CHAPTER FIVE
PACE AND ENLARGEMENT
IN HANDEL'S ORCHESTRAL WORKS

In chapter 1 I spelled out the major durational differences between the types of enlargement one finds in Handel's solo instrumental works and those one finds in his orchestral works. Enlargement in the solo and chamber works tends to be motivic and often involves the thematic expansion of the basic pace; enlargement in the orchestral works tends to be more abstractly durational and to involve the characteristic expansion of grouping paces and grouping structures. The analyses I presented in chapter 4 showed in ample measure also how the solo works generally emphasize tonal rather than durational enlargement, and how they rely more on a large-scale rhetorical underpinning than on a specific durational scheme to support their local expansions. The orchestral works, on account of their larger scale and greater length, place more emphasis on systematic durational expansion as such and on the coordination of tonal and durational enlargement, which becomes a major issue for their rhetorical structures to work out.[1]

In this chapter I shall focus on the means by which durational expansion and grouping enlargement come to chart the durational and rhetorical outlines of complete orchestral movements. A special concern, as we go along, will be the assistance the expansions receive from other types of enlargement in carrying out their task, and the expansions' participation in the preparation for later tonal enlargement. After completing

[1]It goes almost without saying that solo compositions do make use of durational enlargements—recall the grouping modulation from one-bar to two-bar grouping pace in bars 1-4 and 5-9[a] of the F-minor Allemande, chapter 1, and that the orchestral works display their share of motivic enlargements and basic-pace fluctuations; neither media could project a sense of improvisation without both types of enlargement.

the tonal and durational analysis of the Allegro from the E-minor Concerto Grosso, Op. 6, No. 3, begun in chapter 1, I shall examine in detail the still more complex fourth-movement Allegros from the G-minor Concerto Grosso, Op. 6, No. 6, and the A-minor Concerto Grosso, Op. 6, No. 4.

I. Handel: Concerto Grosso in E Minor, Op. 6, No. 3, III: Allegro, Bars 23-68

The Allegro from the E-minor Concerto Grosso is reproduced in its entirety in Example 5.1; a complete tonal reduction appears in Examples 5.2, and pace reductions of each period follow in Example 5.3.

I described in chapter 1 the manner in which the first full-fledged period of the Allegro (bars 5-22) acquires its extemporaneous periodicity and the speed with which it doubles the basic time frame of the four-bar theme that opens the movement. The discrepancy in grouping, style, and sources of borrowing between bars 1-4 and bars 5-12 triggers a chain of progressive enlargements that continues through to the end of the piece. At this point it needs to be reiterated only that the Allegro's opening period, like a large three-part ritornello, comprises an eight-bar orchestral *Vordersatz* (bars 5-12), a four-bar solo sequential *Fortspinnung* (bars 13-16), and a six-bar orchestral *Epilog* (bars 17-22). The six-bar *Epilog*, which confirms the arrival at the mediant, contradicts slightly the modest periodicity established by the *Vordersatz* and the *Fortspinnung*. Other things being equal such a contradiction would appear to stem only from the kind of repetition that is often added for emphasis at cadential areas. But here the contradiction does disturb the prevailing periodicity sufficiently to trigger a response by the upcoming *Vordersatz* of the Allegro's second period. The *Vordersatz*, which follows in bars 23-28, also occupies six measures: Its assertion of a six-bar length now touches off the next stage in the periodic growth of the piece.

Before turning to these durational matters I should like to present an overview of

the Allegro's tonal structure and its principal tonal enlargements, for it is within their broad context that the composition's remaining durational enlargements take place.

I. 1. Tonal Overview

The second period: Bars 23-40. Framed by the opening four-bar theme, which returns unchanged at the very end, the Allegro as a whole comprises three large periods. Each period divides in the manner of a large-scale ritornello into three phrases that display either the ritornello's characteristic succession of *Vordersatz, Fortspinnung*, and *Epilog* or one of its easily recognizable variants. The second period spans 18 measures (bars 23-40) and divides into three six-bar phrases. The first phrase—the *Vordersatz* (bars 23-28)—introduces an expanded variant of the opening theme and rises directly from the mediant to the dominant. The second phrase (bars 29-34) moves largely within the dominant and, in characteristic *Fortspinnung* style, establishes the key area's presence through a sequence assigned to the solo violin. Acting as the *Epilog*, the third phrase (bars 35-40) then confirms the arrival at the dominant with an elaborately prepared authentic cadence. The entire period's *raison d'être* is overwhelmingly durational, as we shall later see, but the period also contains at least one remarkable tonal feature that ties in with its durational enlargements and therefore merits description here.[2]

If one compares the rising outline of the *Vordersatz* in bars 23-28, and especially the concurrent third progressions d^2-e^2-$f\#^2$ and b^1-c^2-d^2 (see Example 5.4), with the similarly rising concurrent lines d^2-e^2-$f\#^2$ and b^1-$c\#^2$-d^2 in the violin solo of the first period's *Fortspinnung* (bars 13-16), one senses that the new *Vordersatz* is a hidden repetition of the earlier violin solo. If one then goes on to compare the new solo sequence

[2] One could argue that the second period divides into 6 + 8 + 4, with an *Epilog* beginning at bar 37 in much the same way the *Epilog* of the first period began at bar 17. But the drastic change in design that announces the entrance of the precadential II^6_5 in the key of the dominant at bar 35 speaks, quite persuasively to mind, against this alternative reading.

in bars 29-32 and its orchestral continuation in bars 33-34 (i.e., the new *Fortspinnung*) with the multiple voice exchanges in the first period's *Epilog* (bars 17-20, see again Example 5.4), one senses that the new *Fortspinnung*, too, is a hidden repetition and a substantial enlargement—of the descending inner-voice line g^2-f natural^2-e^2-d^2, which fills in the earlier voice exchanges. It appears, then, that the first two parts of the second period repeat the last two parts of the first period in both disguise and augmentation.[3]

The third period: Bars 41-68. The Allegro's third and last period is its most complex. It comprises two sets of *Fortspinnung* phrases (bars 41-48, standing in for a *Vordersatz*, and bars 49-56), an *Epilog* (bars 57-64), and a literal repetition of the Allegro's opening four-bar theme (bars 65-68). The tonal reduction in Example 5.2 shows how the two *Fortspinnung* phrases pool their resources to convert the dominant from a minor to a major harmony by moving away temporarily to the mediant. They extend the mediant in somewhat parenthetical fashion until it is time to arpeggiate down to the now-major dominant. The climactic *Epilog* paves the way for the reappearance of the tonic, and the tonic is set in place by the reprise of the opening theme.

The solo and orchestral first violins, entering on a high d^3 in bar 41 with material drawn directly from bars 5-12, resume the enlargement of the opening theme's octave

---

[3]This is a type of connective repetition that Schenker and many of his followers, particularly Oswald Jonas, would consider profoundly improvisatory but in a very practical way. The hidden parallelism provides a sense of continuity and an inner connection between the two periods, which otherwise stand apart from each other in many respects, especially in texture and motivic design. The connection affords the educated violinist and the conductor a built-in guide to shaping and shading the second period in a highly expressive and knowing way, for it allows them to bring out both the period's novelty and its hidden familiarity. Once the performers realize that the sequential material in bars 29-34 embodies an artful paraphrase of earlier material, the danger they face of molding the passage in a generically mechanical fashion is likely to vanish. Handel's instrumental music is replete with similarly veiled links between adjacent phrases and periods; it is only on account of my focus on durational matters that I do not dwell on such links at greater length.

descent from E to E that was begun by the bass in those early measures and was cut off abruptly at D, in bar 12. The two *Fortspinnung* phrases of the third period bring the enlargement back to life and carry it down through to a pungently Neapolitan $f8^2$ in bars 53-55, and to a diatonic $f\#^2$ that hovers tacitly over the violins' e^2-$d\#^2$ in bars 55-56. The *Epilog* (bars 57-64) repeats the descent in drastically shortened form and prepares for the reintroduction of e^2 by the repetition of the Allegro's four-bar theme. The brackets in Example 5.2 indicate that the entire set of enlargements takes place in the middleground, over the remaining stretch of the fundamental melodic line's descent, $\hat{2}$ - $\hat{1}$ ($f\#^2$-e^2).[4]

Now the principal reason for the octave enlargement's early break-up and for the postponement of its completion during the first period does seem to be durational, or at least temporal. The scope of so extensive an enlargement as the one Handel pursues here requires the support of a long phrase or (in this case) a complete large period if the enlargement is to unfold over time in a properly spacious way. The first step of the enlargement, E-D (bars 5-12), was traversed in a demonstrative, gestural way, perhaps because the stentorian upper-voice formations of the two-measure segments in bars 5-12 were too short-breathed to carry out so demanding a task: The projection of a long line does require a good deal of tonal and durational support after all, and the grouping modulation from a two-bar to a four-bar primary periodic span had at that point only begun. Postponing the enlargement allows Handel to complete the grouping modulation and to establish an eight-bar periodic span before the D that was cut off reenters, in the form of d^3, in bar 41.[5]

---

[4]I explained in chapter 1 that the octave descent which spans the entire Allegro takes place in the middleground and does not receive support from a specific bass progression: The Allegro's primary melodic tone remains $\hat{5}$, and the octave descent remains a thematic, rhetorical ploy. It is not a structural linear progression.

[5]Recall that the enlargement of the motive B-C-B-A-G in the E-minor Fugue also required a good deal of tonal and durational preparation.

In the long run, the enlargement of the octave descent transcends the realms of both tonal and durational resources, for its principal purpose is rhetorical. The enlargement provides the strategic backbone for the two climactic passages of the Allegro, the texturally iridescent quadruple sequential expansion in bars 49-52 (Example 5.5a, one of the wildest passages in all of Handel's oeuvre), and the extraordinarily shrill reclamation of the high d^3 in bars 58^b-61 (Example 5.5b). The quadruple sequential expansion is the crux of the Allegro: It introduces the central tones of the octave descent, A and G, in the guise of a bridge between the solo violin's d^3-$c\#^3$-b^2 in bars 41-44 and the entire ensemble's F natural and F# in bars 53-56. The reclamation of d^3 summarizes the descent and expands on the brassy quality of bars 5-12, where the descent began.[6]

The registral transfer of the octave enlargement from the bass of bars 5-12 to the upper voice of bars 41-68 supports these climactic missions. It also explains why I referred earlier to the extension of the mediant in bars 45-48 as "somewhat parenthetical," even though the extension is essential to the achievement of the local eight-bar phrase length. The upper voice in these tonally ancillary measures interrupts the enlarged descent temporarily with a rising motion that emerges from out of the inner voice below, and the interruption in turn intensifies the subsequent climax in bars 49-52 in the manner of *reculer pour mieux sauter*.

By the end of the second *Fortspinnung* in bar 56 the descent has reached $f<^2$ over the major dominant, and it remains for the *Epilog* in bars 57-64 and for the subsequent reprise of the four-bar theme to bring in e^2. The outline of the *Epilog* emerges quite clearly in Example 5.2: The phrase it encompasses prolongs the dominant by ascending through the dominant's upper fourth, F#-G-A-B (bass, bars 57-63); the phrase then extends the dominant still further, in more obviously cadential fashion, by rising to the neighboring C#

---

[6]I mentioned in chapter 1 that bars 5-12 evoke the sounds of the Bolognese brass ensemble. The sound that Handel draws from his string ensemble here seems to strive for even more.

(bass, bars 63-64). The ascent through the dominant's upper fourth again dwells on the mediant in "somewhat parenthetical fashion" (bars 57-60[a]), the passage bearing great similarity to the earlier parenthetical extension of the mediant. In this instance, d^3 (bar 60) is reached by an ascent from the inner voice that once more lends weight to the ensuing climactic outburst. And the outburst—the foreshortened descent from d^3 to $f\#^2$ in bars 60-61—leads directly to the reappearance of the original four-bar theme, in bar 65. As it introduces the closing tone of the enlarged descent, the theme presents the descent from e^2 to e^1 in its primordial form.

I have dwelled at some length on the Allegro's tonal narrative because the enlargement of the Allegro's grouping structure, to which I now turn, is charged with setting the durational stage on which this narrative is played out. Although the Allegro's tonal and durational enlargements evolve quite separately—after bar 12 they are no longer directly connected to each other—they nonetheless remain inextricably bound through the roles they play in realizing the Allegro's rhetorical structure. The tonal narrative depends on the durational narrative for completing its enlargements, and the durational narrative acquires its sense of purpose by assisting the realization of the tonal enlargements.

It will be very difficult, at this early stage in the present chapter, to explain why many of the Allegro's expansive passages embody only apparent, rather than genuine, durational expansion. I shall defer the detailed theoretical discussion of the Allegro's durational expansions to the pages that follow the analysis of the Allegro from the G-minor Concerto Grosso. The need to tackle a greater number and a more varied spectrum of orchestrally oriented expansions in the G-minor Allegro will facilitate considerably the task of explaining the nature of the expansions in the E-minor Concerto.

I. 2. Durational Analysis

I. 2. 1. The first period (bars 1-22)

More on bars 17-22. I mentioned earlier that the first period's six-bar Epilog (bars 17-22) spans two uneven groups, four and two measures long. The two groups contain two discrete sets of events—the multiple voice exchanges of bars 17-20 and the insistent cadential gestures of bars 21-22. Now one could argue that from a more local perspective the *Epilog* divides, in more egalitarian fashion, into three two-bar groups. And in fact this equal division is sufficiently clear-cut for us to hear the *Epilog* also as a six-bar subphrase that is made up of three more or less equally significant two-bar segments. Such deliberate instability and ambivalence in grouping is nothing but a typical symptom of Baroque periodic growth: It simply reconfirms one's impression that a grouping modulation is once again underway. The diagram in Example 5.6 lays out the larger scheme in which the modulation takes place.

In the course of bars 17-22 grouping modulation has already transformed the two-bar periodic span of bars 5-12 into a four-bar span, and without delay it now sets upon expanding the newly won four-bar span still further. The new expansion, to a six-bar span, overlaps the confirmation of the four-bar span. Far from unusual, the simultaneity of the two procedures simply indicates that the Allegro's grouping structure remains in a state of continual growth.

And so it is that even before the first period closes, its unstable groups begin to prepare for a more far-reaching modulation to six-bar grouping (6=3x2), which becomes fully effective during the second period. The second period reaffirms the six-bar grouping, and soon begins preparations for a still more extensive modulation, to eight-bar grouping. Eight-bar grouping eventually takes hold during the third and last period.

I. 2. 2. The second period (bars 23-40)

Bars 23-28. Because its six-bar length has already been prepared, the first phrase of the

second period—its *Vordersatz*—enters in elegantly seamless fashion: The three-part paraphrase of the opening four-bar theme that it lays out sounds not disruptive but resonant, even though it alters drastically the disposition of the materials it adapts from the opening theme. Only the basic one-bar segment introduced in bars 1 and 2 reappears, but it is extended three times in a row for one measure by a cadential tag, on the rising bass steps G, A, and B. Each one-bar segment is set in stark unisons and octaves, just like the opening theme, but each cadential tag is scored in the sonorous manner of bars 5-12. These differences in texture evolve from the durational conflict between bars 1-4 and 5-12 in a subtle but not entirely hidden way. The cadential tags are essential at all levels of durational structure since they provide the mechanism for achieving the six-bar length required by the Allegro's grouping modulation. Appearances to the contrary, these extensions do not embody genuine durational expansion.

Bars 29-34. The six-bar *Fortspinnung* in bars 29-34 divides into a four-bar subphrase and a two-bar segment, and both subgroups consist of solo figural passagework played by the first concertino violin (see the pace reductions in Example 5.3). Like the characteristic division of three measures into 2 + 1 that recurred throughout the Allemande from the D-minor Suite (chapter 4), the division into 4 + 2 here acquires a certain thematic quality through its association with similar divisions elsewhere in the piece. (And just as the Allemande's 2 + 1 segments were matched by segments dividing into 1 + 2, so are the Allegro's 4 + 2 groups matched by groups dividing into 2 + 4.)[7] The four-bar subphrase whose thematic outlines I discussed earlier (bars 29-32) contains a double sequential expansion that embellishes and extends the dominant by falling to it from a neighbor-note harmony (see, again, the tonal reduction in Example 5.2). The expansion suggests that in

[7]In the Allegro from the A-minor Concerto Grosso, groups of 6 + 8 are similarly matched by groups of 8 + 6.

addition to the hidden enlargement of the voice exchange in bars 17-20 the subphrase performs another task: It transforms the idiom of apparent descending fourths that filter through the locally nested multiple voice exchanges of bars 17-20 into a full-fledged linear progression.[8] As presented in bars 17-20, the original idiomatic diminution falls at a figural pace of eighth notes, and because it comprises different steps of invertible counterpoint it does not add up to a genuine linear progression. But now, with each of its constituent tones (g^2, $f\#^2$, e^2, and d^2) occupying a full measure, it is finally legitimized as a real fourth progression.[9]

Notwithstanding many textural and thematic similarities, the present sequential enlargement differs from the quadruple sequential expansion in the *Fortspinnung* of the first period (bars 13-16) in its mechanics. The earlier progression presented a rising second (E-F#) in the bass that was embedded within a rising third (D-E-F#) at a deeper level and within a rising fourth (D-E-F#-G) at a still deeper level (recall Example 1.24). The enlargement here, in bars 24-32, outlines a self-contained, quasi-autonomous fourth led by the upper voice and followed by the bass. Since each tone of the fourth now occupies a full measure, the progression as a whole adds up to a single basic segment that is four bars long.

From a larger periodic perspective the presence of an unbroken span of four bars—it is not readily divisible into 2 + 2—within the framework of a six-bar phrase signifies that periodic instability still prevails and that preparations for a still larger grouping modulation, from a periodic span of six bars to one of eight bars, is quietly under way (see the diagram in Example 5.6). Quite apart from the niceties of hidden repetition, this is the most significant role that bars 29-32 play. In fact, the task of preparing for the

---

[8]Recall that each of the apparent fourths in bars 17-20 derives from the descending steps in bar 3 and consists of two adjacent groups of two tones.

[9]Figure 43 in Schenker 1935/1979/2001 outlines the progressions that underlie the imaginary fourth of bars 17-20.

forthcoming periodic enlargement takes precedence over the introduction of artful thematic work. That explains why the subphrase they occupy appears uneventful figurally, and perhaps also why there is a need to enrich its appearance with a deeper, more obscure meaning. As it is, the doubly expanded one-bar basic pace of the subphrase is not as extravagantly spacious as the quadruply expanded two-bar pace of bars 13-16 (recall again Example 1.21), and the temporary one-bar grouping pace it shows offers little that is new.

The two-bar segment that follows in bars 33-34 is something of a tonal extension. It, too, does not add much that is new. Rather, it simply reconfirms the upper voice's arrival at d^2 and d^3 over B in the last measure of the four-bar subphrase (bar 32; see Example 5.2). The addition of the segment is nonetheless durationally essential, for it helps procure the basic six-bar length of bars 29-34 and it helps maintain the six-bar grouping of the second period. The emphatically uneven division of six into 4 + 2 destabilizes the 3 x 2 division of bars 23-28 and prevents an excessively stable periodic formation of sixes from taking hold. In so doing—and without calling attention to the matter—it prepares for the transition from six-bar to eight-bar grouping.[10]

Bars 35-40. The *Epilog* of the second period also supports the period's grouping modulation, and it does so in similarly systematic fashion. Its six bars, however, divide into 2 + 4 rather than into the previously established 4 + 2. The division again destabilizes the potential symmetries of the period; it sustains, instead, their growth in time.

The pressing repetitions in the *Epilog*'s opening two measures (bars 35-36) are essential at all levels since they help secure the *Epilog*'s basic six-bar length. Appearances

---

[10]In discussing these difficult passages it is sometimes necessary to repeat observations in the course of technical explanations.

again to the contrary, the close contrapuntal activity on which the repetitions are based restores the Allegro's quarter-note basic pace. The four-bar subphrase that follows (Bars 37-40) presents a cadential set of multiple voice exchanges very similar to those in the first period's *Epilog* (bars 17-20) but recomposed to suggest an unbroken four-bar basic segment. The voice exchanges are held together by an unnotated change of meter to 3/2 time, which prevails in bars 37-39, and they are followed by a single cadential measure, bar 40 (see Example 5.3). Reasonably unobtrusive—a mere cadential ploy at this stage—the unnotated 3/2 prepares for the metric displacements and the disruptions that mark the Allegro's concluding, aperiodic phrase (bars 57-64).[11]

When one compares the common six-bar length of all three phrases in the Allegro's second period, however differently articulated each phrase is, with the more foursquare grouping in the first period one becomes keenly aware of the transitional and developmental character of the second period as a whole. In the larger scheme of things it now begins to appear that the second period fits into a formal plan which calls for the three periods of the entire Allegro to make up a ritornello cycle on a grand scale. The first period introduces all the basic materials of the piece in the manner of a *Vordersatz;* the second period alters and transforms them in a transitional and developmental way, just as a *Fortspinnung* would, according to the plan laid out by the entire Allegro's comprehensive durational scheme; and the third period presents the tonal, durational, and thematic outcome of the earlier transformations, resolving their tensions in typical *Epilog* fashion.[12]

With the adoption of consistent six-bar grouping during the second period,

---

[11]Handel's use of unnotated 3/2 time here derives directly from bars 9-11 and bars 14-18[a] of Scarlatti's G-minor Sonata, K. 12; see chapter 1, Example 1.19.

[12]This scheme has a basic similarity to Kofi Agawu's beginning-middle-end paradigm, and to the tripartite schemes described by Paul Everett in his monograph in Vivaldi's Op. 8; see Agawa 1991 and Everett 1996.

questions begin to arise about the possibility of a very gradual shift in the hypermeter of the piece, from the two-bar hypermeter of the first period to (perhaps) a four-bar hypermeter in the third period. I raise the issue briefly at this point because, as I mentioned earlier, solo passages in a Baroque concerto often present a basic pace that is slower than the basic pace of the surrounding ritornello; they consequently show a larger hypermeter than the hypermeter of the orchestral passages around them, even though they don't necessarily introduce any expansion as such. This *could* have been the case in bars 29-32, even more than in bars 13-16, on account of the stronger four-bar grouping in the later subphrase, but the great brevity and the concision of the solo passages in bars 29-32 again does not allow sufficient time and space for the bona fide realization of a new durational setting. The Allegro from the G-minor Concerto Grosso, which I discuss later in this chapter, offers several genuine and typical examples of such temporary conversion.

I. 2. 3. The third period (bars 41-68)

Bars 41-48. We have already had occasion to observe that the E-minor Allegro's third and last period is considerably more elaborate than the preceding two periods. Its two *Fortspinnung* phrases (bars 41-48 and 49-56) and its *Epilog* (bars 57-64) extend for eight bars each, and they bring to completion the grouping modulation begun during the first and second periods. Both the first and the second *Fortspinnung* divide into two four-bar subphrases; the *Epilog* divides unevenly.

The first subphrase of the first *Fortspinnung* (bars 41-44) harks back to two consecutive passages in the first period: It draws on material introduced in bars 5-12 in order to restart the falling octave enlargement broken off by the bass D at bar 12 (recall Examples 1.22 and 1.23), and it also presents a descending orchestral variation on the quadruple sequential expansion introduced by the concertino in bars 13-16 (Example 5.7; the preponderance of repeated notes in bars 5-12 and bars 41-44 draws attention to the

larger connection between the two passages). The dual expansion—tonal and durational—now falls from the high d^3, and it progresses as a fused enlargement as far down as b^2. Although their rhythms are the same, the progressions in bars 13-16 and bars 41-44 differ contrapuntally: The later progression presents a V^4_2-I^6 variant of falling fifths, whereas the earlier progression outlines a series of 5-6 exchanges.[13]

The second subphrase (bars 45-48) proceeds rather faster but offers some expansion nonetheless. It enlarges the quarter-note basic pace to movement in half notes, and it outlines the neighbor-note motion e^2-d^2 at the enlarged half-note pace (bars 45-46, supported by lower parallel tenths in the bass). The importance of this neighbor-note motion resides in its interruption of the resumed octave descent. The pretext for the interruption is the progression that follows—the rising 5-6 suspension series that emerges from the inner voice (bars 47-48). The 5-6 series maintains the expanded half-note basic pace while it presents, by way of a seemingly incidental parallelism, a diminution in invertible counterpoint of the rising sequence in bars 13-16 (compare the progressions and see the brackets in Example 5.8). Now the immediate mission of the 5-6 exchanges is the return to the high register and the preparation for the Allegro's first thematic and textural climax in bars 49-52. But the 5-6 exchanges also accomplish a more important task: They help outline several rising fourths whose significance transcends their immediate purpose. These fourths stretch over different layers of thematic play and they straddle different spans of instrumental activity. One finds them in the solo violin's figurations at the very surface, plainly visible in the score, in the progression that underlies the bass of the subphrase as a whole (see again the brackets in Example 5.8), and in the larger, veiled recollection of bars 13-16 to which I just called attention. In concert with the falling steps e^2-d^2 in the first subphrase, these rising fourths signal a subtle and hidden preparation for

[13]I point to the hidden connection between the two without further comment here; an appraisal of its significance must await a later study of Handel's motivic isorhythm.

the return of the Allegro's opening four measures at the very end of the piece: The opening theme, we recall, begins with a rising fourth that brings in the large falling step e^2-d^2. Its preparation is no incidental nicety: Since the theme's return projects many structural and rhetorical repercussions, it is an event that merits close thematic anticipation.

Even before going on to the third period's remaining two phrases, we can observe readily that the Allegro's grouping structure has changed, and that its grouping modulation has achieved the goal of establishing an eight-bar periodic span. Notwithstanding the persistent prominence of four-bar grouping as the Allegro's enlarged basic segment and the continuing prominence of two-bar grouping as its principal grouping pace, it is the eight-bar span that emerges as the most significant durational feature of the first phrase. At this point the eight-bar span requires confirmation only by one additional eight-bar phrase for it to assert its primacy at the head of the newly won periodic grid.

With a periodic grid in place, the notion of a new and slower four-bar grouping pace is not one to be discarded entirely. The leading elements of the design—texture, orchestration, register, figuration and the like—all change every four measures, some quite drastically, and the sense of an ancillary four-bar pace governed by the design does emerge. But the length and the substance of each measure, coupled with the absence of direct parallelisms between the adjacent groups of four bars, prevents the four-bar pace from establishing itself as the principal grouping pace. If anything, the absence of such four-bar parallelisms ultimately weakens the emergence of a truly dynamic periodicity because it attenuates the durational identity of each four-bar group.

Bars 49-56^a. The second eight-bar phrase of the Allegro's third period begins with the composition's first climax, the quadruple sequential expansion in bars 49-52. It is no coincidence that the progression echoes several earlier sequential expansions: Its climactic impact is all the greater because its apparent novelty—a mélange of angular motives,

piquant orchestral textures, and explicit *forte* dynamics—is reinforced by its replication of the sequences in bars 13-16 and bars 41-44. The repetition, at once audible and concealed, is outlined in Example 5.7; its power resides in its reserve.[14]

Because all the sequential expansions in the first two phrases of the third period are needed to procure the eight-bar length of the phrase and the four-bar length of the subphrase, they remain essential at the eight-bar and the four-bar levels of the phrase and the subphrase; the same applies to the figural repetitions at the two-bar level of the segment, within the multiple voice exchange in bars 53-56. I shall return to the fine durational significance of these expansions and repetitions after the analysis of the Allegro from the G-minor Concerto Grosso; for now, I should like to note how the repetitions in bars 53-56 coincide with both the resumption of the quarter-note basic pace and the adoption of *forte* dynamics by the full orchestral complement. The simultaneity of these gestures once again heightens the momentum and the drive sustained by the passage without, again, contributing much that has not been presented before. Handel's invention resides in his sparing intensification of this familiar material, namely in the Phrygian inflection, f natural^2-e^2, of the first-inversion tonic's neighboring supertonic sixth chord, which colors the multiple voice exchanges in bars 53-56 (Example 5.9). As a rule, Handel calls upon such inflections, which enter contrapuntally as Phrygian auxiliaries but exit harmonically as Neapolitan surrogates for the structural $\hat{2}$, to reinforce events that are prominent already or events that have been marked for significance in some other way as well.

---

[14]The contrast between the climactic gestures at bars 49-52 and the solo textures, fragmented instrumental exchanges, and *piano* dynamics of the earlier expansions forestalls the appearance of redundancy. Along the same lines, the entire eight-bar phrase seems to convey a new thought, but it represents a hidden repetition—now rhythmic, now tonal—of the entire preceding phrase: Bars 49-52, we know already, are identical to bars 41-44 sequentially, and the many falling quarter-note whole steps and half steps in bars 53-56 embody diminutions of the falling neighbor-note figures in the corresponding earlier measure, bars 45-46 (Example 5.9).

Although the second phrase spans the entirety of bars 49-56, its upper voice is truncated at the tail end of the phrase by half a measure through the premature, overlapping entrance of the third phrase, the *Epilog* of the third period, in the middle of bar 56. This is an instance of mid-bar displacement typical of the compound 4/4 (even though the bass doesn't quite follow suit, as we shall see). The displacement affects the preceding *Fortspinnung* only mildly: while the phrase is abbreviated by half a measure, its eight-bar periodicity remains crystal-clear. The displacement does affect the *Epilog* phrase, though, and in several fundamental ways.

Bars 56^{b}-68. The purpose behind the displacement in bar 56 is largely tonal and rhetorical, and its explanation—along with an account of the surrounding rhythms—requires a close reading of measures that follow, from several different angles. For all its mounting fury, the Allegro has not yet exhausted its energy. The gestures of climax and reprise, which intensified the third period's second phrase, only set the stage for the dramatic events that now take place during the third, closing phrase.

The opening measures of the *Epilog* intensify the Allegro's discourse further in several obvious ways, among them the rising register of the melodic line and the more frequent use of imitative figures in the inner parts. Less obvious but equally important is the transposed diatonic recomposition of the Neapolitan inflections we just heard. This reharmonized transformation enlists the help of invertible counterpoint and begins with the form of the two-bar neighbor-note motion c^{2}-b^{1}; it spans the opening two measures of the phrase, and it incorporates the first of several forays into unnotated 3/2 time (bars 56^{b}-58^{a}, compare Examples 5.1c and 5.3c). Just when the first violins reach the high point of their ascent to the three-line octave in bar 60, where they will summarize the Allegro's all-encompassing octave descent, the now-diatonic Neapolitan inflection reappears. It reenters in the bass, at the very moment the rising bass reaches its own high point and reverses its direction. The half step migrates up to the first violins.

These sweeping gestures, unlike the Allegro's earlier touches of tonal drama, show a good deal of metrical irregularity, and it is the high degree of irregularity—uncommonly high for Handel—that holds the key to the essence of the phrase. Besides generating expressive friction and hinting that the Allegro's closing measures are at hand, it forces the Allegro to abandon its hard-earned periodicity. The pace reductions in Example 5.3c show how the fleeting suggestion of 3/2 time at the turn of bar 57 triggers the onset of a more sizable passage in unnotated 3/2, at bars 58 ^{b}-62. They also disclose that bars 56^{b}-64 divide unevenly into a displaced five-bar subphrase (bars 56^{b}-61^{a}) and an abbreviated, similarly displaced four-bar subphrase (bars 61^{b}-65^{a}), which closes with the overlapping entrance of the opening theme. Both subphrases divide unevenly as well—the first into segments of two and three bars, and the second into segments of one and a half and two and a half bars. For the very first time in the course of the Allegro, the two-bar grouping pace and the Allegro's original one-bar grouping pace both dissipate.

Before I attempt a measure-by-measure account of these irregularities, it would be helpful if I explained the rhetorical reasons for their intrusion. Two reasons emerge for Handel's abandonment of the periodicity he took 56 measures to set in place. As I pointed out in chapter 1, the rhetorical structure of the Allegro centers on a reconciliation between the rarefied contrapuntal milieu of bars 1-4, borrowed in the main from Domenico Scarlatti's densely linear Sonata in G minor, K. 8, and the more earthy environment of bars 5-12, borrowed in the main from Scarlatti's more homophonic and more explicitly folkloristic Sonata in G minor, K. 12. By enlarging the modest grid with which he started into a full-blown periodic hierarchy, Handel evens out the differences between the small-scale, angular temporality of K. 8 and the broad, sweeping temporality of K. 12. While Handel's periodicity grows, the durational earmarks of the two opening groups become submerged in the Allegro's rhythmic flow, and the diverse styles and temporalities of the groups fuse into one. Over the span of three periods Handel adjusts the loosely prolongational flux of the material drawn from K. 12 to the faster moving and

more strictly regimented ebb and flow of the material drawn from K. 8. By the time Handel has reached bar 56 he has elevated the middle and the low styles of K. 12 almost all the way up to the high style of K. 8 and at the same time he has loosened his grip on the high style of K. 8 just enough to make the admixture work.

With the abandonment of the periodic grid at the climax of the E-minor Allegro Handel turns to a densely packed learned style that projects its authority in no uncertain terms.[15] This narrative reversal in plot discloses the direction at which Handel has quietly been spinning his narrative thread all along. The attempt at reconciling the tonal and durational rhythms of K. 8 and K. 12, the middle and low styles, and the elaborate durational enlargements that the reconciliation entailed, embodied neither the Allegro's *raison d'être* nor its strategic scheme. It served only to procure the space for the enlargement of the Allegro's all-encompassing octave descent, which we associate with the high style of bars 1-4. The enlargement having been accomplished, the fusion of styles and its earned periodicity yield to the severely tonal counterpoint and to the irregular rhythms of the high style. Handel's abandonment of his periodicity signals the triumph of the high style over its more accessible but less rewarding counterparts. Within this framework the return of bars 1-4 in bars 65-68, at the close of the Allegro and at the conclusion of the falling octave's enlargement, represents far more than a cyclic homecoming or a formal nicety—it symbolizes the triumph of long-span contrapuntal voice leading and inventive tonal enlargement over ready made, everyday compositional resources.

The second reason, closely related, for Handel's abandonment of his periodicity resides in the equally symbolic temporal vision that the Allegro's newly minted irregularity affords—a vision of an unregulated temporal world that might exist beyond

---

[15]Hatten 1994 often refers to the sense of authority the composer invokes by adopting the high style.

the advent of periodicity. The entire Allegro was based on the reconciliation of durational contrasts through continual periodic growth. Now that a fully operative periodic grid has finally been achieved, Handel allows us to have a look at the less patterned or differently patterned world beyond, a world that employs the periodic grid as its point of departure but thrives on a temporality of fantasy and improvisation. At the risk of exaggerating a little, one might say that Handel used periodicity as an instrument in his search for a temporal other.

With these observations in mind, let us look more closely at the durational irregularities of bars 56^{b}-64. The effect of metrical and temporal instability that obtains throughout bars 56^{b}-62 stems largely from Handel's adoption of unnotated 3/2 time and from the initial lack of coordination between the outer voices in performing the metrical adjustments involved (see again Example 5.3; each inner voice follows the closest outer voice).[16] The progress of the upper voice suggests 3/2 time in bars 56^{b}-57 and then again throughout bars 58^{b}-62; the patterning of the bass, by contrast, continues to show movement in undisplaced 4/4 time up to bar 58. Only at the middle of bar 58 does the bass join the upper voice in outlining 3/2 time; one does not really hear the bass in bars $57\text{-}58^{a}$ as an expression of a measure in 3/2 time, not even retrogressively.

The upper voice opens the phrase in the middle of bar 56 with the neighbor-note motion b^{1}-c^{2}; it extends c^{2} all the way to the downbeat of bar 58, where the reappearance of b^{1} is supported by the more regularly patterned bass. Although one is inclined to accept the resumption of 4/4 time at this point, new thematic patterns appear at one-and-a-half-bar intervals at the middle of bar 58, at the downbeat of bar 60, and (in tandem with the entrance of the second subphrase) in the middle of bar 61: The new patterns are supported by the violins' ascent from d^{2} to a^{2} in bars 58^{b}-60^{a}, by the overlapping

---

[16] Again, the idea of using 3/2 in this developmental way is prompted by Scarlatti's K. 12; the on-again, off-again articulation of 3/2 derives from Scarlatti as well, even though Handel employs unnotated 3/2 liberally elsewhere (chapter 2).

climactic descent from d^3 to g^2 and $f\#^2$ in bars 60^a-$61^{a/b}$, and by the subsequent extension of $f\#^2$ in bars 61^b-62. It is the evenly spaced recurrence of these changes in patterning that calls for reorientation in 3/2 time through bar 62. The notated meter resumes in bar 63, a measure and a half after the new subphrase has entered.

The bass, by contrast, proceeds more predictably, at least at first. As it starts out, the bass outlines a sustained neighbor-note motion, A-G, which spans bars 57 and 58; each of the two tones occupies essentially one measure. In support of the displaced upper voice, though, the bass anticipates A on the last beat of bar 56, and it begins to articulate its ascent away from G, up to C (helping out the upper voice's ascent from d^2 to a^2) already in the middle of bar 58. Now since the opening tone of the bass ascent is the very same G that also serves as the terminus of the neighbor-note motion A-G, the beginning of the ascent meshes in with the conclusion of the falling step A-G. Two meters consequently operate in bar 58—4/4 and 3/2, and they manage to overlap and coexist within the same measure without compromising the momentum of the passage.[17]

The mounting tension of the passage is due in no small measure to the steady acceleration of the basic pace (Example 5.3). In bars 57-58^a, under the upper voice's slow neighbor-note motion c^2-b^1 and the unnotated 3/2, the basic pace aligns itself with the bass and shows a quadruply expanded one-bar movement. But at bar 58^b, with the beginning of the ascents to the higher register in both outer voices—and with the

---

[17]The complex adjustment of two ongoing meters in bars 56^b-58^a is facilitated by the opportune thematic intensification of voice leading that happens to be readily available over the undisplaced bass in the middle of bars 56 and 58: The stable voice leading at bars 56^b and 58^b—an emphatic semi-cadential dominant and a lightly tonicized mediant—fits in very smoothly with the appearance of fresh turns of phrase at each of these two spots. The unnotated 3/2 meter is then substantiated by the suspension of motivic emphasis on the downbeats that follow at bars 57^a and 59^a.

These complexities are difficult to describe in words but, on Handelian terms, they evolve naturally with each spin of Handel's improvisatory armature. Recall Example 2.28b in chapter 2: The displacement in the upper voice, contemporaneous with the notated meter in the bass, took place as a matter of course.

beginning of the 5-6 suspension series that mediates between them—the basic pace accelerates to half-note movement. As the climactic descent falls from d^3, in bars 60-64, the basic pace resumes its original quarter-note movement. Despite the insistent repetition and the embellishment of the supertonic 6/5 chord, marked *piano*, which enters in the middle of bar 61 and extends through bar 62, the quarter-note basic pace prevails (just as it did, analogously, in bars $35\text{-}36^a$) on account of the supertonic's reappearance in alternating 6/5 and 4/3 positions at the distance of a quarter note. Finally,during the last two measures before the reentrance of the tonic (bars 63-64), the movement of the basic pace accelerates further and fluctuates, as it often does in cadential surroundings, between the Allegro's essential quarter-note pace and an accelerated eighth-note cadential pace.

Although in a very obvious way the return of the Allegro's four-bar opening theme in bars 65-68 suggests that the piece has come full circle with the completion of its enlarged octave descent, it also offers a yardstick by which to measure how far away from its highly suggestive but capsular beginnings the Allegro has traveled, and how well it has realized the potential for enlargement embedded in its opening theme.

I. 3. Durational observations on Handel's E-minor Allegro as a whole

Hypermeter. One of the most intriguing questions that the E-minor Allegro raises concerns the presence of hypermeter and the extent of its influence in an environment that allows periodicity to grow only one step at a time (an environment so different from Classical periodicity, whose grid enters almost all at once at the beginning of the piece).[18] Since I have already addressed the applicability of a full-blown hypermetrical approach—along with the applicability of durational reduction—to the Baroque

[18]Morgan 1998 contains a well nuanced description of the grid's terraced entrance in Mozart.

repertoire during the Introduction and, in passing, elsewhere, I shall offer only a brief response here.[19]

Because Handel does not cultivate a four-bar grouping pace—there is insufficient patterning at the four-bar level for a distinct count of 1 2 3 4 to come through—a four-bar hypermeter does not crystallize, notwithstanding the Allegro's periodic growth. The Allegro's four-bar groups simply don't pass the standard hypermetrical counting test that William Rothstein devised for large hypermeasures.[20] Furthermore, although all of the orchestral allegros under consideration here (and, for that matter, most of Handel's orchestral allegros) contain extended periodic stretches, they remain fundamentally aperiodic pieces in the long run, when all is said and counted. In the study of Handel's music, then, it is probably best to limit one's application of four-bar hypermeter—and of the durational reduction by a factor of four it invites—to special cases.[21]

Now throughout the E-minor Allegro the compound 4/4—the type of 4/4 time in which the measure is initially the largest hypermetrical unit—prevails on account of the four-to-the-bar basic pace, which Handel reasserts repeatedly. I would nonetheless read a two-bar hypermeter beginning at bar 5 and continuing all the way down to the end of the Allegro's penultimate phrase in bar 56: The decisive change from one-bar to two-bar grouping that occurs at bar 5 certainly justifies this hypermetrical shift of gears. The large 1 2 count at the level of the measure that is Rothstein's tell-tale sign of hypermetric activity can doubtless be applied to bars 5-6, 7-8, and so on almost throughout, except where one-bar grouping resumes briefly (as in bars 29-32), and where unnotated 3/2 time takes over (as in bars 37-39). One could conceivably try to make a case also for a temporary triple hypermeter in the Allegro's second period, and for a large-scale four-bar

---

[19]Willner 1998.

[20]Rothstein 1995, p. 334.

[21]Willner 1999 offers several examples.

hypermeter in the first two phrases of the third period if one so wanted. But again the results would be awkward at best, because one's sense of a sustained 3 x (1 2) and 2 x (1 2 3 4) count in the two periods is quite weak.[22] In any case, the emergence of larger grouping during the second and the third periods is so heavily dependent on the prior establishment of a two-bar hypermeter and a two-bar grouping pace during the first period, and on their steady maintenance later on, that we continue to rely on the smaller, not on the larger entities for our general hypermetrical orientation throughout.

Obbligato paces. Thanks to the prominence of the E-minor Allegro's three quadruple sequential expansions (bars 13-16, 41-44, and 49-52, Example 5.7), a wide two-bar obbligato pace anchored on each expansion's principal chords becomes a prominent feature of the piece. Beyond the assistance it provides in promoting grouping modulations, it forges a web of tonal and durational links between strategic passages that are noncontiguous. It also helps stabilize short two-bar groups (bars 5-6, 7-8, and 9-10; bars 23-24, 25-26, and 27-28) during the Allegro's periodic growth.

A faster one-bar obbligato pace sustains the double sequential expansion in bars 29-32 and the dovetailing suspension formations in bars 33-34 (consult again Example 5.3b). Like the two-bar pace in bars 23-28, it helps put the second period's skewed, tripartite periodicity in place.

Grouping structure and time frame. The growth of the Allegro's grouping structure and the growth of its primary periodic span define the outlines of the Allegro's various time frames. The merit of the time frame as a theoretical notion resides in its flexibility. It can be defined in preliminary fashion as the span of time that a complete tonal or durational structure, operation, or attribute at a given level occupies or requires in order to

[22]Except at the regularly patterned *Vordersatz* of the second period, in bars 23-28.

accomplish its task and to run its course. In other words, a time frame is the characteristic block of time that marks and identifies the length of a discrete musical phenomenon at a given level.[23] The importance of the notion resides in its sensitivity to the *changes* that a time frames might undergo in the course of the composition. If, say, the work's basic segment has expanded from one to two bars (as the basic segment of the E-minor Allegro has, in bars 5-22), the augmentation of the basic segment's time frame, as such, is likely to emerge as an important compositional issue with potentially significant repercussions for the later articulation of durational features of the piece. The diagram in Example 5.6 illustrates the observations that follow in schematic form. Fluctuating time frames abound in pieces that call for the maintenance or growth of periodicity. That is where they carry a good deal of compositional and analytical weight. A vivid example from the E-minor Allegro is the ripple effect set in motion by the expansion in basic grouping from a one-bar to a two-bar time frame in bars 5-12. The expansion effectively doubles the four-bar thematic time frame established by the opening theme. The augmented thematic time frame of the *Vordersatz* in bars 5-12 therefore encompasses eight bars, and the corresponding but irregularly enlarged time frame of the group that comprises the four-bar *Fortspinnung* in bars 13-16 and the six-bar *Epilog* in bars 17-22 encompasses ten bars.[24]

Along the same lines, one could describe the entire Allegro's periodic growth in terms of the changes in time frame that its primary periodic span undergoes. During the opening four-bar theme, the periodic span encompasses all of one measure; in bars 5-12 it already embraces two. The primary periodic span's time frame widens, gradually, in a modulating fashion, from a two-bar length to a four-bar length during the violin solo of bars 13-16 and the orchestral voice exchanges in bars 17-20; by the end of the first period,

---

[23]After all, one prominent feature by which we identify musical phenomena is their characteristic length: We associate them aurally with their given length.

[24]Handel, we recall, added two bars (21 and 22) to signal the continuation of grouping modulation in the upcoming second period.

at bar 22, the periodic span takes in four-bar subphrases. During the second period (bars 23-40) it widens further to encompass six-bar phrases. Finally, throughout the last period (bars 41-65), it stretches again and extends over three large eight-bar phrases (despite the irregularities of the third period's last phrase).

The value of expressing these and similar observations so abstractly resides in what the growth of the time frame can tell us about the piece as a whole. The changes to which it points encapsulate in a nutshell the extraordinary growth of the Allegro's fundamental durational unit from one measure to eight measures. Its drastic alteration underlines the strategic significance of the enlargement.

I hasten to emphasize that *cumulative* length, as such, is not the issue here: The length of the Allegro's three periods—18, 18, and 24 bars—offers no indication that each period's internal durational dynamics are in a state of constant flux, or that the relations between the durations of each period's segments, phrases, and subphrases change continually from period to period. It is the intricate web of relations between these durations that makes up the phrase rhythm of the Allegro. The observation of an ever-expanding periodic time frame is so helpful in defining the Allegro's large-scale phrase rhythm because it breaks the analytical barriers set up by the nearly even length of the Allegro's large groups. It allows us to follow the principle of *incremental grouping* (chapter 1, Example 1.27; chapter 3, Example 3.16) when incremental grouping is masked by the approximately equal length of the largest periods.

Harmonic projection of duration. Baroque temporality operates within a very limited periodic grid. The composer must construct any sizable periodicity from the ground up; the time frames at the beginning of a movement don't supply the listener with explicit indications that additions to the grid might be forthcoming. That is one reason why Handel goes to the length of setting up a confrontation between bars 1-4 and bars 5-12 of the E-minor Allegro: One must have an inkling that periodic enlargement is on the

horizon if one is to follow and retrace the composition's durational design while the piece unfolds.

What sort of periodic framework does the listener project when such a piece begins? A good deal of further research, much of it in the areas of music cognition and music perception, is needed before this question can be answered properly. Theories of metrical projection and symmetrical construction recently advanced by Christopher Hasty and Robert Morgan may prove to be useful in undertaking such a study.[25] The notion of harmonic projection, though—the listener's intuitions and expectations regarding the tonal destination of the stretch in question and the time the stretch will need to get there—will probably prove to be even more useful: Harmonic and durational boundaries often coincide, and many listeners possess a good, empirically acquired sense of tonal and durational orientation.

Some years ago I proposed such an approach as I tried to find a means of explaining the preponderance of foursquare periodicity in Bach's gavottes and bourrées: Harmonic and temporal projection was the centerpiece of the paper, "Nascent Periodicity and Bach's Progressive *Galanterien,*" which I read at the annual meeting of the American Musicological Society in 1992.[26] Although this paper will require substantial revision before it can be published, I offer it here in an appendix to the dissertation since the ideas it lays out are in some ways compatible with the theories of Hasty and Morgan, and with perceptual studies of the listener's harmonic expectations undertaken by Janshed Bharucha.[27] For the time being, in any case, Fred Lerdahl and Ray Jackendoff's *Generative Theory of Tonal Music*, though not specifically geared to the abstractions of

---

[25]Hasty 1997, Morgan 1998.

[26]Willner 1992

[27]Bharucha 1995.

harmonic projection and expectation must remain the foundational study in the field.[28]

It may eventually turn out that it is in fact the *absence* of specific durational and harmonic expectations (like those we experience in our encounters with later styles) that plays the major role in our experience of most Baroque periodicities. What one might call *rhetorical periodicity*—the kind of earned periodicity we find in the E-minor Allegro—will then emerge as the focal point of Baroque projection.

I. 4. Rhetoric and style

Rhetorical structure and the superimposition of styles. The Allegro's strategic scheme and plot archetype are both highly significant for they invoke issues of style that are more intimately related to the Allegro's durational structure than they appear at first to be. I have already recounted in chapter 1 how Laurence Dreyfus suggested during the 1992 AMS meeting that the increasingly periodic framework of early eighteenth-century music (primarily J. S. Bach's *Galanterien,* but by extension other periodic genres and the music of other composers) was due not so much to their adoption of "progressive" procedures as it was to the composer's tendency to mix the high, middle, and low styles—to superimpose one style on top of another and to take advantage of the need to resolve the tensions between them.[29]

In the E-minor Allegro (to summarize the observations I offered earlier in this chapter and in chapter 1), the austere and contrapuntally suggestive unisons of bars 1-4, borrowed largely from Scarlatti's K. 8, contrast in remarkable ways with the much more lightly homophonic and prolongational setting of bars 5-12, which is borrowed largely from Scarlatti's K. 12. Handel resolves the tension between the two sources he has

---

[28]L & J 1983.

[29]I present a very detailed account of this issue in Willner 2004.

juxtaposed through the deliberate establishment of a fully periodic grid, which affords the two styles in question ample room in which to argue and resolve their differences. Yet as I have gone to some length to explain, this strategic scheme only represents a means to an end: It supports the overarching enlargement of the Allegro's opening theme. Despite the Allegro's narrative complexity, then, its all-important plot archetype, which at the deepest rhetorical levels engenders the Allegro's inner life, seems to be the simple *enlargement archetype,* which I introduced in passing in chapter 4. The *troping archetype*, which calls for mapping the generic descriptors of one style onto those of another (to the temporary discomfort but enduring mutual benefit of both), also seems to operate here if at a slightly lower level of rhetorical structure, in the service of the enlargement archetype.[30] The archetypes work together, for neither could operate without the help of the other. At the same time they also convey a sense of binary opposition, for enlargement asserts the priorities and the authority of the high style, while troping accommodates a large array of disparate resources from a potpourri of lower styles.[31] Given the hierarchical nature of Baroque rhetoric, it is only reasonable to suspect that a single archetype governs the dialectic between the enlargement and the troping archetypes at a higher rhetorical level. That is the elevation archetype, to which I now turn.[32]

---

[30]The notion of troping plays a major role throughout Hatten 1994. For a valuable treatment, see Monelle 2000.

[31]Because there are many instances in which Handel typically collapses fragments from K. 8 onto fragments from K. 12 and vice versa within the same passage (as early as bars 1-4, where the essential progression derives from K. 8 but the unfolded sixths that modify the progression derive both K. 8 and from K. 12), it would be impracticable to show systematically how the tonal, thematic, and textural tensions between the two styles are expressed and resolved at the measure-to-measure or even at the phrase-to-phrase level. As the Allegro proceeds, its two styles become too closely fused to be taken apart for the purpose of a minutely detailed stylistic parsing (recall my comments on bars 23-28). In the long run, it is through the gradual growth and eventual implosion of the Allegro's periodic design that the effect of the tensions between the two styles is most clearly manifest and can most concretely be traced.

[32]Hatten 1994 discusses matters of stylistic elevation in great detail. His observations

The elevation archetype. The two Scarlatti sonatas embrace the peculiarities of Iberian folk idioms in a very artful and intense way, but Handel draws only upon their thematic matter, rounding out their rough edges as best he can. One is consequently not always aware as keenly as one might be that the enlargement and the troping archetypes operate at the service of a still more abstract archetype, the *elevation archetype*. During the Introduction I suggested that when Baroque instrumental works in the high style mix a wide range of lower styles—as well as borrowings, genres, national idioms and the like—they often claim stylistic elevation as one of their principal goals. To set the tone for such elevation, they call upon higher levels of artifice than the levels of their mixed components. Their insistence on a higher level can sometimes be much more explicit than Handel's: Couperin's programmatic union of the French and Italian styles as the basis for music performed at Mount Parnassus in "L'Apothéose de Corelli" is among the most dramatic examples.[33] In Handel's E-minor Allegro, the octave enlargement that spans the entire piece and the troping of styles that makes the enlargement possible combine to create a unified, elevated, and grand manner of expression that is larger than the sum of its parts. It remains an archetype rather than an unicum because it embodies the way in which many of the long movements in Op. 6 are put together.[34]

The octave enlargement and the phrase rhythm of the E-minor Allegro—its sequential expansions, and the enlargement of its periodic grid—all come about through the need to realize the elevation archetype in tones and in rhythms. That is why I

---

are foundational to any hierarchic study of style relations.

[33]Couperin's invention of the sonade belongs with these examples too.

[34]Couperin's "Les Nations" and Bach's Brandenburg Concertos also cultivate this archetype. (Awareness of borrowings from Telemann and Vivaldi concertos in the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Brandenburg Concertos enhances the projection of the archetype.) Dreyfus 1996 offers many additional examples.

maintained during the Introduction that there is a direct correlation between the simplicity of the rhetorical patterns that mark the entire piece and the complexity of the smallest temporal details that mark the surface. Simple though they are, these rhetorical patterns are not easy to realize in the foreground.

Markedness and stylistic troping. That stylistic confrontation should provide the narrative substance for the Allegro's developmental discourse is hardly surprising when one considers the mixed background of Handel's Op. 6. Composing a set of concerti grossi at the end of the Baroque era, in evocation of Archangelo Corelli's style but without calling upon the idioms of that style directly, posed a major practical challenge: How was Handel to sustain a fresh and original way of writing at a time when the galant style was becoming firmly entrenched on the continent and had begun to displace its forebears, the middle style and the mixed style, even in conservative London?[35] Although the galant style did not usurp the high early eighteenth-century style quite yet, the high style's contrapuntal density and seemingly uniform chordal rhythm was fast becoming a formalized cliché, or, more ominously, an emblem of unnatural, learned artifice.[36] The task that Handel set for himself involved nothing less than the invention of a marked style that would refresh and rejuvenate the unmarked idioms, turns of phrase, and figural progressions of the older style without altering them beyond recognition. In each concerto and in each movement Handel rose to this challenge in a different way, most often borrowing from more than one piece and from more than one composer at a time in order to create a thematic, textural, and durational mix as intentionally unbalanced as it was attractive and distinct. One might speculate that Handel's solution is borrowed from

---

[35]I mentioned during the Introduction that the ten pasticci Handel produced in the 1730's were all culled from Neapolitan operas.

[36]Yearsley 1994 and 2002 are the foundational studies of changes in attitude towards learned counterpoint during the early eighteenth century.

Couperin's self-conscious mix in "Parnasse" and "Nations."[37]

The rhetorical and the durational essence of Handel's Op. 6 resides in Handel's endlessly resourceful strategies for reconciling the oppositions that he had built into each movement by choosing seemingly incompatible source materials for it. In the E-minor Allegro, the blunt announcement of the troping archetype, right at the outset, sets up a strong desideratum that the tensions between the high and the low troping ingredients be resolved in the course of the piece. Other movements in Op. 6 proclaim the subject of their discourse less aggressively, and some require close familiarity with their stylistic ambience and with their borrowings for their dialectic to emerge. Most of Op. 6 falls somewhere in between these two extremes. Retracing Handel's elaborate way with troping through durational enlargement is indispensable to understanding the phrase rhythm of the piece.

Tracing the stylistic merger in the E-minor Allegro on a measure-by-measure basis is a tiresome exercise because the Allegro's two styles become so closely joined in the course of the piece. But one can find many movements in Handel's Op. 6 where a more open and more roughly worked-out conflict between the high, the middle, and the low is more easily demonstrable and renders an endeavor of this sort worthwhile. The fourth movement, a bracing Allegro, from the G-minor Concerto Grosso, Op. 6, No. 6, is one such piece.

II. Handel: Concerto Grosso in G Minor, Op. 6, No. 6, IV: Allegro

II. 1. Sources

---

[37]Schachter 1994 discusses Schoenberg's notion that tonal compositions center on an attempt to redress a preliminary imbalance which the composer has introduced deliberately. Further study may well disclose that Handel modeled his solution on the mixture of styles and textures in the sonades from Couperin's "Les Nations."

The archetypes. The same troping and elevation archetypes that govern the phrase rhythm of the Allegro from the E-minor Concerto Grosso combine to make up the tonal, durational, and rhetorical backbone of the Allegro from the G-minor Concerto Grosso. The presence of the enlargement archetype here is mute: The two archetypes and Handel's strategies for their articulation stand out in sharper relief here because they don't enlist the help of any third archetype. As things stand, the troping archetype, which pits two incompatible sources of borrowings one against the other, cannot operate on its own, and cannot complete the process of elevation singlehandedly, try though it might. The Allegro therefore eventually halts on an impasse. Paradoxically, Handel's attempt to find a *modus vivendi* for his disparate sources is much more thoroughgoing and methodical here—of necessity, for his sources are still less compatible than the sources for the E-minor Allegro, notwithstanding several fortuitously common motivic elements which again make it possible for the borrowings to interlock at the very surface.[38]

The Couperin borrowings. The G-minor Allegro's basic materials are drawn from two contrasting keyboard works of François Couperin. The Allegro's principal ritornello theme comes from the now homophonic, now contrapuntal Allemande, "L'Ausoniéne," from the eighth Ordre of Couperin's Pièces de Clavecin; the Allemande is a stylized dance movement that belongs to the upper echelons of the middle style. The ritornello's central group of contrasting passages derives from the lighter and more explicitly galant character piece, "L'Évaporée," from the fifteenth Ordre; this is an elfin miniature that embodies Couperin's artful simulation of the low style.[39] It is no coincidence that "L'Évaporée"

[38]These are the thematic common denominators to which I referred in chapter 1. The unfolded sixths in bars 1 and 2 of the E-minor Allegro are good examples; recall Example 1.20.

[39]Eugene K. Wolf has drawn valuable distinction between *a* galant style, which displays the studied, often precious manner of the French Rococo, and *the* galant style of

also serves as the basis for bars 5-9 of "La Rejouissance" from the Royal Fireworks Music, which numbers among Handel's own rare excursions into the middle and the low styles. The G-minor Allegro is reproduced in Example 5.10, and a summary tonal sketch of the piece appears in Example 5.11; pace reductions follow in Example 5.12. Couperin's "L'Ausoniène" is reproduced in Example 5.13, and the first reprise from his "L'Évaporée," is given in Example 5.14a. For reference (necessary, as we shall see, in order to support my claim for the Concerto Grosso borrowing), I also quote the first reprise from Handel's "La Rejouissance," in Example 5.14b.[40]

"L'Ausoniéne." Although it has its share of learned progressions—a central episode of polyphonic play in bars 19-30[a] and a closing series of extended, dovetailing suspensions in bars 36-45—"L'Ausoniéne" belongs firmly in the middle style. The reasons for this (perhaps surprising) classification include the Allemande's relatively rapid tempo and pithy motives; its blunt 2/4 meter and sparse tonal vocabulary; its compact and closed harmonic progressions (especially the short cadential progression that supports the opening theme in bars 1-4); its spare melody-and-accompaniment setting, which is only occasionally varied by chromaticism, polyphony, and chordal punctuations; and—the tell-tale feature that tips the scales—the Allemande's composite pacing, which promotes many mercurial changes of texture, rhythm, and thematic design within a brief period of time. The composite quality of the opening theme's bass line (to cite but one example) is remarkable: After a measure and a half of tonic pedal, the bass accelerates precipitously

---

the Mannheim symphonies, which relies on homophony, repetition, and slow harmonic rhythm; see Wolf 1980.

[40]These borrowings—singly and as a group—are rather less obvious than the Scarlatti borrowings in the E-minor Concerto Grosso Allegro. Their authenticity, so to speak, will become clear as we proceed and come across additional parallelisms between the G-minor Allegro and "L'Ausoniéne."

to movement in quarter notes (A#, bar 2[b], implicitly sustained through the end of the measure) and to cadential movement in eighths (the entirety of bar 3).[41]

In adapting "L'Ausoniéne" to his more rarefied concerto-grosso environment, Handel elevates its style by recasting its lean homophonic textures in the richly polyphonic fabric of Corelli's orchestral sound picture. Comparing just the first four bars of the two pieces, we observe that the dark colors of Couperin's opening theme, which stress the keyboard's austere middle register, acquire a completely different quality when Handel shifts the theme to the two-line octave and couples it with a series of the lower strings' closely spaced chords in the one-line and small octaves. Perhaps on account of the change in medium, Handel's transformation of the Allemande appears to be effortless—it assumes the quality of a generic Italian concerto theme. But its magic ease has a lot to do with *Couperin's* Corellian affiliations, which permeate his Allemande theme. Couperin often made a concerted effort to fuse the Italian master's solemn style with his own folksy manner in the most deliberate and self-conscious way. The fusion is most clearly evident in Couperin's chamber music, but it is quite apparent elsewhere too; the blunt directness of Allemande can, I think, be attributed to Corelli's influence (there is no other Couperin Allemande that resembles it in that sense).[42] More important, Couperin lends his Allemande a distinctly orchestral quality (of which more presently). It may well be that Handel's Allegro represents an orchestral realization of the textural treasures hidden

---

[41]The dramatic impact of "L'Ausoniéne" is one reason why many composers have borrowed from it; the opportunities it affords for breaking a source up into many small sections and expanding one or more is another. Among those who borrowed from "L'Ausoniéne" are Bach (C-minor Partita, Capriccio), Mendelssohn (Italian Symphony, last movement), Schumann (Davidsbundlertänze, No. 4), and Brahms (Clarinet Quintet, last movement). I discuss the Couperin legacy and its reception history in Willner 2004.

[42]Couperin renders his indebtedness to Corelli explicit when he welds the French and the Italian styles together in "Les Nations," "L'Apothéose de Lully," and "Le Parnasse, ou L'Apothéose de Corelli." Dreyfus 1996 casts some doubts about Couperin's sincerity in professing admiration for the Italian style, but he puts Couperin's Italocentric preferences to good use all the same.

in Couperin's suggestive but sparing counterpoint.[43]

"L'Évaporée." If the headlong energy of "L'Ausoniéne" and the ritornello structure of its opening twelve measures evoke an Italianate concerto, the airy two-part texture of "L'Évaporée" captures all the effervescence of the French keyboard vignette. Yet at the same time, its markers—the insistent figural repetitions, the static pace, and the bare textures—also capture the folksy wit of the low French style. Just as Handel elevates the middle style of "L'Ausoniéne," he also transforms the homey and unpretentious setting of "L'Évaporée" into something more substantial and more consistently galant, reinventing them as wildly ornamental, cadenza-like outbursts whose arpeggiations mimic and perhaps also mock the emerging periodicity of the pre-Classical style. A quick glance at the opening measures of "L'Évaporée" and at bars 7-12 of Handel's Allegro will illustrate what I mean. Handel's extravagant amplification of Couperin's modest arpeggios—the ever-rising arpeggiated excursion to the three-line octave—could be regarded as a parody on the vocal pyrotechnics of those ten Neapolitan pasticci Handel produced during the 1730s.

---

[43]The hidden orchestral quality of Couperin's music, to which I referred earlier, must have been an equally strong reason for Handel's choice of "L'Ausoniéne" as a source for borrowing, even though "L'Ausoniéne" never announces its potential orchestration very loudly. Couperin conjures up a rich array of sonorities through suggestion and insinuation—by means of aural metonymy and synecdoche—and he relies on the cumulative effect of embellishments and sustained inner-voice tones in the central register of the keyboard to generate and sustain a wide spectrum of instrumental colors. Bars 1-4 of "L'Ausoniéne" are particularly rich in examples: Their low-lying yet crystalline succession of sonorities leaves Handel with plenty of room in which to add several strands above.
For many vivid observations on the orchestral qualities of keyboard music and their implications for performance, see Schenker 2000.
Couperin's keyboard works lend themselves well to orchestral transcription (for instance, Richard Strauss's), and many of his chamber works have been recorded by orchestral ensembles quite successfully. Handel's and Bach's "orchestration" of Couperin's keyboard and chamber works is a phenomenon that deserves further study.

Unlike the stylistic conflicts in the E-minor Allegro, the confrontations Handel sets up here turn out in prospect to be irreconcilable. Despite the elevation of both sources the differences between them remain fundamental at the level of the basic premise. Not even the motive they share—the figure straddling the opening upbeat and downbeat of "L'Évaporée," which Handel merges with two similar figures that appear right at the beginning of "L'Ausoniéne" (Example 5.10a)—can conceal the essential incompatibility of the two sources. As Handel's Allegro evolves, it borrows more and more from "L'Ausoniéne," but it moves no closer to a union with "L'Évaporée"; the borrowings from "L'Évaporée" remain a self-enclosed, nearly parenthetical intrusion through to the end of the Allegro. Handel's attempt at stylistic fusion ultimately becomes an allegory in tones, a programmatic depiction of the difficulties that stylistic growth entails. In the absence of the enlargement archetype, Handel presses the troping and elevation archetypes onto limits beyond which they cannot be pushed.

(Owing to Handel's radical transformation of "L'Évaporée" there may be scholars who will doubt the plausibility of my claim to a borrowing in this instance. Though it offers no confirmation as such, Handel's more direct use of the same material in "La Rejouissance"—observe how Handel's festive fanfares in bars 4-8 magnify Couperin's mildly rustic gestures in bars 1-8—does help establish Handel's vested interest in Couperin's short piece.[44] The Fireworks connection confirms, circumstantially but in an important way, that "L'Évaporée" served as a source for Handelian borrowings in general, and that ties in with Handel's and other composers' tendency to borrow from the same piece and the same set of pieces more than once. However roundabout it may appear to be, support of this type is essential to the convincing portrayal of any Handelian borrowing even in the absence of uncertainties: few borrowings in the literature exist in

---

[44]Note the similarity here between the two composers' treatment of $\#\hat{4}$ as a feigned afterthought that is tacked on to the first period, just before the double bar.

isolation.)[45]

Handel's stylistic fusion. Handel sets the contrapuntally elevated tone of the G-minor Allegro in bars 1-6, appropriated from "L'Ausoniéne, and then contradicts it with the galant, homophonic tone of bars 7-12, appropriated from "L'Évaporée." The upbeat figure common to the two borrowings serves as a kind of motivic pivot between them in bars 7-8 and allows them to interlock (see again Example 5.15b).

Although bars 5-6 repeat bars 1-2 on the mediant and would therefore appear to rank with the high materials in bars 1-4, they actually belong with the galant materials in bars 7-12 because they unfold together with bars 7-12 under the auspices of a single phrase—bars 5-12—which extends the mediant as one harmonic entity. The bluntly transposed reappearance of bars 1-2 in bars 5-6[a], so soon after the beginning of the piece, is uncommon, but at least in this instance that is precisely the point: The drastic alteration in the generic character of the thematic incipit that we encounter in bars 5 and 6 aligns the two measures durationally with the lower materials of bars 7-12. It also offers immediate premonition of the Allegro's impending stylistic crisis. Further, it underlines the improvisatory nature of the Allegro by changing its style in a drastic and foundational way during its formative, expository stages.[46]

II. 2. Tonal Overview

---

[45]The bigger picture and wider perspective give greater substance and credence to each borrowing. I thank John H. Roberts for emphasizing the importance of this tenet in a private communication.

Handel's orchestral transformation of Couperin's battle pieces in the Royal Fireworks Music is a subject that deserves a full-length study.

[46]This is yet another instance of Handel changing his source of borrowing to feign improvisation.

Handel's Allegro consists of five large periods: An opening twenty-bar ritornello (bars 1-20), three sets of exchanges between the solo concertino violin and the tutti (bars 21-42, 43-56, and 57-76) in which the solo violin, so unlike its Vivaldian counterpart, plays a role of ever-diminishing importance, and an apparent sixteen-bar orchestral coda (bars 77-92). The Allegro's upper-voice structure is of particular concern to us because its registral disposition, which spans both the one-line and the two-line octaves, calls for a good deal of literal repetition. In fact, the structural significance of the Allegro's figural repetitions gives us a clue to the meaning of the many figural repetitions throughout Handel's Op. 6.

The first period: Bars 1-20. Like most Handelian ritornellos, the Allegro's ritornello comprises three parts, but unlike most of them it is expanded by material whose durational status is open to question. The three parts are: a brief *Vordersatz* (bars 1-2); a fundamentally brief two-bar *Fortspinnung* (bars 3-4) that is unexpectedly extended by a quasi-independent, eight-bar phrase in the key of the mediant (bars 5-12); and an *Epilog* (bars 13-20) whose extensive cadential repetitions procure eight bars in order to complement the eight-bar extension of the *Fortspinnung*. Later on, I shall deal with the durational and harmonic repercussions of this elaborate division, and with the further division of the ritornello's three parts into two or three smaller ritornello parts each; for now I should like to concentrate on the ritornello's upper-voice structure.

The upper voice of the ritornello outlines the three-part *Ursatz* in its locally applied form, with a descent from5 that takes place largely in the one-line octave and a descent from3 that shifts gradually from the one-line to the two-line octave. The tonal reduction in Example 5.11 shows how the *Vordersatz* and the *Fortspinnung* in bars 1-4 center on a polyphonic movement between the structural $\hat{5}$ and the structural $\hat{3}$ below (d^2 and bb^1), and how this polyphonic core is framed by a descent from a covering $\hat{8}$ above and by a complementary descent to an embellishing $\hat{1}$ below. As it often does, $\hat{3}$ swings

away from its submerged location in the inner voice and rises on to the top of the tessitura, over $\hat{5}$ and $\hat{8}$; its ascent takes place developmentally, during the extension of the *Fortspinnung* in bars 5-12. (Recall Handel's similar superimposition at the beginning of the D-minor Allemande).

Despite the ancillary outline of a descent from $\hat{5}$ to $\hat{1}$ in the key of the mediant (f^2 to bb^1), which spans the entire *Fortspinnung*, the chief mission of bars 5-12 is to establish the $\hat{3}$ of the tonic (bb^2) in its new register as the more prominent (if not necessarily the more substantial) of the two principal melodic tones of the *Ursatz*. The superimposition takes place concurrently in the ritornello's *Ursatz* and in the *Ursatz* of the complete movement. (The brief but conspicuous d^3 over bb^2 also suggests the presence of an applied three-part *Ursatz* in the key of the mediant.) The passage contains several surprises: The bluntly transposed repetition of bars 1 and 2 over the mediant in bars 5 and 6; the extension of the *Fortspinnung* just when the *Epilog* is expected; and, above all, the lightly homophonic and prolongational quality of bars 7-12, which contradicts the basic contrapuntal setting of bars 1-4 and pulls the ritornello in a different stylistic direction. Much of what takes place later on, in particular durationally, stems from the need to address this stylistic imbalance.

The *Epilog* in bars 12-20, after recapitulating bars 1 and 2 over an apparent tonic, leads to $\hat{2}$ over the dominant in both the two-line and the one-line octaves (a^2 and a^1) and to $\hat{1}$ in the one-line octave (g^1).[47] The implicit conclusion of the upper descent in the two-line octave is not hard to imagine—the line is picked up as soon as the solo violin enters at the end of bar 20—nor is it difficult to spot the descent of the lower line, since much of it (5-4-3, d^2-c^2-bb^1) is carried out on behalf of the ritornello's applied three-part *Ursatz* by the descent in the key of the mediant during the *Fortspinnung*. The most

[47]The apparent tonic in bar 15 is a contrapuntal sonority that comes about through a 5-6 exchange over the mediant of bars 5-12.

challenging—and durationally the most significant—part of each descent centers on the continual interplay between $\hat{2}$ and $\hat{1}$ in the two-line and in the one-line octaves. Owing to the structural status of each tone in each register, the nearly exact repetition of bar 15 in bar 16 at the lower octave can probably not be regarded as a durational expansion, or even as an idiomatic echo of bar 15. Each of the two measures presents different tones of the applied three-part *Ursatz*: Bar 15 introduces the a^2 of the upper descent, and bar 16 brings in the a^1 of the lower descent. Observe how this profoundly compound melodic line continues to shift repeatedly from the upper to the lower descent in bars 17-18 and then in bars 19-20, until the ritornello comes to a close.

Passages that activate both the one-line and the two-line octaves in the way the stretch in bars 15-20 does are common throughout the orchestral repertoire of the high Baroque. Among the principal difficulties of weighing the tonal—and consequently also the durational—significance of the turbulent registral activity during such passages is the absence of any real long-range patterning in the prominent registral shifts they contain. Sometimes the melodic line will activate the upper or the lower descent exclusively for a substantial stretch, and sometimes it will hop restlessly (as it does here) from one descent to the other. To be sure, both the *Fortspinnung*'s repetitions and the *Epilog*'s are durationally significant, but not in the ancillary, extending manner that one tends to ascribe to them offhand.

The second period: Bars 21-42. Much of the Allegro's second period is taken up by a long violin solo, which leads to the major supertonic (bar 35); a brief orchestral *Epilog* completes the tonicization of the dominant, for which the major supertonic lays the ground. Example 5.11 traces the complex path of the violin's polyphonic figurations and the slower polyphonic melody that underlies these figurations: The violin's compound trajectory falls essentially from the upper descent's $\hat{3}$ (bb^2) to its $\hat{2}$ (a^2), but it dips briefly to the $\hat{6}$ (eb^2) below—that is, to the upper neighbor of the lower descent's $\hat{5}$ (d^2).

The most remarkable feature of this solo line is its preoccupation with basic structural matters: its nearly exclusive engagement of the Allegro's primary melodic tones and their neighbors, and its improvisatory, seemingly incidental enlargements of the tonal space enclosed by the Allegro's preliminary descents from g^2 to eb^2 in bar 1 and in bars 2-3 (see Example 5.17).[48] The orchestral *Epilog* in bars 35-42 adds a brief descent from $\hat{5}$ to $\hat{1}$ (a^2 to d^2) in the key of the dominant.

The third period: Bars 43-56. Handel begins the Allegro's third period with a solemn quotation of the opening ritornello's incipit over the dominant in the one-line octave, and he follows it up immediately with a semi-humorous, mock-improvisatory repetition of the incipit in the two-line octave, as if he were trying to rectify a registral error (bars 43-44 and 45-46).[49] But the display of humor and thematic redundancy is misleading: Like the registrally modified repetitions in the opposite direction in bars 15-16 and bars 17-20, Handel's repetition here is structural rather than ancillary. The first, lower incipit activates the $\hat{5}$ (d^2) of the Allegro's lower descent, which is held over from the opening of the piece; the second, upper incipit activates the $\hat{2}$ (a^2) of the Allegro's upper descent, which was established in the course of the preceding period (see again Example 5.11). The two incipits, although they are identical in appearance, operate along quite different structural strands. Since the strands are more or less equal in significance tonally, the incipits remain to all intents and purposes equally significant durationally. The same tonal principle applies when we gauge the durational significance of the echo-like repetition of

---

[48]The violin solo is a gloss over the sequences that follow "L'Ausoniéne"'s double bar; I'll discuss the borrowing briefly later.

[49]Improvisatory and humorous though it sounds, the repetition at the higher octave is not entirely unusual: A similar repetition occurs, for instance, in the analogous spot during the closing Allegro from Vivaldi's G-minor Violin Concerto, Op. 12, No. 1. The points of contact between Handel and Vivaldi are few in number, so it's hard to say whether a borrowing is involved.

bar 49 at the lower octave in bar 50, which follows in short order.[50]

Despite the reassertion of the high register, it is to the lower descent that the third period now turns its attention, leading as it does to the implicit establishment of $\hat{4}$ (c^2) over the subtonic, F major.[51] The subtonic, in turn, represents the dominant's upper third: Its tonicization is part of a large-scale neighbor-note motion, V-IV-V#, which is prolonged by the unfolding, V-VII, IV-"I", V#. The progression extends to the fourth period and transforms the dominant from a minor to a major sonority by departing away from its orbit harmonically and yet remaining in its vicinity contrapuntally. Its principal difficulty, analytically, resides in its reversal of the order in which it presents its bass tones and the harmonies on top: Instead of proceeding through the customary $\hat{5}$ -natural $\hat{7}$, $\hat{8}$ - $\hat{4}$, $\hat{5}$, it moves via $\hat{5}$ -b$\hat{7}$, $\hat{4}$ - $\hat{8}$, $\hat{5}$.[52] The colorful subtonic—a bright major-key oasis within an environment of darker, minor-key sonorities—is the contrapuntal agent that transforms the essentially dissonant upper-voice $\hat{4}$ into an extended consonance at levels closer to the surface.[53]

The upper voice of the third period poses a more familiar problem. Throughout the tonal repertoire but particularly in Baroque style, the point of arrival of a structural tone that is supported by the local tonicization of a key area often remains implicit during

---

[50]Inasmuch as the two lines of the three-part *Ursatz* do not operate at quite the same level, one incipit resides more deeply in the background than the other. But in what concerns the durational weight they maintain at the surface, I would say that they unfold on more or less equal terms.

[51]As the subtonic undergoes tonicization, $\hat{4}$ acquires the status of $\hat{5}$ in the key of F.

[52]Though not exactly common, the progression is not entirely unusual, especially within the confines of G minor. Couperin's "La Milordine," the basis for some of the sequential transformations in Handel's F-minor Allemande, emphasizes a similar sequence of keys; so do the Andante from Handel's G-minor Suite (1720), and the Courante from Bach's G-minor English Suite.

[53]The oasis mirrors the mirage that the tonicization of B♭ depicts during the opening ritornello.

the confirming cadential statement of the new, temporary tonic. The explicit statement of the structural tone is replaced at the surface by an altogether different event—by the conclusion of the locally applied upper-voice descent in the tonicized key.[54] Even though the statement of the structural tone remains the *raison d'être* of the passage at a deeper level, the tone is left for us to supply aurally at the moment of the new tonic's confirmation. Chances are, though, that the tone has already been prominent in the preceding measures and that it can therefore be easily imagined. And if that is not the case, the tone and the linear progressions associated with it are most likely to become prominent soon afterwards. This is what happens here.[55]

The lower descent's $\hat{4}$ (c^2) enters at the beginning of the fourth period, which follows immediately (bars 57ff.), and it is echoed at the beginning of the fifth period (bars 77ff.). (That the two periods' presentation of $\hat{4}$ is not as straightforward as it might be need not concern us now.) For its part, the upper descent's $\hat{2}$ (a^2) is similarly sustained—implicitly, that is—through the subtonic's tonicization. In the foreground, the upper voice of the subtonic's tonicization is taken by a widely composed-out descent from $\hat{5}$ to $\hat{1}$ (c^2 to f^1) and by an overarching rising *Urlinie* $\hat{5}$ - natural $\hat{6}$ - natural $\hat{7}$ - $\hat{8}$ (c^2-d natural^2-e natural^2-f^2) in the key of the subtonic transferred idiomatically from the background level to the surface.[56]

The fourth period: Bars 57-76. The Allegro's fourth period opens with an eight-bar progression from the subdominant, C minor, to the dominant, D, via an illusory tonic.

---

[54]The implicit structural tone in question could be any scale degree in the composition's home key, but it is usually represented by $\hat{3}$ or $\hat{5}$ in the local, tonicized key; it is replaced at the cadence by the local key's $\hat{1}$.

[55]Rothstein 1991 provides a thoroughgoing introduction to the notion of implicit tones.

[56]Neumeyer 1987a is the standard account of the rising *Urlinie*.

The progression completes the unfolding V-VII, IV-"I", V natural and it brings the Allegro back to reality as it were by turning from the bright, otherworldly major sound of the subtonic to the darker orbit of the home key and its dominant. Both the subdominant, C, and its upper fifth, the contrapuntal G-minor chord (which follows and reduplicates the sonority of the tonic), serve to support a structurally important but thematically inconspicuous inner-voice tone, G. The significance of this G resides in its role as the upper neighbor that separates the diatonic and chromatic forms of the leading tone, F: It prevents the direct chromatic succession F-F# from taking place in the middleground.[57]

The brief subdominant (bars 57-58) takes up the previously implicit4 and renders it explicit in two registers—as c^1 in the bass and, within the polyphonic framework of the compound upper voice, as the apparent inner-voice tone, c^2, which operates under the more immediately prominent eb^2 above.[58] The subsequent two-bar traversal through the tonic area (which then extends, in a different capacity, for three additional measures, to bar 63) presents the consonant passing tone $\hat{3}$ (bb^1) in similar fashion, under a more prominent but ornamentally covering $\hat{5}$ (d^2). The tonic, acting as a contrapuntal rather than as a harmonic agent, transforms the passing $\hat{3}$ into a consonance (in addition to supporting the aforementioned inner-voice G). Because everything above the bass moves so openly down by step as the bass falls a fourth from C to G during bar 60, one clearly hears $\hat{6}$ and $\hat{4}$ giving way to $\hat{5}$ and $\hat{3}$. And when the dominant takes over in bar 64, it is not too difficult to hear $\hat{3}$ (bb^1) gravitate a step further down to $\hat{2}$ (a^1), which enters as an inner-voice tone in the violas just as the upper descent's sustained a^2 reappears in the

---

[57]Baroque composers avoid such successions at the deeper levels but not in the foreground; compare Schenker's comments on the C-minor Fugue from Bach's Well-Tempered Clavier in Schenker 1935/1979/2001 (paragraph 233) with the Fugue's foreground chromaticism (Example 105^5).

[58]Example 5.11 shows how c^2 assumes greater structural significance than eb^2: In its archetypal way, $\hat{6}$ (eb^2) upstages $\hat{4}$ (c^2) for the sake of the thematic design.

two-line octave above.[59]

The importance of tracing the submerged and frequently implicit lower descent in such precise fashion resides in the need to keep track of the continual interplay between the Allegro's two obligatory registers. The obligatory status of each descent's register is confirmed by the length at which the descent's closing stretch is worked out: The two closing stretches occasion a number of very substantial and very similar cadential progressions. Without an awareness of these cadential chains' precise tonal and registral disposition within the larger structure of the piece, one could easily mistake many of the restated progressions for plain cadential repetitions, extensions, or expansions, and consequently assign them far too little durational significance. The remaining 12 measures of the fourth period (bars 65-76) present the first chain of extended cadences. These carry the upper descent to a close on $\hat{1}$ (g^2), the descent's $\hat{2}$ having been held over all the way from the dominant tonicization in the second period. The second chain of cadences and the conclusion of the lower descent take place during the fifth period.[60]

The fifth period: Bars 77-92. The Allegro's fifth and last period consists of nothing but large cadential progressions that retrace and summarize the path of the lower descent. It is by no means unusual for the higher and the lower descents to be staggered across two periods in this fashion. The upper descent often takes place first and closes somewhat

---

[59]The prominence of g^2 and f^2 during the tonicization of the subtonic in the third period, coupled with the prominence of f^2-eb^2-d^2 in the present period, suggests another opportune enlargement of the descents from g^2 in the Allegro's opening measures (bar 1 and then bars 2-4), but again the connection does not appear to be particularly significant. The tonal reductions show how IV and V natural connect locally through the characteristic prefix IV($I^{(6)}$-IV)-V.

[60]For the sake of procuring length on a large orchestral scale, Handel problematizes the registral properties of the descents. Bach, under similar circumstances, is more likely to thematize the passage from a descent's $\hat{4}$ its $\hat{3}$ by embellishing $\hat{4}$ with a neighboring $\hat{5}$. See, for instance, the long Preambulum from the G-major Partita for Clavier.

tentatively, and the lower descent then provides the more elaborate and definitive cadential seal.[61] During the extended closing progressions of the fifth period, a fully explicit if substantially delayed (and therefore not quite structurally supported) statement of the lower descent's $\hat{4}$ and $\hat{3}$ (c^2 and bb^1) at last appears at the proper register, in bars 77-80.

* * *

The ceaseless repetitions to which I referred again and again during the foregoing paragraphs emerged quite systematically as tonally exigent gambits. One could hardly deny, though, that these repetitions are also charged with carrying out specific durational tasks. To what extent, and at what level, do they embody expansions? Only a close durational reading of the Allegro can disclose the answer. I must therefore ask the reader to bear with me a little longer as I navigate my way through these treacherous metrical waters.

II. 3. Durational Analysis

II. 3. 1. The opening ritornello (bars 1-20)

The opening ritornello, to summarize my earlier observations, divides into three phrases: bars 1-4, containing the *Vordersatz* and the *Fortspinnung;* bars 5-12, expanding the *Fortspinnung* at the point where the *Epilog* is expected; and bars 13-20, concluding the expansion of the *Fortspinnung* and presenting the delayed *Epilog.* Each of the two longer and more expansive phrases, bars 5-12 and 13-20, is constructed like a miniature, self-contained ritornello nested within the larger ritornello, and each begins with a restatement of bars 1-2 (transposed to the mediant in bars 5-6, largely unaltered in bars

[61]The upper descent's perfect authentic cadence is in fact frequently elided.

13-14). It seems at first that the major-key transformation of bars 1-2 in bars 5-6 may only be a local developmental ploy, however unexpected and disruptive; but as bars 7-12 and the extended homophonic repetitions based on Couperin's "L'Évaporée" get underway one becomes increasingly aware that the progress of bars 1-4 has indeed been cut short either by an interpolation or by an artful intrusion of foreign, galant materials. Once the intrusion of these foreign elements has taken hold and has described a complete cadential progression (bar 12), there is little Handel can do but restart the ritornello yet again (bars 13-14). Let us see what the durational consequences of the galant intrusion are.

Bars 1-4. To signal at once the high style it embodies, the *Vordersatz* in bars 1-2 displays the compound 4/4 and establishes a basic pace of four-to-the-bar; unlike other themes in the compound 4/4 we have encountered so far, though, the *Vordersatz* shows not a one-bar but a two-bar grouping pace. The adoption of a comparatively large grouping pace at the outset steers the Allegro's stylistic conflict away from matters of grouping structure and toward tonal issues instead. Because the *Vordersatz* reaches only as far as a local back-relating dominant, it is up to the ensuing *Fortspinnung* to find and establish a stable mediant (see again Example 5.11). As it ascends to the mediant—the midpoint of a large I-III-V-I arpeggiation spanning the entire ritornello—the *Fortspinnung* in bars 3-4 expands the basic pace sequentially to movement in half notes (Example 5.12). The sequential expansion assists in procuring the essential two-bar length of the *Fortspinnung* and in so doing it substantiates the ritornello's two-bar grouping pace.

A short two-bar or four-bar *Epilog*—one that would complete the large tonic arpeggiation, restore the four-to-the-bar basic pace, and perhaps introduce some cadential acceleration—could reasonably be expected here by a listener familiar with the style of the piece: See my hypothetical realization of Handel's "proper" conclusion in Example 5.16. Couperin, in his Allemande, offers just such an *Epilog*, but he allows it to close in the mediant (bars 5-12 in Example 5.13). It is Handel's surprising extension of the

Fortspinnung at this point that sets the tone—and provides the substance—for the Allegro's stylistic and durational confrontations.[62]

Bars 5-12. Adhering to his strategy of embedding smaller ritornellos within larger ones, Handel expands the *Fortspinnung* by introducing a ritornello-within-a-ritornello. The *Vordersatz* of this embedded ritornello, bars 5-6, coincides with the aforementioned transposition to the mediant of bars 1-2, the *Fortspinnung* and the *Epilog* fuse into an unbroken six-bar stretch in bars 7-12 (= 2 + 1/2 + 2 + 1 1/2 measures). The fused stretch brings in an extravagant series of repetitions, extensions, and arpeggiations—the galant intrusion based on Couperin's "L'Evaporée"—that generates an effect of expansion and at the same time an effect of disruption and discontinuity. The ensuing disjunction calls in turn for some sort of complementary synthesis and rapprochement which might, in prospect, resolve these tensions.[63]

Bars 5-12 as interpolation or expansion. At the deepest level, the entirety of bars 5-12 embodies an optional, nonessential interpolation. As far as voice leading and texture are concerned, the ritornello could continue directly from the mediant of bar 4 to the apparent first-inversion tonic of bar 13 through a 5-6 motion over the mediant. And the underlying presence of a shorter, relatively predictable model for the entire twenty-bar ritornello (Example 5.16) suggests that the passage could be thought of as a kind of *Dehnung* in

---

[62]The emphatic conclusion of Couperin's ritornello theme on the mediant seems to have prompted Handel to emphasize his own mediant as much as he does.

[63]Disjunction of this sort is fairly rare in Handel's instrumental music, even in Op. 6; it is, however, quite common in the Scarlatti Essercizi, including those—like K. 16, in B♭—from which Handel borrowed profusely. But, along Bloomian lines, the movements that rely most heavily on the disruptive K. 16—the opening Larghetto affetuoso of Op. 6, No. 4, in A minor, and the fourth movement, the Andante, of Op. 6, No. 7, in B♭—are among those that emphasize perpetual motion most insistently. (These borrowings were first noted in Derr 1989.)

Schenker's sense even though, as I pointed out earlier, bars 5-12 are charged with the tonal task of establishing $\hat{3}$ ($b\flat^2$) in the two-line octave.[64] One might even say that at this deepest level the basic pace stays put between bar 5 and bar 12, and that its inactivity opens a door through which an autonomous prolongation in the guise of a durationally insinuating eight-bar phrase can invade the piece in the manner of a stylistic Trojan horse.[65]

At levels closer to the foreground, though, reading bars 5-12 wholesale as an expansion tells us little about the durational or the rhetorical significance of the events they enact. At the surface, in fact, many of these events are so firmly embedded in the tonal and the durational fabric of the piece that it becomes necessary to examine the passage as if it were an essential durational entity at all levels, namely as if the larger interpolation or expansion it carried out did not really take place. What this closer and more conservative look might reveal is a different and much more modest set of expansions, one that takes place closer to the foreground and relates more directly to the measure-to-measure progress of the surface. From this relatively narrow perspective the basic pace halts only when the small-scale foreground expansions take place, not during the entirety of bars 5-12.[66]

It would be helpful (and, from an organicist point of view, reassuring) if before proceeding to a detailed account of bars 5-12 we could formulate some sort of synthesis between the two views of these measures—between their interpretation as an

---

[64]A detailed analysis of the closing Allegro from the A-minor Concerto Grosso will demonstrate that $\hat{3}$ can be effectively introduced as a high suspension over the dominant much later; $\hat{3}$ does not absolutely require its own supporting chord.

[65]I discuss the durational consequences of such invasions in general terms in Willner 1999, pp. 216-221.

[66]Rothstein 1989 and Braunschweig 1997 contain particularly good discussions of the different levels at which expansions can take place concurrently.

interpolation on one level and their interpretation as an essential member of the design on another. But I believe Handel did intend the passage to be heard on two separate levels simultaneously, namely as a stylistic intruder that was—and at the same time was not quite—part and parcel of the piece. I can only hope that my analysis of the entire movement and my pursuit of related multiple meanings in the later stages of the Allegro will bear this observation out.[67]

Expansion at the four-bar and eight-bar levels. When parsing the intrusion depicted in bars 5-12 as a more or less full-fledged member of the ritornello's durational design, one must exercise great caution in defining the components that carry out expansion relative to the foreground, and in deciding what sort of expansion it is. Paradoxically, parsing the passage from the larger perspective of the four-bar subphrase and the eight-bar phrase presents few difficulties: In order to gauge the larger durational significance of each measure at those higher levels it is simply necessary to examine the relative length of the passage as a whole within the still larger framework of the ritornello and that of the entire Allegro. In this instance one learns that the eight measures of the passage are preceded by a four-bar phrase and are followed by an eight-bar phrase, by a fourteen-bar solo episode, and by an eight-bar orchestral *Epilog.* One concludes, quite logically, that whatever expansions bars 5-12 do contain, they serve the purpose of bringing the length of the phrase up to eight bars. At the level of the eight-bar phrase (at least in this instance), any expansion remains essential and does not count as an optional or ancillary addition to the basic length of the piece. One might say that it is an *apparent expansion*.

Parsing the very same progression at the two-bar level of the segment and trying

---

[67]The multiplicity of meanings is possible because each meaning emerges at a slightly different level. Several of the analyses in Laufer 1999 follow a similar route; so does the analysis of the opening movement from Beethoven's Piano Sonata, Op. 109, in Samarotto 1999b.

to determine whether it embodies expansion at that level is a different matter, and it is a much more difficult task. It requires us to ask what precisely does constitute an expansion at that level—what is ancillary, and what is not. Answering this question will require a brief digression to explore the minimum requirements for expansion within a moderately periodic framework. (The expansions and extensions that William Rothstein calls prefixes and suffixes need not concern us here because they are fairly rare in Baroque instrumental music. Even Scarlatti's extraordinary cadential repetitions usually occur within the framework of the tonal structure's basic length.)[68]

Apparent expansion at the two-bar level. As long as a two-bar grouping pace—and, consequently, a modest periodic grid—prevail strictly, it is necessary for an expansion to be longer than two measures to qualify as a genuine durational expansion. While the grid remains in force, the addition or repetition of material within any of its smallest, most basic two-measure units does not qualify as a genuine expansion because these units have already been prefabricated, as it were, by the durational design: The addition or repetition inside the two-measure unit serves only to fill in the prefabricated slot. It would be impracticable to regard the smaller one-bar or half-bar core units that the addition or repetition enlarges as the bases for durational expansion.

One might offhand argue, along similar lines, that it would be equally impracticable to regard addition or repetition of a discrete two-bar group as an expansion: Reducing out a minor periodic addition or repetition just for the sake of normalizing all the nonperiodic core elements that are not repeated or extended will only reveal an ad hoc and abstract basic length that does not possess any remarkable compositional or analytical significance. As we go along, though, we shall find that in Handel's Op. 6 (and, by

---

[68]On prefix and suffix see Rothstein 1989; I discuss the tonal nature of Scarlatti's apparent expansions in Willner 2000. The systematic and idiomatic quality of Handel's many repetitions and extensions precludes their interpretation as ad-hoc elongations.

extension, throughout the high Baroque) the lines are more blurred than that. There are many circumstances under which the addition or repetition of a two-bar group may count at least as an apparent expansion at the two-bar level. And it is possible, too, that Handel and other composers used an abstractly unclear basic length as a sort of mnemonic device when putting together an extended movement that was about twice as long; I shall deal with this issue later on.)[69]

All things considered, one cannot deny that short repetitions, extensions, or additions—even within two-bar groups—possess a decidedly transient quality: they *sound* ancillary, and they display the quality of an expansion. It is only because they remain essential at *all* levels of the durational design that I stop short of calling them expansions or and have mixed feelings even about calling them apparent expansions. (Despite the appearance of complexity and redundancy, it is necessary to retain the distinction between apparent expansion and essential expansion, for an apparent expansion that is essential at one level often turns out to be a genuine, nonessential expansion of another level. Adding the descriptors essential and nonessential and specifying the durational level of the expansion in question immediately clarifies the significance of the expansion within the larger durational context in a way that a simpler designation like elongation could not do on its own.)

Genuine expansion at the two-bar level. As for additions or repetitions that add up to nonperiodic segments longer than two measures these by contrast usually do qualify as full-fledged expansion at the two-bar level and occasionally also at the four-bar level, for they throw the grid off at least temporarily at that level and they obliterate the prevailing two-bar grouping pace. In most cases such expansions will still fit in comfortably within the larger confines of eight-bar grouping, at which level they will remain essential. Only at

---

[69] Compare, in this connection, Roland Barthes's notion of the nucleus in literary criticism (1988/1994).

the lower two-bar level and perhaps at the four-bar levels will they emerge as genuine, nonessential expansions. The analytical value of these rather fine and paradoxical distinctions resides in the precision they bring to our contemplation of temporal plasticity, and in the rigor with which they define the durational give-and-take of the foreground. If they appear to be fussy at times, they do possess the advantage of pointing to metrical shadings that might help the performer grapple with the mysterious repetitions in Op. 6 and with the oscillating diminutions in the organ concertos.[70]

Expansion in bars 5-12. Putting these observations and their implications together, we may conclude that the durational hallmark of a genuine expansion at the two-bar level and at the four-bar level is the brief interruption it occasions in the even pacing and even articulation of the periodic grid. I shall now illustrate the practical application of this principle as I return to bars 5-12 of the G-minor Allegro and to their expansions (see again Example 5.12). In light of the foregoing remarks it should now be apparent why, even though bars 7 and 8 clearly complement bars 5 and 6, the extension of bar 7 in bar 8 for the duration of just one measure through a series of repetitions remains essential at all levels, from the two-bar segment level to the eight-bar phrase level. Only one bar long, the extension is necessary for the procurement of the two-bar segment in bars 7 and 8, notwithstanding the closure of the group into the downbeat of bar 9. At the same time, the extension is also necessary for the procurement of the eight-bar phrase encompassing the entirety of bars 5-12. Nowhere does the extension disturb the periodic grid or the two-bar grouping pace.[71]

---

[70]I discuss the minimal requirements for sequential expansion (two basic paces and two expanding ancillary chords) in Willner 1999.

[71]It would be a little specious to claim that the extension is necessary for the procurement of the fused six-bar stretch in bars 7-12, or its four-and-a-half bar internal *Fortspinnung* (bars $7\text{-}11^{a} = 2 + 1/2 + 2$), since these, at their level, are not exactly periodic.

Only the two-bar, cadenza-like arpeggiation that extends in the upper voice from the middle of bar 9 to the middle of bar 11 represents a true expansion of the foreground at the two-bar level. Note how the expansion splits and converts a two-bar group (bars 9^a and 11^b-12 = 1/2 + 1 1/2) into a four-bar group, and how it obliterates the two-bar grouping pace of the ritornello. The expansion comes into its own as the bass and the accompanying inner parts drop out on the second beat of bar 9 and reenter on the second beat of bar 11: The upper voice could easily continue directly from the second beat of bar 9 to the third beat of bar 11. It is hardly a coincidence that the material introduced by the expansion—the dramatic fall into the bass register and the subsequent return to the upper voice—is also the material that Handel adds to the more modest falling and rising arpeggios in bars 13-15^a of Couperin's "L'Évaporée" (see again Example 5.14a, bars 9-10 and 13-14).

Though nonessential at the two-bar level, the expansion remains essential at the higher eight-bar level, for it enlarges the six-bar basic length of the entire phrase (bars 5-12) by two bars to the eight-bar length required by the larger periodic design of the ritornello. (It seems that the expansion is also nonessential at the four-bar level, but the issue is moot because four-bar groups don't play an important role in the ritornello's durational scheme.)

Stylistic repercussions. Now the effects of the expansion in bars 9^b-11^a are more substantial and more far-reaching than they appear at first to be. As the expansion enters in bar 9, the quarter-note progress of the basic pace is suspended: Its suspension, combined with the temporary suspension of the two-bar grouping, brings the ritornello's phrase rhythm to a kind of dead end, a durational cul-de-sac, which is signaled by the unusual and unusually conclusive authentic cadence in the key of the mediant in bar 12 (unusual because the larger 20-bar ritornello has not yet come to an end). It is this impasse that prompts the return, quite unusual too, of the original *Vordersatz* at the

beginning of the larger ritornello's third and last phrase.

Looking at the impasse at bar 12 from the larger stylistic perspective of bars 1-12, one must try above all to understand and to hear it in terms of the way it originates in the stylistic differences between bars 1-4 and 5-12: in terms, that is, of the contrast between the rich, fast-moving counterpoint of bars 1-4 and the lightly textured, expansive homophony of bars 5-12. It is as if Handel were trying to refashion the temporality of the opening *Vordersatz* of bars 1-2 in a different, more contemporary and more expansive style during the ensuing, extended *Fortspinnung*, but for all his efforts soon came to a dead end and had to start all over again. Accordingly, Handel now devotes the remaining measures of the large 20-bar ritornello—and, for that matter, the rest of the Allegro—to the realization of a less confrontational ritornello scheme and to the search for a more conciliatory rapprochement between the two starkly contrasting manners of composing. Along the way to the coda, he also dissolves the discrepancy between the four-bar and eight-bar lengths of the two opening phrases by increasing gradually the emphasis on the alternation of six-bar and eight-bar groups.

Bars 13-20. I already observed that there is more to the quasi-parenthetical reprise of bars 1 and 2 in bars 13 and 14 than meets the eye: Handel tries to pick up at the downbeat of bar 13 what he left incomplete at the fourth beat of bar 4, and to conclude his ritornello under the premises he established in bars 1-4. The most expedient way to recapture the contrapuntal setting of these measures is to repeat the *Vordersatz* of bars 1 and 2, and to reassert its basic durational premise (along with that of the Allegro's high style) by starting a third ritornello-within-a-ritornello. But things are no longer quite the same: The extensive repetitions and the general tonal inactivity in bars 5-12 have irrevocably altered the nature of the piece. The six bars that now follow, bars 15-20, do complete the embedded ritornello, but they seem to extend just a single chord—the dominant—for almost their entire run. Not that the extension is the continuous

prolongation it appears to be: The tonal reduction in Example 5.11 shows that the meaning of the dominant changes with the progress of the passage. The extension certainly emphasizes the static quality of "standing on the dominant," but it masks an underlying neighbor-note progression, D-C-D, and a more elaborate cadential unfolding D-F#-D, G-C, D in the bass. It also adds an incidental tonic and a more substantial IV/II^6 to the seemingly endless repetitions of the D major seventh chord. To underscore these tonal adjustments, without which the extension would probably not be tolerable aurally, Handel allows the thematic material which the *Fortspinnung* brings in at bar 15 to recompose, over the dominant, the Bb extension of bar 7, Handel then repeats the transformation in bar 16 and, varied, in bar 18. Finally, Handel has the figurations he introduces on the first two beats of bar 19 reappear two more times within bars 19 and 20. In all, bars 15-20 present a bewildering mix of the old, the new, and the varied. What is one to make of it?[72]

Repetition and expansion in bars 15-20. From an abstractly durational perspective, the expansions in this passage and in several similar cadential passages later on are very difficult to parse because in the absence of drastic harmonic changes it is not always clear what is being expanded, and for how long. Quite aside from the assignment of structural significance to what appears to be a group of echo repetitions (recall my earlier comments), one cannot even be entirely sure that an apparent expansion is under way. To sort out the larger durational meaning of the transformations in bars 15-20 one must, after weighing the *tonal* significance of each segment and each phrase, determine whether the tonal and the thematic contribution of the proposed expansion is indeed sufficiently redundant to justify its interpretation as an ancillary durational addition. There is always

[72]The violins' busy sixteenth-note figures in bars 15-20 derive from the closing, coda-like stretch of Couperin's "L'Ausoniéne," bars 44 and 46.

a chance that its contribution might be substantial enough to preclude such an interpretation under any circumstances.

Now in my earlier remarks on the ritornello's tonal design I pointed to the structural substance that accrues to the registrally displaced repetition of bar 15 in bar 16: Strictly speaking, the repetition constitutes neither an echo nor an expansion. I later established that the repetitions we have here are too short to qualify as expansions in any case. All the same, it would be unfortunate were one to dismiss categorically the possibility that the repetition does have a genuine durational role to play, since along with the repetitions in bars 19-20^{a} it facilitates the establishment of the phrase's eight-bar length. *There is no way out of the quandary beyond the realization that literal or semi-literal repetitions sometimes replace the addition of brand-new material without undertaking any durational task of their own.* That does not exclude the possibility that the same material, when it reappears in longer form later on, might still undertake just such a task: If we didn't hear it as an expansion the first time around—and in this instance I daresay we don't—we may still hear it as an expansion in its later transformations.[73]

II. 3. 2. The second period (bars 21-42)

The violin solo: Bars 21-35. The conflict between the Allegro's two styles affects the

[73]With a rich contrapuntal texture but a homophonic chordal environment, the repetitions in bars 16 and 19^{b}-20^{a} seem to reconcile the two styles of the Allegro. Like similar repetitions in other concerto-grosso movements, they signal a radical departure from the fast changing contrapuntal milieu of Op. 6 but at the same time they allow the surface to hang on to and even to emphasize the linear qualities of that very same milieu. They embody, in other words, Handel's decidedly ambivalent flirtation with the galant style. As for larger harmonic rhythm and pacing, the repetitions show discrete chordal extension rather than patterned obbligato pacing since each set of repetitions maintains its own distinct durational profile and does not mold a patterned or predictable harmonic entity.

remaining four periods of the Allegro quite profoundly, but each period responds to the conflict in a somewhat different way even though each period shows the similar outlines of a large ritornello. The opening three measures of the fourteen-bar solo episode (bars 21-35[a]) that begins the second period suggest a presentational *Vordersatz*; the remaining eleven measures of the solo passage outline a developmental *Fortspinnung*. The period then closes with an overlapping orchestral *Epilog*, which restores the larger eight-bar grouping established during the opening ritornello (bars 35-42). The central solo's *Fortspinnung* consists effectively of twelve bars divisible into 6 + 6, but it appears to be abbreviated to 11 = 6 + 5 by the overlapping entrance of the *Epilog*. As extended solos in Baroque concertos often do, the violin solo here replaces the Allegro's compound 4/4 with the simple 4/4: Its slower two-to-the-bar basic pace is due to this replacement rather than to a direct expansion of the orchestral ritornello's more rapid four-to-the-bar pace (though the effect, on the face of it, is largely the same).[74] Despite the deceleration, the episode preserves the old-style intensity generated during the early stages of the opening ritornello since it retains the contrapuntal milieu of bars 1-4 and, further, since it contracts the ritornello's two-bar grouping pace to a one-bar pace.[75] The Allegro's original pacing patterns resume at the entrance of the tutti in bar 35.

Group-by-group account. Because the solo passage is rather more complex than its spacious appearance would seem to suggest, it requires a formal parsing for its essence is to crystallize. Including both the *Vordersatz* and the *Fortspinnung*, the passage comprises

---

[74]This is a good example of a phenomenon I described but did not exemplify abundantly earlier, namely the change in meter that is likely to accompany changes in pacing, grouping, texture, and thematic design when a concerto's soloist enters.

[75]This is a good example of another phenomenon I described but did not exemplify abundantly earlier—the coincidence of expansion in one sphere and contraction in another.

three groups of measures which, step by step, move towards the major supertonic: bars 21-23, 24-29, and 30-35 (= 3 + 6 + 6). Even though the half-note basic pace of the passage does not expand the quarter-note pace of bars 1 and 2 directly, there is a close expansive and spatial link between the Allegro's opening measures and the entire episode (see the brackets in Example 5.17a): The figurations of the upper voice in the *Vordersatz* of bars 21-35 are based on a conjunct and disjunct movement in quarter notes that in a very free way widens the tonal space encompassed by the disjunct eighth-note figures introduced in bar 1. The pace reductions in Example 5.12 show how stepwise motion by two underlying voices, each progressing in half notes, underlies the essential polyphonic movement in quarter notes. The enlargement is borrowed from Couperin's less ornate but similarly developmental and polyphonic elaboration of his Allemande's opening four-bar theme, just after the Allemande's double bar (see the brackets in Example 5.17b).[76]

The first of the solo violin's two six-bar groups (bars 24-29) simplifies the long-range design of the violin's diminutions by stating the same figure four times in each measure. Unlike the short repetitions in bars 5-12 of the E-minor Concerto Grosso Allegro, which kept the basic pace going because they reemphasized the same structural chords at the quarter-note basic pace, the more extended and more ornamental repetitions here slow the solo passagework's widened half-note basic pace down still further, to movement in whole notes. Once the repeated-sixteenths figure has been reduced out, it becomes apparent that the polyphonic progress of the solo upper voice has decelerated to movement in half notes, and that this compound movement now stands for a still slower and more fundamental motion, in whole notes, by each of the two underlying polyphonic voices (see again the reductions in Example 5.12). The basic pace of the six measures, then, is a one-bar pace; it is twice as slow as the pace of the preceding three measures. For

[76]Handel in this instance takes over Couperin's expanded tonal and durational setting but not his characteristic shape enlargements, of which the Allemande has many.

better or for worse, its enlargement brings us face to face with the uneasy notion of a basic length, since in a fairly obvious way it expands the three-bar basic length of the group to six bars. (It also brings to mind the contrast between the four-bar length of bars 1-4 and the eight-bar length of bars 5-12 and 13-20.) I shall comment on the basic length of each period in passing as I go along, and provide a more concrete theoretical account of it—to the extent that it is possible to do so—after completing the durational analysis of the entire Allegro. The reader can glance ahead at the diagrams in Example 5.20 to assess the difficulties the task involves.[77]

Handel's second six-bar solo group (bars 30-35) maintains the expanded one-bar basic pace of the preceding six-bar group but does so through a sequential expansion that closes into the following orchestral *Epilog*. In light of my earlier remarks regarding genuine and apparent expansion, the question inevitably arises whether sequential expansion as a rule remains consistently genuine or turns out to be only apparent under certain circumstances. Because sequential expansion embodies a tonal and durational idiom that is based on an unexpanded tonal and durational model—a pair of linear progressions in the outer voices, to which ancillary chords are added—it usually does offer genuine expansion, at least at the deeper levels. Exceptions confine themselves to settings that are strictly periodic, but even then one might say that they are "expansion-based." The reason has to do with the expansions' generic status: In the music of the high Baroque, sequence and sequential expansion take precedence, as an idiom, over periodicity and the periodic grid.

The sequential expansion in bars 30-35, then, enlarges the three-bar basic length of the group (established by the expanded half-note movement of the basic pace) to a six-bar stretch, just as the figural repetitions in bars 24-29 did, although that is not immediately

---

[77]In the absence of a large periodic framework or the entire Allegro, the basic length acquires the status of an interesting—rather than an analytically significant—phenomenon.

obvious for the expansion shows considerable irregularity in its opening two measures and also gives up its last measure when it overlaps with the ensuing *Epilog*. On account of the sequential expansion's ancillary voice leading (indicated by parentheses in Example 5.12), the solo upper voice accelerates its characteristically polyphonic figural movement from half notes to quarter notes even as the deliberate underlying motion in whole notes remains unchanged. One could say that the expansion is essential at the six-bar level of the subphrase but nonessential at other levels. More important is the stylistic and rhetorical significance of the six-bar length as such: It allows the solo episode and the later passages deriving from it to stand out in relief against their foursquare orchestral surroundings.

The tutti: Bars 35-42. The overlapping orchestral *Epilog*, which enters in bar 35, restores the larger eight-bar grouping that prevailed in bars 5-20 but not its two-bar grouping pace or its small-scale, internal periodicity. It is as if the intervention of the solo violin's polyphony had stripped the later stages of the ritornello of their galant trappings. The two-bar group with which one might have expected the *Epilog* to begin is replaced by a two-and-a-half-measure extension of the major supertonic seventh (the dominant in the key of the dominant) that is based on the dominant extension in bars 19-20^{a}. Since the supertonic extension mirrors the earlier, periodic dominant extension one is justified in expecting the resumption of two-bar grouping. But because the supertonic extends for two and a half bars, one hears its extension as a genuine expansion at two levels: at the level of the one-bar segment that prevailed during the preceding violin solo, and at the level of the two-bar segment that was established during the opening ritornello. Against the lingering aural perspective of the violin's one-bar grouping pace, the expansion enlarges one measure—bar 35—into a two-and-a-half-measure segment, bars 35-37^{a}.

Along the same lines, one hears the three-measure segment that follows—from the middle of bar 37 to the middle of bar 40—as a single measure, namely bar 37^{b}-38^{a}, that has been expanded by two measures (bars 38^{b}-40^{a}); this expansion, which continues the

temporary suspension of the two-bar grouping pace, is based on a transposed adaptation in the key of the dominant, D minor, of the opening ritornello's B♭ arpeggio expansion (bars 9^{b}-11^{a}). The arpeggios' transformation attenuates the galant quality of the passage by laminating its earlier bright sonorities with the darker shades of D minor. The transposition signifies the reverse encroachment of the Allegro's conservative Baroque discourse into the space previously reserved for the Allegro's galant fioriture.

The genuine, nonessential durational enlargement occasioned by the supertonic extension and by the D-minor arpeggios operates, admittedly, only at the local levels of the one-bar and the two-bar segments. At the larger level of the eight-bar phrase, the extension and the transposition again present the paradox of essential enlargement inasmuch as they help substantiate the *Epilog*'s characteristic eight-bar length.

Notwithstanding the chordal extensions that underlie bars 35-37^{a}, the elaborate contrapuntal and thematic activity within these extensions—their dogged reiteration of the supertonic on each beat—restores the opening ritornello's quarter-note basic pace. The remaining two and a half measures of the *Epilog* (bars 40^{b}-42), which follow the two expansions just described, conclude the anticipation of the approaching minor dominant with a set of elaborate cadential progressions. The two-and-a-half-bar length of the progressions again prevents the periodic grid from reformatting internally within the *Epilog*'s eight bars (see the reductions in Example 5.12).

Put together now, the pace enlargements of the earlier violin solo and the chordal enlargements of the *Epilog* almost double the basic length of the entire second period (consult the diagrams in Example 5.20). Although it is abstract and perhaps not very important on a moment-to-moment basis, the augmentation of the basic pace gains in significance when it is weighed along similar augmentations that span the Allegro's other periods.

Figural repetition. This is perhaps the proper moment at which to mention that Handel's

very extensive use of chordally sustained figural repetition during the opening ritornello (bars 19-20[a]) and during the second period (bars 35-37[a]) is a highly characteristic feature of the thematic design throughout Op. 6. Although it appears to be strongly influenced by the prevalence of similar idioms in Domenico Scarlatti's Essercizi, a major source for borrowings in Op. 6 (recall especially Example 1.19), such repetition can be found on a somewhat smaller scale in many of Handel's earlier instrumental works as well. In these earlier works it probably derives from the very same sources that inspired Scarlatti's: the Venetian and the Corellian repertoires, where equally insistent and only slightly less persistent repetitions serve much the same purpose of "buying time"—of building a phrase up to its requisite length. The influential but tonally oriented repetitions in Scarlatti's Essercizi therefore only lead Handel to enhance an earlier idiom of his own, and to lend it greater substance, rather than to fashion a new one.[78]

It is instructive to compare the behavior of the basic pace during these idiomatic figural repetitions with its disposition, at a deeper level, during large-scale expansions such as the enlargement of the mediant, B♭, in bars 9[b]-11[a]. Simple foreground repetitions typically maintain a fast harmonic rhythm and show only a very short, apparent expansion at the two-bar segment level, if that; even extensive series of figural repetitions, despite their long-range harmonic stasis and their reluctance to introduce new material, will not usually stop the foreground or the basic pace from going on. Only genuine expansions that are based on some sort of a model—like the expansion in bars 9-11[b]—will retain the quality of nonessential interpolations, bring the basic pace to a temporary halt at the deeper levels, and suspend it until the expansion has run its course.

In later, periodic styles, the temporary fermata-like interruption of an established pace occasioned by a genuine expansion offers, within limits, an opportunity for a relatively ad-hoc and improvisatory passagework on account of the opportunities it

---

[78]I discuss the touch rhythm that underlies Scarlatti's repetitions in Willner 2000.

presents for the temporary suspension of the periodic grid. In the fundamentally aperiodic style of the high Baroque, on the other hand, the temporary addition or interpolation of new paces and new patterns of grouping over a set of detained structures, which takes place during genuine expansion, requires, paradoxically, a more stringent—not a looser—sense of durational order. It therefore usually calls for precisely the opposite arrangement: The introduction of a short-lived but substantial hierarchy of paces and durations that is likely to be more periodic than its surroundings. It is for that reason that genuine Handelian expansions, within their unmarked Baroque surroundings, tend to assume a distinctly marked, even foreign quality.[79] On account of their internal periodic order, these expansions often open the door for the temporary introduction of full-blown periodicity, a periodicity that can be quite explicit even when the composition, in the long run, remains decidedly aperiodic. The B♭ arpeggios in bars 9-11^{b} and their D-minor transformation in bars 37^{b}-40^{a} have it both ways: They suggest a galant framework, but they avoid its grid. The periodic vision that their foreign-sounding quality evokes does emerge though—through the eight-bar length of the phrase by which they are framed.

II. 3. 3. The third period (bars 43-56)

Bars 43-56. I described earlier how the Allegro's third period begins with two statements of the opening ritornello's two-bar *Vordersatz*, transposed to the dominant—first in the one-line octave and the second, as if to adjust a registral misstep, in the two-line octave (bars 43-46). Since the repetition belongs to a different structural voice-leading strand, it must not be read as an ancillary durational expansion or addition, despite its evidently

[79]I discuss the seeming anomalies of this scenario in my analysis of the Royal Fireworks Ouverture in Willner 1999.

expansive qualities. Furthermore, like the upcoming repetition of bar 49 in bar 50 (which is also registrally displaced), it contributes in an essential way, at the eight-bar level, to the procurement of the eight bars that make up the period's opening phrase and extend to the entrance of the solo violin in bar 51. Most important, the gestural *Vordersatz* repetition shows a distinctly narrative and rhetorical quality: One might say that it portrays the registrally hesitant progress of the ritornello's Baroque incipit in the face of dramatic competition from the wide-open tessitura of the galant arpeggio stretches (which, we recall, appeared just before the entrance of the present *Vordersatz*). For all these reasons put together I would be inclined to let these repetitions retain their full structural value, and I would forgo their interpretation as durational expansions at any level, even at the level of the apparent expansion (where one might certainly be tempted to reduce them out in order to uncover a shorter basic length).

The Vordersatz: Bars 43-50. Despite its brevity—14 measures—the third period recounts and summarizes all of the opening ritornello's narrative conflicts and even adds several new turns of phrase to the ritornello's three divisions. The opening eight-bar phrase that makes up the period's *Vordersatz* displays the outlines of a smaller three-part ritornello: Its registrally uncertain two-bar *Vordersatz* (bars 43-44 and 45-46) matches the beginning of the Allegro and leads to a transposition to the dominant of the original two-bar *Fortspinnung* (bars 47-48). These are followed by an inconclusive two-bar *Epilog* (bars 49-50) whose open-endedness allows the voice leading and the design to continue without cadencing. The absence of cadential articulation, to which I called attention during the Introduction, emphasizes the nested quality of the smaller, eight-bar ritornello. The brief three-bar violin solo in bars 51-53 serves as the *Fortspinnung* of the period's encompassing 14-bar ritornello. In its developmental way, it expands the solo setting's generically broad half-bar basic pace to movement in whole notes. But although the design of the solo passage recalls the old-style polyphonic play of the second period's 14-bar

solo episode, its greatly diminished length signifies an additional "progressive" compromise the Baroque materials must accept in order to accommodate the growing intrusion of the galant passagework. The drastic shrinkage in the episode's length confirms the suspicion, raised during the second period's *Epilog*, that material influenced by the galant passagework has now begun to take up as much by way of durational space as it already has by way of registral space. An expansively cadential three-bar *Epilog* (bars 55-57) based on the short *Epilog* in bars 19-20[a] closes the period in the subtonic.

The Epilog: Bars 51-56. A conflation of sequential expansions and apparent expansions that straddle the *Fortspinnung* and the *Epilog* helps achieve the combined six-bar length of the two groups (bars 51-56). The sequential expansion with which the three-bar solo in bars 51-53 is occupied (consult again the pace reductions in Example 5.12) augments the progression's one-and-a-half-measure basic length to three bars, and it suggests that the ritornello's two-bar grouping pace has been replaced by a three-bar pace, however tentatively. The orchestral *Epilog* in bars 54-56 extends the subtonic's dominant by one measure, thereby converting the length of the *Epilog* from two to three measures and confirming the temporary three-bar grouping pace. Splitting hairs, one might say that the extension—in light of the three-bar grouping pace, which the extension procures—now qualifies only as an apparent expansion. Important or not, this interesting anomaly points to the different standards that prevail for the parsing of sequential expansions and the parsing of chordal extensions. The casually periodic phrase rhythm established by these informal enlargements makes it possible for the resulting six-bar phrase to match approximately (however imprecisely) the eight-bar length of the preceding orchestral phrase. Such *approximate periodicity* is one of Handel's signature durational procedures in Op. 6.[80]

---

[80]I doubt that Handel meant for the six measures in bars 51-56 to be heard as subliminally dissonant in relation to the preceding eight measures (bars 43-50) in Harald

All in all, the third period shows a heavy concentration of Baroque materials, including an eight-bar ritornello that ignores or avoids the opening ritornello's galant passages and a solo stretch that harks back to the solo violin's earlier Vivaldian episode. Yet although the galant arpeggios are largely absent, their influence can be detected readily in the period's registral uncertainty, its sharply diminished scale, and in its relatively incomplete thematic design and cadential articulation.

II. 3. 4. The fourth period (bars 57-76)

Bars 57-76. At the beginning of the fourth, penultimate period the conflict between the Allegro's Baroque and galant materials picks up with renewed vigor. This period, too, shows the outlines of a large-scale three-part ritornello and the conflation of six-bar and eight-bar phrases: It comprises a substantial eight-bar *Vordersatz*, a somewhat shorter six-bar *Fortspinnung*, and a similarly scaled six-bar *Epilog*. The change in internal proportions, like the corresponding changes during the preceding periods, is significant in that it again prevents the more precise periodicity of the galant passages from taking over the entire piece (still a viable possibility, even at this late point). More important, it allows the new *Vordersatz*—which begins not with the germinal incipit of bars 1-2 but with a new and weighty sequential theme—to maintain greater durational weight than the *Vordersatz* groups of the first two periods did. The large eight-bar *Vordersatz* introduces several new and distinctly Baroque motives (borrowed, we shall see, from Couperin's Allemande) during its first three and a half measures, and it recomposes the B= arpeggios of bars 9-11[a] in the darker tones of the home key, G minor, during the remaining four and a half bars. The reappearance of the arpeggios within the *Vordersatz* rather than within

---

Krebs's sense of subliminal dissonance (Krebs 1999), but I would not want to exclude that possibility entirely.

the ensuing *Fortspinnung* or within the *Epilog* (where one would expect them to appear) provides the arpeggios with even greater thematic weight and continues their step-by-step elevation to the more severe and more formal setting to the Allegro's high Baroque style.

The Vordersatz: Bars 57-64. The new Baroque theme introduced in bars 57-60 restores the Allegro's perennial two-bar grouping pace and builds up the four-bar length of the subphrase it occupies through a pair of expansions. (Despite the overlapping entrance of the transposed B♭ passages in the middle of bar 60 one still hears bars 57-60 as a four-bar group.) The new theme transforms the length of the group from two measures to four by adding orchestral echoes and elaborations to the solo concertino violin's brief motivic fragments. The fragments appear in bars 57 and 59, the echoes and elaborations in bars 58 and 60. (Note the contrast between the violin's characteristically slow half-note basic pace and the tutti's figural quarter-note pace.) Without calling upon sequential expansion as such, the resonant orchestral echoes simulate its idioms and take advantage of its durational properties. The new theme hinges on the entrance of the Allegro's first thematically conspicuous set of suspensions (Example 5.18a), which assists the passage in preserving the Allegro's older, more contrapuntal style. The decidedly Baroque quality of the suspensions crystallizes rapidly if one becomes aware of their source, a similarly conspicuous and thematized chain of suspensions in Couperin's Allemande (Example 5.18b).[81]

Owing to the sequential nature of the new theme and the highly repetitive, ancillary quality of the orchestral additions to its solo violin fragments, one may well be tempted to regard the theme's enlargements as genuine, quasi-sequential expansions. But the theme's restoration of the Allegro's two-bar grouping pace, however, and the absence

[81]This is also the source for the fugal subject of the Capriccio from Bach's C-minor Partita.

of a conventionally patterned sequential model for the enlargements, weigh in favor of the enlargements as apparent expansions. This is clearly a borderline case, one that fuses the idioms of genuine and apparent expansion into an analytically impenetrable whole.[82]

The second part of the *Vordersatz* acquires its four-bars-plus length by bringing in the aforementioned Baroque G-minor transformation of the galant B= arpeggios. These enter prematurely in the middle of bar 60, and just as they have done earlier, they add a full two bars to the basic length of the passage. Since the addition of the arpeggios once again suspends the two-bar grouping pace reestablished during the first half of the *Vordersatz*, it embodies genuine expansion at the two-bar level of the segment. The addition of the arpeggios also accounts for the extension of the contrapuntal G-minor chord of bars 59-60 through to bar 63.

The Fortspinnung: Bars 65-70. The fourth period's *Fortspinnung* contains the Allegro's last violin solo and proceeds at the solo episode's characteristically slow half-note basic pace. It retains the old-style polyphonic setting of the earlier solo passages, but instead of pursuing a developmental line it repeats the same two-bar progression three times, with some important modifications during the last repetition. Because the *Fortspinnung* restores the Allegro's two-bar grouping pace, it is difficult to determine whether one might add at least the first, if not the second, of its two repetitions to the Allegro's short list of genuine expansions; the second repetition is too drastically modified (as we shall soon see) to be included in the list. Now the first repetition offers a good example of a potential expansion of the type I mentioned in my comments on the minimal length of expansion at the two-bar level. Since the minimum is two bars, it raises the following

[82]A devil's advocate might of course ask why bother to find out what the parts of the whole are. As long as such an attempt does not fall into the trap of note-to-note fussiness, the more we try, the better our shadings and those of analytically aware players will be in performance.

question: When a grouping pace of two bars prevails and the repeated segment extends for precisely two bars, can one read the repetition as a genuine expansion? If pressed, I would say no: The expansion ultimately remains more apparent than real, for it is essential—in this instance, at the six-bar phrase level—to the procurement of the *Fortspinnung*'s six bars. When push comes to shove in the case of two-bar additions, the level that sets the criteria for the expansion is the larger of the two levels involved, here the six-bar level. The role the repetition plays at the six-bar level of the phrase supersedes in significance the role it plays at the two-bar level of the segment.[83]

The durational meaning of the solo violin's second repetition can only be gauged with the help of a closer look at the voice leading of the passage and at the structure of the remaining measures of the Allegro. Beyond a hint at the impending cadential closure, the solo repetitions in the *Fortspinnung* bring in a harmonically tinged Phrygian inflection, changing the expected a natural^2 to ab^2 in bar 69 through the seemingly incomplete neighbor-note motion g^2-ab^2. (The ornamental ab^2-g^2 is in fact completed in bar 70 when g^2 is reasserted by the second concertino violin and by the tutti's first violins.) Although contrapuntal rather than harmonic in both origin and resolution (see Example 5.11), the Phrygian complex begets a conspicuous Neapolitan sixth chord that requires some sort of harmonic resolution, however delayed such resolution might be on account of the prominence of ab^2 at the head of a second thematic repetition in the two-line octave. The *Epilog,* which follows, does of course provide a complete return to the tonic, but a sufficient residue of Neapolitan tension remains to occasion the addition of yet another, coda-like period (an addition that we know to be necessary for registral reasons as well). An extended and genuinely harmonic Neapolitan sixth chord assumes a central role in articulating this last, highly gestural period, which is also charged with dissipating the

[83]But that does not contradict or rule out the repetition's participation in an expansion at the two-bar level. Whether the expansion at the two-bar level is of any significance depends on the circumstances at hand.

figural energy of the Allegro and with bringing the narrative conflict between the Allegro's two styles to some sort of conclusion.

The reason the solo violin's Neapolitan repetition in bars 69-70 hardly qualifies as a durational expansion, then, has to do with its tonal duties. The repetition realizes a progression so substantial that it cannot be reduced out even in an abstract parsing of the Allegro's basic length. It does not qualify, not even ambivalently, as an apparent expansion.

The Epilog: Bars 71-76. The fourth period's *Epilog* continues to maintain the period's distinctly Baroque cast. The new material that the *Epilog* introduces in its opening two and a half measures shows a highly intensified elaboration, in chromaticized contrary motion, of the diatonic *Epilog* in Couperin's Allemande (Example 5.19).[84] Because the chromaticism in Handel's *Epilog* and its half-measure continuation enlarge the Allegro's two-bar grouping pace, and because the two-and-a-half measure dominant extension that follows in bars 73^{b}-75 exceeds the two-bar grouping pattern in the same way, we tend to hear a temporary two-and-a-half bar grouping pace rather than a pair of durational expansions. The one-bar cadential tag that follows closes the fourth period on a durationally inconclusive note; this is an effective strategy considering that a full-blown coda awaits right ahead.

Bars 57-58: Basic length. In what concerns length as such, the durational design of the

---

[84]Handel's chromaticism also takes in Couperin's developmental spinning of the *Epilog* in the later passages of his Allemande (bars 32^{b}-36^{a}), as well as the chromaticism that pervades the entirety of Scarlatti's D-minor Sonata, K. 18. I believe these connections obtain despite the familiarity of Handel's chromatic progression: Throughout the tonal literature, the use of distinctive borrowings from a distinctive source will lead the composer to borrow also more common stock progressions and thematic patterns from the same source. The two kinds of borrowing work side by side.

fourth period resembles that of the third period, but it extends for six additional measures: Instead of collapsing the large-scale ritornello onto two phrases eight- and six-bars long, it allows each of the ritornello's three parts to occupy a full phrase. And so it is that its three phrases are eight, six, and again six bars long, reinforcing in a thematic way the alternation of six- and eight-bar grouping that has been building up for some time.[85] Like the second and third periods, the fourth period augments its basic length; and again, the significance, if any, of the augmentation will emerge only later on. Here I should like just to complete my basic account of it by comparing its articulation with that of the third period's basic length. Let me then explain what the diagrams in Example 5.20 mean.

The three diagrams depict the fully expanded foreground of the piece below two reductive layers. The uppermost, "background" layer reduces out every possible expansion, including the apparent as well as the ambivalent borderline expansions, in order to arrive at the most skeletal (or nuclear) basic length possible. The "middleground" layer below excludes only the expansions that have been certified as such in the text. It is the middle, not the upper layer that matches the rhythms of the Allegro most closely. The middle layer aims to exclude only the expansions that we hear as genuine expansions at *some* level, be it the level of the two-bar segment, the four-bar subphrase, or the eight-bar phrase. The exclusions in the upper layer take place on a mechanical and rather speculative "see what happens" basis.

Returning briefly to the basic length of the third period, we observe that the *Vordersatz* (bars 57-64) doubles its basic length of four bars through the introduction of the orchestral interjections in bars 58 and 60 and through the repetition of the B= arpeggios in their G-minor reincarnation (bars 61^{b}-63^{a}).[86] The *Fortspinnung* and the

---

[85]Recall the thematic alternation of three-bar and two-bar segments in the Largo from the D-major Concerto Grosso, Op. 6, No. 5 (Examples 3.40-3.41).

[86]The augmentation comes through despite the irregular division of the eight measures (bars 57-64) into 3 1/2 + 4 1/2.

Epilog, symmetrically balanced in both the foreground and the middleground, add two measures each to their four-bar stretches—the *Fortspinnung* (bars 65-70) through the repetition of bars 65-66 in bars 67-68, and the *Epilog* (bars 71-76) through the familiar extension of the running-sixteenths over the dominant (bars 73^{b}-75), which begins here in the middle of the measure. Bars 69-70, on account of their dramatic Neapolitan inflection, remain within the basic length of the *Fortspinnung* despite their similarity to bars 67-68. In all, one might indeed say that the length of the period has approximately—but not precisely—doubled. A quick glance at Example 5.20 and at the fourth period discloses that despite their different lengths at the surface the two periods augment their basic length in much the same way, and to the same extent.

II. 3. 5. The fifth period (bars 77-92)

Bars 77-92. The Allegro's last period, above and beyond performing its assigned registral and tonal tasks, also serves as the Allegro's coda; that is probably the reason why it is marked by a particularly high degree of repetition. In any case, since the Allegro as a whole highlights repetition as a major compositional and stylistic issue, it is only proper for its coda to focus on repetition in a very prominent way. The period divides into three parts: a four-bar *Vordersatz* (bars 77-80) that echoes the first four bars of the previous period, if without either solo-tutti contrasts or suspension figures; a more extended and more weighty six-bar *Fortspinnung* (bars 81-86^{a}) that reintroduces and resolves the previous period's Neapolitan tensions; and a matching six-bar *Epilog* (bars 86^{b}-92, beginning in the middle of bar 86 and therefore appearing to extend for seven measures) that recasts the galant B= arpeggios emphatically in the tonic for the second and last time.[87] The proportions of the three parts again differ from those in the preceding

[87]For the third time in a minor key, if one counts the arpeggios' transposition to the dominant at the end of the second period, bars 39-40.

periods, but this time they seem to favor the weighty *Fortspinnung* rather than the short *Vordersatz*. All the same, the period's division into 4 + 6 + 6 echoes the now-familiar division of the previous two periods into 8 + 6 and 8 + 6 + 6.[88]

Each of the coda's three parts performs a variety of thematic and durational duties and perorates different elements of the design. While the *Vordersatz* sublimates the notion of repetition, presenting variants of the repetitions introduced during the previous *Vordersatz*, it also perorates the rising-sixteenths figure that preceded the original B♭ expansion in bars 7-8, that by repeating it numerous times over a seemingly inactive bass.[89] And while the *Fortspinnung* occupies itself with reemphasizing the quarter-note basic pace, it also takes time out to dissipate the momentum of the Allegro's one-bar *Vordersatz* incipit by repeating it several times over the first-inversion tonic and by leading it to the very same Neapolitan sixth chord that was so prominent in the previous period. The *Epilog* finally brings the Allegro to a close with the aforementioned transposition to the tonic of the galant B♭ stretch.

Bars 77-92: Basic length. Since the coda unfolds within the single registral orbit of the lower descent from5 (the upper $\hat{3}$-$\hat{2}$-$\hat{1}$ descent having closed at the end of the previous period), its durational outlines are somewhat easier to parse than are the outlines of the four earlier periods. Much like the length of the preceding period, the coda's actual length at the surface is far greater than its basic length, but most of its expansions are more apparent than real. Unlike the fourth period, the coda allows its two-bar grouping pace to

[88]Codas in Handel's instrumental music are fairly rare but not entirely exceptional. They are rather more common in Couperin's music, where the *petite reprise*—the extra repetition of the last few measures before or after the last repeat sign—paves the way for the occasional appearance of genuine codas.

[89]When one normalizes the voice leading that underlies the repetitions one realizes that the repetitions restore the Allegro's quarter-note basic pace.

prevail (at least for a while) and to set up a genuine periodic grid. The *Vordersatz,* though similar to that of the fourth period, expands its basic length much more drastically, through idiomatic repetitions that resemble a double sequential expansion (consult again Example 5.12). The repetitions augment the length of each of the two principal chords of the progression from one half to two bars. The *Fortspinnung*, in much the same way, repeats its opening measure and adds one measure to the Neapolitan sixth chord's extension, thereby transforming four measures into six, but again as essential additions within the framework of the prevailing two-bar grouping units (see Example 5.20). Only the *Epilog* shows genuine enlargement: It breaks the two-bar grouping pace and adds three measures of transposed B♭ arpeggios (bars 87^{b}-90^{a}), converting three and a half measures into six and a half.

The very slow underlying pace of the *Vordersatz* in the coda (bars 77-80), and the similarly slow pace of the corresponding measures at the beginning of the fourth period (bars 57-60) mirror each other as they present the Allegro's two isolated instances of a genuine obbligato pace, a two-bar pace established by the two-bar extensions and the repetitions in each *Vordersatz.* In the coda the obbligato pace is realized by the opening C-minor sixth chord (bars 77-78) and by the ensuing B♭-major sixth chord (bars 79-80); in the fourth period, the obbligato pace is realized by the similarly sustained C-minor chord (bars 57-58) and the sustained G-minor chord (bars 59-60). The newly found sense of order that the obbligato pace brings about, punctuated as it is by the closing tonic transposition of the B♭ arpeggios, concedes that the galant affiliations of the homophonic B♭ expansion have more or less taken over the piece. But it also signals that their success has been achieved at substantial cost, namely at the cost of submission to the Allegro's Baroque home key and surrender of the arpeggios' bright tonal color and light figural touch. For their part, the coda's extensive repetitions and its underlying harmonic stasis indicate that the homophonic setting and the prolongational design of the B♭ materials have irrevocably modified the Allegro's fundamentally contrapuntal fabric.

Between dénouement and impasse. Looking back through the Allegro, we recall that the uneasy rapprochement between its two styles was set in motion already by the dominant extension and the running sixteenths figures in bars 19-20^{a}, and that it was followed up and intensified by the appearance of many similar but more extended idioms throughout the piece. Now that the Allegro is complete, we can assess the concessions each style has made in order to sustain the presence of the other. We soon realize that for the two styles to coexist and to operate on equal footing in the long run, each has had to give up simply too many of its salient features to survive intact. That is perhaps why the Allegro must end on a note of impasse: On the one had, the vigorous Neapolitan sixth chord extension in bars 83^{b}-85^{a} suggest that the Allegro's Baroque materials are in charge; on the other, the transposed B♭ arpeggios appear to have the last say because they close the piece. Ultimately, the Baroque affiliations of the Neapolitan progression seem to win out since they ensure that the galant passages in the coda conform strictly to the cultural requirements, as it were, of G minor. But it is a very close call.

Adding to the complexity of the situation is one's nagging suspicion that at some level the energetically repetitive extension of the tonic in bars 81-82, which leads up to the extension of the Neapolitan sixth chord in bars 83^{b}-85^{a}, also displays a tired, stop-go quality, and that the transposed B♭ arpeggios, notwithstanding their ubiquitous presence, never really develop in any direction at all. It is possible that Handel, whose capacity for mixing styles without losing sight of their origins was matched only by Bach's and Scarlatti's, intended to suggest in a programmatic, allegorical way that the Allegro's two styles were in the end incompatible, and that their deliberate yet awkward mix worked on some rhetorical levels but not on others. On a large scale this Janus-faced premise is a worthy match to the seeming contradiction in bars 5-12, where Handel succeeds in suggesting an ancillary interpolation on one level and a structural addition to the piece on another.

II. 4. Phrase rhythm and rhetorical structure

Plot archetypes. The Allegro's strategic scheme—its early suggestion and subsequent realization of a dialectical exchange between two competing musical styles—realizes a conflict between two plot archetypes, a conflict whose identity becomes increasingly clear in the later pages of the piece, when the materials that derive from the early B♭ expansion begin to appear repeatedly in the minor keys of the dominant and the tonic. As I mentioned at the outset, these archetypes are the familiar *troping archetype*, and *elevation archetype*: the same archetypes that helped chart the general course of action in the Allegro from the E-minor Concerto Grosso. We must keep in mind that each Allegro articulates the dialectic between its archetypes in a different way. With the help of enlargement, the E-minor Allegro fuses its high and low ingredients into one developmentally integral whole, and it allows the elevation archetype to have the upper hand. With no comparable help at hand, the G-minor Allegro keeps its Baroque and galant components closer to a state of equilibrium, and it prevents the elevation archetype from dictating the Allegro's narrative trajectory. The Allegro's Baroque and galant ingredients remain largely separate. Under the terms of their separation the Allegro's "progressive" stretches are troped wholesale onto the Allegro's conservative Baroque foundation. All the more remarkable, then, that as an aural experience the Allegro's dialectical discourse conjures up not so much the effect of two discrete, alternating styles but rather the impression of a closely worked whole that by turns filters one style through the lens of the other. Handel's invention resides in conjuring up this illusion and in maintaining it to the very end.

The troping and elevation of styles is particularly revealing here in that it discloses some of the compositional principles that underlie Handel's hybrid and composite borrowings. When Handel culls a diversity of elements from different pieces and different

styles and then reassembles them under one roof, he sets up a paradigmatic, archetypal situation in which various degrees of compatibility and incompatibility between stylistically diverse sources provide the principal elements of compositional friction. The sources' compatibility in the realm of, say, melodic shape allows them to coexist peacefully, but if anything it also underlines their incompatibility in the contrapuntal, durational, and harmonic spheres. The emphasis Handel places on their incompatibility, and on the gradual shift in the precarious balance between them, is the rhetorical nub of the piece. We can see why it is that retracing Handel's way with his borrowings can provide us with the key to unlocking the composition's rhetorical structure and its durational design. While the description of the borrowings' synthesis of grouping and pacing patterns may not yield a very specific or neatly patterned hypermetrical picture, it does provide us with substantial clues to unraveling the mysteries of Handel's temporal layout: It discloses why phrases and periods extend for as long as they do and, more specifically, why pockets of expansion appear in one area but not in another.

Basic length. Three of the G-minor Allegro's five periods—all but the opening ritornello and closing coda—seem to double the basic length of their underlying progressions.[90] As I pointed out, however, many of the expansions involved are more apparent than real because they are indispensable to the realization of the tonal design and to the procurement and maintenance of the two-bar grouping pace required by the larger durational scheme. In other words, most of the Allegro's expansions are essential at the two-bar level of the segment. Many are also essential at the four-, six-, and eight-bar levels on account of the roles they play in realizing the tonal structure. We need to keep

[90]Because the ritornello and the coda participate in articulating the fundamental structure, I include their basic length in reckoning the basic length of the Allegro. The structural significance of Baroque ritornellos and codas is usually greater than that of counterparts in the Classic and Romantic eras.

that in mind as we revisit the diagrams in Example 5.20. These, again, illustrate that the basic length relates to the length of the foreground in two different ways: Example 5.20a discloses the basic length that remains when all the apparent expansions are reduced out completely, and Example 5.20b portrays the basic length as it stands when the apparent expansions are left intact. When the apparent expansions are reduced out, the basic length extends for just over one half the surface length; when the apparent expansions are left intact, it extends for about two thirds or three quarters of the foreground.[91]

Either way, the basic length does not appear to provide the durational backbone of the Allegro's temporality: It yields few clues that will help us unravel the durational mysteries of the piece. The sheer irregularity with which it is enlarged, and the absence of any patterning in its enlargement, is enough to throw into doubt its value as a working durational phenomenon—and, conversely, as an analytical tool. All the same, one can surmise that the approximate doubling of the basic length and its plasticity close to the foreground might have helped Handel keep track of the various expansions, apparent and real, on a segment-to-segment, phrase-to-phrase, and period-to-period level. Indeed, augmenting the basic length may have been Handel's quasi-mnemonic mechanism for keeping track of his improvisatory durational setup as he went along. And while the approximate doubling of the nuclear basic length at the surface brings to mind Bach's frequent reliance on large-scale symmetry in some of his most complex and unpatterned suite movements, one must keep in mind that Bach's symmetries often revolve around the double bar that is ubiquitous in binary form, and that they engage the help of underlying, hidden symmetries.[92] The long allegros of Handel's Op. 6 have no dividing double bar,

---

[91]Braunschweig 1997 offers a particularly lucid account of the different levels at which the basic length operates. The basic length, it turns out, is a relative, not an absolute, phenomenon. Its virtue, such as it is, resides in its flexibility.

[92]I discuss Bach's hidden symmetries and periodicities in Willner 1996a and 1998, where I derive the notion of hidden periodicity from Schachter 1987/1999b. Rothstein 1989 contains a perceptive overview of these issues; see especially chapters 3 and 4.

and they show few symmetries that are deliberately concealed.[93]

Markedness, hybrid borrowings, and improvisation. Handel's quest for markedness is a major reason—though, it should by now be apparent, not the only reason—for Handel's mixture of diverse styles and his dependence on a wide range of borrowings within the span of a single movement. Looking back again at the G-minor Allegro one can observe how Handel aims for markedness by borrowing and elevating strong but relatively unmarked Baroque idioms and then, having evoked a generically Frenchified Corellian style, canceling out this basic premise by adding and elevating a chain of more popular but equally strong and equally unmarked galant idioms. From this perspective, Handel's hidden reason for borrowing from Couperin's two pieces (and from Scarlatti's two sonatas in the E-minor Allegro), beyond the sources' thematic and textural attractiveness, resides in each pair's potential for acquiring markedness—for provoking stylistic tensions when faced with a different kind of unmarked foreground, and for generating a high degree of friction during the subsequent attempt at synthesis, elevation, and sublimation.[94]

With the survey of Couperin borrowings in the D-minor Allemande in mind (chapter 4), we can observe how Handel here calls upon stylistically disparate borrowings in order to simulate the effect of improvisation. The difference is only one of scale: The impish leap from one borrowing and one style to another is now bolder and more explicit, in keeping with the G-minor Allegro's greater length, its richer medium, and its more

---

[93]In addition to the basic length, Handel relies on enormous barlines that appear in his manuscripts at irregular intervals of anywhere from four to eight measures. Since these have no structural significance of any sort, we may safely conclude that they represent a purely mnemonic device.

[94]This is one of the major patterns of borrowing that emerge throughout the tonal era. A still more significant pattern—but one that cannot detain us here—is the conflation of hybrid borrowings in the quest for rhythmic spontaneity and simulated improvisation. Many of Handel's borrowings fall into this second category.

diversified font of sources. From the surprising outburst of the B♭ arpeggios in bars 5-12 to the D-minor and G-minor transformations of the arpeggios later on, the quirky but artful maneuvers between two different modes of composition owe their ever-refreshing immediacy to the fluent exchanges between Couperin's "L'Ansoniène" and his "L'Evaporée."

II. 5. More on expansion

Chordal extensions and repetitions in Op. 6, No. 3. Having addressed the relation of grouping pace to durational expansion and, specifically, to chordal extensions that support figural repetition at the one-, two-, and three-bar levels (and at the unnotated levels in between), we are finally in a position to return to the Allegro from the E-minor Concerto Grosso and to check whether its many chordal extensions and figural repetitions embody durational expansion. As I explained earlier, in situations where a two-bar grouping pace prevails, a two-bar period grid prevails also. Under such circumstances, repetitions within two-bar groups only provide the tonal substance that fills in the contents of the two-bar time slots, which have been prefabricated and preassigned by the periodic grid. These repetitions don't expand any preexisting models. To constitute genuine expansion, at least at the two-bar level, chordal extensions and figural repetitions like those in bars 5-12 of the E-minor Allegro have to burst the boundaries of the two-bar slots. Similarly, in situations where a one-bar or a one-and-a-half bar grouping pace prevails, the extension must continue beyond the one-bar and one-and-a-half-bar length if it is to qualify as a genuine expansion.

Since basic one-bar segments and a one-bar grouping pace prevail mainly during the opening four-bar theme of the E-minor Allegro and only sporadically later on—larger segments and a two-bar grouping pace are mostly part in force between bars 5 and 56—pthe many additions and repetitions that appear throughout the movement would

have to exceed two bars each to count as genuine expansions. Not only do few such additions occur: A large number of the repetitions also play an essential role in building up longer, overarching thematic progressions.

During the Allegro's first period, what appears to be a varied repetition of bars 5-6 in bars 7-8 quickly asserts its participation in the basic thematic fabric of the *Vordersatz* which spans bars 5-12 (under circumstances I explained in chapter 1). It therefore does not qualify as an expansion at the two-bar segment level, not even as an apparent expansion. From a larger perspective, the seemingly varied repetition is essential at both the four-bar subphrase level and the eight-bar phrase level, where it performs double duty in procuring the length of each group. This is another instructive example of the complexities involved in parsing two-bar groups that pretend to be ancillary: The apparent durational redundancy of such groups at the surface is canceled out by their greater significance—tonal, thematic, and rhetorical—in the larger scheme of things.

The various repetitions within the pre-cadential, multiple voice exchanges near the end of the first period (bars 17-20) and near the end of the second period (bars 37-38^{a}) do not qualify as expansions at any level. Not only does their length fall short of the required two-bar minimum for expansion at the two-bar level: The entire subphrase in which each repetition occurs appears to retain its integrity as a single tonal and thematic entity by following a continuous thematic and contrapuntal thread; recall the tonal and durational reductions in Examples 5.2 and 5.3. The similar but more developmental voice exchanges in bars 53-55 do contain a much greater number of literal repetitions, especially of half-bar segments, but these serve to build up the basic length of the two-bar units in bars 53-54 and 55-56, and they too therefore embody no expansion.

Along the same lines, the insistent pre-cadential extension and repetition of the supertonic 6/5, which in the key of the dominant precedes the multiple voice exchanges in the second period (bars 35-36), and which in the key of the tonic, closes the final pre-cadential stretch in unnotated 3/2 time near the end of the third period (bars 61^{b}-62), also

serves to establish the basic two-bar and one-and-a-half-bar building blocks of each passage. It consequently represents apparent rather than full-blown expansion.[95]

Finally, we must reckon with the Allegro's substantial sequential expansions. These idiomatic progressions, in striking contrast to most of the Allegro's extensive ad hoc repetitions, all embody genuine expansion, inasmuch as they enlarge a pre existing model. At the same time they also remain essential at the level of the group whose length they help procure. Thus the three corresponding quadruple expansions in bars 13-16, 41-44, and 49-52 are essential at the four-bar subphrase level, and so is the double sequential expansion in bars 29-32.

Epilog

"*Everything* is an expansion," muttered a theorist while glancing, not without skepticism, at some of my early durational reductions—drastic sketches, from which all expansions were left out. "Where are the reductions?" asked another while looking at my later, more conservative pace reductions—comparatively tame sketches, across which most of the expansions survived. The changes in my approach reflect the wide-ranging and fundamentally hierarchical meaning that expansion, as a compositional procedure and as an analytical tool, has put across during the past three centuries. I hope to have demonstrated how it is that even in early eighteenth-century music expansion is already carried out in a layered way. Each durational level in the high style of the late Baroque possesses its own set of expansions, and each expansion, while an incidental enlargement on some levels, remains an indispensable addition on others. Expansion therefore changes its character, its effect, and its affect with the depth of the level at which one chooses to

---

[95]During stretches of unnotated 3/2 time the grouping pace modulates temporarily to a pace of a bar and a half. Bars 59-64 are so unpatterned, though, that it would be difficult to infer any grouping pace outside of bars 58^{b}-62.

contemplate it. Baroque expansion is consequently a highly expressive, indeed personal phenomenon.[96]

Sensitivity to this tiered multiplicity of meanings is an analytical resource well worth cultivating, notwithstanding the time and the effort involved. It helps the theorist, the historian, and the performer organize and shade music that is perpetually rushing forth at high speed within a restricted range of dynamics. Those who master this resource will find themselves better prepared to accomplish the dual mission of Schenker's approach: the artistic re-creation of the music through analysis, and its artful rendition in performance.

---

[96] That is why Kevin Korsyn, after reviewing several attepts to find "the" expansion in the opening 16 measures of Mozart's Piano Sonata in G, K. 283, concludes that while the expansion does indeed exist, it resides primarily in the listener's ear. See Korsyn 2003, pp. 91-96. Carl Schachter outlines a similar view in his elegant reading of Chopin's Mazurka in A♮, op. 24, No. 3, bars 1-12; see Schachter 2004, pp. 102-3.