GMTH Proceedings 2008

herausgegeben von | edited by
Florian Edler, Markus Neuwirth und | and Derek Remeš

Musiktheorie als interdisziplinäres Fach
Music Theory and Interdisciplinarity

herausgegeben von | edited by
Christian Utz

8. Kongress der | 8th Congress of the
Gesellschaft für Musiktheorie
Graz 2008

Band 4 der Schriftenreihe | Volume 4 of the Series
musik.theorien der gegenwart

herausgegeben von | edited by
Christian Utz und | and Clemens Gadenstätter

Fortspinnungstypus

A New Definition based on Eighteenth-Century Theory

Junko Kaneko

Wilhelm Fischer's concept of *Fortspinnung* has become one of the most frequently used terms in modern descriptions of late-Baroque musical style ever since it first appeared as the central idea of his fundamental study *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Wiener klassischen Stils* in 1915. Nevertheless, modern use of this term and the underlying concept are troubled by two problems. First, Fischer's original meaning and his underlying theory are sometimes distorted or obscured. Secondly, the theory itself is somewhat inconsistent and sometimes at odds both with the music of the late Baroque and with musical conceptualization of that period. Restoring Fischer's original meaning, therefore, will not entirely solve the problems that surround this term. Rather, the concept behind the term can be profitably enriched by an infusion from eighteenth-century theories. The most detailed theory of phrase and period to come out of the 18th century was initially created by Joseph Riepel in the first two instalments of his *Anfangsgründe zur musicalischen Setzkunst*, published in 1752 and 1755, respectively, and elaborated in Heinrich Christoph Koch's three volumes of *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*, published in 1782–1793. Riepel's treatise, which he must have begun to write during the 1740s, has the additional recommendation of reflecting musical thought current during the lifetime of Johann Sebastian Bach. While Fischer's insight into the historical significance of the *Fortspinnungstypus* period remains important, its value can be enhanced through correction and clarification based on the study and application of Riepel-Koch theory. The purpose of this article is to show how period theory can illuminate and improve Fischer's insightful concept and provide a better basis for modern analysis of late-Baroque music.

Wilhelm Fischer's concept of *Fortspinnung* continues to haunt modern interpretations and analyses of Baroque music. First appearing in 1915 as the central idea of his fundamental study *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Wiener klassischen Stils*, *Fortspinnung* has become one of the most frequently used terms in modern descriptions of late-Baroque musical style. Fischer's original meaning and his underlying theory, however, are sometimes distorted or obscured in modern writings. For example, Laurence Dreyfus writes in his article *J. S. Bach's Concerto Ritornellos and the Question of Invention* in 1985, »The *Fortspinnung* [...] is premised on the absence of either a defined tonic [...] or an authentic cadence resolving [into] the tonic«.[1] But this description of *Fortspinnung* is inaccurate as regards the »absence of a tonic«. Dreyfus neither provides a definition of tonic nor offers a secure test for its presence or absence. In fact, some of Fischer's examples of *Fortspinnung* actually conclude with a cadence.

William Drabkin defines the term in the article on *Fortspinnung* in the *Grove Music Online* as:

---

1 Dreyfus, *J. S. Bach's Concerto Ritornellos*, p. 331.

A term devised by Wilhelm Fischer (1915) to stand for the process of continuation or development of musical material [...] by which a short idea or motif is »spun out« into an entire phrase or period by such techniques as sequential treatment, intervallic transformation and even mere repetition.[2]

However, concentration on a single motif, long or short, is not essential to Fischer's *Fortspinnung*. Fischer's *Fortspinnung* segments are never defined by intervallic transformation or repetition in the absence of sequence. And Drabkin's term »development« is anachronistic. It neither reflects what Fischer said, nor what Baroque music does.

It is, however, not prudent to put all the blame on recent writings alone because Fischer's theory itself is somewhat inconsistent and sometimes at odds both with the music of the late Baroque and with musical conceptualization of that period. Restoring Fischer's original meaning, therefore, will not entirely solve the problems that surround this term. Rather, the concept behind the term can be profitably enriched by an infusion from eighteenth-century theories. The purpose of this article is to show how period theory can illuminate and improve Fischer's insightful concept and provide a better basis for modern analysis of late-Baroque music.

Wilhelm Fischer defines *Fortspinnung* as »a motivically related or foreign modulating ›spinning-out‹, consisting of one or more successive sequences«.[3] He demonstrates that it is a structural segment within a period that always has one or more sequences. A period that contains *Fortspinnung* is called a *Fortspinnungstypus* period. Such a period may contain up to three definable segments: *Vordersatz*, *Fortspinnung* and *Epilog*. As a period, it must end with a cadence. The *Vordersatz* and *Epilog*, however, are optional; only the *Fortspinnung* is essential for the definition of the *Fortspinnungstypus* period. Thus, according to Fischer's definition, the *Fortspinnung* can actually stand alone as a period if it concludes with a cadence.

According to Fischer, there are three basic types of sequences as shown in Figure 1. The »step-wise sequence« (stufenweise Sequenz, Fig. 1a) in which a melodic segment is progressively transposed by a single diatonic step rising or falling.[4] 2. The »sequence within the chord« (Sequenz im Akkord, Fig. 1b) in which a melodic segment is repeated on the successive notes of a single chord. 3. The »interval sequence« (Intervallsequenz, Fig. 1c) in which only one portion of a melodic fragment is successively transposed at a steadily increasing interval from the original degree, while the rest of the melodic fragment remains unchanged. Although it is not listed as a distinct type by Fischer, some of his examples contain a sequence that might be called transposed repetition in the strict sense.

A *Vordersatz*, if one is present, appears at the beginning of a period, and it is normally closed off, at least to some extent, before the *Fortspinnung* segment begins by a melodic-harmonic articulation of the V-I, fully cadential type, or, most characteristically, of the half-cadential type, ending on V. A sequence or repetition of a motif sometimes appears in the *Vordersatz*. In this case, the sequence within a *Vordersatz* tends to be a sequence within the chord, »in contrast to the fifth-leap sequence of the

---

2 Drabkin, *Fortspinnung*.
3 Fischer, *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte*, p. 29: »eine motivisch verwandte oder fremde modulierende ›Fortspinnung‹, aus einer oder mehreren aneinander gereihten Sequenzen bestehend«.
4 Fischer also calls this type of sequence a »fifth-leap sequence« (Quintschrittsequenz).

Figure 1: Fischer, *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte*, p. 33. a. Step-wise sequence (top); b. Sequence within the chord (middle); c. Interval sequence (bottom).

Fortspinnung«.[5] Fischer emphasizes that a step-wise sequence is most frequently used in the *Fortspinnung* because of the circle-of-fifth chord progression, which is »the harmonic kernel of the *Fortspinnung*«.[6] Indeed, it can either convey modulation or remain in the same key.

At times, an *Epilog* concludes the period. It is either a short cadential segment, or a cadential phrase. An *Epilog* is present when there is a distinct preparation before the concluding cadence of the period, or when the concluding cadence is repeated. There are many instances where a *Fortspinnung* concludes the period without an *Epilog*.

A typical *Fortspinnungstypus* period, extracted by Fischer from the first movement of Johann Sebastian Bach's Sonata for Viola da Gamba and Harpsichord no. 3 in G Minor, BWV 1029, is given in Figure 2. Fischer analyzes this opening period as two measures of *Vordersatz*, four measures of *Fortspinnung*, and two measures of *Epilog*. After the *Vordersatz* ends on the dominant of G minor, there follow a step-wise sequence (mm. 3–5) and a sequence within the chord (mm. 5–6), in which the dominant-seventh of G minor is intensified by the pedal on C3, the seventh of the chord. In spite of Fischer's earlier, somewhat vague account of *Fortspinnung* »modulating ›spinning-out‹«, no modulation takes place in the *Fortspinnung* here. Instead, the harmonic progression in this *Fortspinnung* follows the diatonic circle-of-fifth pattern which tends to prolong rather than change the tonic as Fischer himself notes: »The fifth-leap sequence, treated in its totality, remains purely tonal; after all deviations it returns again to its starting point, and its application is excellently suitable to reinforce a key once reached«.[7] Obviously then, change of key is not a necessary trait of *Fortspinnung*, but rather a subsidiary characteristic of some sequences. Confirming the original key, the *Epilog* (mm. 7–9) ends with a full cadence on the tonic.

Fischer also analyzes the opening period of Bach's two-part Invention no. 6 in E Major, BWV 777, as shown in Figure 3. The *Vordersatz* consists of a tonic phrase and its contrapuntally inverted repetition (mm. 1–8). In the following *Fortspinnung*, the

---

5   Ibid., p. 44: »im Gegensatz zur Quintschrittsequenz der Fortspinnung«.
6   Ibid., p. 43: »[d]er harmonische Kern dieser Partien [Fortspinnung]«.
7   Ibid., p. 35: »Die Quintschrittsequenz bleibt, in ihrer Totalität auftretend, rein tonal; sie kehrt nach allen Abweichungen wieder zu ihrem Ausgangspunkt zurück und ihre Anwendung ist vortrefflich geeignet, eine einmal erreichte Tonart zu bekräftigen.«

Figure 2: Fischer, *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte*, p. 32. Showing mm. 1–9 from J. S. Bach's Sonata for Viola da Gamba and Harpsichord no. 3 in G Minor, BWV 1029.

key modulates to the dominant. The *Fortspinnung* uses the step-wise sequence (mm. 9–13) and ends with a full cadence in the key of the dominant in m. 18. Because the cadence immediately follows the sequence without preparation, it is a part of the *Fortspinnung*. Fischer designates the last two measures as the *Epilog*, in which merely the closing chord is repeated.

Fischer gives another example in which the *Vordersatz* contains something like a *Fortspinnung*. Figure 4 shows the first part of the Sarabande from Bach's English Suite no. 2 in A Minor, BWV 807. The *Vordersatz*, which ends with a cadence on the tonic, actually consists of a sequence within a chord (mm. 1–4). The following segment is the real *Fortspinnung*, which modulates to the relative major. This *Fortspinnung* is divided into two parts (mm. 5–8 and mm. 9–12). Each part has a different type of sequence: an interval sequence and a step-wise sequence. The former sequence ends on the dominant of the relative major key, while the latter ends with a full cadence in that key. This period does not have an *Epilog* according to Fischer.

Figure 3: Fischer, *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte*, p. 51. Showing mm. 1–20 from J. S. Bach's Invention no. 6 in E major, BWV 777.

Figure 4: Fischer, *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte*, p. 29. Showing the first part of the Sarabande from J. S. Bach's English Suite no. 2 in A Minor, BWV 807.

These examples were chosen and analyzed by Fischer to illustrate his idea of *Fortspinnung* as a feature of Baroque melody. Yet they raise some problems that remain unresolved. The *Vordersatz* in the Sarabande begins with a sequence. Why is it considered to be *Vordersatz* and not *Fortspinnung*? Fischer also failed to establish a clear demarcation between the end of a *Fortspinnung* and the beginning of an *Epilog* in the viola da gamba sonata. The boundary between a *Fortspinnung* and an *Epilog* can be quite ambiguous unless there is a clear cadential articulation between them. Furthermore, the *Fortspinnung* of the invention and the Sarabande contain non-sequential segments in mm. 14–18 in the former, and in mm. 7–8 and 11–12 in the latter. Why are these concluding non-sequential segments not termed *Epiloge*? These problems are rooted in the fact that Fischer does not give us a clear definition of a phrase or of a period. Far more consistent and useful definitions of phrase and period can be found in eighteenth-century theory, especially in the treatises of Joseph Riepel and Heinrich Christoph Koch. As John Walter Hill points out, »conceptualization about music has changed over time in tandem with changes in musical styles, so that strictly modern musical perceptions, uninformed by theories of the period, are often misleading and less fruitful«.[8] It is not too much to say that, as cultural outsiders in a diachronic sense, we can never understand the music of the past well without knowing how it was conceived by its creators; accordingly, the definitions in eighteenth-

8   Hill, *Cognate Music Theory*, p. 117.

century theory and the theoretical framework that underlies them offer hints that may help to resolve the contradictions and ambiguities that arise from Fischer's analyses and terminology.

Joseph Riepel (1709–1789) was the first theorist to propose a thorough and extensive theory of melodic phrase structure. Riepel's first two instalments of *Anfangsgründe zur musicalischen Setzkunst*, published in 1752 and 1755 respectively, are important because of their concentrated treatment of melody, considered in close connection with harmony, their attempt to associate melody with speech, their focus on instrumental music, and their innovative terminology. Riepel's theory of phrase structure was followed and elaborated by Heinrich Christoph Koch in the three volumes of his *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*, published in 1782–1793. Koch's primary concern in this work is the hierarchical order of »incises« (*Einschnitte*) in »phrases« (*Sätze*), »periods« (*Perioden*), »parts« (*Theile*) and »musical pieces« (*Tonstücke*).

   The most significant concept of Riepel's theory is the idea of phrase punctuations and their underlying harmonic formulas. As shown in Figure 5 taken from Riepel's treatise, a foursome (*Vierer*) is the most regular and comfortable phrase unit, called *Absatz*. It is classified into two types: a tonic phrase called *Grundabsatz* and a dominant phrase called *Änderungsabsatz*. A *Grundabsatz* always ends with a V-I progression, while an *Änderungsabsatz* always ends with a half cadence, on V. These phrase endings can occur not only in the main key of the work, but also in any local keys. When a phrase ending includes a full cadence, it is called a *Cadenz* by Riepel and a *Schlußsatz* by Koch.

Figure 5: a. Riepel, *Anfangsgründe. Zweites Kapitel*, p. 52. A *Grundabsatz* with an *Einschnitt* in m. 2 marked (top); b. Ibid., p. 51. An *Änderungsabsatz* and a *Cadenz* (bottom).

The first twosome (*Zweyer*) in a basic, unexpanded *Absatz* concludes with a minor punctuation point called *Einschnitt*, but it is not a real phrase ending.[9] The conclusion of an *Absatz* is a major punctuation point, which is the full and real phrase ending. Riepel explains the complementary relationship of two twosomes in an *Absatz* through a verbal analogy »A Phrase. Just as if the notes wanted to speak to us here with the following words: ›Geometric figures and numbers help, perhaps (□-*Einschnitt*), the ear to tune the harpsichord‹«.[10] In other words, a phrase must

---

9   In addition to *Einschnitt*, Koch uses »caesura« (*Cäsur*) at times. »Caesura« is also used as an alternative to both major and minor punctuation points by Koch.

10 Riepel, *Anfangsgründe. Zweites Kapitel*, p. 52: »Ein Satz. Gleichsam als wollten uns die Noten hievor mit folgenden Worten anreden: Zirkel und Zahlen helffen vielleicht (□-Einsch.) dem Gehöre das Clavier

contain a subject and a conclusion, as Koch describes later that »an incomplete phrase or an incise [*Einschnitt*] would be a melodic segment which lacked either a subject or a predicate«[11], and their correlation is what distinguishes a phrase from all other melodic segments.

Whatever type an *Absatz* is, a punctuation point is »complete« (*vollkommen*) when it ends on a strong beat, or »incomplete« (*unvollkommen*) when it ends on a weak beat, as shown in Figure 6 from Riepel. Likewise, when the melody of an *Absatz* ends with the root note, it is »conclusive« (*endlich*), but when it ends with any other note, it is »inconclusive« (*unendlich*). As will be discussed later, unlike Riepel, Koch treats the incomplete phrase ending as an overhang (*Ueberhang*), one of several phrase prolongation techniques.

Figure 6: Riepel, *Anfangsgründe. Zweites Kapitel*, p. 43. The phrase ending in m. 8 in the first system is marked with *vollkommen* and *unendlich*, and another in m. 4 in the second system with *unvollkommen* and *endlich*.

With respect to the hierarchical relationship between phrase, period and part, Koch fills out Riepel's description. Although the number of phrases in a period is variable, depending on the length of a work or movement, a short period, such as one in dance music, can consist of as few as two phrases, the second ending with a full cadence. Yet, in most of Koch's descriptions of a period and examples of larger compositions, a period more often consists of four phrases or more, of which the last one is a *Schlußsatz*.

According to Riepel's description, a basic *Absatz* of four measures or metric units may be lengthened by (1) doubling cadences, (2) repetition of minor or major punctuation points, namely *Einschnitt* or *Absatz*, (3) repetition or prolongation of any internal segments (*Ausdähnung*), (4) insertion (*Einschiebsel*) of materials within a single phrase or between two phrases. Figure 7 shows some of these phrase prolongation techniques. The first system is an example of two basic phrases without lengthening (*Ohne Verdoppelung*). In the second system, the second phrase is lengthened by means of doubling the cadence (*Mit Verdoppelung*). In the third example in the third and fourth systems, the second phrase is lengthened by repetition of internal segments (mm. 6–7 are repeated in 8–9) and *Einschiebsel* of materials within the phrase (mm. 10f.). In the last example, a deceptive cadence replaces the original full cadence

---

stimmen«. This English translation is from Hill's article *The Logic of Phrase Structure*, in which he provides a critical English translation of *Zweites Kapitel*, pp. 51–53 with commentary.

11 Koch, *Versuch*, vol. 2, pp. 351f.: »alsdenn wäre ein noch unvollständiger Satz oder ein Einschnitt, ein solcher melodischer Theil, dem entweder ein Subject oder ein Prädicat mangelt.« English translation in my citations of Koch is from Baker, *Heinrich Koch*.

in m. 8, and the full cadence comes four measures later (*Oder eine falsche und betriegende Cadenz*).

Figure 7: Riepel, *Anfangsgründe. Zweites Kapitel*, p. 61. Phrase prolongation techniques.

Among these phrase prolongation methods, Riepel gives the least information about *Einschiebsel* between (rather than within) phrases, he merely states: »The fourth way to prolong a song is *Einschiebsel*, which is called *parenthesis claudatur* in Latin«.[12] Figure 8 clearly shows two external *Einschiebsel* between two different phrases. Here between a *Grundabsatz* and an *Änderungsabsatz* (Fig. 8a), Riepel inserts a four-measure melodic segment, which consists of an interval sequence in the first case and a step-wise sequence in the second case (Fig. 8b). Although both of these external *Einschiebsel* between phrases have four measures, they are not »phrases« for two reasons. First, because of the suspension between the third and fourth measures of the *Einschiebsel*, the punctuations are weaker than an *unvollkommen* ending of a phrase. Secondly, two twosomes in each *Einschiebsel* are not related as subject and conclusion. Neither melodic contours nor harmonic progressions produce the directionality toward the concluding punctuation of a phrase. Thus, they are not phrases in Riepel's sense.

Koch's term for *Einschiebsel* is *Parenthese* (parenthesis), »the insertion of unessential melodic ideas between the segments of a phrase«.[13] Thus, for Koch, a *Parenthese* normally appears only *within* a phrase. However, he acknowledges a common exception: »most often parenthesis is used with the repetition of complete phrases, and in this case the incidental melodic section inserted between a phrase and its repetition is

---

12 Riepel, *Anfangsgründe. Zweites Kapitel*, p. 60: »Die vierte Art, einen Gesang zu verlängern, ist das Einschiebsel, welches von den Lateinern *Parénthesis claudatur* genennet wird.«

13 Koch, *Versuch*, vol. 2, p. 451: »die Einschaltung zufälliger melodischer Theile, zwischen die Glieder eines Satzes.«

likewise a complete section«.[14] Thus, unlike Riepel, Koch accepts an *Einschiebsel* between phrases only when the *Einschiebsel* itself forms a complete phrase and when it is inserted between a phrase and its repetition. In Figure 9, taken from Koch's treatise, the *Einschiebsel* in mm. 5–8 is a phrase, an *Änderungsabsatz*, and it is framed by repeated *Grundabsätze*. This *Änderungsabsatz-Einschiebsel*, however, is less suitable as a concluding phrase to the previous phrase when compared with the last phrase in mm. 13–16 because of its sudden chromatic shift.

Figure 8: a. Riepel, *Anfangsgründe. Zweites Kapitel*, p. 60. Two basic phrases (*Grundabsatz* and *Änderungsabsatz*); b. Ibid., p. 61. Two examples of *Einschiebsel* between phrases marked with brackets.

Figure 9: Koch, *Versuch*, vol. 3, pp. 220f. *Einschiebsel* between a phrase and its repetition.

In addition to the above-mentioned phrase prolongation techniques explained by Riepel, Koch introduces two more techniques: overhang (*Ueberhang*) and appendix (*Anhang*). An overhang is, in fact, identical to Riepel's incomplete phrase ending,

14 Ibid., vol. 3, p. 220: »Am öftersten bedient man sich der Parenthese bey der Wiederholung vollständiger Sätze, und in diesem Falle ist der zufällige melodische Theil, welcher zwischen einen Satz und dessen Wiederholung eingeschaltet wird, ebenfalls ein vollständiger Theil.« In this sentence, Koch uses »Theil« as a generic term for any levels of melodic structure.

defined by Koch as a decoration made »by means of striking afterwards other notes contained in the triad at its basis [...] and in this case the punctuation note obtains an overhang or a feminine ending, which in addition can be mixed with passing notes and neighbouring notes in various ways«.[15] These overhang notes, according to Koch, must fit within the measure of the punctuation note, unless the metrical unit of the phrase is two measures. Otherwise, it is »against the nature of the meter«.[16] As for an appendix, »[it] can be a section of the phrase itself, whose repetition makes the meaning of the phrase more emphatic [...] or [...] may be an incomplete segment which is not yet present in the phrase but which is able to define its substance more closely«.[17] Figure 10a shows an appendix, in which the alternation of the concluding harmonies of a cadence (V-I) is repeated, extending the phrase for another two measures. Koch also amends the previous rule against allowing an overhang to exceed a full measure, saying »The caesura note of a cadence is at times provided with an overhang, [...] this overhang often turns into an appendix, which further strengthens the close itself«.[18] As shown in Figure 10b, the note C4 of the concluding harmony is repeated beyond the bar line, resulting in an appendix.

Figure 10: a. Koch, *Versuch*, vol. 2, p. 423. An appendix marked with a bracket; b. Ibid. An appendix of a prolonged tonic chord marked with a bracket.

According to the Riepel-Koch theory, a basic foursome musical phrase can be prolonged by several means, among which the *Einschiebsel* between two different phrases is recognized only by Riepel. The significance here is that the materials of Riepel's *Einschiebsel* between two phrases neither belong to nor help to form any basic phrase. The fact that the components of the *Einschiebsel* between two phrases in both of Riepel's examples (Fig. 8) include sequences strongly suggests a parallel between Riepel's *Einschiebsel* and Fischer's *Fortspinnung*. Consequently, Riepel's highly consistent theory may provide some remediation of the inconsistency and ambiguity in

---

15 Ibid., vol. 2, pp. 393f.: »vermittelst des Nachschlags anderer, in dem dabey zum Grunde liegenden Drey-klange enthaltener Töne [...] und in diesem Falle bekömmt die Cäsur einen Ueberhang, oder einen weibli-chen Ausgang, welcher überdieß noch auf vielerley Art mit durchgehenden und Wechselnoten vermischt werden kann«.

16 Ibid., p. 397: »[ein] Fehler wider die Natur des Tactes«.

17 Ibid., p. 435: »[Dieser Anhang] ist entweder ein Theil des Satzes selbst, durch dessen Wiederholung der Inhalt des Satzes nachdrücklicher gemacht wird [...] oder [...] ein noch nicht im Satze vorhandener unvoll-ständiger Theil, der aber vermögend ist, den Inhalt des Satzes genauer zu bestimmen«.

18 Ibid., p. 422: »Die Cäsurnote einer Cadenz wird zuweilen mit einem [...] Ueberhange versehen, [...] und dieser Ueberhang gehet sehr oft in einen Anhang über, welcher gleichsam den Schluß selbst mehr bekräf-tigt«.

Fischer's *Fortspinnungstypus* period. Based on this period theory, Fischer's examples shown above may be re-analyzed.

Fischer's analysis of the Sarabande (Fig. 4) displays the problem that the *Vordersatz* is comprised of a sequence but is not defined as *Fortspinnung*. Fischer admits the use of a sequence in a *Vordersatz*, but then his theory does not explain the essential difference between a *Vordersatz* and a *Fortspinnung*. Furthermore, it is noticeable that the two-bar sequence in the *Vordersatz* of Bach's Sarabande is very similar to the *Einschiebsel* between the phrases in Riepel's examples (Fig. 8). However, according to the theory of Riepel and Koch, the Bach sequence forms an *Absatz* and is not an *Einschiebsel* between phrases. First of all, although the punctuation in the fourth measure is *unvollkommen*, it is *endlich*. Secondly, although the melody of the *Einschnitt* ends *endlich* in m. 2, the bass does not have the root note and moves toward the next measure in descending motion. Thus, it produces directionality toward the second twosome. Thirdly, the punctuation of m. 2 must be an *Einschnitt* because of the chord progression VI-i, while the V-i progression in m. 4 concludes an *Absatz*. In short, because of the different strengths of punctuations in mm. 2 and 4, the reciprocal relation of subject and predicate is produced in this example. Thus, this *Vordersatz* forms an *Absatz* according to Riepel and Koch, not a sequential *Einschiebsel* between phrases. Furthermore, it is also apparent that not only Fischer's *Vordersatz* but also his *Fortspinnung* in this example consist of regular, complete phrases. The period is thus formed by a *Grundabsatz* in the tonic key (mm. 1–4) and an *Änderungsabsatz* (mm. 5–8) followed by a *Schlußsatz* in the mediant key (mm. 9–12). All sequences here belong to one of the *Sätze* and do not constitute independent sections inserted between *Sätze*.

Fischer's examples from Bach's invention (Fig. 3) and viola da gamba sonata (Fig. 2) have an *Epilog* at the end according to his analysis. The problems are that these *Epiloge* are different in terms of phrase structure, and that it is difficult to distinguish Fischer's *Epilog* from his *Fortspinnung* when an *Epilog* contains a sequence. The *Epilog* in the invention is very short (mm. 19f.). It is preceded by a cadence that concludes the *Fortspinnung* (mm. 9–18). However, as shown in Figure 11, from the Riepel-Koch standpoint, the *Epilog* in the invention is not an *Absatz*, but rather a mere extension of the preceding closing chord beyond bar line, making it an *Anhang*, as explained by Koch. The *Fortspinnung* in the same work consists, in Riepel's view, of an *Einschiebsel* (mm. 9–12) and a *Schlußsatz* in the dominant key (mm. 13–18). Significantly, this *Einschiebsel* is an inserted sequence between the *Grundabsatz* 2 (mm. 5–8) and the *Schlußsatz* and does not form an *Absatz*. It is also notable that the subject of the *Schlußsatz* (mm. 13-16) starts as a continuation of the sequence from the *Einschiebsel* b e t w e e n phrases (mm. 9–12), and is prolonged by an *Einschiebsel* w i t h i n the phrase, which consists of the same rhythmic motif.

In Fischer's example of Bach's viola da gamba sonata (Fig. 2), the *Fortspinnung* (mm. 3–6) consists of an *Einschiebsel* b e t w e e n phrases after the *Änderungsabsatz* (mm. 1-2) which serves as Fischer's *Vordersatz*. This *Einschiebsel* is made up of two sequences (mm. 3–5.2 / 5.3–6), of which the second one is supported by a pedal on C3. Fischer's *Epilog* (mm. 7–9) directly emerges from these sequences, and in the Riepel-Koch view, it is a *Schlußsatz* in the tonic, which is expanded by an *Einschiebsel* w i t h i n the phrase, consisting of the repetition of the contracted subject motif (mm. 8.1–2)

Figure 11: Bach, Invention no. 6 in E major, BWV 777, mm. 1–20. Analytical annotations added by the author. Analysis according to Riepel-Koch theory indicated on top of each staff. Parentheses indicate analysis according to Fischer. Solid brackets indicate sequences.

placed between the subject (m. 7) and the conclusion (mm. 8.3–9.1). From Riepel's and Koch's perspective, both the invention and the viola da gamba sonata contain *Einschiebsel* between phrases, which Fischer analyzed as *Fortspinnung*, and they are, without exception, sequential. The Sarabande, however, does not have any kind of *Einschiebsel*, rather it consists of three complete phrases.

A new definition of Fischer's *Fortspinnungstypus* period, based on the terminology used by Riepel and Koch, for the better analysis of works such as a concerto movement by Bach can be best summarized as follows: A *Vordersatz* can be one phrase or two. It can be either a *Grundabsatz* as in the Sarabande in Figure 4, or an *Änderungsabsatz* as in the viola da gamba sonata in Figure 2, or contain two phrases as in the invention in Figure 11, or, at times, even a *Schlußsatz*. Although Fischer's *Fortspinnung* segment often contains various superfluous parts, it should only consist of a pure sequence(s). This sequence(s) is an *Einschiebsel* between a phrase of the *Vordersatz* and the following *Schlußsatz* which ends the period. All other non-sequential parts in Fischer's *Fortspinnung* are either a phrase (*Satz*) or *Anhang*. When there is a phrase before the sequence, it belongs to the *Vordersatz*. When a phrase comes after the sequence, it is normally a *Schlußsatz* and belongs to an *Epilog*. It should be noted, however, that the non-phrase sequence of *Fortspinnung*, at times, continues into the *Schlußsatz* as in the invention in Figure 11. As a result, the *Einschiebsel* and the following *Schlußsatz* are almost unseparable in this case. An *Anhang* is a segment after a full cadence of the *Schlußsatz* and before the start of the next period and always is a part of

an *Epilog*. Furthermore, even when a *Fortspinnungstypus* period seems to consist only of a *Fortspinnung* without a *Vordersatz* and an *Epilog*, it must, at least, include a *Schlußsatz* to be a period, resulting in a *Fortspinnung* and an *Epilog*.

In addition to the above definitions, some clarification to differentiate an *Einschiebsel* between two different phrases from a proper phrase is necessary. An *Einschiebsel* between phrases is purely sequential. At times, it consists of four measures, giving the misleading impression that it is a foursome phrase as shown in Figure 8b from Riepel. It could only be termed a phrase, however, if the first twosome and the second twosome describe the complementary relationship of subject and conclusion. In order to decide if such a relationship is given, one must consider whether the types of major and minor punctuation points (usually in the second and fourth measures) are *vollkommen* or *unvollkommen*, and *endlich* or *unendlich*. A basic phrase without prolongation is normally a foursome, but it is often lengthened by doubling of cadences, repetition of punctuation points or internal segments, insertion of materials within the phrase and/or addition of an appendix.

By introducing period theory, especially from Riepel's *Anfangsgründe*, the phrase structures of Fischer's examples are explained more consistently. In Fischer, the concept of a phrase is not fully applied; consequently, phrase and insertion – *Absatz* and *Einschiebsel* – are not distinguished. As a result, neither *Vordersatz* nor *Fortspinnung* nor *Epilog* is well characterized, and both *Einschiebsel* and *Absatz* are frequently found, in disarray, in Fischer's *Fortspinnungstypus* periods. Through period theory, however, sequential portions of a *Fortspinnung* are either clearly differentiated from the rest of the period as an *Einschiebsel* between two different phrases, or, as in the case of Bach's Sarabande, are a part of an *Absatz*. Furthermore, as mentioned, only Riepel includes the *Einschiebsel* between two different phrases as a means of phrase expansion, while Koch does not consider this option. Indeed, non-phrase sequences had become uncommon before Koch's *Versuch* appeared.[19] The disappearance of *Einschiebsel* between phrases, and the omission of this technique in Koch's *Versuch* are significant milestones along the path of style change in the 18th century, a path that can be better understood through the use of period theory.

References

Baker, Nancy Kovaleff: *Heinrich Koch and the Theory of Melody*, in: Journal of Music Theory 20/1 (1976), pp. 1–48.

Drabkin, William: *Fortspinnung*, in: *Grove Music Online*, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com (accessed 15 Dec, 2008).

Dreyfus, Laurence: *J. S. Bach's Concerto Ritornellos and the Question of Invention*, in: Musical Quarterly 71/3 (1985), pp. 327–358.

Fischer, Wilhelm: *Zur Entwicklungsgeschichte des Wiener klassischen Stils*, in: Studien zur Musikwissenschaft, Beihefte der Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich 3 (1915), pp. 24–84.

19 Domenico Alberti's keyboard sonatas op. 1 for example, published posthumously in 1748, include typical *Einschiebsel* without *Absatz* between two different phrases, while Johann Christian Bach's keyboard sonatas op. 5, published in 1766, do not have any instances of it. For detailed discussion and analyses on this style change, see Kaneko, *Fortspinnung as Einschiebsel*, pp. 43–60.

Hill, John Walter: *The Logic of Phrase Structure in Joseph Riepel's* Anfangsgründe zur musicalischen Setzkunst*, Part 2 (1755)*, in: *Festa Musicologica*, ed. by Thomas J. Mathiesen and Benito V. Rivera, New York: Pendragon Press 1995, pp. 467–487.

— *Cognate Music Theory*, in: *Music in the Mirror: Reflections on the History of Music Theory and Literature for the 21st Century*, ed. by Andreas Giger and Thomas J. Mathiesen, Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press 2002, pp. 117–141.

Kaneko, Junko: *Fortspinnung as Einschiebsel: A Reinterpretation of Fischer's 1915 Analysis in Light of Riepel's 1752–55 Theory*, Master thesis, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign 2004.

Knouse, Nola Reed: *Joseph Riepel and Emerging Theory of Form in the Eighteenth Century*, in: Current Musicology 41 (1986), pp. 46–62.

Koch, Heinrich Christoph: *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition*, 3 vols. [1782, 1787, 1793], Hildesheim: Olms [R]1969, translated partly by Nancy Kovaleff Baker as *Introductory Essay on Composition: The Mechanical Rules of Melody, Sections 3 and 4*, New Haven: Yale University Press 1983.

London, Justin: *Riepel and Absatz: Poetic and Prosaic Aspects of Phrase Structure in 18th-Century Theory*, in: Journal of Musicology 8/4 (1990), pp. 505–519.

Ratner, Leonard: *Eighteenth-Century Theories of Musical Period Structure*, in: Musical Quarterly 42/4 (1956), pp. 439–454.

Riepel, Joseph: *Anfangsgründe zur musicalischen Setzkunst. Erstes Kapitel: De Rhythmpoeïa, oder von der Tactordnung* [1752]; in: *Joseph Riepel: Sämtliche Schriften zur Musiktheorie*, vol. 1,1, ed. by Thomas Emmerig, Wien: Böhlau [R]1996.

— *Anfangsgründe zur musicalischen Setzkunst. Zweites Kapitel: Grundregeln zur Tonordnung insgemein* [1755], in: *Joseph Riepel: Sämtliche Schriften zur Musiktheorie*, vol. 1,2, ed. by Thomas Emmerig, Wien: Böhlau [R]1996.

Sisman, Elaine: *Small and Expanded Forms: Koch's Model and Haydn's Music*, in: Musical Quarterly 68/4 (1982), pp. 444–475.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign