpret the theme’s key as C major: the theme comes in right after the authentic cadence in C major and it is accompanied by the second countersubject. To complicate matters, since the theme does not appear in full, this fifth entry may be seen as an episode. This ambiguity will be explored and discussed further with the realizations later in this chapter. To finish this overview of the fugue, after another authentic cadence in the subdominant key (D minor) in mm. 22–23, the composer presents a built-in stretto, which is formed of the head of the subject. The last entry at m. 24 that begins as the answer in E minor subsequently elides into the subject in the tonic (A minor).

Turning now to the subject, and the counterpoints at each entry, the structure of the subject appears simple enough, as illustrated in \textbf{Example 9.3}; the subject begins with $\hat{5}\hat{1}$, thus the head of the answer will have a tonal adjustment to $\hat{1}\hat{5}$. Apart from the first note under the tonal adjustment, the rest of the answer continues as a real answer.
Example 9.3. Subject (mm. 1–4) and its chordal reduction of the partimento fugue in A minor

If we examine the written-out countersubject and the given figures more closely, however, the subject becomes a much more complex one to harmonize; repetitive melody patterns in the opening invoke a descending-fifths sequence and the countersubject demands applied chords in between, as shown in the third entry (Example 9.4) and the fourth entry (Example 9.5). As Renwick presumes, the subject of this partimento fugue might be “the most harmonically replete” one in the Langloz manuscript.219

Example 9.4. Simple realization of the subject in three voices, mm. 7–10

---

219 Renwick (2001), 63.
Example 9.5. Simple realization of the answer in four voices

The fifth entry in mm. 14–16, an abbreviated entry lacking the tail, will be harmonized at first in just the two given voices, as CS2 appears for the first time. The subject here reproduces the pitches of the head of the original subject, suggesting a return to the original key, A minor, but the modulation to C major suggests that the statement may also be heard in this new key (hence the tonal ambiguity noted earlier). The answer in mm. 16–19 (the sixth entry) can be realized at variance with what is shown in Example 9.5, making good use of the second countersubject just introduced in mm. 14–16. As can be seen in Example 9.6, the second countersubject works well in the soprano in m. 16, where it can come to the fore and be audible. The first one-and-a-half measures of this answer are realized in only three voices, there having been only two active voices in the music immediately preceding. Due to the brevity of the second countersubject at this point (it first appeared against the abbreviated fifth entry), the second countersubject requires the two additional measures (mm. 18–19), realized here with the tail of the first countersubject.
**Example 9.6.** Different realization of the answer with the second countersubject, mm. 14–19

Having thus realized the subject and the answer in three and four voices, a simple realization for the rest of the partimento fugue may just follow the figures originally provided in the manuscript. I assume that the simple version presented in **Example 9.7** might be something similar to what a partimento player would play on the keyboard as a first pass.
Example 9.7. Simple realization of the partimento fugue in A minor, mm. 1–16
Example 9.7. Simple realization of the partimento fugue in A minor, mm. 17–28 [Cont’d]

A simple realization like Example 9.7, however, as has been noted several times, would not be the end of it. To transform this simply realized partimento fugue to a full-fledged fugue, we will need: 1) to make over the simple realization into a more intricate version with better
voice leading and imitations; and 2) to complement the realization with interpolations and expansions to supply any fugal elements that are missing.

The first task in making over the simple version to a more florid version will not be dealt with in great detail in this chapter, for the reason that the choices made for le parti libere—the voices accompanying the subject and the countersubject in free counterpoint—are subjective and variable depending on one’s musical taste. I do hope, however, that the following examples detailing the florid versions of the voices that counterpoint the subject will explain my conduct of le parti libere.

Not much needs to be changed for a florid realization of the subject in three voices. Adding suspensions is one charming and effective way to decorate, as was explored with D-major partimento fugue in Chapter 2.\textsuperscript{220} However, suspensions do not seem to work well with our subject because of its many chordal leaps and the countersubject that follows the subject in parallel thirds most of the time. Accompanying with a series of parallel thirds or sixths was possible only at the tail of the subject (mm. 9–10 in Example 9.8), as those intervals were already employed at the beginning of the countersubject. Another way to elaborate the inert top voice would be imitation. Luckily, we have a good motivic idea that moves in contrary motion to the head of the subject: the descending scale that connects the last note of the counter answer and the root of the tonic chord (E-D-C-B-A, bracketed at m. 7). The lower system of Example 9.8 presents how this motive may be applied to the soprano to create a better melodic gesture. In a similar way, the theme can be realized in four voices, as shown in the following Example 9.9.

\textsuperscript{220} Example 2.12 and 2.13 in Chapter 2.
Example 9.8. Simple and florid realization of the subject in three voices, mm. 6–10

Example 9.9. Florid realization of the answer in four voices

Before undertaking the second task, to complement missing fugal elements, a more complete structural analysis of the partimento fugue should proceed. As suggested in Example 9.2, and as the reader has surely noticed in the first realization of the Example 9.7, the boundary line between the exposition and the middle section is rather imprecise. Not only was the last answer of the exposition (the fourth entry at m. 10) abbreviated without an appropriate cadence in the dominant key (E minor), but it is also awkwardly connected to an authentic cadence in the
relative major key (C major) at m. 14 (see the upper system of Example 9.10). This kind of hurried modulation to the closely related key at the end of an altered theme statement is commonly found in many partimenti; a practitioner of partimenti would revise this without great difficulty, however. First, the theme can be changed to a full statement rather than an abbreviated one; then the short modulation can be expanded with a sequence to arrive at the designated key, C major. Accordingly, the fourth entry of our A minor partimento fugue may be revised as shown on the lower system of Example 9.10. Here the incomplete answer of the original partimento fugue (mm. 10–12) is revised to become a complete form of the answer in the bass, and the hasty modulation to C major (mm. 12–14) is expanded with a descending-fifths sequence that restores the previously missing tail of the answer as its motive. Not only does this expansion permit us to offer a full exposition and successful modulation to the relative major key, but it gives a sense of stability, balancing the four-measure phrase rhythm. C.P.E. Bach’s revision of the Eb major sonata (Wq. 65/7, mov.1) stands in parallel to this; revising its incomplete theme statement with an abrupt modulation at the recapitulation of the early version, Bach succeeds in marking an important event of the piece by making the theme statement more explicit.\textsuperscript{221}

\textsuperscript{221} See Example 6.2.8 in Chapter 6.
Example 9.10. Revision and expansion of the fourth theme entry and the following modulation to the relative major key (mm. 10–16 in the final version)

With this expansion in place, we may repurpose those modulating four measures (mm. 13–16) as the first episode of our A-minor fugue, an episode that follows an exposition (mm. 1–13) that now presents the themes carried through all four voices in complete statements. The rest of the formal plan for our fugue depends on the identity of the theme at the fifth entry, mentioned earlier in this chapter but left for further discussion until now. Three interpretations are available for this ambiguity. The fifth entry could be (1) the subject itself; (2) part of an episode; or (3) stretto. Before proceeding further, we will need to consider each of these three options.

As can be observed in Example 9.11, this theme (mm. 14–16 of the original partimento fugue) is another incomplete statement of the subject. Like the original fourth entry, this fifth entry has a one-measure shortage in length.
Example 9.11. Theme entries in the original partimento fugue, mm. 10–16

Just as we revised the fourth entry to a full statement, the same may be done with this fifth entry at m. 14. Along with the complete statement of the answer (the sixth entry) that trails behind, this pair of entries (the fifth and sixth entries) might serve to initiate a counter-exposition. The announcement of the second countersubject imparts its weight to this interpretation as well, as a second countersubject often serves to mark a counter-exposition. A counter-exposition, though, would require an additional set of subject-answer entries, which will demand extra work in written counterpoint. Assuming we retain the voices of the fifth and the sixth entries, the soprano and bass, as given by the original partimento fugue, we would have to introduce the seventh and the eighth entries in the alto and tenor to complete the counter-exposition; the placement of the theme in the middle voices will require adding music to the realization.

As the second option, the incomplete statement of the subject can be utilized as a part of another episode, rather than as the basis for a counter-exposition. Earlier in this chapter, when deciding in which keys the theme is stated, we noted that the fifth entry of the theme could be in C major because of its circumstances. Although the theme is the original tonic version (equally starting with the opening subject, E-A-B-C), it comes right after the PAC in C major in mm. 13–14; the incomplete subject ends with C major as well, before it could modulate back to A minor. Given the sequential feature implanted in the subject, one can continue the pattern, and easily move to a new key where next theme will occur (Example 9.12)
Example 9.12. Expansion of the theme at fifth entry as an episode with descending-fifth sequence

The single-staffed feature of the partimento fugues, however, allows us the third option, an interpretation mentioned earlier: a stretto. What is written on the single staff of the partimento fugue is a summarized arrangement of the theme entries; whenever a theme enters in a new voice, the previous voice will be abandoned. Thus, as can be seen in the upper system of Example 9.13, the fifth entry in question is interrupted when the answer jumps in at m. 16 in the original partimento fugue, whereas the answer at the sixth entry is presented in its full extent. This notation of an incomplete subject with the complete answer raises the question whether the subject may merely be incompletely notated, without necessarily being so incomplete in the realization. On this reading, the fifth entry may be interpreted as a part of another built-in stretto, at the distance of two measures (see the lower system of Example 9.13).
Example 9.13. The fifth entry interpreted as a stretto (mm. 14–18 of original partimento fugue)

Of these three interpretations of the fifth entry I will take the last, the one just discussed, which will best serve the purposes of this chapter, developing a partimento fugue to a fully fledged fugue. That is, setting the fifth entry as a stretto will allow us to interpolate a middle section with episodes and theme entries in other keys, which are absent in the original partimento fugue. Example 9.14 shows the plan for an interpolated middle section aligned with the original partimento fugue. Measure 14 of the partimento fugue can be greatly expanded with: two additional theme entries (one in the relative major key, the other in the subdominant key), a pedal point on the dominant, and episodes connecting each other. The original entries 5 and 6 will become entries 7 and 8, with the new entries 5 and 6, together with their episodes, comprising the interpolated middle section.

Although the subject can be stated in any closely related keys, here the relative major (C major) and the subdominant (D minor) are selected, since these two keys are the only keys the original partimento fugue supplies with an authentic cadence (at mm. 14 and 22). As discussed earlier in Chapter 2, cadences in other than the tonic and the dominant keys are often indications of possible theme entrances. A preparation for the new fifth entry, in C major, has already been given in Example 9.10; as discussed earlier when revising the last statement of the exposition, the altered tail that modulates to C major may be expanded to Episode 1 to prepare a C major entry. The new fifth statement of the subject can enter at the end of this new episode, as can be seen in the lower system of Example 9.15; the subject is placed in the soprano, as it has not yet been heard in the soprano since the start of the piece, where was unharmonized. The second countersubject accompanies the subject in the bass with an effect like that of the fifth entry at m. 14 of the original partimento. The tail of the second countersubject, which is not given in the original, is created by inverting the direction of its motive.
Example 9.15. The fifth theme statement in relative major key, realized with the second countersubject (mm. 15–19)

Despite its brevity, the given second countersubject is still beneficial, as in most partimento fugues. Not only does it facilitate the realization of a subject that is not placed in the lowest voice, it is also ready-to-use material for the forthcoming episode, which in this case, will modulate to D minor. This second episode uses another descending-fifths sequence, which already has been predicted with the second interpretation of the ambiguous fifth entry (Example 9.12). As can be seen in Example 9.16, the main motive of the second countersubject and the altered head motive of the subject are interchanged as the sequence moves to D minor.
Example 9.16. Episode 2 with invertible counterpoint

This modulating sequence has prepared the sixth statement of the subject, here in D minor and placed in the tenor, which had just rested during the preceding episode 2. The following episode 3 uses a descending-fifths sequence once more, yet with different inversion. As shown in Example 9.17, the Neapolitan chord of the tonic, attained by the deceptive cadence at the end of the sixth statement, plugs into the third inversion of the dominant chord (E major, V\(^4\)); the bass of this dominant (D) then descends chromatically to the pedal point on the dominant at m. 31, the lowest register of the piece. This kind of chromatic approach was discussed earlier in Chapter 3, with J. S. Bach’s revision to the C-major prelude. Adding this well-marked dominant then allows for a pedal point, one of the fugal elements often missing in partimenti. Long notes on \(\Hat{5}\) that suggest a *cadenza doppia*—and of course its potential expansion—are rather common at the end of partimenti, but pedal points like the one added here that continue over a measure are not found in the partimento fugues of the Langloz manuscript. In the case of Neapolitan partimenti, according to van Tour, pedal points are sparsely found in partimenti by

---

\(^{222}\) Placing the theme in the middle voice is often avoided in realization of the partimento fugues, especially when they are improvised for faster and more secure playing.

\(^{223}\) Example 3.1.6 in Chapter 3. The arrival point of Bach’s use of chromatic approach to the low register was the subdominant, not a dominant pedal, but it makes sense to relate these two passages to each other, as both signal important events in their respective pieces.
certain composers, such as Giovanni Paisiello (1740–1816).\textsuperscript{224} The reason for the scarcity of pedal points is unknown. Nevertheless, the pedal point is a great device to extend a piece, and attractive space to experiment with motivic development in a fugue. As shown in the second system of Example 9.17, the head of the subject is presented in the dominant key (E major; the first time in the piece) on the dominant pedal at m. 31. A new phrase that accompanies the fragment of the subject in the soprano is repeated in different voices. Overlapping each other, the phrase is raised stepwise in an ascending sequence, which extends the dominant until the Neapolitan chord returns at m. 35.

Example 9.17. Episode 3 and the dominant pedal, mm. 25–37

Moving now to the fugue’s final section, the simple realization of the original partimento fugue contains two built-in strettos, as noted before: the first stretto in mm. 14–20, in which the

\textsuperscript{224} Van Tour (2015), 217.
subject in the soprano and the answer in the bass are two measures apart; and the second, incomplete stretto in four voices in mm. 23–25. Although this simple version might work in an ordinary fugue as is, opportunities for further expansions remain.

The codetta at the end of the full answer in the first stretto (mm. 19–23 of the original partimento fugue) looks like another descending-fifths sequence with walking bass that fills the space between the strettos. A contrapuntally more intricate version can be made with a few partial subject entries, as shown in the lower systems of Example 9.18 at mm. 43–46. A more significant revision would involve adding a completely new stretto at the end of this codetta, which ends with a D minor cadence. This would add a new, second stretto before the final one. This interpolation may be so written as to enable the first theme entry of the final stretto at the original m. 23 to be revised to the subject in tonic, not the D-minor inflected answer shape (changing D-A-B-C in the original to E-A-B-C). The beginning of the final stretto will be better delineated with this revision. In addition, since the distance between the entries is one measure in the new second stretto, the leading of the subject entries closer and closer will occur gradually, the three stretti occurring at a distance two, then one, then one-half measures.
Example 9.18. Insertion of stretto 2 (mm. 42–54)

The final stretto comes at m. 54, as the theme entrances are overlapped by a half measure in descending order (Example 9.19). The last entrance with the answer in the bass is conjoined
to the subject without its incipit (E-A-B) “in an imaginative way.” The tail of this conjoined subject is slightly altered for the double cadence in the original partimento fugue (mm. 27–28). In my final version, a deceptive cadence at m. 59 once again delays the final cadence as has been observed with many earlier examples. The head of the subject, which has not yet been presented in the bass with the tonic key, is exposed in a harmonic context of the dominant in the following m. 60. The last measure of the original partimento fugue is once again expanded by a pedal point on the tonic (mm. 61–65). At the first measure of the tonic pedal, the head of the subject is presented in augmentation in the tenor, along with the head of the subject and answer overlapped in the upper voices.

---

225 Renwick (2001), 63.
Example 9.19. The final stretto and the tonic pedal

Having now presented the stages for transforming the A-minor partimento fugue,

Example 9.20 demonstrates the expansion of the original partimento fugue in two charts aligned vertically, and Example 9.21 shows the final version of our A-minor fugue. Although it may not
be comparable in craftsmanship to the work of the great maestros, this effort to demonstrate the stages of a fugal composition, I hope, will prove the potential and the use of partimenti as composing sketches. The compositional choices strove to remain in the same vein as partimenti masters of the time used; transposition of the theme to the other keys, theme statements connected by sequences, emphasis made at the important events of the piece, and an appended coda.
Example 9.20. Structural analyses of the original partimento fugue and the final version
Example 9.21. Final version of A-minor fugue, mm. 1–16
Example 9.21. Final version of A-minor fugue, mm. 17–32 [Cont’d]
Example 9.21. Final version of A-minor fugue, mm. 33–49 [Cont’d]
Example 9.21. Final version of A-minor fugue, mm. 50–65 [Cont’d]
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