

**Musical Logic and Rhetorical Persuasion
in the North-German Toccata**

by

Leon W. Couch III, D.M.A., Ph.D.
Texas A&M University

Abstract

Musical Logic and Rhetorical Persuasion in the North-German Toccata

A rhetorical analysis of the north-German *praeludium* explains the purpose behind its diverse textures. This paper examines the musical analogue to proof required by the analytical metaphor. The resulting model argues against the stereotypes found in organ repertory books and against vital aspects of recent rhetorical applications to the genre: The *praeludium* does not rely solely upon unexplainable alternations of textures nor do *confirmationes* result from relationships between fugal sections. Each fugue instead contains a full set of musical proofs. With this established, other imitative keyboard genres of this period can be understood rhetorically, with important implications for performance.

The goal of music is to teach, to delight, and to move. This goal is common to the musician and the orator, although the musician uses different means than does the orator.

Jan Albert Ban (1637)

The goddess Persuasion must have been, in a manner, the mother of poetry, rhetoric, music, and the other kindred arts.... Not only the best order of thought and turn of fancy, but the most soft and inviting numbers, must have been employed to charm the public ear, and to incline the heart by the agreeableness of expression.

Anthony Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury (1711)

Rhetoric and poetics are so closely related to the art of music that anyone wishing to study music seriously cannot afford to remain ignorant of them. All of these arts work toward a common goal: to master our feelings, and to give our passions a certain direction.¹

Johann Joseph Klein (1783)

Introduction

Throughout Western history, writers have extolled the numerous relationships between language and music. Seventeenth-century musicians drew even more explicitly upon the theories and practices of rhetoric to create, explain, and describe musical effects. The quote above by the musician and priest Jan Albert Ban displays a common sentiment throughout the

¹Jan Albert Ban, *Dissertatio epistolica de musicae natura, origine, progressu, et denique studio bene instituendo* (Leyden, 1637), 110; Ban's Latin quote in Brewster Rogerson, "Ut Musica Poesis: The Parallel of Music and Poetry in Eighteenth Century Criticism" (Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1945), 48. Anthony Ashley Cooper, Earl of Shaftesbury, *Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times, etc.* (1711), ed. J. M. Robertson (London, 1900), I, 249, as quoted in John Hollander, *The Untuning of the Sky: Ideas of Music in English Poetry 1500–1700* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1961), 195–96. Johann Joseph Klein, *Versuch eines Lehrbuchs der praktischen Musik* (Gera: C. F. Bkemann, 1783), 15, as quoted in Mark Evan Bonds, *Wordless Rhetoric: Musical Form and the Metaphor of the Oration* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1991), 59.

Baroque periods. Ban lists the shared purposes of the two liberal arts: *docere*, *delectare*, and *movere*. Significantly, he quotes Cicero in his first sentence, simply replacing the word “rhetoric” with “music”.² Similarly, the Englishman Anthony Cooper states that music, like rhetoric, not only expresses an emotion (*delectare*), but actually changes listeners’ emotional states (*movere*). Johann Joseph Klein, perhaps the most important German aesthete of Mozart’s time, simply demands that any competent musician must know both rhetoric and poetics.

Throughout this period, in fact, rhetoric provides the most mature conceptual framework, terminology, and pedagogy for the understanding of all the arts, including music.³ Rhetoric teaches how to invent arguments, arrange ideas, express ideas persuasively, and deliver them either in speech or, more commonly during this period, in the written word. The parallel to music pedagogy of the time seems clear: Baroque music pedagogy teaches how to create melody, organize phrases, express affections, and perform properly. Trained orators (or their speech writers) study how to move listeners to particular feelings and thoughts about a subject, act, or person, by employing studied methods of argumentation and style. These methods sway audiences through beauty, logic, emotional appeal, physical gesture, and other means. Likewise, seventeenth- and eighteenth-century composers espouse the same desires, achieved through mode, rhythm, melody, musical figures, style, organization, and performance techniques. The musician is somewhat like an orator, but without the words.

²See Marcus Tullius Cicero, *Orator*, trans. H. M. Hubbell, reprint ed. (Cambridge: Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, 1997), 69; and Marcus Fabius Quintilian, *The Instituto Oratoria of Quintilian* (90 C.E.), Vol. III, trans. H. E. Butler (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1922–1939, reprint ed., Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 181. Also see, Saint Augustine *On Christine Doctrine*, trans. D. W. Robertson, Jr. (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997), 136ff.

³George J. Buelow, “Teaching Seventeenth-Century Concepts of Musical Form and Expression: An Aspect of Baroque Music,” *College Music Symposium* 27 (1987): 1–13.

After a brief synopsis of rhetorical theory, I will demonstrate by example how the musical organization and procedures in one of the most dramatic seventeenth-century keyboard genres, the north-German toccata (NGT), parallel those in forensic oratory.⁴ This analytical metaphor depends principally on the structure of an artwork's body; that is, the identification of musical parallels to rhetorical propositions and their proofs. Thus, this paper primarily examines how north-German keyboard composers experimented with imitation (fugue) as potential "musical proofs"⁵, a topic misunderstood in the current literature. (The evaluation of competing modern schemes is reserved for the end of the paper, once the reader has gained sufficient background through the preceding discussion and demonstration.) With this vital issue of musical proof solved, one may ultimately examine musical topics and view the role of other musical sections in context.

Historical Background to Seventeenth-Century Musical-Rhetorical Analysis

In the crucible of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Lutheran Germany, several beliefs and traditions from antiquity fused into the *musica poetica* discipline.⁶ This discipline, *musica*

⁴In his 1969 dissertation, Kenneth George Powell first defined this subgenre of the *praeludium*: The work must (1) be from northern Germany or its sphere of influence; (2) must be composed between 1650 and 1710; (3) be for keyboard; (4) contain four or more sections; (5) start with a free section (not fugal); and (6) contain at least two fugal sections (adapted from Kenneth G. Powell, "An Analysis of the North German Organ Toccatas," *The Diapason* 62 (April 1971): 27).

⁵This emphasis on the procedure of musical proof, of course, begs the question of what is being proved. This issue will be solved simply by identifying concrete musical features, and the more contentious issue of musical or external topics will be reserved for a later, more lengthy article. Similarly, a rhetorical analysis of a speech can identify a proposition and examine the structure of argumentation without discussing the speech's particular subject matter. I will only mention in passing some of possible topics and emotional goals of particular works suggested by various musical figures and key connotations.

⁶Diagram 1 revised from Leon W. Couch III, "Musical Rhetoric in Three Prælua of Dietrich Buxtehude." *The Diapason* (March 2000): 14. The chart summarizes and refines the prolonged explication in Dietrich Bartel, *Musica Poetica: Musical-Rhetorical Figures in German Baroque Music* (Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1997).

poetica, was devoted to the teaching of musical composition; and, rhetorical theory provided the most powerful component. (See the lefthand column of Diagram 1.) Any education at the time included rhetoric and the writings of Marcus Cicero and sometimes Marcus Quintilian, who were held in especially high regard.⁷ In fact, Lutheran *Lateinschule* curricula in the Renaissance and Baroque periods commonly aimed towards a capstone course in rhetoric. Rhetoric was no longer limited principally to civic life as in Greek times, but was highly valued for its utility in comprehending sacred texts, conceiving sermons, and writing prose. In the absence of viable competing aesthetic systems and with so many correspondences between these liberal arts of rhetoric and music, most educated readers and listeners naturally understood the temporal arts in rhetorical terms.

In the center column of Diagram 1, one finds the ancient belief that human music connects to the heavens. Music can, in a way, “tune” our souls to be harmonious with the ratios of heavenly bodies and thereby make us better people: We hear good music to become good. Thus, the cosmological conception and the Doctrine of Ethos in the righthand column are highly intertwined. (In the seventeenth century, incidentally, Andreas Werkmeister also pursued this concept of numerology in detail.)

Emotional states (the affections) were an important component of the Doctrine of Ethos (right column). Rhetoricians were taught a working knowledge of them, as an awareness of audiences’ attitudes was vital when employing emotional arguments. Highly influenced by humanism and probably rhetoric’s emphasis on affecting listeners, musicians of the late

⁷Brian Vickers, “Figures of Rhetoric/Figures of Music?” *Rhetorica* 2 (1984): 2–3; idem., *In Defence of Rhetoric* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 256–70; and Joseph S. Freedman, “Cicero in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Rhetoric Instruction,” *Rhetorica* 4/3 (Summer 1986): 239. For some contrary arguments about students’ depth of knowledge, see Daniel Harrison, “Rhetoric and Fugue: An Analytical Application.” *Music Theory Spectrum* 12 (1990): 2–3

Renaissance and throughout the Baroque were intent upon arousing (not just representing) the affections.⁸

Humans supposedly exhibit one of four temperaments, and external stimuli such as music can alter individual's emotional states (affections). This so-called doctrine of affections can explain why people like different music—for instance, people who like dark music might have darker temperaments and may need corrective music—and it explains why individuals respond differently when hearing the same music. Although it was not until 1649 that Descartes published a thoroughly rational study of the passions themselves, these vital ideas have been around since Greek times. In his *Art of Rhetoric*, for instance, Aristotle devotes much of his second book to analyzing specific affections and other vital aspects of an audience.

Martin Luther's emphasis on the Word and particularly his conviction that music elicits faith led to a flowering of German sacred music.⁹ Luther's beliefs along with Melancthon's emphasis on rhetoric pedagogy converged in treatises by Burmeister and others in a field of German music pedagogy now called *musica poetica*. (See center of Diagram 1.) The disparate musical-rhetorical ideas and approaches of the seventeenth century culminate with Johann Mattheson and Johann Nicolaus Forkel during the eighteenth century.

By the end of the eighteenth century, rhetoric pedagogy ossified, and rhetoric instruction

⁸For an excellent survey and thought-provoking discussion of the affections and music in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, see Claude Victor Palisca, "Moving the Affections through Music: Pre-Cartesian Psycho-Physiological Theories" in *Number to Sound: The Musical Way to the Scientific Revolution* (Boston: Kluwer Academic Publications, 2000), 289–308. For a survey of relevant seventeenth-century thought, see Chapter 2 from Leon W. Couch III, "The Organ Works of Dietrich Buxtehude (1637–1707) and Musical-Rhetorical Analysis and Theory" (Univ. Cincinnati: D.M.A. thesis, 2002).

⁹See Carl F. Schalk, *Luther on Music: Paradigms of Praise* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1988), 55. Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht and his student Dietrich Bartel both discuss the likely influence of Lutheran doctrine on the development of *musica poetica*: Bartel, ix–xi, 3–9, and 59–64, and Hans Heinrich Eggebrecht, "Über Bachs geschichtlichen Ort," *Johann Sebastian Bach* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970). For a wonderful summary of Luther's beliefs on the ethical and theological power of music, see the discussion and cited sources in Rebecca Wagner Oettinger, *Music as Propoganda in the German Reformation* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2001): 36–50.

languished in German school curricula. Simultaneously, a preference for more natural and personalized expression arose.¹⁰ Other constituent beliefs of *musica poetica*, such as the cosmological conception of music, continued to decline at the end of the eighteenth century as new and autonomous aesthetic approaches to individual arts emerged. As a studied discipline, *musica poetica* evaporated. Johann Nikolaus Forkel was the last to contribute directly to its development, although vestiges can be easily found in phrasing theories of Joseph Riepel and Heinrich Christoph Koch that continue into nineteenth-century form theory.

The north-German toccata flourished near the zenith of belief in musical-rhetorical relationships. Thus, it should not surprise readers that musical works from solidly Lutheran Germany might employ rhetorical expressions and organization. Approaching the north-German toccata from such a historical mindset helps explain the purpose behind their heightened expression, their design, and their lack of purely musical unity.

Modern Architectural Descriptions of the North-German Toccata

Despite the ubiquitous seventeenth-century use of rhetorical metaphors to discuss music, most keyboard repertory surveys rely upon static architectural models more typical of late nineteenth- and twentieth-century thought. Both Willi Apel and Kenneth Powell describe the “north-German toccata” as a the genre that stereotypically alternates between toccata (T) and fugal (F) textures.¹¹ This description ascends to nearly a definition of the genre: “The toccata

¹⁰For one of the best studies of the move from mimetic to expressive theories of art, see M. H. Abrams, *The Mirror and the Lamp: Romantic Theory and the Critical Tradition* (New York, NY: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1958), Chapter 1 and especially pp. 88–94 on eighteenth-century German musical aesthetics. Also see Vickers, *In Defence*, 196; and Bartel, 25–28, 34–36, and 157–58.

¹¹Willi Apel, *The History of Keyboard Music to 1700*, trans. and rev. by Hans Tischler (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972), 592–93. Kenneth George Powell, “The North German Organ Toccata (1650–1710)” (D.M.A. diss., Univ. of Illinois, 1969).

became a large-scale work in which rhapsodic and fugal sections alternated.”¹² The *Praeludium in d*, BuxWV 140, is a seemingly ideal example of their descriptions. (Notice the alternation of “T” and “F” in the first row of Table 3.)

A survey of the repertory, however, shows that alternation is not a telltale feature: Nicolaus Bruhns’s *Praeludium in e* (Table 12c), for instance, contains several successive toccatas without intervening fugues, and Vincent Lübeck’s *Praeludium in g* (Table 13d) presents successive fugues with little toccata texture. Does a listener imagine a suppressed toccata in between two successive fugues or fantasize a fugue inserted between two toccatas? Probably not. When this alternation apparently exists, such as in BuxWV 140, it is an especially dispassionate way to perceive the music: without purpose, Buxtehude appends juxtaposing textures until boredom sets in. Alternation by itself is not a dynamic compositional process with direction and purpose that matches the genre.

Powell attempts to solve this problem by establishing a hierarchy.¹³ In his view, the little purely musical coherence in Buxtehude’s *praeludia* derives from the toccata texture itself—thus the name north-German *toccata*. (Today, scholars rightly prefer the term *praeludium*.) In fact,

¹²John Caldwell, “Toccata,” in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 1980 ed., 19. Also see Apel, 613; John Shannon, *Organ Literature of the Seventeenth Century: A Study of Its Styles* (Raleigh: Sunbury, 1978), 225–33; Corliss Richard Arnold, *Organ Literature: Volume 1: Historical Survey* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1995). Jacobus Kloppers and Timothy Albrecht call the architectural model the “absolute” form (Jacobus Kloppers, “Die Interpretation und Widergabe der Orgelwerke Bachs” (Ph.D. Diss. Johann Wolfgang Goethe–Universität, Frankfurt am Main, 1965); and Timothy Edward Albrecht, “Musical Rhetoric in Selected Organ Works of Johann Sebastian Bach,” D.M.A. diss. (Eastman School of Music, Univ. of Rochester, 1978)).

¹³Schenkerian prolongations can explain tonal coherence by demonstrating rudimentary prolongations. See Lawrence Archbold, *Style and Structure in the Praeludia of Dietrich Buxtehude* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, 1985). This valuable, anachronistic approach does address the theoretical coherence issue, but such analyses rarely aid the organist desiring to employ analyses for performance interpretations, because this repertory does not rely upon standard later tonal practices such as modulation as a dynamic process over the course of the entire movement. That is, the prolongation and often idiosyncratic progressions suggest a static effect.

Powell claims these works are essentially continuous toccatas with inserted fugues.¹⁴ Ignoring two long fugues (in duration), the numerous engaging toccata textures of Bruhns's *Praeludium in e*, for instance, might provide a potential example. But, works such as Buxtehude's *Praeludium in g*, BuxWV 150, offer only a meager amount of toccata textures (14 measures) in contrast to an overwhelming 120 measures of well-developed imitative counterpoint. It is absurd to claim that, with only 10% free passagework, BuxWV 150 relies upon toccata textures for its coherence and direction.¹⁵ Listeners easily recognize both Bruhns's and Buxtehude's works as examples of the same genre, and, therefore, Powell's hypothesis about toccata textures clearly fails to explain the coherence in this genre.

Despite the convenience of Powell's architectural model in categorizing works, relying solely upon the alternation of two textures as an artistic principle does not do justice to this dramatic repertory—it is a fine way to describe but not to interpret the NGT. These two theorists, Apel and Powell, and their successors were not asking the right questions to bring out the magic of this older time, for they viewed forms in a static architectural design more appropriate to later compositional periods that were less smitten with malleable oratorical processes. They viewed the NGT as two sets of boxes with unpredictable music poured within. In contrast, a rhetorical model—derived from a temporal art—can describe the variety of arrangements, but, more important, simultaneously informs a performer on each section's persuasive purposes.

¹⁴Kenneth G. Powell, "An Analysis of the North German Organ Toccatas," *The Diapason* 62 (April 1971): 28.

¹⁵Even if toccata textures were to bind those works together, the sheer diversity of motives in free sections clearly defies modern theoretical desires for unity and a consistent interpretation matching the drama of the works.

An Introduction to Rhetoric: Musical-Rhetorical Compositional Stages and Forms

As I asserted earlier, rhetoric provided several German Baroque authors a model for composition pedagogy;¹⁶ that is, explaining the composition and the structure of musical works to neophytes. In this section, I will briefly summarize an idealized compositional process and then a basic musical-rhetorical scheme for arranging musical sections, modeled after eighteenth-century and classical authors. This background provides a foundation for a truly rhetorical reading of the north-German toccata.

The compositional process in music can be examined in stages analogous to those in rhetoric. Table 1 shows how two influential Baroque theorists adapted traditional rhetoric pedagogy to music-composition teaching. In the first stage, *inventio*, an orator determines a speech's topic and discovers potential arguments. Similarly, a music student imagines a piece's character: its meter, key, theme, and pre-compositional processes.¹⁷ Much like an orator, this composer then decides on the arrangement of musical ideas; i.e., the *dispositio* determines how pre-compositional material is ordered in time. During the third stage, *elaboratio*, the composer achieves a musical style (low, middle, high) through use of musical gestures (figures). As in oratory, these musical-rhetorical figures not only enhance elegance and persuasiveness; being disturbances of standard syntax, they often connote the affections.¹⁸ A musical score may result

¹⁶In *Wordless Rhetoric*, Bonds demonstrates and mentions repeatedly that treatises outside the *musica poetica* tradition also employ the rhetorical approaches to pedagogy, with important implications for historical understandings of musical form. Vickers also studies shows relationships between the ordering of material (in addition to the concepts) within treatises of art and that in rhetoric (Vickers, *In Defence*, Chapter 7). For instance, he connects the titles and some content of Zarlino's *Institutione armoniche* to that of Quintilian's *Instituto Oratoria* (Vickers, *In Defence*, 362).

¹⁷Mattheson translated in Hans Lenneberg, "Johann Mattheson on Affect and Rhetoric," *Journal of Music Theory* 2 (1958): 69.

¹⁸This claim about figures occurs throughout music and rhetoric literature from nearly all periods, but one can read, for instance, J. Peter Burkholder, "Rule-Breaking as a Rhetorical Sign" in *Festa Musicologica: Essays in Honor of George J. Buelow*, eds. Thomas J. Mathiesen and Benito V. Rivera. (Festschrift series, no. 14) (Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon, 1995), 369–389; and Warren Kirkendale, "*Circulatio*-Tradition, *Maria Lactans*, and Josquin as

from this stage. In Mattheson's *decoratio* stage, an inspired performer improvises ornaments that further augment musical effects and affections. The "analogous" rhetorical stage, *memoria*, however, is devoted to constructing images and mnemonics for a successful rendering of a speech's content and expressions. Mattheson's *decoratio* obviously does not parallel the rhetorical *memoria*, probably because verbatim memorization was not important to skilled improvisors of the day. In the last stage, *executio*, the artist employs practiced performance techniques for delivery of a speech or musical piece. In summary, these compositional stages provide a way to dissect and discuss musical creation, from a work's conception to its completion (that is, performance). Even if imperfectly crafted after rhetoric pedagogy,¹⁹ Mattheson's explanations thus provide an explicit analogy to speech writing and delivery according to Cicero and numerous other famous rhetoricians (first column of Table 1).

Although Mattheson adapted a stock forensic formula (Table 2) to a Marcello aria in his *Der vollkommene Capellmeister* (1739),²⁰ Cicero's disposition seems more aptly applied to the north-German toccata. The musical purposes of introductory free sections in the NGT are analogous to those in rhetorical *exordia*:

(1) to get an audience's attention, usually by playing loudly and curiously;

Musical Orator" *Acta musicologica* 56/1 (1984): 69. Since the 1970s, several scholars have attempted to reign in the enthusiasm about and the scope of figure-passion relationships: George J. Buelow, "Teaching Seventeenth-Century Concepts," 2; and Williams, "The Snares and Delusions of Musical Rhetoric: Some Examples from Recent Writings on J. S. Bach." *Alte Musik: Praxis und Reflexion*, eds. Peter Reidemeister and Veronika Gutmann (Winterthur, Switzerland: Amadeus Verlag, 1983), 234–35. For more on the underlying Aristotelean concept of *mimesis* underlying seventeenth- and eighteenth-century aesthetics, see Couch, "The Organ Works of Dietrich Buxtehude," Chapter 2, and Abrams, 8–14.

¹⁹Mattheson defended himself against contemporary criticism of his rhetorical applications in *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*, and contemporary scholars have also been critical. See Dreyfus, 8; and Vickers, "Figures," 19.

²⁰Johann Mattheson, *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*, trans. Ernest Charles Harriss (Ph.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1969), 754ff. Mattheson's choice of this aria to debut his theories is unfortunate.

- (2) to impress listeners with the performer's *ethos* (social standing), by displaying virtuosic technique in pedal solos and manual passagework, and
- (3) to establish the audience's goodwill, by neither playing too loudly nor too dissonantly, but somewhat pleasantly.

In his verbose way, Mattheson celebrates these goals and methods of the *stylus phantasticus*:

this style is the most free . . . so that the singer or player can display his skill, . . . but not without the intent to please, to overtake and to astonish. . . . Whoever can bring forth the most artful decoration and the most unusual occurrences succeeds best.²¹

Exordia, whether musical or spoken, can fulfill these goals without being related to the body of the artwork.²² Ministers, for instance, often begin sermons with curious or humorous stories.

These stories may be quite long and may irrelevant to the topic—it doesn't matter, for there is great purpose. Likewise, many of Buxtehude's openings seem bizarre and unrelated: "One is bound neither to words nor to melody . . . regardless of what is placed on the page."²³

Nevertheless, Buxtehude's *exordia* clearly fulfill their musical-rhetorical purpose.

Although some rhetoricians recommend capturing the audience's attention through irrelevant or extravagant means, most respected writers recommend that the *exordium* prepare the audience in some more specific ways for the speech to come.²⁴ Mattheson agrees:

The *Exordium* is the PROLOGUE AND BEGINNING OF A MELODY
WHEREIN THE GOAL AND THE WHOLE PURPOSE OF THE THING MUST
BE REVEALED SO THAT THE LISTENERS ARE PREPARED AND ARE

²¹Mattheson, 217, as translated in Snyder, 250–51.

²²Some rhetoricians, such as Cicero and Quintilian, feel that *exordia* should be related, while others such as Aristotle allow for more diversity (Aristotle, 427–37).

²³Mattheson, 217, in Snyder, 250.

²⁴Quintilian, 4.1, vol. 2, 9. Also see, *Ad Herennium*, 11ff.

STIMULATED TO ATTENTIVENESS.²⁵

(Perhaps Kircher's a segment of early description of *stylus phansticus* might hints at this additional purpose: "to teach the hidden design of harmony and the ingenious composition of harmonic phrases and fugues."²⁶) The relationship between the opening of BuxWV 149 and subsequent sections probably accounts for its popularity amongst modern literature and performances. Rhetoric manuals generally agree that, however well planned they may be, *exordia* impress the listener as being spontaneously improvised—poor rhetors show their art too deliberately and thereby undermine any significant persuasive effect. The especially related *exordium* of BuxWV 137 provides a popular example.²⁷

In speech, the *narratio* provides a factual account; that is, background information. Although factual narratives may be quite long in oratory, most rhetoricians suggest they be brief. Without the truly external circumstances and a lack of linguistic specificity to the external, what background does a musical case really need? If rigidly forced to employ this most common forensic model, one might consider the NGT fugue theme(s) themselves to constitute a musical *narratio*, because these themes suggest emotional content with their melodic design, key/mode, and musical figures and motives: these are the facts with which the musical speech will work. One might instead reasonably consider the opening toccata to contain both *exordial* and

²⁵Mattheson, 753.

²⁶Kircher, as translated in Snyder, 251.

²⁷As a prelude to the musical speech (fugues), motivically related *exordia* might display musical invention frozen in time on a score—an improviser searches out and strikes upon figures and then “fugues” on the relevant ones, like “flute-players [who] begin by playing whatever they can execute skilfully [sic] and attach it to the key-note” (Aristotle, 427). With highly related *exordia*, such as in BuxWV 137, one might expect that the *exordium* was planned to introduce the musical speech's subject, but that the improvisatory character artfully disguises any sense of the overly deliberate, “so that the discourse seems unprepared” ([Pseudo-Cicero], *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, trans. Harry Caplan, reprint ed. (Loeb Classical Library, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 21). See also Longinus, *On the Sublime*, trans. W. H. Fyfe (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 231. On the popularity of the latter text during the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, see George Alexander Kennedy, *A New History of Classical Rhetoric* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), 191.

narrative purposes, as opening sections “prelude” on the key. It might even make sense to divide the opening free passages into two halves, one more introductory and one supposedly more expository in nature;²⁸ but, such subdivision seems unnatural and unnecessary. No musical passages seem to truly recount a history, nor is there a true musical need for a rhetorical *narratio*, as in law.²⁹ Because no section in the NGT truly achieves a *narratio* purpose, it is best left out of a musical-rhetorical metaphor. Despite being common to forensic oratory, after all, the *narratio* in rhetorical theory is an optional component: “A speech has two parts. It is [only] necessary to state the subject and then to prove it.”³⁰ That is, the body of the speech (*propositio/confirmatio*) is all that matters.

With the *propositio*, an orator not only states his topic but often also outlines the organization of subsequent arguments in the body of the speech. At this point, he/she does not yet do any actual proving of points. For instance, one might say in a *propositio*, “In the court of law, I’m going to show he is guilty, for (1) this murder was to his advantage, (2) he felt it was unlikely he would be caught, and (3) he had opportunity.” After the points are briefly listed, the orator immediately proceeds into the body of the speech by proving each point listed in the

²⁸Lena Jacobsen is the only analyst who attempts this subdivision. As Jacobsen cites, the qualities of a good *narratio* are brevity and clarity (Lena Jacobson, “Musical Rhetoric in Buxtehude’s Free Organ Works,” *Organ Year Book XIII* (1982), 66). As an example, she cites the fugato in BuxWV 137, which strikes me much more as a digression from the ongoing recitative-like rhetoric. In BuxWV 147, she then correctly identifies a fugato in BuxWV 147 as a digression. In a specious argument, Jacobsen feels that, along with the sections’ lengths, the very shortness of the musical figures gives some *narrationes* a sensation of brevity. She claims the imitation of motives in BuxWV 153, m. 5, is a feature of the *narratio*. None of the above truly tell a story containing the facts prior to a case, as in oratory. Still, I believe there is potential in this idea of *exordium/narration* yet to be teased out by an imaginative analyst.

²⁹Mattheson’s description is similar to the rhetoric *narratio*, but the analytical application to Marcello’s aria phrase seems questionable. See Mattheson, 753.

³⁰Aristotle, *The “Art” of Rhetoric*, trans. John Henry Freese (Cambridge: Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, 1926), 425. Aristotle in fact derides the use of *narratio* in the other two types of oratory, deliberative and epideictic.

propositio.³¹ At the beginning of first fugues, the theme enters by itself, so that a listener clearly knows the subject of the musical speech. The setting of the theme (*propositio*), e.g., a contrapuntal complex, during the fugal exposition, tells the listener what mode of argumentation the composer will take (fugue) and how he intends to musically “prove” the subject during the body of the work (complement relations, invertible counterpoint, etc.). An orator, for instance, might enumerate all possible reasons for guilt in the *propositio* and then methodically prove or refute each in the speech’s body. (See Speech 1.)

The body of orations normally contain several proofs (*confirmationes*) and/or often rebuttals (*confutationes*), depending on the nature and purpose of the discourse. Their order and number are variable. In *encomia*, for instance, only *confirmationes* may be needed (if at all), while most forensic cases at some point require rebuttals. Whatever their order, the *confirmationes* should always prove the points listed in the *propositio*. Later in the paper, I will argue that one can perform seemingly logical proof—and show how smart one is—through fugue by interchanging the vertical location of the themes, such as with invertible counterpoint, or by using complement relations between successive points of imitation (horizontal). The fugal process continues until it has seemingly performed all the actions promised in the *propositio*.³²

Although this paper primarily examines the construction of the *propositiones* and *confirmationes* in NGTs, I should introduce other internal musical-rhetorical functions. In *confutationes*, a rhetor forecasts arguments that someone may use against a case, and rebuts

³¹In early classical rhetoric, the *propositio* grew out of the *confirmationes*: “Some rhetoricians added other parts. At the beginning of the proof often a ‘proposition’ and a ‘distribution’ of headings is discussed” (Kennedy, *A New History*, 5). Mattheson does not mention the outlining of the argument as part of his musical *propositio* (Mattheson, 754).

³²The association between argumentation and fugue seems strong throughout the literature. Even the Mattheson’s aria analysis involves imitation during the *confirmatio*.

them. One might proceed, for instance, to answer a rhetorical question such as “Could a foreigner have secretly climbed the city’s walls instead? No. They are guarded at night, and during the day all would see.” Such logical counterargument occurs only infrequently in music, but later I shall display two texted musical examples and a masterful parody of one in BuxWV 140. Music, instead, provides a myriad of ways to introduce contrary affections through a change of key, introduction of foreign themes and material, breaking up motives, and even humor. Passages employing these techniques are more alike to an emotional counter-proof than to logic.³³ Such contrary musical statements strengthen a theme and its affections by contrast.³⁴

Other types of internal free sections are musically related to the *confutatio*, in that they are non-thematic, but they exhibit essentially distinct musical-rhetorical purposes. In a *digressio*, for instance, the composer/orator primarily wishes to relieve listeners from the tedium of an involved argument, but may also obfuscate embarrassing facts through delay, create anticipation for new items, reestablish the audience’s attention (often through humor), or simply lend gravity to what is essentially trivial. Second fugues of NGTs more commonly contain *digressiones* to relieve the listener from excessive straightforward proving of the mode and theme.

Especially long or complicated speeches, on the other hand, might require internal introductions (*exordia*), restatements of facts (*narrationes*), or summaries (*perorationes*) in order

³³As Aristotle and his successors recognized, three general categories of proof can be used to confirm a proposition or rebut contrary views: (1) *logos* (enthymeme/dialectic), (2) *ethos* (appeal to authority or social standing), and (3) *pathos* (emotional pleas) (Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 17). Aristotle’s categories remain throughout subsequent rhetorical theory.

³⁴The passages Mattheson marks *confutatio* involve thematic development and modulation. Doubting that music can really refute, Sharon Gorman criticizes Jacobsen for calling internal free passages *confutationes*, and she generally labels such sections as *digressiones*, internal *perorationes*, or internal *exordia* (Sharon Lee Gorman, “Rhetoric and Affect in the Organ Praeludia of Dieterich Buxtehude (1637–1707)” (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1990)).

to keep the listener understanding the speech or simply to sustain an audience's attention. All these types of internal sections are up to the discretion of the speech writer (optional), and thus presumably not included on Cicero's or Mattheson's basic stock formulas. In my analyses, incidentally, I label passages that exhibit both *confutatio* and *confirmatio* characteristics as *argumentatio* (A), or a combination of proving and refuting. The function of these relatively rare sections, *argumentationes*, are often not musically distinct, because of breakdown of textures, motives, and modulation. (Often the theme may be present but not in a contrapuntal texture and/or the wrong key to fulfill requirements of standard musical-logical discourse.) In summary, the order and number of internal sections (proofs and optional passages) in orations and musical works vary considerably, depending on genre, venue, topic, and the complexity (or difficulty) of a case.

A conclusion (*peroratio*) of a speech is vital to driving points home, eliciting sympathy, and, most important, securing the speech in the listeners' minds.³⁵ One may simply summarize an oration by recapping one's arguments, as in *ritornelli*, rondos, and ternary forms, but a properly rhetorical *peroratio* must make an "appeal to the emotions."³⁶ NGTs do not perform a dry summary (although one might hear, for instance, the last entry of the second fugue in BuxWV 162 as an internal *peroratio* to the fugal section). Other methods involve repetition to amplify key points, as with ciaccona and other musical-rhetorical repetition figures. The ground bass of BuxWV 148, for instance, clearly achieves a conclusion and cements the theme in listeners' memories. By exceeding the normal range upper voice or the introduction of

³⁵For Aristotle, the *peroratio* has four purposes: "to dispose the hearer favourably towards oneself and unfavourably towards the adversary; to amplify and depreciate; to excite the emotions of the hearer; to recapitulate" (Aristotle, 467). In his discussion of the fourth point, he suggests frequent repetition, perhaps like a *passacaglia*, is more appropriate to *perorationes* (ibid., 469).

³⁶Quintilian, 6.1.2, 416–17.

accidentals, the variations in BuxWV 148 simultaneously increase the emotional fervor.

Rhetoric manuals also advise against introducing new themes or developing new arguments when finally concluding.

As Aristotle states, conclusions put “the hearers into an emotional frame of mind.”³⁷ The emotional intensity should exceed that in the *exordium*.³⁸ Thus, pleas for pity, mercy, condemnation, and the like are common towards the end of speeches. Similarly, Buxtehude and Bruhns often capture audiences’ attention and thrill them with an unexpected silence and a final flourish, e.g., BuxWV 137, 140, 149; Bruhns em (bigger), and so forth. In his *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*, Mattheson specifically prescribes this: “The closes, where one breaks off suddenly, *ex abrupto*, also provide useful means to arouse the emotions here.”³⁹ *Perorationes* aim towards securing a compelling performance in listeners minds, whether or not a composer presents a synopsis.

In summary, similar free textures (the “toccata sections”) perform different musical-rhetorical functions within the NGT genre, while fugal procedures generally substitute for logical proof found in oratory. As an orator should understand the purpose and organization of her speech, keyboardists need to perceive musical-rhetoric organization, the diversity of musical-rhetorical purposes, and rhetorical gestures in NGTs.⁴⁰ With BuxWV 140 and other works, I will

³⁷John Henry Freese in his summary of Aristotle, li. Aristotle says “One should rouse the hearer to certain emotions—pity, indignation, anger, hate, jealousy, emulation, and quarrelsomeness” (Aristotle, 469).

³⁸Quintilian, 4.1.28, 20–21. Also *ibid.*, 6.1.29, 400–401.

³⁹Mattheson, 755.

⁴⁰The common intuition that fugue should be played more regularly and that free sections (often *stylus phantasticus*) should be played more wildly reflect the compositional styles of more plain writing and more ornate styles, just as in rhetorical theories of style and delivery thereof. Cicero recommends that “the plain style is best for proof, the middle style for delighting, the vehement style for moving the passions” (Cicero, *On the Orator* 69, summarized in Kennedy, *A New History*, 157). Also see St. Augustine, *On Christian Doctrine*, 136ff.

suggest how a performer's knowledge of musical rhetoric immediately informs registration, phrasing, pacing, and touch.

A Sample Musical-Rhetorical Reading: *Praeludium in d*, BuxWV 140

As previously mentioned, the *Praeludium in d*, BuxWV 140, seems an ideal representative of the alternation principle (Table 3, first row). Below, I will show below that a musical-rhetorical interpretation (Table 3, second row) provides a richer interpretation. As speech writers and analysts label passages according to their rhetorical purpose and features, I will similarly not force the music into a rigid forensic formula. Instead, I will examine the musical-rhetorical effect of each section, allowing for the omission of the *narratio* and a second set of proofs with its own *propositio*.

The *exordium* (E) employs several figures intended to capture an audience's attention: (1) a dramatic opening dissonance, *inchoatia imperfecta*, (2) descending cascades of sixteenth notes (*catabasis*),⁴¹ and (3) fast, loud passage work on the manuals and especially the pedals. (See Example 8.) These introductory features simultaneously earn the audience's confidence and establish the performer's *ethos*: he can play. (Listen to CD, Track 14.)

While capturing the audience's attention, the *exordium* of BuxWV 140 prepares the listener for what will occur later. As I shall mention later, the downward scales, melodic rests, parallel thirds, and other motives gain significance in the body of the speech. Taken together, these suggestive features arguably suggest the mood of the piece. Demarked by silences, the

⁴¹Ascending scales (*anabasis*) are the norm in the *praeludium* genre. Thus, the opening *catabasis* gesture further suggests a darker topic. Other works with *catabasis*, BuxWV 146 and BuxWV 155, begin with and emphasize downward gestures. An exception, the perfectly happy *praeludium* BuxWV 162 contains some downward opening motions.

especially dramatic moves in mm. 12–13 and mm. 15–16 engage the listener through rhetorical questions or asides, somewhat like whispering “Could our hero be dead?” The half cadence and ending melodic second were recognized during the century as indicative of questions (although questions usually end with an upward inflection), and the homophonic passages (*noëma*) suggest a quiet performance on a secondary manual: “When introduced at the right time, it [*noëma*] sweetly affects and wondrously soothes the ears, or indeed the heart.”⁴² Loud block chords destroy this effect. Furthermore, silence usually connotes death, sleep, gasps of weeping, or other like topics. The ensuing *catabasis* (descending passage) seem to darkly answer the musical questions. The dramatic silences (*aposiopesis*) permit easy manual and/or registration changes.

While such gestures perhaps suggest a topic or mood, establish the performer’s *ethos*, and capture the audience’s attention, others simply earn listeners’ goodwill through elegance of musical speech. The compound melody (*heterolepsis*) throughout fashions a *stylus-luxurians* style—the passage is not a smooth, unaffected species counterpoint. In summary, performers should recognize these sort of affective, rhetorical, and stylish gestures and musical figures. A performance that depends solely on fast tempi and alternating textures may astonish listeners, but will miss the other purposes behind numerous *exordial* features.

Like a good speaker who informs the audience of necessary background and his approach (*propositio*), and who then proceeds into the body of the speech for proofs (*confirmationes* and *confutationes*), Buxtehude’s musical speech states its materials (theme) and the procedure (fugue); then he proves his theme through the body of the fugue. In m. 20 (Example 9), the audience literally discovers the work’s subject. Before then, listeners may be excited by the

⁴²Joachim Burmeister, *Musical Poetics*, trans. Benito V. Rivera (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 165.

music, but they can only make an educated guess at the musical and affective message.⁴³ In BuxWV 140, the *propositio* (fugal exposition), mm. 20–27 (Example 9), defines the contrapuntal complex with which the theme and mode will be proved in every voice. The succeeding point of imitation, a *confirmatio* (Cn) in mm. 28–36, fulfills the promise of invertible counterpoint and displays other musical devices one expects from the initial proposition. (Listen to CD, Track 15.) After these elements, the *propositio* (exposition) and a *confirmatio* (later points of imitation), such fugues generally disintegrate into a flourish (f), because one has proved one’s point and does not generally need further argumentation.⁴⁴ Later in the paper, I will address musical logic more directly.

The so-called *confutatio* (Cf) in mm. 45–54 (Example 10) abruptly switches from the fugue’s tragic-heroic character to a wistful non-thematic atmosphere. The unstable tonal center and unpredictable rhythms suggest Athanasius Kircher’s description of the affection of love, a “combination of longing & joy—unstable; calm tempo; rhythm sometimes fast and slow; contrasting intervals reflecting longing & joy.”⁴⁵ Perhaps a sweet flute would be suitable for this affection, but another affection might be projected by alternative registrations and performance techniques. Whatever contrary affection is chosen, this musical section is not logical but rather emotional,⁴⁶ and, depending on one’s point of view, it constitutes either a rebuttal or a

⁴³Although introductions are not necessarily related to bodies, the scales of both themes (subject and countersubject) are essentially descending scales, one punctuated by rests and one chromatic. The two move together in parallel thirds, like passagework of the opening.

⁴⁴The flourish might be considered a small internal *peroratio*.

⁴⁵Bartel, *Musica Poetica*, 37.

⁴⁶Argumentation need not be logical, but can be emotional or ethical (Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 17). This paper examines “logical proof” in the NGT, but this section may present the musical equivalent of an ethical counterargument. Our “hero” of BuxWV 140 exhibits both strength and tragic qualities, but not the rebuttal’s fickle affection of love.

digression. In either case, the contrary affection is quickly swept aside. (Listen to CD, Track 16.)

The quizzical passage in mm. 55–64 (Example 11) has been often considered fugue,⁴⁷ because it presents two brief points of imitation on a consistent theme. Any fugue teacher, however, would award such a miserable “fugue” a failing grade. Imitation occurs at successive ascending fourths (E-A-D-G in mm. 55–58 and A-D-G-C in mm. 58–60) fails to reinforce any modal boundaries. Why would Buxtehude, a master of seventeenth-century fugue who personally knew the fugal theorists of his day, construct such a poor fugue? This *stretto*-like passage does not constitute a confirmation fugue; rather it forecasts and mocks a potential argument of the musician/orator’s imagined opponent through the rhetorical figure *prosōpopoeiae*⁴⁸). It is a counterargument (*confutatio*) that “proves” an intentionally stupid, short, foreign theme. Imitations at unusual intervals in the seventeenth-century were used for texts containing false witness, as in Schütz’s passion (Example 12). In the midst of the bad argument in BuxWV 140, the opponent’s point becomes mired in wrong notes (accidentals) and spasmodic rhythms involving especially slow and fast rhythms (mm. 60–64). (Listen to CD, Track 17.) This poorly constructed and foreign argument collapses under its own weight, suggesting the orator’s opponent lacks acuity at logic.⁴⁹

⁴⁷Gorman, 99 and 102. Citing tenuous motivic connections, Gorman considers this a *confirmatio* section with “somewhat irregular” entrances, and she does not recognize the significance of the “poignant affective gestures.”

⁴⁸For an example of this technique, *prosōpopoeiae*, one can read Cicero’s speaking as if he were his oratorical enemy Clodius in *For Caelius* (Kennedy, *A New History*, 139–40). This figure was common in funeral sermons throughout the seventeenth century. See Gregory Scott Johnston, “Protestant Funeral Music and Rhetoric in Seventeenth-century Germany: A Musical-rhetorical Examination of the Printed Sources” (Ph.D. Dissertation: University of British Columbia, 1987).

⁴⁹Some analysts who want to develop an especially dramatic interpretation, incidentally, might claim that the actual opponent—some dufas—speaks, as in theater, but the speech-writer is mimicking the opponent’s argument. A dramatic interpretation pushes beyond rhetoric into the realm of theater and dialogue, because it claims multiple characters speaking, rather than one speech, in which the audience hears a one-sided oration. In a rhetorical

Unlike proper fugues, this “anti-fugue” might best be played unpredictably, as if imitations were inserted into a *stylus phantasticus* passage.⁵⁰ A performer might overemphasize the poor quality of its laconic theme. An organist might even intentionally accent awkward juxtapositions of note durations and introduction of unfortunate accidentals, through stopping and starting. Mattheson prescribes such wild playing for these sorts of *stylus phantasticus* passages,⁵¹ rather than employing a more regular pacing expected of fugues. To imitate the voice of the imagined opponent, an organist might even choose a craggy, old krummhorn stop with a dopey pedal registration for the ill-formed argument. It is as if a rival organist failed to improvise a successful fugue. Such a rhetorical image profoundly affects performance interpretations.

At the end of this poor, foreign argument in m. 64, the original fugue theme boldly reenters, this time cast in 3/4 meter. This initiates a strong set of proofs (Cn) in a second fugue (Example 13). This fugue triumphs over all contrary arguments and affections, virtually saying “No! This tragic heroic mood is what this musical-speech is about. The contrasting affections and themes are foreign.” (Listen to CD, Track 18.) Although the musical orator’s case was made during the first fugue, the memory of rebuttals are best swept away. Proving the same theme through different means strengthens Buxtehude’s case immeasurably. This second fugue ends with rests punctuating two *amplificationes* of the theme in mm. 91–97, in which the descending scales are obvious. The brilliant move to F major yields a triumphant almost heroic

reading, the fugue on a foreign subject by a musician/orator might actually have been attractive to an imagined opponent but it will be cast in a negative light for a *confutatio*. Rhetorical theory, however, does allow for interrogation in forensic rhetoric (Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 463–67).

⁵⁰Perhaps such uses of fughetta in *stylus phantasticus* works leads Mattheson to state that “one must know what fugues are before one can construct toccatas”(Mattheson, 478).

⁵¹See translations of Mattheson in Kerala J. Snyder, *Dieterich Buxtehude, Organist in Lübeck* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1987), 250.

effect diverging from the darker connotations of the minor key and its chromatic countersubject. This is more like an affective argument praising the accomplishments of a deceased hero.

After the fugue and the *Uralinie* close in m. 102, the conclusion (*peroratio*) begins. (Listen to CD, Track 19.) If music speech used *ritornello* or ternary form, the refrain would return as a summary. A chaconne might be well placed here to reiterate the subject, without the introduction of new argumentation or material. But, with such strong proof through two fugues and an imitative rebuttal, either musical procedure would probably be excessive. Instead, this conclusion impresses the listener with the performer's skill, somewhat like the *exordium*, while further securing the affection and motives. True to its rhetorical purpose and seemingly following Mattheson's later advice, this *peroratio* section provides a memorable end with a silence in m. 117. As a result, the last measures parallel emotional outbursts so common to the ends of public orations.⁵² (Listen to CD, Track 20.)

In summary, this *praeludium* compels the listeners with a dramatic but wordless speech. It does not bore audiences with an inexplicable alternation touted by repertory books:

Oh, yes. Here's another T-F-T-F'T'-F-T scheme. I don't know why he appended so many [diverse] sections. Maybe I should just stop playing after the second toccata—no one would know the difference.⁵³

A musical-rhetorical interpretation can replace a dispassionate taxonomy with a dynamic temporal analogy.

⁵²In the peroration of Demosthenes's *Against Androtion*, for instance, "omits a recapitulation and is devoted to awakening the emotions of the jury" (Kennedy, *A New History*, 72).

⁵³Focusing on tonal analysis, Archbold concludes *praeludia* fall into three sections: the opening, the first fugue, and the remaining sections, if any (Archbold, 14). As previously argued, earlier scholars such as Apel and Powell also provide little explanation of the patterns. But, Plato and many rhetoricians emphasize that speeches (and artworks generally) must work somewhat like an organism, "with parts suitably fitted to each other and to the whole, arranged not at random but in an order that expresses meaning or purpose" (James H. Nichols, Jr., commentary to Plato's *Phaedrus* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998), 106). See Plato, *Phaedrus*, 72–75. A speech's ordering should be clear and logical (Nichols, 97), and it should be about a topic (Plato, 74).

Fugue as Proof: *Confirmationes* in First Fugues

A truly rhetorical analysis of music must contain an explanation of musical proof; that is, the structure of a musical-rhetorical speech's body.⁵⁴ In the first sentence of his rhetoric treatise, Aristotle clearly exhorts the importance logical proof: "Rhetoric is a counterpart of dialectic." He continues, "Proofs are the only things in it [rhetoric] that come within the province of art; everything else is merely an accessory."⁵⁵ Although Aristotle discusses many important categories of proofs, Aristotle develops the concept of and various methods of enthymeme, the rhetorical version of dialectic throughout the treatise. Without a musical equivalent, we do not have a valid analogy between rhetoric and music.

Fortunately, composers of the north-German toccata purposely imbue fugues with a feeling of a logic analogous to enthymeme (the rhetorical version of syllogism) found in oratory: Like rhetoric uses enthymeme, music has its own version of syllogism, fugue. As Ban states, rhetoric and music share the same goals, but "the musician uses different means." (Probably for this reason, one never finds a Buxtehude *praeludium* without a fugue, but one can find fugues that are not *praeludia*.) The perceived musical logic in NGT can be most easily observed in major-keyed *praeludia*, and the procedures discovered there can be applied to minor-keyed *praeludia* where Burmeister's figures (often manipulations of fugal techniques) can be more commonly observed. As one would expect, knowing the specific structures of musical

⁵⁴This issue has not been adequately nor critically examined in modern music literature. The discussion of this literature will be postponed to the end of this paper in order to give the reader sufficient background and examples to understand the discussion.

⁵⁵Aristotle, 3–4.

arguments is as important to a musician as knowing enthymemes is to an orator.⁵⁶

When listeners remark that a musical process such as fugue seems logical, they are responding to the forecasting of future argumentation and its subsequent fulfillment. As it turns out, an analysis of successive points of imitation—not the “traditional” subject-answer pairs but rather groups of four entries—generally displays such a relationship. Furthermore, points of imitation segment NGT fugues aptly into sensible musical units that are somewhat like paragraphing in prose or oratory.⁵⁷ Fugue in the NGT does more than impress a listener with a theme through sheer repetition of thematic entries—fugues are not a series of unarticulate musical utterances—they present a somewhat predictable procedure with purposes analogous to enthymeme.⁵⁸

The fugue in Buxtehude’s *Praeludium in C*, BuxWV 137 (Tables 4a–c), employs the most common fugal “logic”: complement relations between successive points of imitation. (Listen to CD, Track 2.) Notice the S-A-S-A diagonal of exposition entries in mm. 36–42. For every subject in the exposition, an answer appears in the next point of imitation, mm. 43–48; and, likewise, for every answer in the exposition, a subject appears in the next point of imitation. What is being proved? The mode and also the theme. The presentation of a subject and its tonal answer in each voice virtually ensures that all modal boundaries are emphasized in all voice

⁵⁶Because fugues in this genre rarely modulate, they can easily lend themselves to a monotonous series of tonic-and-dominant thematic entries; this fact probably led Apel to further deride many of Buxtehude’s fugues (Apel, 616). Apel’s somewhat pale view of Buxtehude’s accomplishments contrasts Spitta’s: “A just estimate demands that, as Mozart’s symphonies stand their ground next to those of Beethoven, so too Buxtehude, with his preludes and fugues, his chaconnes and passecailles [sic], should retain his place next to Bach” (Spitta, 283). Those bored by Buxtehude’s fugues are not listening for the right features.

⁵⁷For the performer, this “paragraphing” might seem equivalent to classical-music phrasing. For late eighteenth-century phrase theory, see Koch and Riepel in Strunk source readings (Oliver Strunk, ed., *Source Readings in Music History*, rev. Leo Treitler (New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1998).

⁵⁸Aristotle only permits a series of statements to form a speech’s body in epideictic oratory: “In epideictic speeches, amplification is employed, as a rule, to prove that things are honourable or useful; for the facts must be taken on trust, since proofs of these are rarely given, and only if they are incredible” (Aristotle, 453).

ranges and that every scale degree is played in every voice—that is, the mode is proved.

(Seventeenth-century composers did not have a theory of harmonic progression to establish key centers.) What could be stronger proof of the mode? Despite disagreement over particulars, seventeenth-century composers and theorists advocated mode (key) as one of the most important carriers of affect, probably the ultimate artistic goal.⁵⁹ The importance of key affections cannot be overemphasized, as it is an inherently important issue whenever fugue is used, and also one of the most important compositional choices during the *inventio* within any genre.

In BuxWV 137, the musical setting reinforces the perception of the points of imitation and thus highlights this process. The strongest cadences often occur in the bass after each point. Often at such junctures, the contrapuntal texture significantly changes, e.g., voices drop out. See mm. 43, 49, 56, 67 in Example 14. Buxtehude's fugue in BuxWV 137 leads organists to naturally emphasize the points of imitation; i.e., performers seemingly “paragraph” their musical speech. Notice also that this straight-forward fugue contains no significant *digressiones*, other than those that precede cadences that terminate points of imitation. This *praeludium* incidentally uses a redundant entry (Burmeister's *palilogia*) at the end of the first fugue. Some might consider this mini-summary to be part of an internal *peroratio*, although it seems to start in m. 65 with the traditional flourish. Later on, incidentally, the emphasis of repetition through a ground bass (Burmeister's *anaphora*) later on successfully substitutes “proof by amplification” for reiteration of musical proof expected in a second fugue. Such chaconnes seem to simultaneously provide the summary-like sensation of a *peroratio*.

Buxtehude's *Praeludium in G*, BuxWV 162 (Tables 5a–5c), also demonstrates the simple

⁵⁹Gregory Butler claims that theorists considered fugue to not only have a regarded intellectual/technical component, but also “a highly expressive and affective musical force” (Gregory Butler, “Fugue and Rhetoric,” *Journal of Music Theory* 21 (1977): 50).

pattern of proving the mode through complement relations (S-A-S-A in mm. 16–22 and A-S-A-S in mm. 22–30) during its first fugue. Like most complete themes, the subject contains a melodic cadence, tempting the performer to rest approximately every two bars or to randomly select points for longer phrasing. Underneath this, however, the more structural cadences (“paragraphing”) again occur at the ends of points of imitation in mm. 22, 30, and 35. After proving the mode during the first two points of imitation, the contrapuntal texture continues but without a logical need. This slow breakdown of the fugal texture (mm. 31–39) thereby provides a seamless and playful conclusion (internal *peroratio*) to the fugue. Notice, once again, this proper proof contains no *digressiones*.

The second fugue of BuxWV 162 incidentally presents simple proof. I return later to the prominent use of second themes (countersubjects) and invertible counterpoint—an extremely important and telling practice developed in north-German fugal theory—and I will discuss several of its potential musical-rhetorical purposes.

Lübeck’s *Praeambulum in G* (Tables 6a–6b) also presents the most stereotypical (simplest) fugal structures. (Listen to CD, Track 22.) The S-A-S-A diagonal of exposition entries in mm. 33–43 is obviously complemented by the A-S-A-S diagonal entries in mm. 44–55. (Interestingly, this is the same pattern employed in Buxtehude’s *praeludium* of the same key discussed above.) Once again, by virtually covering the entire gamut—all the modal scale degrees and modal boundaries with a subject and an answer in every voice over the course of two points of imitation—one proves the mode. The first entrance virtually says, “This is the material I’m working with,” while the first point of imitation (the *propositio*, P) states “This is what I’m going to do with this subject: fugal technique and S-A complements.” In m. 44, the composer fulfills his promise in the body of the fugue with a musical proof (*confirmatio*, Cn):

“Here’s the musical proof!” After the straight-forward proving of G major, the fugue dissipates. In a key known for cheerful simplicity, the confirmations of the second fugue operate in the same way.

Unlike the previously discussed works, the texture of Lübeck’s fugue obscures the points of imitation. Instead, brief *digressiones* subtly separate the points of imitation. (In Buxtehude’s music, *digressiones* rarely interrupt proof presented in first fugues.) The brief digression in m. 43 seamlessly connects the half cadence at the end of the bass entrance to a first-inversion tonic chord on m. 44 for the beginning of the *confirmatio*. (See Example 15.) Likewise, the longer digression in mm. 54–55 relieves some tedium of excessive musical proof, simply connecting the first-inversion tonic triads at the beginning of m. 54 to that in m. 56. This more continuous contrapuntal texture and more subtle indications of musical-rhetorical sections point towards eighteenth-century fugue.

In m. 47, the bass voice cadences and drops out right in the middle of the alto’s thematic entry—a rare situation. Thus, a performer here must choose either to disrupt the flow of the theme to cadence well with the bass (strange), or one can follow the musical-rhetorical design and choose melodic cadences (more natural). The latter interpretation seems more natural, but it rarely occurs to performers trained today on standard harmonic analysis, because one routinely looks for cadences in the bass. In terms of short-term phrasing, the rhetorical structure and absolute musical form diverge significantly. The performer must negotiate between these interpretations.

In summary, complement relations provide a process analogous in effect to simple rhetorical proof, but through purely traditional musical means. Rhetorical *propositiones* outline points and often indicate a method of proof. Likewise, fugal expositions announce the theme

and method of proof, while succeeding points of imitation fulfill the promised actions through complement relationships. In the most succinct *praeludia*, only two fully developed points of imitation are required for complement relations to prove the mode in each voice.

Strengthening the Sensation of Proof: Invertible Counterpoint

Although complement relations provide sufficient proof of a mode and a theme, north-German theorists developed the techniques of invertible counterpoint, probably to further strengthen the sensation of rhetorical proof (enthymeme⁶⁰). A composer can be seen to outline potential arguments with a contrapuntal complex in the *propositio*, which are subsequently fulfilled through inverting the complex within the body of the fugue (*confirmationes*). This process may seem more analogous to standard argumentation in oratory: proof by contraries, proof by comparison, dialectical reasoning, enthymeme, and the like. These procedures are easily found in works by Buxtehude's successors, Bruhns and Lübeck (not to mention J. S. Bach). By then, the procedure seems well worked out, both in theory and practice.

Bruhns's *Praeludium in e* (Tables 7a–7c), not only presents standard complement relations; Bruhns also employs invertible counterpoint to strengthen his argument. (Listen to CD, Track 7.) The first point of imitation presents a contrapuntal complex, that is, a proposed argument. (See Table 7a.) The languishing *passus duriusculus* (chromatic descent) of the first theme is quite distinct from the lively repeated-note theme above it. (See Example 16.) After a

⁶⁰In a superficial but perhaps sufficient reading, the first theme might be considered the major premise (e.g., “All men are mortal”) of a syllogism, while the second theme would be the minor premise (“Socrates is a man”). The conclusion (“Socrates is mortal”) seems lacking in music. In enthymeme, the premises may, first of all probabilities rather than certain truths, and, more important, the steps of reasoning may be assumed. One might even just state the premises without the conclusion, or the conclusion without the one or both premises (“Socrates is mortal”). For this reason, musicians might consider the structure of double counterpoint to be close to enthymeme. One might even push this concept of musical enthymeme further to describe complement relations. The subject is the major premise (e.g., D-A of Dorian), while the answer is the minor (e.g., A-D of Dorian). Then conclusion is the experience of mode or the actual playing of all the notes of the gamut.

clearly divisive cadence in m. 49–50, the second point of imitation in the body of the fugue fulfills the promise: The second themes occur below the first. In this work, the first fugue seems to use proof by contraries: a slow morose theme contrasts a fast repeated theme. Such “proof” occurs Thucydides’s history (Speech 2), in which the slow Spartans contrast the more dynamic Athenians. Aristotle states that “contraries are easily understood [by audiences] and even more so when placed side by side, and also because antithesis resembles a syllogism [logic].”⁶¹ Recognizing proof by antithesis in Bruhns’s *praeludium*, one might play each theme with a contrasting style representative of their respective affections, as if one were reading Thucydides’s passage aloud. (Music however has the advantage of being capable of contrasting themes simultaneously, while speech must state contraries successively in time.) Towards the end of the fugue, Bruhns significantly uses emotive figures such as *noëma*, *aposiopesis*, and *saltus durusculus*. This shows the *stylus-luxurians* techniques commonly associated with *confutationes* encroaching upon *confirmationes* as the north-German style progressed; such musical figures heighten the expressivity of minor-keyed fugues written at the end of the compositional period under study. Also, it suggests a sort of upwelling of emotions appropriate to the work’s overall affection.

Lübeck’s *Praeludium in g* (Table 8a–8d) not only demonstrates logic with countersubjects; it also exhibits *confutatio*-like argumentation encroaching into the traditionally *confirmationes*-like sections (fugue). Digressions (*digressiones*) and musical development of themes (*argumentationes*) obscure the standard logical patterns and regular thematic entries, creating a sense of rebuttal and confirmations together (“*argumentatio*”) within NGT fugue. By Bach’s time, this practice perhaps reduced the need for distinct musical-rhetorical sections

⁶¹Aristotle, 393. Aristotle states antithesis is concise and instructive (*ibid.*, 413).

differentiated by rhetorical effect and purpose, and led to fugues as self-contained musical forms without the distinct contrasts of textures in NGTs. In Bach's music, one easily senses confirming arguments and diverging from argumentation within a continuous contrapuntal texture in a way that we generally do not observe in Buxtehude's. We do, however, see signs of this development in Bruhns's and Lübeck's free works.

In the *Praeludium in G*, BuxWV 162 (previously discussed and in Tables 5a–5c), the second fugue also presents invertible counterpoint. Did Buxtehude's use of this procedure influence later composers, such as Bruhns and Lübeck? An even stronger parallel between the master and his students may be the more prolonged use of *digressiones* in second fugues. As in speeches saturated with extended proof, such digressions relieve the tedium of logic, especially when presented with a second set of proofs: i.e., variety is just as important as logic to persuasion.

Musical Enthymeme in BuxWV 140

Returning finally to the investigation of musical-rhetoric in Buxtehude's BuxWV 140, we can now see that its first fugue displays the stronger invertible counterpoint with three themes as well as the standard logic of complement relations (Table 9a–c). (Listen to CD, Track 15.) The second countersubject (CS2) occurs consistently above the first countersubject (CS), and the first countersubject above subjects and answers. During the second point of imitation, the significant rearrangements of the themes occurs: the theme (S or A) occurs above the countersubjects, the second countersubject occurs below the first one, and the subject is placed between the two countersubjects. Unlike the double-counterpoint observed in other works, Buxtehude thankfully does not perform all the permutations in every voice part over the course

of numerous points of imitation in BuxWV 140. (The answer, for instance, never occurs with the countersubject above and second countersubject below.) Buxtehude's presentation is aurally convincing enough—all that matters in a musical speech is a convincing musical presentation, not a theoretically complete listing of all possibilities. In fact, a prolonged presentation of all permutations would be perhaps the worst rhetorical move possible: its tediousness would lose the audience.⁶² A logician but not an orator would be so completely pedantic; and such a hypothetical musical piece would be better placed in a treatise.⁶³

More important than an iron-clad presentation of inverted counterpoints is the proof of the mode. The bass voice in the second point of imitation, mm. 27–36, does not receive its complement (Table 9a). As soon as the third point of imitation does present the expected complement in mm. 40–42, the first fugue evaporates into a flourish and cadence (mm. 42–44), seemingly following Johann Gottfried Walther's later advice: The *Dux* and *Commes* "are exchanged among one another until each voice . . . has had both the *Dux* and the *Comes*."⁶⁴ This explains the necessity of this terse subsection.

At this point, one should note that the two subjects of BuxWV 140 modifies the work's affection: an essentially heroic line (*exclamationes* with rests and leaps) intertwines with a

⁶²Persuasiveness "depends on two things, clarity and familiarity. . . . So to be persuasive we should aim for diction which is not elaborate or inflated. . . . You should not elaborate on everything in punctilious detail but should omit some points for the listener to infer and work out for himself. For when he infers what you have omitted, he is not just listening to you but he becomes your witness and reacts more favourably to you. For he is made aware of his own intelligence through you, who have given him the opportunity to be intelligent. To tell your listener every detail as though he were a fool seems to judge him one" (Demetrius, *On Style*, ed. and trans. Doreen C. Innes (Cambridge, MA: Loeb Library, Harvard University Press, 1995), 480–81). Demetrius's advice seems well applied to Baroque fugue (for expert listeners), including such works as J. S. Bach's *Passacaglia in C Minor*.

⁶³In the *inventio*, the composer might work out all the possible arrangements, like the orator who thinks of all the potential means to argue a case. The *praeludium* BuxWV 140 would require 24 points of imitation to fulfill all of its obligations. But like the orator, the musician will choose a subset of all possible arguments to construct a persuasive case. Presenting all the possible arguments, pro and con, is more of a schoolboy exercise.

⁶⁴Johann Gottfried Walther, *Praecepta der musicalischen Composition* (1708), 185, as translated in Snyder, *Dietrich Buxtehude*, 254.

chromatic descent (*passus duriusculus*). (See Example 9.) With the serious and potentially somber key of D minor, one may think of a fallen hero, suggesting perhaps a noble trumpet stop and stalwart principal. (The cascading descending passages (*catabasis*) and rhetorical questions in the *exordium*, now in retrospect, seem especially appropriate to a darker topic.) This fusing of different species of affections, much like Descartes derivation of secondary passions from primary passions, potentially adds subtlety to general categories of “happy” and “sad” key affections. For the purposes of this paper, however, I can simply claim that the second subject in BuxWV 140 strengthens the primary subject through proof by comparison. Comparison between like items, like metaphor, makes a stronger case and tinges the primary theme with additional meaning. The use of multiple intertwined themes, esp. with one of an ethical character, is a major trait of great speakers such as Demosthenes:

This technique becomes a characteristic feature of Demosthenes’ oratory, known as “psychological planning”: though his speeches usually contain systematic treatment of issue in a logical order, an organic unity of concepts and ideas is achieved by continually playing variations on a small number of themes through the speech. These themes often relate to the moral character of the speaker or the lack of moral character of his opponent.⁶⁵

The use of additional themes (called “countersubjects” today) might be analogous to several different confirmation procedures in rhetoric. Unlike complement relations which simply prove the mode and thereby the affections, invertible counterpoint not only creates a stronger sensation of logic; it also suggests the increasingly prominent role of melody as a theoretical topic and carrier of meaning. Whatever conclusions a performer makes about the purpose of invertible counterpoints, one must think of how additional themes contribute to the

⁶⁵Kennedy, *A New History*, 72ff.

sensation of logic and how they modify the affection of the work as a whole.⁶⁶

Other Experiments in Argumentation

Aristotle defines rhetoric “as the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever.”⁶⁷ In other words, the orator discovers all the possible means of persuasion available and selects the best amongst them, to his or her ability, for a particular case. Musical composition (*musica poetica*) might be seen similarly. Composers consider their subject (theme, key, affection, words), and choose the most persuasive means for their musical goals. Burmeister’s musical-rhetorical figures serve as an early attempt to categorize the many polyphonic musical procedures available at his time. These same figures can occasionally be observed ornamenting or even serving as musical proof within the NGT. For the north-German school of composers, counterpoint was one of the most current theoretical topics; and, fugue in the NGT, as demonstrated below, can be seen as a place in which composers experimented with all “possible means” of contrapuntal persuasion.

In Buxtehude’s *Toccatà in d* (Tables 10a–10d), BuxWV 155, the proof is done by standard means and Burmeister’s *metalepsis*.⁶⁸ That is, the two parts of the theme become separated. The melodic design of the subject suggests this separation in the *propositio* (mm.

⁶⁶Although I mention this modification of meaning in relation to BuxWV 140 here, one can find more detail in a paper in progress (Couch, “Musician as Orator”).

⁶⁷Aristotle, *Rhetoric*, 15.

⁶⁸Unlike some musical figures, such as *anaphora*, that exhibit features analogous to the rhetorical figure with the same Latin name; Burmeister’s musical figure *metalepsis* has little, if no, relationship to the rhetorical one. For this reason, I qualify whenever I use Burmeister’s definitions. Several authors have criticized Burmeister’s figures: Vickers, “Figures,” 35–36; idem., *In Defence*, 364; Harrison, 9; and Paul Mark Walker, “Fugue in German Theory from Dressler to Mattheson.” (Ph.D. diss., SUNY Buffalo, 1987), 136 and 155. The *exordium* of BuxWV 155, incidentally, not only foreshadows subsequent motives, but presents an unusual fugato with a related theme—it is not a digression in the usual sense. Rather, the intentionally hurried effect gives the listener the impression of an impassioned orator jumping into proofs before concluding the introduction properly. After engaging the audience’s through emotional gestures, *noëma* cools the passions somewhat for the subsequent intricate proofs.

28–37), thereby strengthening the sensation of proof when the promised procedure occurs in the *confirmatio* (mm. 36–45). (See Example 17.) This musical figure is rare, but was identified in earlier contrapuntal practice by Burmeister in *Musica Poetica* (1606).

The old *ricerare* technique of inversion (Burmeister's *hypallage*) can ornament standard proof. This can be observed in the second fugue of Reinken's *Toccata in G* (Tables 11a–11c) and the first fugue of Buxtehude's *Praeludium in a*, BuxWV153 (Table 12a–12c). Reinken's first fugue, incidentally, uses standard procedures, and Buxtehude's second fugue approximates what later become complement relations. These two works can be seen as early experiments in other forms of musical-rhetorical proof. Inversion rarely occurs in the *praeludium* genre, and it can be hard to find an internal feature of the *propositio* that forecasts this procedure. In Buxtehude's work, the upwards leap of the answer seems to suggest inversion. (See Example 18.)

In some works, a second subject (countersubjects) can seemingly substitute for an answer within points of imitation. In Buxtehude's *Praeludium in A*, BuxWV 151 (Tables 13a–13c), the countersubject spans the modal degrees expected of an answer but has a somewhat different melodic effect than the subject's (Example 19). Thus, the mode is proved, even if a singular theme is not, over the course of two points of imitation, mm. 23–35. I.e., this demonstrates an early concern for proof of the mode (and presumably for key affections) perhaps over that for melody. (For Mattheson a little later on, melody reigns.)

Without truly proving either theme completely in the traditional way, this work (BuxWV 141) experiments with the semblance of proving two nearly equivalent, intertwined musical themes. Technically, the logic is weak; neither theme receives its full complement in each voice, but aurally it may be good enough. Over the course of the first fugue, nearly every voice

presents the subject and answer, but the countersubject does not really receive its own tonal answer. The closest attempts occur in m. 29–30 and m. 43–44, in which the CS enters on tonic rather than the dominant pitch.

One might consider instead mm. 23–35 as the true first point of imitation, in which each voice gets a subject or an answer. And then take mm. 35–50 or later as a second point, in which nearly every voice gets its complement (S or A). The tenor voice never receives a satisfactory complement. The second fugue, incidentally, does not attempt to prove the mode through complement relations.⁶⁹ Rather, it only proves through invertible counterpoint and then provides repetition figures in lieu of a true *peroratio* for the work. With some relationship to BuxWV 155 in its handling of two themes, BuxWV 151 is obviously another experiment at handling two themes but much closer to later double fugue.

Buxtehude's *Toccatà in F*, BuxWV 156 (Tables 14a–14c), presents the uncommon situation of *stretto*. The *confirmatio*, mm. 40–49, contains seven entries, but only four participate in the logical structure. Because the *commes* of a *stretto* are psychologically masked by the leading voice, they seemingly do not participate in the musical logic. (Unlike in later genres, incidentally, *stretto* in the NGT is not a technique reserved for ends of pieces.)

In mm. 16–36 of Buxtehude's *Praeludium in g*, BuxWV 150 (Tables 15a–15c), one seems to hear three points of imitation with a countersubject in lieu of subject/answer entries, but, in these measures, standard logic operates covertly. The soprano voice, first entering on m. 20, receives its complement in m. 34. Likewise, the alto voice, entering in m. 18, presents its

⁶⁹In her analysis of the exceptional work BuxWV 151, Gorman states that the divergent breaking up of motives after the first fugue, mm. 50–62, functions as a *confirmatio*: “The section is clearly structured as a *Confirmatio*, not a *Narratio*” (Gorman, 213). First, such motivic development and a lack of the central theme is a hallmark of non-*confirmatio* sections. Secondly, the relationship between fugues and their themes is what constitutes a *confirmatio* in her and the other theorists' definition.

thematic complement in m. 27. The countersubjects operate as redundant entries in terms of complement relationships and also as proof by comparison. Such hidden logic of complements must be a feature to which only an advanced listener might respond; perhaps it is solely intended for connoisseurs of fugue. This is the only work of the entire genre that has such a complicated fugal design.

North-German keyboard composers were clearly experimenting with a variety of musical-rhetoric figures in NGT fugue. These experiments well exceeded the desire to secure the mode (traditional complement relations are sufficient), and they generate the sensation of proof, as Albert Ban states, through other means. Perhaps the desire for musical logic drove the significant development of fugal theory within this compositional school, from tonal answers to invertible counterpoint, with the NGT being a lab for such theorizing. Being written, these works probably served as exemplars for future generations. And, if intended as sample preparatory exercises for improvisation, one can observe that careful pre-compositional planning (*inventio*) was quite highly developed and that these masters may have considered a much larger array of techniques than one might have guessed in their regular duties and auditions.⁷⁰

Applications to other Seventeenth-Century Keyboard Genres

Although the above analytical method was originally developed for the NGT, it should and can easily describe any German *praeludium*. (The NGT is the most numerous subgenre of the seventeenth-century *praeludium*.) Furthermore, this model can easily explain the construction of highly related late seventeenth-century north-German keyboard genres, such as the canzona, the fantasias, and the stand-alone “fugue”. These are all expressions of a north-

⁷⁰Recall that, in rhetoric, discovery of proofs and other pre-compositional planning occur in the *inventio* stage (Kennedy, *A New History*, 59). Also, see Table 1.

German compositional/improvisational technique that employ studied imitation.

Before I proceed to show the utility of this analytical model to these additional keyboard genres, please recall that the body (*confirmationes*) is the most important and the only necessary component of a speech. All other sections, although useful to particular rhetorical situations, are optional. One can see this in Table 2 with the tripartite model (Aristotle/Burmeister) so common to seventeenth-century music treatises. From the discussion more detailed forensic formulations (Cicero/Mattheson), one can confirm proofs ideally comprise the body of works.

The few *praeludia* that are not NGTs simply contain only one fugue, i.e., T-F-T, T-F-T-T, and so forth. These single-fugue *praeludia* present the simplest of musical speeches with an *exordium*, body (*confirmationes*), and often a *peroratio*. Often, the free sections symmetrically balance around the proof (and thereby satisfy the modern architecturally oriented mind). In BuxWV 164 (Table 16b), mm. 1–19 constitute the *exordium*, mm. 20–30 the body, and mm. 31–50 the *peroratio*. The first point of imitation, mm. 20–25, presents the facts, topic, and nature of the argument in three-voice fugue (Table 16a). The proof, by complement relations, occurs with a redundant entry, and it has a summary entry in m. 30 (Burmeister's *pallilogia*). The remainder (*peroratio*) concludes with strongly establishment of the key of G major and its modest but happy affection. It is a straightforward case with a beginning, middle (body), and end.

North-German fugues are those musical speeches that dispense with an opening *exordium*. This practice is also common to deliberative oratory, in which speakers commonly omit introductions when audiences are already receptive and knowledgeable.⁷¹ Thus, stand-

⁷¹Aristotle, 434–35, and 438. Being composed of musical proofs, fugues should therefore impart the musical impression of logic; that is, musical enthymeme or even dialectic. It should not be surprising that, like dialectic is associated with philosophers, fugue is esteemed and developed by musical theorists.

alone fugues (and ricercares) are musical works comprised of musical proof, perhaps also intended for the knowledgeable.

In reality, Buxtehude's works entitled "fugue" often have more than one musical-rhetorical section. BuxWV 175, for instance, contains three fugues (Tables 17a–17d). It is a model exercise at writing out related proofs, omitting the optional (and presumably variable) free musical-rhetorical sections.⁷² Such a piece might have even been supplied to students as an exercise in improvising optional sections (*exordium*, *confutatio/digressio*, and *peroratio*), perhaps in a predictable alternation of textures T-F₁-T-F₂-T-F₃-T. The three-voice setting is rather modest, probably more suited to student players. This proposed genesis of a historical performance, from conception to performance, explicitly contradicts Powell's thesis of toccata textures being primary, because the fugues serve as the foundation of the proposed musical speech. Furthermore, this genesis suggests that compositional stages of Table 1, in which the thematic ideas, key, and contrapuntal structure are conceived in the pre-compositional *inventio* stage made explicit by a model work such as BuxWV 175. BuxWV 175 may actually be a nascent *praeludium*. (With related themes in 4/4, 6/8, and 3/2 sections, the *Canzona in G*, BuxWV 170, also seems like an excellent but much more virtuosic candidate for a nascent *praeludium*.)

In the gigue fugue, BuxWV 174, one finds the standard proof with the first point of imitation in mm. 1–24 and the complements in mm. 25–43. After this, changes in texture,

⁷²The first fugue presents a standard G-major fugal theme (the D-B interval and the canzona rhythm). The second fugue proves a related theme, in which the tail is the inversion of the first fugue's tail. The third fugue combines the first fugue theme and a variant the second fugue theme, although the entry schemes and cadences seem somewhat haphazard. The *propositio* suggests the use of the themes from the previous fugues. Over the course of the fugue, each voice receives the answer and the subject from both fugues. Upon the last expected entry, S₁, the fugue ends. (See Table 17c.) By this point, the theme and mode, however, has been more than well proved, suggesting this is more of a textbook exercise.

motivic development, and the introduction of accidentals all imply more argumentative passages. It is the weight of these argumentative passages that almost satisfy modern listeners, as they substitute for a true *confutatio* one would find in a *praeludium*; they make the musical speech much more effective and substantial. By the end, the repetition and scales seem to proclaim C major with a *peroratio* function.

With procedures vaguely resembling those in BuxWV 140, BuxWV 176 provides arguably the most interesting Buxtehude “fugue”. The opening fugue, mm. 1–27, proves a theme normally, although the theme contains a foreign pitch (A flat). (See Table 18a and Example 20a.) After a short free passage, mm. 28–30, a brief counterargument occurs in mm. 31–41. The prior G-minor cadence in m. 30 and the two-voice imitation on foreign material establish a foreign key of G minor (Example 20b). This ill-formed foreign “theme” outlines a descending minor triad (D–B-flat–G). The subsequent sextuplets also later take on lesser significance.

The unsteady second fugue, mm. 41–53, attempts to reestablish the key, but, at first, the argument becomes infected by the counterargument (Example 20c).⁷³ Even in the exposition, the tonal digression in m. 78 highlights the key of G minor and the transposed headmotive outlines the lower tetrachord of the G mode. Although the exposition otherwise proceeds normally, the remainder of the second fugue fails to prove the theme (Table 18b.) Instead of completing the expected complement relationships, Buxtehude transforms (by transposition) the head motives into ascending triads (D–F-sharp–A and G–B-flat–D), which have affinity to the counterargument. This fugue may be analogous to rhetorical argumentation, perhaps like a

⁷³The ascending triad of the second fugue theme, B-flat–D–F (M3, m3 upwards), might be considered a transposed harmonic inversion of a descending minor triad, D–B-flat–G (M3, m3 downwards). Other than being nominally in B major, the second fugue theme might be almost more related to the foreign argument, or seen as riding between two opposing viewpoints represented by B-flat major and G minor.

failed attempt to use contrary evidence for one's case or an example of deliberative rhetoric in which one weighs two sides of an argument. Depending on one's interpretation, this musical section may be an *argumentatio* or a faulty *confirmatio/confutatio*.

The third fugue of BuxWV 176 commences in m. 53 (Example 20d and Table 18d). Here, the disjunct theme, now in 12/8, is aurally distant but related. (See Example 20d.) A few entries, such as the tenor in m. 55, even enter on the wrong pitch. It is as if the speaker loses his confidence upon having presented somewhat persuasive contrary viewpoints (imitations) in *confutatio*. The second point of imitation begins like a proof and even reintroduces the foreign pitch A-flat, but the logic is somewhat incomplete. In fact, the soprano entrance in m. 64 outlines the descending G minor chord in addition to employing the A-flat pitch. Upon achieving the complement in the bass (m. 66), the composer secures the key of B-flat major through a long dominant pedal. (Incidentally, the writing weakly maintains four voices, as if the composer felt compelled to continue with four-voice proofs, until m. 66.)

As if the orator "throws in the towel," the unimpressive *peroratio*, mm. 71–75, simply confirms the key of the work through the most routine of figuration (Example 20e). Its simplicity starkly contrasts the musical orator's earlier attempts at more complicated persuasion. Unlike BuxWV 140, which seems to be the work of an skilled musical orator, this work presents a shakey case. Like some display pieces of oratory or Plato's *Gorgias* in which the author's viewpoint seems purposely and increasingly problematic, the performer plays a musical case in which issues become increasingly unstable. (By resorting to standard arpeggiation, perhaps this work's form parallels Socrates's resorts to myth to persuade his less-than-savvy interlocutors.) Other than lacking an *exordium*, this work has all the characteristics of a masterfully troubled *praeludium* (Table 18d). I invite organists to consider such a performance interpretation.

In terms of musical-rhetorical form, both fantasias and canzonas by Buxtehude and his circle follow the above principles of fugue. These genres begin with imitative sections (F) and can contain succeeding musical-rhetorical sections, such as F-F-T, T-F-T, and so forth. In other words, these musical speeches also omit *exordia* but can have a variety sections after the first set of proofs (*confutationes*, *confirmationes*, and/or *digressiones*); they often end with a *peroratio*. (As with BuxWV 176 and 175 discussed above, one could easily create a convincing *praeludium* out of a canzona (esp. the G-major ones) by improvising a short prelude.)

As one might expect of its genre, the canzonetta, BuxWV 172, does not strike the listener as a profound work that boasts of complicated contrapuntal designs intended for experts, but instead displays rather witty manipulation of standard fugal procedure through truncation of themes (Table 19a). The first point of imitation, mm. 1–15, establishes a playful *Spielzeuge* theme in the happy key of G major. (See Example 21a.) After hearing the soprano voice rest for several measures and enter prominently with a head motive in m. 14, a culturally competent listener would expect this “answer” to constitute the beginning of the second point of imitation. The second point of imitation instead begins in m. 15, after the cadence terminating the first point. (See Example 21b.) This point begins normally, but the false entry in the bass further teases listeners. The less observant will conclude that the necessary proof ends with a cadence in m. 21, but the more theoretically minded will have counted only one complement of the three required for solid proof of the mode. (The only proper entry occurs in m. 17, as shown in Table 19a.) The next imitation, starting in m. 21, provides the complement for the alto and tenor voices. The expected complement for the bass finally occurs in m. 27. After the completion of the musical logic with this entry (despite no convincing complement for the soprano other than a prominent tail in m. 29), the light contrapuntal texture disintegrates, as a listener might expect

(Example 21c). The succeeding music confirms the key through a secondary dominant of the dominant, stock arpeggiated figuration, and the theme without its head motive. Reminding the listener of the work's joyful topic, the *peroratio* of BuxWV 172 even seemingly presents a brief synopsis with one final entry in m. 38. This happy piece, in summary, presents a fun theme; and, through playful truncation of the theme, Buxtehude pleasantly thwarts and later rewards the listener familiar with how a "fugue should go."

The wise contrapuntalist might notice additional clues of Buxtehude's good-natured humor in BuxWV 172. The countersubject appears to be a suspension chain in terms of rhythm, but is rather true to the work's happy affection with a series of consonant 5–3 ties (4–6 inverted). (See Example 21a.) Barely noticeable to the lay listener as a non-descript quarter-note accompaniment to the subject, the countersubject fails to appear during the false entries. (See Examples 21b and Table 19a.) In mm. 14 and 16, merely one tie appears in accompanying voices. This is confirmation of the above interpretation.

For the knowledgeable, however, the promise of invertible counterpoint is not fulfilled within the first three points of imitation. The only full entry to receive a countersubject below the theme is in mm. 18–20. It is a tease of what is to come. The "headless" themes in the so-called *peroratio* above somewhat fulfill the promised inverted counterpoints in mm. 30–31, mm. 34–35, where the countersubject is below the theme's tail. (See Example 21c and Table 19a.) For the expert listener, thus, the proof continues beyond the last complete entry in mm. 27–29. Therefore, mm. 32–33 actually constitute a *digressio* that employs ties associated with the countersubject; the passage's qualities are not evidence of a *peroratio* after all! What a brain-tease! The proofs through invertible counterpoint continue in mm. 34, with the incomplete entries in mm. 36–40 being gratuitous. Still in the fugue proper, the last thematic entry in mm.

38–40 fulfills the missing complement relation promised at the opening of the fugue. (Although it may appear to be a summary statement, it is in reality very much part of the canzona’s proof.) The *peroratio* for the attentive, knowledgeable listener, thus, starts in m. 42 with the standard flourish. (See Example 21d and Table 19b.)

The manipulation of standard contrapuntal practice in BuxWV 172 thus addresses two audiences: the lay listener and the expert who is knowledgeable of invertible counterpoint. Although it bears the name of a simple genre, the *digressio* and playful processes substitute for the more fully developed contrast and argumentation of a *praeludium*.

With the above reasoning and examples, I have demonstrated how the proposed musical-rhetorical model applies to most contrapuntal keyboard genres of Buxtehude’s circle, and how these genres are highly related by creative fugal technique. In fact, some works can be easily and convincingly converted into NGTs. Furthermore, the flexibility of the musical-rhetorical formal labels encourages the recognition of the diversity of compositional approaches to imitation in these genres. Most important, however, this flexibility permits a variety of piece-specific performance interpretations. One does not fit the music to a pre-conceived list of analytical boxes, but rather describes musical effects with them and discovers Buxtehude’s contrapuntal and formal genius.

Competing Modern Musical-Rhetorical Analyses of the North-German Toccata

A few more recent authors have applied rhetorical principles to explain the form and, to a very limited extent, the expression in late seventeenth-century north-German keyboard music. Because the metaphor to rhetoric (especially proof) has not always been examined thoroughly examined in these studies when applied to musical items, all studies fail to describe portions of

the repertory and their musical effects.

In his analysis of BuxWV 149, John Butt presents the most common application of rhetorical labels to Buxtehude's works.⁷⁴ (See BuxWV 149 on Tables 20–21.) Sharon Gorman's dissertation on Buxtehude's *praeludia*, which predates Butt's essay, exhibits similar procedures towards musical form throughout. The earliest complete rhetorical study of Buxtehude's work, Lena Jacobsen's article also shares many features. Recognizing that the two or more fugues of NGTs are often highly related, all three authors assert that the second fugues serve as musical proof (*confirmationes*), while first fugues function as either "*propositiones*" (Butt) or "*narrationes*" (Gorman/Jacobsen). These assertions are wrong for at least six reasons.

First, consider the *praeludium* without a second fugue (e.g., T-F-T). With the above assertions, their criteria necessarily imply such musical works simply lack bodies! As Table 2 demonstrates, rhetoricians, such as Aristotle, demand that speeches have bodies composed of proofs. Having only presenting one T-F-F-T example in his discussion, Butt is silent on this problem. But, in their analyses of BuxWV 138, both Jacobsen and Gorman simply abandon their own analytical approach by labeling the first fugue as a *confirmatio*. In the method developed by all three authors, however, the second fugue is a *confirmatio* by virtue of its relationship to a previous fugue: the *confirmatio* is "a reworking and confirmation of the central thesis [the first fugue or "*propositio*"]."⁷⁵ For this very reason, Gorman and Jacobsen fail to use a consistent analytical method on the *praeludium* genre, and, by implication, so does Butt. The first fugue must contain or constitute a *confirmatio* in all *praeludia*. Single-fugue *praeludia* are afterall

⁷⁴John Butt, "Germany and the Netherlands," in *Keyboard Music before 1700*, 2d ed., ed. Alexander Silbiger (New York: Rutledge, 2004), 198–99. Butt derives his analytical approach from Jacobus Kloppers, *Die Interpretation und Wiedergabe der Orgelwerke Bach* (Frankfurt, 1966), 57–58.

⁷⁵Butt, 199. Jacobsen states that the *confirmatio* "confirms the kernel thought of the *Propositio*" (Jacobsen, 71 and also 75). It is hard to believe the most fully developed fugues, first fugues, are merely a kernel.

recognizable members of the same *praeludium* genre; and there is nothing significantly different about these abbreviated forms, other than the number of sections.

Second, a determined listener subscribing to any of these three analytical approaches but who is unfamiliar with BuxWV 138 (or other T-F-T works) would assume during listening that the first fugue of BuxWV 138 is either a *narratio* or a *propositio*. Not until well into the *peroratio* or perhaps only at the final cadence, would the listener realize that a second fugue fails to appear. Thus, such a listener would completely miss the first fugue as being proof of anything, and be forced to claim the musical speech lacks a body. Because listeners staunchly dedicated to these author's approaches would, once again, have to conclude that any T-F-T work from this period are incomplete works, an improvised second fugue would be required by these theories for proper performance; or listeners would dispense with their analytical approach, as Gorman and Jacobsen do.⁷⁶ As musical speeches, T-F-T works completely satisfy audiences, and, thus, any listener must dispense with these sort of labelings for the entire *praeludium* genre. The first fugue, once again, must contain *confirmationes*. (Notice how this second proof is a rearrangement of the first in prose, much like the genre under examination!)

Third, consider the thought experiment in which a performer interchanges the second and

⁷⁶“Unlike the first fugues of most praeludia, this section of BuxWV 138 is best understood as a *Confirmatio* rather than a *Narratio*, due in part to the fact that it is the only fugal section in the piece Without proof there is no case” (Gorman, 85). Although there are no substantial differences between this first fugue in BuxWV 138 and other first fugues with invertible counterpoint, Gorman claims that amplification techniques in mm. 56–58, 59–61, and 62–63 justify a *confirmatio* label for the first fugue (Gorman, 87). This is illogical. Her own approach necessitates a *narratio* label for the first fugue and *confirmationes* labels instead for any amplification. This is problematic for two reasons: (1) amplification figures in this location of this repertory typically exhibit a *peroratio* function. She admits this with *peroratio* label for the amplification passages (Gorman, 88). (2) The amplification figures are not remotely as strong as a fully fledged second fugue that supposedly reworks the earlier fugue. As she has defined musical proof and the location of amplification in a *peroratio*, these brief amplification figures cannot serve as proof. So, without valid justification, Gorman simply changes the label of the first fugue to *confirmatio*, and rejects her own analytical procedure. Although unstated, her analysis of BuxWV 145 seems to follow the same flawed logic. In BuxWV 144 and 157, the same T-F-T problem surfaces, but she better justifies that the first fugues as *confirmationes* by their reworking of material in the *exordia* (Gorman, 132), basically arguing that the *exordia* assume many of the *narratio* features of her theory. In her diagrams, she still highlights the amplifications following the solitary fugues, as if that would justify her case.

first fugues. Would the listener recognize that the “*narratio*” or “*propositio*” occurs in the later half of the piece and the *confirmatio* precedes? No. Thus, musical passages in these authors’ theories contain no distinctly different musical-rhetorical features justifying their rhetorical labels (other than their arrangement in time). The experience of interchanging the order of the fugues, however, does support the claim that both fugues provide satisfactory and independent sets of proofs (*confirmationes*).

Fourth, these authors’ analytical approaches do not satisfactorily explain the nature of the proof. How do second fugues “rework” first fugues? Perhaps a good listener simply recognizes related themes and that is sufficient for the sensation of proof? This would be a large-scale repetition or amplification figures, in which a poor orator simply reiterates in lieu of anything substantial (proof).⁷⁷ This initially plausible explanation lacks profundity, and fugue seems to be a rather complicated technique when a simpler repetition figure and less copiousness could more easily do the job. (If repetition is all that is necessary, we would also expect pieces with toccata-chaconne-tocatta, which are nonexistent.)

North-German theorists must have given fugue such great attention for more profound reasons than needing to develop an overgrown method of repetition, esp. when so many musical procedures of repetition were already available. Perhaps, then, listeners remember great detail from the first fugue and observe manipulations of these details in the second one? If so, which

⁷⁷This is exactly the approach Lena Jacobsen states: “Structural intensification is achieved through the technique of quantitative comparison” (Jacobsen, 71). This is faulty for several reasons. (1) Proof by comparison occurs between two different types of objects, not between a claim and an elaboration of the same claim. (2) Some fugues arguably do not have related themes (Apel, 615), but rather prove the same thing: the mode. Nevertheless, let us test Jacobsen’s claim with another thought experiment. Imagine an organist who truly believes that the audience’s simple recognition of related themes creates a sensation of musical logic. Instead of playing the fugues of BuxWV 140, he simply plays each fugue’s subject once but not the remainder of the fugues during the course of the performance. By Jacobsen’s reasoning, this obvious presentation of related themes would be especially effective proof. It is obvious this would be a failed performance, as there is something about fugal procedure, not just the repetition, that conveys the sensation of proof in the NGT.

details? Highly attentive and skilled listeners might theoretically memorize all the orderings of entries from the first fugue and observe manipulations of them in the second fugue. To me, this is rather far fetched. These analysts, in summary, have not asked what music item is proved and instead have based their argument solely on recognition of recurring motives. And, this recognition, in turn, depends upon the discredited assumptions that a work must have two or more fugues and that fugal themes are necessarily related.⁷⁸ Directly put, these analysts have not discussed the bodies of these artworks, the most important aspect of a musical-rhetorical analogy. Considering and recognizing the inherent musical-logical procedures within all north-German fugues solves this problem. In terms of asking what is being proved, “mode,” “key,” or “affection” answer the problem of thematically unrelated fugues; while, thematically related fugues might be said to prove theme(s) as well.

Fifth, these analysts misunderstand the very rhetorical meaning for labels they use for first fugues. Jacobsen asserts that the “*Propositio* exposes and further develops the central thought and essence of the *exordium-narratio*,”⁷⁹ and Butt boldly and wrongly states that

⁷⁸“The fugue subject of the musical *Confirmatio* [second fugue] is closely derived from the material presented in the *Narratio* [first fugue according to Gorman]”(Gorman, 222), but Apel strongly disputes this in Hedar’s work (Apel, 615). Apel’s criticism can be applied to all the above analysts’ work. The fugues certainly share the purpose of proving the key of the work. Second fugues only frequently borrow characteristic pitches and motives, and only commonly share a derived theme. Without intention, Gorman’s statement that “all the ‘factual’ divisions [*narratio*” and *confirmatio*] of Buxtehude’s oratory are related thematically, whether in an obviously derivative way or with only a hint of a shared motive binding them” (Gorman, 224) implies that, in fact, a theme is not always being proved. Only in an aside at the end of her discussion of *confirmations*, Gorman seems to hint towards the idea that fugues serve the greater purpose of establishing affection through key connotations: “It is in the fugal sections in particular, then, that Buxtehude’s sense of a work’s overall affect as determined by key is most evident, although there are too few examples to make a definitive statement about the composer’s understanding of their affect” (Gorman, 225). Considering the importance of such a claim, a responsible performer, unlike the scholar, does not have the luxury of interpreting a *praeludium* without tackling the problem of content.

⁷⁹Jacobsen, 67.

propositio contains “the weightiest argumentation of the piece.”⁸⁰ As defined in rhetoric, the *propositio* is a statement of the subject matter and often a listing of points to be argued in the future *confirmationes*. *Propositiones* do not argue anything! They do not develop anything! They certainly do not duplicate arguments found in *confirmationes*; for it would be indeed strange for an orator to spend most of his precious court time discussing how he might go about proving his case rather than winning his case (with *confirmationes*). Butt’s and Jacobsen’s statements betray their strong musical intuition that the first fugue constitute proofs instead.

In contrast to Jacobsen and Butt, Gorman labels first fugues (but not in the T-F-T piece) consistently as *narrationes*. Ideally brief, a *narratio* presents a synopsis of facts. She rightly states that *narrationes* should be straightforward and not too elaborate.⁸¹ Her application of this label to first fugues is problematic. First, first fugues are usually the most fully worked out and often the most lengthy contrapuntal section—the most likely candidate for proof. They are often not “straightforward” in terms of the common fascination with invertible counterpoint (multiple themes) and other signs of musical argumentation. Tellingly before her discussion of sample analyses, Gorman states directly that “fugal texture for the Baroque musician by its very nature was an ideal representation of argumentation . . . that is an integral part of the process of proving a thesis.”⁸² In light of Gorman’s statement, it seems strange that first fugues do not earn the label

⁸⁰Butt, 199. Gorman avoids the label *propositio* entirely because of its rhetorical function: “Quintilian considered the *Propositio* to be a part of the *Confirmatio* and not a separate section in itself. In a *Propositio* one indicates what is going to be [underline hers] proven but the actual proofs themselves are not given until the *Confirmatio*. . .” (Gorman, 28).

⁸¹Gorman, 27.

⁸²Gorman, 57, and also 37–38. Jacobsen agrees with a suggestive statement that internal fugal procedures themselves are perceived to be logical: “With a few exceptions this aim of ‘clarity’ [in the *confirmatio*] is implemented through the structural logic of the fugal technique (*Distributio*)” (Jacobsen, 71). She unfortunately does not pursue this thought further, and does not question her comparison procedures between different fugues themes as the basis for labeling sections.

confirmatio in her analyses.

Sixth, these three authors do not adequately place the late seventeenth-century *praeludium* into the development of related Baroque musical forms. How can the eighteenth-century prelude-and-fugue be seen as an outgrowth of the *praeludium* or another expression of its musical-rhetorical principles? How do stand-alone fugues rest on shared rhetorical principles? Might musical-rhetorical sections generally attributed to free passages be successfully distributed inside the relatively continuous contrapuntal textures of the music by J. S. Bach and his circle? (How else could Bach's fugues be so persuasive not only to highly trained musician and also to lay listeners?) This study suggests an approach to contrapuntal genres that fundamentally agrees with Laurence Dreyfus's celebrated approach to Bach's invention.⁸³ Furthermore, the model proposed in this paper recognizes the earlier development of musical-rhetorical keyboard forms in northern Germany, with their T-F-T forms and nascent musical-rhetorical proof. These questions of historical context cannot be adequately addressed with these three authors' attempts at musical-rhetorical labeling.

In summary, Butt, Gorman, and Jacobsen do not recognize the nature of a musical proposition and its relation to proof. Propositions in rhetoric briefly state the topic and often outline future arguments within the body. Individual fugues contain such a passage, but relationships between fugues do not. In any musical-analytical system modeled on rhetoric's, one must identify the location of proof (the body) and discover how such sections constitute musical proof (how compositional relationships are formed over time). The issue of a rhetorical analysis comes down not to finding wild gestures, but understanding the nature of proof. That is, focusing on the body of a speech and examining its arguments: What does the composer intend

⁸³Laurence Dreyfus, *Bach and the Patterns of Invention* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996).

to prove to the audience? How does he prove it? What is the case?

Despite the initial appeal of an interpretation built on rhetorical principles during the past few decades, rhetorical readings of *praeludia* have failed to penetrate most repertory books, probably because the available analytical models do not use all the Latin labels properly and their authors do not deal adequately with the issue of proof.⁸⁴ As a result, these prior models fail to translate rhetorical principles to practical musical issues for performers or listeners. In other words, mistakes in basic concepts and application ultimately rob essential meaning from the rhetoric-music metaphor. The Latin terms seem to be purely academic labels. And, thus, an architectural model was just as useful but much more convenient for repertory texts—it is simpler.

Musical-Rhetorical Figures and Other Affective Elements

Although a study of musical figures and the affections is beyond the scope of this paper, a few points are worth mentioning. Musical signs, including standard musical-rhetorical devices, affect culturally competent listeners whether or not they consciously recognize them, because such signs and processes align with learned linguistic structures and cultural cues. Rhetors depend upon this. A speech's effectiveness does not depend upon the listener being educated in rhetoric. In fact, manuals warn against making speeches seem contrived and too planned beforehand. The same probably occurred in musical experience of the day, which relied upon improvisation much more than practiced performance from musical scores. Musical speech should seem natural and improvised, even when planned, and some techniques are rightly

⁸⁴While promoting a musical-rhetorical reading of BuxWV 149, Butt's ambivalence towards the labels and reticence about musical-rhetorical analysis is clear. In a barely four-page article on late seventeenth-century north-German keyboard music (Buxtehude), Butt devotes over a paragraph qualifying this analytical technique.

hidden from lay audiences. In other words, a rhetorical approach implies that audiences of the time needed not be educated in rhetoric nor in music to enjoy the collection of familiar cultural cues on which musical rhetoric depends.

Musical-rhetorical figures increase the emotional energy of a work, create elegance, and lend style (high, middle, low brow) as well as roughly reflect venue. They can be easily found in their respective repertoires. What is surprising is how well the early figures of Burmeister often describe the fugal structures of the north-German toccata. The elegant and passionate figures of Buxtehude's friend, Christoph Bernhard, permeate north-German toccatas as well.⁸⁵

Perhaps more important than these standard musical-rhetorical figures are the other recognized affective elements of modal and key affections. Baroque and classical authors routinely advocate the choice of mode or key as one of the most important steps in composing: "A mode should be elected and chosen that finely agrees with the word or the material of the text."⁸⁶ In these toccatas, the key often indicates the general message of the works at hand. After all, the key and the theme (in theory) most determine a work's *inventio*. (Musical figures often shape a melody's more specific message(s), but the specificity is hard to achieve in instrumental music.) Despite the wrangling over the specific affections for each mode and key, amongst both Baroque and modern scholars, it is not only clear that most seventeenth-century writers sincerely believed in key associations but that their descriptions were generally more similar than different: Dorian, for instance, best suits serious texts while Ionian is apt for happy

⁸⁵For more specific preliminary study of musical figures in this repertory, see Couch, "Three Praeludia." This shall be the topic of a future paper by the current author, "The Musician as Orator: The 17th-c *Praeludium* and Rhetorical Principles," in which musical-rhetorical figures Burmeister and Bernhard are examined.

⁸⁶Johann Andreas Herbst, *Musica Poetica* (Nuremberg: J. Dümler, 1643), 83, as quoted and translated in Zay V. David Sevier, "The Theoretical Works and Music of Johann Georg Ahle (1651–1706)" (Ph.D. diss., Univ. of North Carolina, 1974), 74.

pieces.⁸⁷ (The differences are in flavor and not in kind.) Although Bernhard may be the theorist closest in time to Buxtehude and other north-German composers, I feel that Mattheson's key associations best fit this particular repertory, perhaps because of (1) his encyclopedic knowledge, (2) his ability to look retrospectively, (3) his proximity to Buxtehude's city of Lübeck, and (4) his dangerous specificity. Although Mattheson claims that his associations only work for people of his temperament, it is nevertheless useful in confirming the general affection of the seventeenth-century *praeludia* determined through numerous other musical elements (musical-rhetorical figures). Because this topic is addressed in greater detail in another article ("Musician as Orator"), I will simply mention that, from Lippius all the way to Kirnberger, significant intervals were considered affective. Also, a survey of performance techniques such as *legato* in specific tempi display strong affective associations.⁸⁸

In summary, Baroque authors provided lists of many common culturally-agreed-upon (but polysemous) signs. If they regarded them as important, we too should consider them when we approach their works. After establishing fugues as primary in the musical discourse of the NGT, this can now be the topic of a future paper.

The "Message" of North German Toccatas

To perform this genre, performers usually settle upon a "meaning" for a work. In instrumental music (without words), choosing an appropriate affection can be much harder. The sheer number of potentially significant musical figures seems overwhelming to the scholarly, and

⁸⁷For a discussion of modal affections according to influential German authors, see Couch, D.M.A. thesis, Chapter 3. Also see the future article Couch, "The Musician as Orator."

⁸⁸Frederick T. Wessel, "The *Affektenlehre* in the Eighteenth Century" (Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1955), 281–82.

the fact that a figure may have several agreed upon connotations (polysemous and polypathous) does not help matters. The reliance upon fugue in the north-German-tocatta genre however gives a hint to figuring out which constellation of meanings coalesce into a convincing pattern.

Although this music is obviously meant to impress the listener (the affect of wonderment), I believe the message of these works is primarily carried by the opening point of imitation. That is, the fugal theme(s) themselves have affective content that align with and modify affective connotations of key. Through study of these two elements and significant figures primarily throughout fugal sections, a performer can determine likely affective message(s) and thereby deliberately decide performance techniques and registrations appropriate for performance, rather than relying solely on a general conception of Baroque style and performance practice. Such an informed guess at meaning is obviously superior to a dry, academic rendering in performance, that solely relies upon the score to “speak for itself”.

The repertory regularly uses the same theme through its various *confirmationes* in two or more distinct fugues. Example 22 provides a sample of the numerous ways seventeenth-century north-German composers frequently maintain vital thematic characteristics of fugal themes within a *praeludium*. In his *Praeludium in G*, Bruhns rebars a 4/4 theme in 3/2, thereby creating a clear relationship. Buxtehude similarly recasts a 4/4 theme in 6/4 with ornamentation in BuxWV 158 (Example 22b). In the *Praeludium in C*, BuxWV 137, Buxtehude preserves the headmotive when transforming from a quadruple to a triple meter (Example 22c). He, incidentally, prominently features this segment in the pedal solo of the *exordium* as well. In the *Praeludium in g*, BuxWV 149, Buxtehude rearranges recognizable intervals and pitches of the theme as well as switches to a triple meter (Example 22d). In his *Praeambulum in G*, Lübeck highlights the stereotypical interval for works in G major (D to B) in both themes (Example

22e). In his *Praeludium in fis*, BuxWV 146, Buxtehude preserves not only the falling fifth but also employs the diminished-seventh interval of the first fugue subject in the countersubject of the second fugue, as if one issue of the first set of proofs is divided into two intertwined issues (Example 22f). (The falling diminished-seventh interval, incidentally, seems typical of works in G minor, perhaps suggesting this work may be transposed to G as an exercise or even for performance.) In Kneller's *Praeludium in F*, the themes of the first and second fugues are related by significant pitches (Example 22g). As I argue in another paper "Musician as Orator," these common thematic relationships and the consistent modal associations project a consistent affection. Here, it is important to see that these musical speeches are nearly always centered on a consistent topic, as defined by modal connotations, motives, fugal subjects, and/or countersubjects.

Summary

A truly rhetorical analysis of the NGT does not rely merely on the identification of extravagant or theatrical gestures; nor does it simply label and arrange sections aptly in time. The musical material itself must share similar purposes to those in rhetoric. Thus, the discussion of the nature and purpose of the body of a speech (proofs) becomes vital to any meaningful rhetorical interpretation. Until now, this aspect of the musical-rhetorical analogy in organ scholarship has been largely unexamined, and the results here require reformulation of the overall musical-rhetorical schemes in current literature on the *praeludium*.

While occasionally mentioning rhetoric these days, organ repertory texts typically define the north-German toccata as a mercurial genre that alternates between free and fugal sections. The convenience of this description makes this analytical approach popular in these textbooks,

but the static nineteenth-century architectural model ultimately provides a poor model for persuasive performances, because it leads to a dependence on a principal of juxtaposition as an artistic principle: *Stylus-phantasticus* passages supposedly unify the works, while inserted fugues essentially provide variety. After establishing the first fugue, succeeding sections function like musical appendages in this view.

North-German toccatas (NGTs) can instead be perceived more dynamically as musical-rhetorical sound-speeches. NGTs move listeners to emotional states through calculated musical-rhetorical moves and organization—much like that in spoken discourse—despite their seemingly haphazard musical organization. The two basic textures, free and imitative, then exhibit a larger variety of purposes than in the architectural model. Full of free passagework, an introduction (*exordium*) prepares the audience for the speech proper by astonishing the listener (gains audience's attention), establishing one's ability to play (*ethos*), and earning an audience's goodwill. The *exordium* is often a prelude to what is to come.

In contrast, internal free sections deal with foreign material somewhat like rhetorical rebuttals (*confutationes*) or digressions (*digressiones*). *Confutationes* contrast the work's musical proofs through foreign themes, motives, keys, and wild *stylus-phantasticus* figuration; while *digressiones* often simply develop motives or temporarily transpose a work's theme(s). When the distinction between *confirmationes* and these contrary sections diminishes, the term *argumentatio* is appropriate. The flashy conclusions (*perorationes*) secure the performance in listeners' minds, often by arousing the passions and recalling relevant motives. Musical perorations of the NGT stereotypically emphasize the subdominant area, present a grand pause, and employ repetition figures. Rhetoric concepts thus explain the balances between the passionate unrestraint of free sections and contrapuntal displays of the fugues, per Kircher's

early description of the *stylus phantasticus*:

The fantastic style is suitable for instruments. It is the most free and unrestrained method of composing . . . it was instituted to display genius [invention of wild passagework] and to teach the hidden design of harmony [counterpoint] and the ingenious composition of harmonic phrases and fugues.⁸⁹

Like classical rhetorical theory, the fugal processes can be examined apart from the content. (Questions of extramusical subjects and affective connotations can be left for subsequent studies.) The first fugue literally establishes the subject of the musical speech and “proves” its mode in all voices. The fugal procedures operate much like oratorical logic, by fulfilling promises outlined in the fugal exposition (*propositio*) within succeeding points of imitation (*confirmationes*). The common methods of proof involve presentation of a subject and tonal answer in each voice over the course of a fugue and use of invertible counterpoint. The first procedure securely proves the mode, theme(s), and thereby (presumably) the affections. The latter imbues the section with a sensation more obviously like enthymeme.

Succeeding fugues dispel any doubts lingering from rebuttals by reestablishing the mode and often a version of the subject(s) through another complete set of musical proofs. With the contrast of the rebuttals, these later fugues even more strongly reinforce these musical elements and, presumably, the intended affections—the topic of future papers. With the case already proved once by the first fugue, the musical logic of subsequent fugues tend to be more relaxed; with only a semblance of logic necessary, the typically less strict counterpoint, *digressiones*, and even *argumentationes* prevent tedium. This paper concentrates on how first fugues constitute full sets of proofs, in contrast to current literature on the the *praeludium* genre.

Other late seventeenth-century keyboard genres use the same musical-rhetorical

⁸⁹Kircher, *Musurgia universalis* (1650), as translated in Snyder, 251–52.

relationships as the NGT. The *praeludium*, including T-F-T pieces, is the most obvious. Most canzonas and fugues also operate much like *praeludia* without *exordia*; while others presage the incorporation of *confutatio*, *argumentatio*, and *confutatio* functions into later fugal textures without such starkly contrasting sections as the NGT. I suspect this stylistic development strives towards a natural concealment of the “art” of persuasive musical rhetoric.

In summary, seventeenth-century *praeludia* ultimately impress listeners with specific affections and bring them to that emotional states through a series of emotional pleas connected with logic and affective connotations of gestures, figures, and mode. (This paper deals with the former issue, while future papers will address the topic of the affections in the NGT.) The evidence from historical accounts of concerts is that, these two elements of emotional pleas and logic hand-in-hand, brought people to these emotional states. People cried and wailed in concerts, and they were elated by music in a way that we would find ourselves as Lutherans embarrassed to do today.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albrecht, Timothy Edward. "Musical Rhetoric in Selected Organ Works of Johann Sebastian Bach." D.M.A. diss., Eastman School of Music, Univ. of Rochester, 1978.
- Apel, Willi. *The History of Keyboard Music to 1700*. Translated and revised by Hans Tischler. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1972.
- Archbold, Lawrence. *Style and Structure in the Praeludia of Dietrich Buxtehude*. Ann Arbor, Mich.: UMI Research Press, 1985.
- Arnold, Corliss Richard. *Organ Literature: Volume 1: Historical Survey*. 3d ed. Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow Press, 1995.
- Aristotle. *The "Art" of Rhetoric*. Trans. John Henry Freese. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.
- Augustine, Saint. *On Christine Doctrine*. Trans. D. W. Robertson, Jr. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1997.
- Bartel, Dietrich. *Musica Poetica: Musical-Rhetorical Figures in German Baroque Music*. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
- Bernhard, Christoph. *Tractatus compositionis aumentatus* from "The Treatises of Christoph Bernhard." In *The Music Forum*, Vol. 3. Edited William J. Mitchell. Translated and preface by Walter Hilse. New York: Columbia University Press, 1973.
- Bonds, Mark Evan. *Wordless Rhetoric: Musical Form and the Metaphor of the Oration*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Buelow, George J. "Music, Rhetoric, and the Concept of the Affections: A Selective Bibliography." *Notes* 30 (1973): 250–59.
- Buelow, George J. "Teaching Seventeenth-Century Concepts of Musical Form and Expression: An Aspect of Baroque Music." *College Music Symposium* 27 (1987): 1–13.
- Burkholder, J. Peter. "Rule-Breaking as a Rhetorical Sign." In *Festa Musicologica: Essays in Honor of George J. Buelow* (Festschrift series, no. 14), 369–389. Eds. Thomas J. Mathiesen and Benito V. Rivera. Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon, 1995.
- Burmeister, Joachim. *Musica poetica* from *Musical Poetics*. Translated and introduction by Benito V. Rivera. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993.

- Butler, Gregory. "Fugue and Rhetoric." *Journal of Music Theory* 21 (1977): 49–109.
- Butt, John. "Germany and the Netherlands." In *Keyboard Music before 1700*, ed. Alexander Silbiger, 147–234. 2d ed. New York: Rutledge, 2004.
- Caldwell, John. "Toccatà." In *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, 1980 ed.
- Cicero, Marcus Tullius. *Orator*. Translated by H. M. Hubbell. Reprint ed., Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Couch III, Leon W. "Musical Rhetoric in Three Præludia of Dietrich Buxtehude." *The Diapason* (March 2000): 14–19.
- _____. *The Organ Works of Dietrich Buxtehude (1637–1707) and Musical-Rhetorical Analysis and Theory*. D.M.A. thesis, University of Cincinnati, 2002.
- Demetrius. *On Style*. Ed. and trans. by Doreen C. Innes. Cambridge, MA: Loeb Library, Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Dreyfus, Laurence. *Bach and the Patterns of Invention*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Freedman, Joseph S. "Cicero in Sixteenth- and Seventeenth-Century Rhetoric Instruction." *Rhetorica* 4/3 (Summer 1986): 227–54.
- Gorman, Sharon Lee. "Rhetoric and Affect in the Organ Praeludia of Dieterich Buxtehude (1637–1707)." Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 1990.
- Daniel Harrison, "Rhetoric and Fugue: An Analytical Application." *Music Theory Spectrum* 12 (1990): 2–3
- Hollander, John. *The Untuning of the Sky: Ideas of Music in English Poetry 1500–1700*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Jacobson, Lena. "Musical Rhetoric in Buxtehude's Free Organ Works." *Organ Year Book XIII* (1982), 60–79.
- Johnston, Gregory Scott. "Protestant Funeral Music and Rhetoric in Seventeenth-century Germany: A Musical-rhetorical Examination of the Printed Sources." Ph.D. Dissertation: University of British Columbia, 1987.
- Kennedy, George Alexander. *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. 2d ed. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.
- _____. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

- Kircher, Athanasius. *Musurgia Universalis sive Ars Magna Consoni et Dissoni in X. libros digesta*. Rome: Francesco Corbelletto, 1650. Facs. repr. ed. Ufl Scharlau. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1970.
- Kloppers, Jacobus. "Die Interpretation und Widergabe der Orgelwerke Bachs." Ph.D. Diss., Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität, Frankfurt am Main, 1965. (Chapters relevant to musical-rhetorical analysis are translated in Albrecht.)
- Lenneberg, Hans. "Johann Mattheson on Affect and Rhetoric." *Journal of Music Theory* 2 (1958): 47–84, 193–236.
- Longinus. *On the Sublime*. Translated by W. H. Fyfe. Based on W. Rhys Roberts. Reprint ed., Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Mattheson, Johann. *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*. Translated and commentary by Ernest Charles Harriss. George Peabody College for Teachers, Ph.D., 1969.
- Powell, Kenneth George. "An Analysis of the North German Organ Toccatas." *The Diapason* 62 (April 1971): 27–29.
- _____. "The North German Organ Toccata (1650–1710)." D.M.A. diss., Univ. of Illinois, 1969.
- Quintilian, Marcus Fabius. *The Instituto Oratoria of Quintilian*. Translated by H.E. Butler. 4 vols. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1922-1939. Reprint ed., Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Plato. *Phaedrus*. Translated and commentary by James H. Nichols. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1998.
- [Pseudo-Cicero]. *Rhetorica ad Herennium*. Translated by Harry Caplan. Reprint ed. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Rogerson, Brewster. "Ut Musica Poesis: The Parallel of Music and Poetry in Eighteenth Century Criticism." Ph.D. diss., Princeton University, 1945.
- Schalk, Carl F. *Luther on Music: Paradigms of Praise*. St. Louis: Concordia, 1988.
- Sevier, Zay V. David. "The Theoretical Works and Music of Johann Georg Ahle (1651–1706)." Ph.D. diss., Univ. of North Carolina, 1974.
- Shannon, John R. *Organ Literature of the Seventeenth Century: A Study of Its Styles*. Raleigh, NC: At the Sunbury, 1978.
- Spitta, Philipp. *Johann Sebastian Bach (1870–80)*. Unabridged Edition. 3 vols. Translated by Clara Bell and J. A. Fuller-Maitland (1889). New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1992.

- Strunk, Oliver, ed. *Source Readings in Music History*. Rev. Leo Treitler. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., Inc., 1998.
- Snyder, Kerala J. *Dieterich Buxtehude, Organist in Lübeck*. New York: Schirmer Books, 1987.
- Vickers, Brian. "Figures of rhetoric/Figures of music?" *Rhetorica* 2 (1984): 1–44.
- _____. *In Defence of Rhetoric*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Walker, Paul Mark. "Fugue in German Theory from Dressler to Mattheson." Ph.D. diss., SUNY Buffalo, 1987.
- _____. *Theories of Fugue from the Age of Josquin to the Age of Bach*. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 2000.
- Wessel, Frederick T. "The *Affektenlehre* in the Eighteenth Century." Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1955.
- Williams, Peter. "The Snares and Delusions of Musical Rhetoric: Some Examples from Recent Writings on J. S. Bach." *Alte Musik: Praxis und Reflexion*. Edited by Peter Reidemeister and Veronika Gutmann. Winterthur, Switzerland: Amadeus Verlag, 1983.

DIAGRAM 1

history of musica poetica

TABLE 1: Application of Rhetorical Stages to Music⁹⁰

Cicero	Bernhard	Matheson
1. <i>Inventio</i> [determination of topic & arguments]	1. <i>Inventio</i>	1. <i>Inventio</i> [meter, key, theme, counterpoint]
2. <i>Dispositio</i> [arrangement of arguments]		2. <i>Dispositio</i> [ordering of sections]
3. <i>Elocutio</i> [style; ideas into sentences]	2. <i>Elaboratio</i>	3. <i>Elaboratio</i> [addition of figures]
4. <i>Memoria</i> [memorization]		4. <i>Decoratio</i> [ornamentation]
5. <i>Pronuntiatio</i> [delivery]	3. <i>Executio</i>	5. <i>Executio</i> [performance]

⁹⁰Chart based on Laurence Dreyfus, *Bach and the Patterns of Invention* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996), 5, as quoted in Leon W. Couch III, "Musical Rhetoric in Three Präludia of Dietrich Buxtehude," *The Diapason* (March 2000): 15.

TABLE 2: Selected Dispositions according to Four Authors⁹¹

Aristotle	Burmeister	Cicero	Mattheson
1. <i>Arche</i> [beginning]	1. <i>Exordium</i>	1. <i>Exordium</i> [introduction]	1. <i>Exordium</i>
2. <i>Meson</i> [middle]	2. <i>Ipsium corpus carminis</i> [body]	2. <i>Narratio</i> [factual account]	2. <i>Narratio</i>
		3. <i>Divisio</i> [list of points]	3. <i>Propositio</i>
		4. <i>Confirmatio</i> [supporting arguments]	4. <i>Confirmatio</i> ⁹²
		5. <i>Confutatio</i> [rebuttals]	5. <i>Confutatio</i>
3. <i>Teleute</i> [end]	3. <i>Finis</i> [end]	6. <i>Conclusio</i> [conclusion]	6. <i>Peroratio</i>

⁹¹Table from Couch, “Musical Rhetoric,” 15.

⁹²On p. 752, Johann Mattheson lists the *confirmatio* as the fourth section, but, in his discussion on p. 754, Mattheson interchanges the positions of the *confirmatio* and the *confutatio* sections (Johann Mattheson, *Der vollkommene Capellmeister*, trans. Ernest Charles Harriss (Ph.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, Ph.D., 1969). It matters very little as the order of these arguments in oration, and music can likewise vary considerably to fit situational needs.

TABLE 3: Rhetorical *Dispositio* and Absolute Form of *Praeludium in d-moll*, BuxWV 140

Mm.	1	4	12	13	15	16	19	20	27	36	42	45	55	61	64	71	81	91	99	102	105	111	117	118	
Abs. Form	T (4/4)							F* (4/4)					(f)	T (4/4)	(F?)	(f)	F* (3/4)				(f)	T	(4/4)		
Rhet. Form	E							Pr	Cn	Cn	(p)	Cf	(d/Cf)	(f)	Pr	Cn	CnCf	A	(p)	P	-				
Str. Fig.			()	§	()			§	§	§'			⊠	§+(⊠)	§	§	§	⊠	⊠				⊠	(£)↗	
Aff.-Gest.			⊠			⊠					⊠			⊠			(⊠)	!	!+⊠	!	ã			⊠	
Orn.	h̃			h̃			h̃			⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮					h̃	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	

Rhetorical *Dispositio*:

E	<i>exordium</i>	N	<i>narratio</i>	A	<i>argumentatio</i>	P	<i>peroratio</i>	T	toccata/free section
(e)	internal <i>exordium</i>	Pr	<i>propositio</i>	Cf	<i>confutatio</i>	(p)	internal <i>peroratio</i>	(f)	flourish
(f)	flourish/free	D d	<i>digressio</i>	Cn	<i>confirmatio</i>	-	continued section	F	fugal section
	sectional break		subsection		rhetorical subsection			*	fugues with related subjects

Absolute Form:

Structural and Textural Musical Figures:

§	<i>fuga realis</i>	ñ	<i>noëma</i>
§'	<i>fuga, incomplete</i>	£	<i>fauxbourdon</i>
§	<i>pseudo-fuga</i>		
()	<i>parenthesis and antithesis</i>		

Repetition Figures:

ã	<i>anaphora</i>
➡	<i>climax</i>
↓	<i>polyptoton</i>

Voice-leading:

h̃	<i>heterolepsis</i>
s	<i>syncope</i>
t	<i>transitus</i>

Gestural Figures:

!	<i>exclamatio and emphasis</i>
¿	<i>interrogatio</i>
⋮	<i>suspensio</i>
⊠	<i>pleonasmus</i>
€	<i>cadentiae duriusculae</i>

Affective/*Hypotyposis*:

⊠	<i>aposiopesis and abruptio</i>
↗	<i>anabasis</i>
↘	<i>catabasis</i>
⊠	<i>mutatio toni</i>
¶	<i>passus duriusculus</i>

Ornamental Figures:

⊠	<i>pathopoeia and parrhesia and saltus duriusculus</i>
~	<i>circulatio, groppo, and circulatio mez.</i>
∞	<i>multiplicatio</i>
→	<i>suspirato</i>
⋮	<i>tirata</i>
⋮	extended trill
÷	dotted rhythms

TABLES 4a–4c: Fugal Structure of Buxtehude's *Praeludium in C*, BuxWV 137

Mm.	36	37	39	40	43	45	46	48	49	52	54	56	58	59	62	64	66
Sop.	S				A				S			A			A	free	
Alt.	A				S				A			S					
Ten.	S				A				S			A					
Bass	A				S				A			S					
Cad.	PAC				PAC				IAC/V				PAC				

Table 4a: Fugue 1

Mm.	75	78	81	84	87	90	93	96	
Sop.	figuration based on head of fugue theme				figuration based on head of fugue theme				
Alt.									
Ten.					C				
Bass	C	C	C	C	C		C	C	
Cad.	PAC		PAC	PAC	IAC	IAC	IAC	PAC	PAC

Table 4b: Chaconne (“Fugue 2”)

Mm.	1	12	22	36	43	50	56	64	68	75	87	99
Abs.	T			F (f)					T	C*		T
Rh.	E			Pr	Cn	Cn	Cn	Cn/p	Cf	Cn	Cn	P
Notes												

Table 4c: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 5a–5c: Fugal Structure of Buxtehude's *Praeludium in G*, BuxWV 162

Mm.	16	17	19	20	22	24	25	27	30	31	32	33	35	36	37
Sop.	S				A				A' S _t '?				S?	S?	S
Alt.	A				S				S'						
Ten.	S				A				A						
Bass	A				S				no bass				A		
Cad.	HC				HC				IAC				PAC		

Table 5a: Fugue 1

M	57	60	63	66	69	72	75	78	86	89	93	107	110	126	129
S	(CS) A				S CS				fragmentation frag A				chords		
A	S	CS			CS A				S' CS						
T	A		CS		S				CS				Chordal & Loose Imitation		
B	S		CS		CS				A						
C	IAC				(HC)				PAC				HC		PAC

Table 5b: Fugue 2

Mm.	1	16	22	30	35	39	50	57	66	94	129	140
Abs.	T	F				T		F*(12/8)		(F?)	(F?)	T
Rh.	E	Pr	Cn	Cn	A	Cf	Cf	Pr	Cn	P		
Notes								<i>digressiones</i>		summary statements	chords	

Table 5c: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 6a–6b: Fugal Structure of Lübeck's *Praeambulum in G*

Mm.	33	35	38	40	44	46	49	51	56	58	61
Sop.	S				A				S		
Alt.	A				S				A		
Ten.	S				A						
Bass	A				S						
Cad.	HC						IAC			IAC	

Table 6a: Fugue 1

Mm.	78	80	83	85	88	90	94	96	98	101
Sop.	S				free	A				free
Alt.	A					S				
Ten.	S					A				
Bass	A					S				
Cad.	HC									IAC

Table 6b: Fugue 2

Mm.	1	12	21	33	44	56	67	78	88	90	101
Abs.	T			F (f)			T	F* (12/8)			(f?)
Rh.	E			Pr	Cn	Cn/p	Cf	Pr (d)	Cn	p	
Notes											

Table 6c: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 7a–7c: Fugal Structure of Bruhns’s *Praeludium in e*

M	21	27	33	39	45	50	56	62	68	75	
S	S	CS	expansional			A	CS				
A	A	CS				S	CS	chords & rests			
T			S	CS				A			
B					A	CS	S	CS	frag. of CS		
C	IAC PAC					IAC PAC					

Table 7a: Fugue 1

M	132	133	134	135	137	138	139	141	145	146	147	148	149	150	151	153	
S	S							fragmentation motives						motives			
A	A				S			A _t						×	×	×	
T	S			A			S _t			A _t			S [×]			S [×]	S [×]
B	A				S				A								
C	PAC/v				PAC/III				PAC						HC		

Table 7b: Fugue 2

1	6	11	13	16	21	50	81	90	95	112	120	125	1	1	1	1	1	155	
													3	3	4	4	5		
													2	7	1	5	0		
T	(18/16	4/4	12/8	4/4)	F		T	(12/8	6/8	3/2	4/4)		F*	(12/8)				T	(24/16)
E					Pr	Cn-p	Cf	Cf	Cf	Cf		Cf	P	C	C	A	p	P	
													r	n	f				
imit. chord i.cpt. arp.																			

Table 7c: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 8a–8d: Fugal Structure of Lübeck's *Praeludium in g*

M	25	27	31	34	36	42	45	49	50	55	57	58	61	62	66	67	71
S	S					A					S					CS	cadential prolong.
A		A					S			CS		CS					
T			S						A		filler						
B				A						CS!			A				
B					S			A							S		
C	IAC					"IAC"					IAC DC PAC						

Table 8a: Fugue 1

M	76	78	79	81	82	84	85	88	91	92	94	95	98	101
S	CS			S				CS			S			
A	S				CS			A		CS				
T		A					CS??		S		link		CS	
B			CS				A	filler				CS	S	
C	IAC				PAC				PAC				IAC PAC	

Table 8b: Fugue 2

113	117	120	124	128	131	136	140	144	149	154	159	161	165	172	176	178
	A	CS		S				CS			S			CS		
S	CS			<i>digressio</i>		A		<i>digressio</i>		CS	<i>argumentatio</i>			<i>argumentatio</i>		<i>argumentatio</i>
			A		CS				S							A
			S		CS				A		CS					
PC				HC				PAC								

Table 8c: Fugue 3

Mm.	1	25	42	56	67	76 81	88 92	107	113	128	159	181
Abs.	T	F				F*		T	F* (3/4)			
Rh.	E	N-Pr	"Cn"	"Cn"	p	Pr-Cn	Cn-Cn	Cf	Pr	A	A	P

Table 8d: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 9a–9c: Fugal Structure of Buxtehude's *Praeludium in d*, BuxWV 140

M	19	21	23	25	27	29	31	33	36	39	40	42
S	S	CS	CS2			A	CS	CS2		A		cadential flourish
A		A	CS	CS2	S	CS	CS2		A	CS2	CS2	
T			S	CS	CS2	CS2		S	CS	CS?	CS	
B				A	CS		A	CS	CS2		S	
C	?				PAC/V							V-I

Table 9a: Fugue 1

Mm.	64	65	67	68	71	74	75	77	81	82	84	85	88	91	95	99
Sop.			CS		A		CS		A					CS'	S	flourish
Alt.		CS				A			CS							
Ten.	S					CS				A						
Bass			A		CS		S				CS			A ₁ '	CS'	
Cad.	IAC				PAC				IAC/III				V-I			

Table 9b: Fugue 2

Mm.	1	19	27	36	45	55	64	71	81	91	102
Abs.	T	F		(f)	T	"F"	F* (3/4)			(f)	T
Rh.	E	Pr	Cn	Cn-p	Cf	Cf	Pr	Cn	Cn-Cf	A-p	P
Notes											

Table 9c: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 10a–10d: Fugal Structure of Buxtehude's *Tocatta in d*, BuxWV 155

M	28	29	31	33	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	43	44	45	
S	CS-A					S- -CS									flourish
A	CS-S					CS- -A									
T	CS-A					S- -CS									
B	S- -CS					CS- -A									
C	IAC/v HC														

Table 10a: Fugue 1

M	63	67	70	74	78	81	85	88	91	93	97	100	103	108
S	CS2	CS2	A	CS		A	CS'	CS2'	<i>digressio</i> CS2 CS2				CS2'	seq. on CS
A	CS	free		A	CS		CS'	S	CS				CS	
T	S	CS	CS	CS	CS2'	CS2'	CS _t '	CS	S _t		CS2?		CS2'	
B	A			S			CS _t '		A _t		CS		A	
C	IAC			PAC/v			PAC			PAC			broken	

Table 10b: Fugue 2

Mm.	20			22			23			25			28		
Sop.	A			A			free & fragmentation			chords					
Alt.	S _t			S											
Ten.	S			A											
Bass	A			S									fragmentation		
Cad.	IAC						IAC						PAC		

Table 10c: Fugal Passages in Opening Section

M	1	20	28	36	47	54	63	74	85	91	103	108	127
A	T		F		T		F* (3/4)						T
R	E		Pr	Cn	Cf	Cf	Pr	Cn	Cf-A	A	Cn-Cf	Cf-p	P
N	free fugal												

Table 10d: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 11a–11c: Fugal Structure of Reincken's *Tocatta in G*

Mm.	24	27	30	33	36	39	42	45	48	51	54	57	60
Sop.	S				A				A				figuration
Alt.	A				S				A				
Ten.	S				A				filler				
Bass	A				S				S A				
Cad.	HC				IAC				HC PAC				

Table 11a: Fugue 1

M	97	99	101	103	105	107	109	110	112	114	116	118
S	S	CS			A _i				A			
A	A		CS'		S _i				S _i			
T	CS'				A _i '				A			
B	A				S _i				A _i			
C	IAC				IAC				IAC			

M	120	122	124	126	128	129	130	131	132	133	134	135	136
S	S _i				A'				S'				cadential and imitation of head motive
A	S?	filler			S'				A'				
T	S _i				A'				S'				
B	S		S		S'				A'				
C	HC				HC				HC				

Table 11b: Fugue 2

Mm.	1	3	24	36	48	60	66	75	97	105	112	120	128	133	140
Abs.	T		F				(f)	T		F*				(f)	T
Rh.	E	Pr	Cn	Cn	p	Cf	Cf	Pr	Cn	Cn	Cn	Cn	Cn	Cn/p	P
Notes															

Table 11c: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 12a–12c: Fugal Structure of Buxtehude's *Praeludium in a*, BuxWV 153

21	23	26	28	31	32	35	37	40	42	44	46	49	51	53	55	58	60	63
S				S _i		S _i '			A				S		S _i '		free	
A				A _i					S				filler		A			
S				S _i					f		A		A _i					
A				A _i					S				S					
IAC/v				PAC					IAC/III				IAC/iv		IAC/iv IAC			

Table 12a: Fugue 1

M	67	68	71	73	75	77	79	82	83	85	87	89	91	93	96	98	100	102
S	S		A					A _t				S _t		chords & frag.		S		
A	free		S					chords				S _t		S _t		S		
T	S		A					A _t						A _t				
B	A		S					S _t										
C	IAC			PC PAC/III					PAC-HC/III				PAC PAC					

Table 12b: Fugue 2

Mm.	1	21	31	42	51	58	65	67	73	83	96	102	105	117
Abs.	T	F					T	F* (6/4)					T	(3/4)
Rh.	E	Pr	Cn?	Cn	Cn-A	A - p	Pr!	Cn	A	Cf	Cf-A	P		
Notes														

Table 12c: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 13a–13c: Fugal Structure of Buxtehude's *Praeludium in A*, BuxWV 151

Mm.	23	24	25	26	29	30	31	32	33	35	38	39	42	43	45	46	49
Sop.	S						CS'					CS	A		CS		S'
Alto		CS			A				CS'	S				(CS?)		CS	
Ten.			S				CS			CS				filler			
Bass				CS					A		S			CS'	(CS _t)		
Cad.	HC				PAC					HC				PAC			

Mm.	50	52	53	55	56	58	59
Sop.	<i>digressio</i>				A	florid	
Alto				A'			
Ten.		S'			CS		
Bass			CS			A'	
Cad.	IAC					HC	

Table 13a: Fugue 1

Mm.	75	77	78	79	81	(83)	84	87	89	91
Sop.		CS		S	CS		S _t	S	CS	
Alt.	CS			filler		filler				
Ten.	S		CS							
Bass			A	CS	S		CS	CS	S _t	
Cad.	HC					HC				

Table 13b: Fugue 2

Mm.	1 18	23	30	35	43	50	62	75	79	84	87	91
Abs.	T	F					T	F*				
Rh.	E	Pr	(Cn)	Cn	(Cn)	D-A	Cf	Pr	Cn	A		
Notes												

Table 13c: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 14a–14c: Fugal Structure of Buxtehude's *Tocatta in F*, BuxWV 156

Mm.	32	33	35	37	40	43	45	47	50	51	
Sop.	S				(A')	A'			S'	(S)	
Alt.	A				A	(S)					
Ten.	S				A			A'			
Bass	A				(S)			A	S	S _t	
Cad.	IAC				stretto		stretto		IAC		HC
					in 2v		in 2v		stretto in 3v		

Table 14a: Fugue 1

Mm.	90	91	92	93	96	97	99	100		
Sop.	S					A				
Alt.	A				S					
Ten.	S						A			
Bass	A					S				
Cad.	(cadence late)							HC		

Table 14b: Fugue 2

1	12	24	32	40	50	55	65	70 (73)	77	80	82	90	95	102	114	123
T	F			T (12/8)			(12/8)			(12/8)			F*		T	
	Pr	Cn	Cn	Cf	Cf	Cf	A	d	Cf	Pr	Cn	P				
fug.				imit.			imit.									

Table 14c: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 15a–15d: Fugal Structure of Buxtehude's *Praeludium in g*, BuxWV 150

M	16 18 20 23	26 27 28 30	32 33 34 35	37 39 40	42 44 45 47	50 52 54 58 59 62
S	S CS _S	CS _A	A	S	CS _A CS _t	frag. A free
A	A	S	CS _A	A	filler	CS _S
T	S	CS _S A	CS _S	CS _S	S' CS _S	A CS _A
B	A	CS _S	S	CS _A	A A	S _t S _t CS _S S
C	HC		IAC	PAC	IAC	IAC/v IAC/iv IAC

Table 15a: Fugue 1

Mm.	90 92 94 97	99 100 102 104	105	107 108	110 112 115 118
Sop.	A	S		rests	A
Alt.	S	(S)	A _t '	A	S
Ten.	A	S		A _t	A'
Bass	S	A _t '		A	A _t
Cad.	IAC		(IAC)	IAC	IAC

Table 15b: Fugue 2

Mm.	3 4 6	7 9 10	13
Sop.	S	A	chords
Alt.	A	S	
Ten.	S	A	
Bass	pedal point		
Cad.	IAC		PAC PAC

Table 15c: Fugal Passages in Opening Section

Mm.	1 3 7 13	16 26 32 37 42 50	64 74	90 99 (104) 110	120
Abs.	T (6/4)	F	T	F* (3/2)	
Rh.	E	Pr Cn/A A/Cn A-p	Cf Cf	Pr Cn-A Cn	P
Notes	free fugal-				

Table 15d: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 16a–16b: Fugal Structure of Buxtehude's *Tocatta in G*, BuxWV 164

Mm.	20	21	23	25	27	28	29	30	31	
Sop.	S			A					(S')	free
Alt.	A			S						
Bass	S				A	(S)				
Cad.	IAC								IAC	

Table 16a: Fugue

Mm.	1	9	16	20	25	31	41	44
Abs.	T			F		T		
Rh.	E			Pr	Cn	P		
Notes	HC		PAC		IAC	IAC	PAC	IAC PAC

Table 16b: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 17a–17d: Fugal Structure of Buxtehude's *Fuga in G*, BuxWV 175

Mm.	1	2	4	6	7	9	11	13	15
Sop.	S ₁			A ₁			S ₁		
Alt.	A ₁			S ₁			A ₁		
Bass	S ₁			A ₁			S ₁		
Cad.	IAC						HC		PAC

Table 17a: Fugue 1

Mm.	19	20	22	24	25	28	30	32	
Sop.	A ₂			S ₂			S ₂		
Alt.	S ₂			A ₂			A ₂		
Bass	A ₂			S ₂					
Cad.	IAC						HC		PAC

Table 17b: Fugue 2

Mm.	39	40	43	44	46	47	49	50	53	55	56	59	60	62	64
Sop.	S ₁			A ₂			S ₂			A ₂ '		A ₁		S ₁	
Alt.	A ₂			S ₁			A ₁			S ₂ '		A ₂			
Bass	S ₁			A ₂			S ₂			A ₁		S ₁			
Cad.	DC						?	PAC stretto				HC		IAC? PAC	

Table 17c: Fugue 3

Mm.	0	1	6	10	x	19	24	30	y	39	44	46	55	59	64	z
Abs.	T?	F			T?	F*			T?	F*					T?	
Rh.	E?	Pr	Cn	Cn	Cf?	Pr	Cn	Cn	Cf?	Pr	Cn	Cn	Cn	Cn	Cn	P?
Notes	free sections might be improvised between fugues; A ₂ =(S ₁) _i S ₂ =(A ₁) _i the division between <i>confirmationes</i> in third fugue are unclear															

Table 17d: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 18a–18d: Fugal Structure of Buxtehude's *Fuga in B*, BuxWV 176

Mm.	1	3	6	8	11	14	16	20	22	25	
Sop.	S				A					(S)	free
Alt.	A				S						
Ten.	S				A						
Bass	A				S						
Cad.	HC									HC	

Table 18a: Fugue 1

Mm.	41	42	44	46	47	48	49	50	51
Sop.	A				S				S _t '
Alt.	S				A				A _t '
Ten.	A				A _t '				
Bass	S								S _t '
Cad.	IAC?				IAC in g		(A _t and S _t in g)		HC

Table 18b: Fugue 2

Mm.	53	54	55	56	58	59	60	62	63	65	66
Sop.	S				S _t						
Alt.	S				A	(S _t)			A'		
Ten.	A?				S		S _t				
Bass	A				A				S		
Cad.	PAC				?		?		out g		PAC

Table 18c: Fugue 3

Mm.	0	1	11	27	31	35	41	47	53	58	63	67	71
Abs.	T?	F	f	T			F*?		F*			f?	T
Rh.	E?	Pr	Cn	p	Cf		Pr?	A	Pr	Cn	A	p	P
Notes	Imit. in g						infected by g			unclear			

Table 18d: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLES 19a–19b: Fugal Structure of Buxtehude's *Canzonetta*, BuxWV 172

Mm.	1	4	7	10	14	15	16	17	18	21	24	27	29	32	33	36	38	41
Sop.	S	CS			A'	CS			A	CS			S?	<i>digressio</i>			S	
Alt.		A	CS			S				S					S?	CS	(CS)	free
Ten.			S	CS				A'			A	CS				S?	CS	
Bass				A				S'	CS		S	CS			CS			
Cad.	HC					HC					HC					PAC PAC		

Table 19a: Fugue

Mm.	0	1	15	21	32	33	41
Abs.	T?	F			T?	F?	T or f
Rh.	E?	Pr	Cn	Cn	d	Cn	P
Notes							

Table 19d: Absolute and Rhetorical Forms

TABLE 20: Selected Musical-Rhetorical Dispositions by Modern Analysts (minor keys)⁹³

BuxWV	Analyst	Measures											
142 (em)	mm.	1	3	17	45	47	66	99	101	114	127	152	
	J	E	N	Pr		A (Cn-Cf				Cn)			P (@ m. 150)
	G	E		N	(f)	Cn			e	Cn	p	P	
	C	E		Cn	(f)	Cn	-	(f)	Cf	Cn	P (@ 129)	(f)	
143 (em)	mm.	1	3	12	16	23		51		57	87	93	
	J	E	N-D	-	-	Pr		Cf		Cn		P	
	G	E				N		D		Cn	p	P	
146 (f#m)	mm.	1	5	14	29	48	50	57		79	91	110	121
	J	E	N-D	-	-	Pr	A (Cn -		Cf -	Cn)	P (@ m. 104)		
	G	E			N	(f)	Cn	p		p	P		
	B	E		N	Pr		Cn			Cf	P		
	C	E		-	Cn	(f)	Cn (f)			Cf	P	(f)	(f)
	X	E			Pr/Cn/Cn/p		Pr/Cn/A/A/Cf/A/p			Cf	P		
149 (gm)	mm.	1	21	50	55	78	102	119	136	151	156		
	J	E	Pr		Cf	Cn		-				P	
	G	E	N		p	e/p		Cn		P			
	C	E	Cn		(f)	Cf		Cn	-	-	P	(f)	(f)

Key:

B Butt C Couch G Gorman J Jacobsen X Author 2006

E *exordium* N *narratio* A *argumentatio* P *peroratio*
e *internal exordium* Pr *propositio* Cf *confutation* p *internal Peroratio*
(f) *flourish/free* D *digressio* Cn *confirmatio*

- section continues with another subsection
| divisive cadence or change of meter or texture
⋮ change of section

⁹³In this table, the horizontal direction is not proportionally spaced, nor are similar sections aligned vertically between different works. (See Gorman, 227, for a table of her analyses aligned vertically.) Instead, this table compares different authors views of the same work, with horizontal spacing determined the limitation of page space and my wordprocessor.

TABLE 21: Selected Musical-Rhetorical Analyses by Modern Analysts (major keys)

BuxWV	Analyst	Measures								
136 (CM)	mm.	1	2	13	46	55	66	79	87	
	J	E	N	Pr	Cf	Cn	-		P	
	G	E		N	p (@ m. 45)	Cn (f)	Cn	p	P	
137 (CM)	mm.	1	12	22	36	68	75		99	
	J	E	N	-	Pr	Cf	Cn		P	
	G	E			N	e	Cn		P	
139 (DM)	mm.	1	8	21	55?	62	70	87	95	99
	J	E	N		Pr	A (Cf	Cn	Cf	Cn)	P
	G	E			N (f)	p	p	(p)	P	
144 (FM)	mm.	1	5			18				47
	J	E	N			Cn				P
	G	E				Cn				P
145 (FM)	mm.	1	2	15	28	40	97	121	123	
	J	E	N	Pr	Cf	Cn			P	
	G	E		D	(E continued)	Cn	p	-	P	
147 (GM)	mm.	1	7	15	20?	25			66	
	J	E	N		-	Cn (@ 26)			P	
	G	E		(N/D)	(E continued)	Cn		(f) or (p)	P	

Perhaps such uses of fughetta in *stylus phantasticus* works leads Mattheson to state that “one must know what fugues are before one can construct toccatas”(Mattheson, 478). Pg # in revised translation. Same with quotations of Mattheson from Snyder.

Speech 1: Gorgias, *Enconium to Helen*¹

[**Exordium** makes audience receptive] For a city the finest adornment (*kosmos*) is a good citizenry, for a body beauty, for a soul wisdom, for an action *arete* [virtue], and for a speech truth; and the opposites of these are indecorous [Establish speaker's ethos] My only wish is to bring reason to the debate, eliminate the case of her bad reputation, demonstrate that her detractors are lying, reveal the truth, and put an end to ignorance. [**Narratio**-like] That the woman I speak of is by nature and birth the foremost of the foremost Clearly her mother was Leda and her father in fact a god Now that my speech has passed over the past, it is to the beginning of my future speech that I proceed and propose the likely reasons for Helen's journey to Troy.

[**Propositio**: proof by enumeration and enthymeme] Either she did what she did because of will of fortune and the plan of the gods and the decree of necessity, or she was seized by force, or persuaded by words, or captured by love. . . .

[**First argument**] If she left for the first reason, then [one] cannot restrain a god's inclination. . . . If blame must be attached to fortune and god, then Helen must be detached from her ill repute.

[**Second argument**] If she was forcibly abducted . . . , it is clear that her abductor, her assaulter, engaged in crime. . . .

[**Third argument**] If speech (*logos*) persuaded and eluded her mind, . . . it is not hard to defend her. . . : speech is a powerful master and achieves the most divine feats with the smallest and least evident body. . . . The power of an incantation enchants, persuades, and alters it through bewitchment. The twin arts of witchcraft and magic have been discovered, and these are illusion of mind and delusions of judgement The persuader, then, is the wrongdoer, because he compelled her. . . . [here, Gorgias proceeds into a proposition & proof of this claim, and then he concludes this sub-argument as follows] Some [speeches] stir audiences to boldness, some benumb and bewitch the soul with devil persuasion.

[**Fourth argument**] If it was love that did all these things, she will easily escape blame. . . . If love is a god, with the divine power of gods, how could a weaker person refuse and reject him? But if love is a human sickness and a mental weakness, it must not be blamed as a mistake, but claimed as misfortune.

[**Peroratio**] How then can the blame of Helen be considered just? Whether she did what she did, invaded by love, persuaded by speech, impelled by force or compelled by divine necessity, she escapes all blame entirely. With my speech I have removed this woman's ill repute. . . . I have tried to dispel the injustice of blame and the ignorance of opinion. [If a true forensic case in front of a mob, pleas for pity and mercy might be used here.]

¹Michael Gagarin and Paul Woodruff, *Early Greek Political Thought from Homer to the Sophists* (NY: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1995), 191–95. Gorgias reportedly lived over 100 years, c. 480–375.

Speech 2: Thucydides's History²

We don't think you have thought through what sort of people these Athenians are: your struggle will be with people totally different from yourselves [the Spartans]. They love innovation, and are quick to invent a plan and then to carry it out in action, while you are good only for keeping things as they are, and you never invent anything or even go as far as necessary in action. Moreover, they are bold beyond their power, take thoughtless risks, and still hope for the best in danger; whereas your actions always fall short of your power, you distrust even what you know in your minds to be certain, and you never think you will be delivered from danger. Above all, they never hesitate; you are always delaying; they are never at home, and you are the worst homebodies, because they count on getting something by going abroad, while you fear you will lose what you have if you go out.

When they overcome their enemies, they advance the farthest; and when overcome by them, they fall back the least. And as for their bodies, they devote them utterly to the service of the city as if they were not their own, while they keep total possession of their minds when they do anything for its sake. Unless they accomplish what they have once set their minds on, they count themselves deprived of their own property. And if they do get what they went for, they think lightly of it compared to what their next action will bring, but if they happen to fail in any attempt, they turn to other hopes and make up the loss that way. You see, they alone get what they hope for as soon as they think of it, through the speed with which they execute their plans.

At this they toil, filling all the days of their lives with hard work and danger. What they have, they have no leisure to enjoy, because they are continually getting more. They do not consider any day a holiday unless they have done something that needed to be done; and they think that an idle rest is as much trouble as hard work. Thus, in a word, it is true to say that they are born never to allow themselves or anyone else a rest.

²Ibid., 89–90. Thucydides flourished 450–411 B.C.E.

Example 8: *Exordium* of BuxWV 140, mm. 1–19

1
inchoatio imperfecta

5

9
catabasis *noëma*

13
catabasis *noëma*

16
catabasis *Narratio* S

Example 9: *Proposio* of BuxWV 140, mm. 20–27

propositio

S 20 CS + CS S

A

* 24 CS A S

confirmatio

* error in invertible counterpoint, resulting in compositional choice to omit second pitch of a *passus duriusculus*
 + missing pitches in un-inverted counterpoint

Example 10: *Confutatio* 1 from BuxWV 140, mm. 46–54

Musical score for measures 46-48. The piece is in G minor (one flat) and common time. Measure 46 features a complex rhythmic pattern in the right hand with sixteenth and thirty-second notes, while the left hand has a simple bass line. Measure 47 continues the right-hand pattern with a melodic line in the left hand. Measure 48 shows a continuation of the right-hand texture with a final melodic flourish in the left hand.

Musical score for measures 49-51. Measure 49 has a more active left hand with eighth-note patterns. Measure 50 features a dense right-hand texture with sixteenth-note runs. Measure 51 concludes with a melodic line in the right hand and a sustained bass line in the left hand.

Musical score for measures 52-54. Measure 52 has a complex right-hand texture with sixteenth-note runs. Measure 53 features a melodic line in the right hand and a bass line in the left hand. Measure 54 concludes with a melodic line in the right hand and a bass line in the left hand, ending with a fermata.

Example 11: False Witness in BuxWV 140, mm. 55–64

(Point of imitation in perfect fourths)

Confutatio 2
(forecasting opponent's poor *propositio*) (forecasting opponent's bad *confirmatio*)

55 "S" "S" "S" "S" "S" "S"

(opponent's arguments fall apart)

60 *Confirmationes* S

Example 12: False Witness through Point of Imitation

Heinrich Schütz, *Historia des Leidens und Sterbens unsers Herrn und heylandes Jesu Christi nach dem Evangelisten S. Matheum*, SWV 479, mm. 332–341.

332

Soprano
Er hat ge - sa - get: Ich kann den tem-pel Got - tes ab - bre - chen und in drei-en

Alto
Er hat ge - sa - get: Ich kann den tem-pel Got - tes ab-bre-chen und in drei-en Ta - gen,

337

S
Ta - gen, in drei-en Ta - gen den-sel-ben bau - - - - en.

A
in drei-en Ta - gen den-sel-ben bau - - - - en, den-sel-benbau - - - - en.

Example 13: Second Set of *Confirmationes* in BuxWV 140, mm. 65ff.

The image shows a musical score for two staves, likely a piano accompaniment. The top staff is in treble clef and the bottom staff is in bass clef. The key signature has one flat (B-flat) and the time signature is 3/4. The score begins at measure 65, marked with a fermata and the dynamic marking *S'*. The melody in the treble staff starts with a quarter note G4, followed by quarter notes A4, Bb4, and A4. The bass staff has a whole note chord of G2, Bb2, and D3. The piece continues with a series of eighth and quarter notes in both staves. A fermata is placed over the first measure of the second system. The second system begins with a fermata and the dynamic marking *CS'*. The melody in the treble staff features a sequence of notes: G4, A4, Bb4, A4, G4, F4, E4, D4. The bass staff continues with a similar rhythmic pattern. The piece concludes with a fermata and the dynamic marking *etc.* in the treble staff.

Example 14: Fugue 1 BuxWV 137, mm. 36-67

Dietrich Buxtehude

Propositio

36 S A

Confirmatio 1

42 (digressio)

S A S

Confirmatio 2

48 S A S

Confirmatio 3

54 (digressio)

A S

Detailed description: This musical score is for a section of Fugue 1, BWV 137, by Dietrich Buxtehude, measures 36 to 67. It is written for a single melodic line on a grand staff (treble and bass clefs) in common time (C). The key signature is one sharp (F#), indicating C major. The piece is a fugue, characterized by its imitative texture. It begins with the *Propositio* at measure 36, marked with a forte 'S' dynamic. The first *Confirmatio* (Confirmation 1) starts at measure 42, featuring a *digressio* (digression) in the bass line. The second *Confirmatio* (Confirmation 2) begins at measure 48. The third *Confirmatio* (Confirmation 3) starts at measure 54, also including a *digressio*. The score uses various articulations, including slurs and accents, and dynamic markings such as 'S' (forte) and 'A' (piano). The notation includes sixteenth and thirty-second notes, as well as rests and accidentals.

Example 15: Lübeck Praeambulum in G, mm. 33-67

propositio
33 S

41 *confirmatio 1*
(*digressio*)
S V

47 PAC?
I S

53 *confirmatio 2*
(*digressio*)
S

62 (flourish)
confutatio

Detailed description of the musical score: The score is written for piano in G major and common time. It consists of five systems of two staves each. The first system (mm. 33-40) is labeled 'propositio' and features a treble staff with a melodic line marked 'S' and a bass staff with a rhythmic accompaniment. The second system (mm. 41-46) is labeled 'confirmatio 1' and includes a 'digressio' section. The third system (mm. 47-52) is labeled 'PAC?' and shows a change in texture. The fourth system (mm. 53-61) is labeled 'confirmatio 2' and features more complex textures. The fifth system (mm. 62-67) is labeled 'confutatio' and includes a 'flourish' section. Various articulations like accents (A), slurs, and dynamic markings are present throughout.

Example 16: Bruhns's Praeludium in e, mm. 21-80

Propositio

21 S CS

31 CS

38 CS A

44 *Confirmatio* S CS

57

58

65

72

A

CS

CS

S

A

CS

α γ

ñ

ñ

ñ

š

š

Legend:

α *aposiopesis*

ñ *noëma*

š *saltus durusculus*

Example 17: Praeludium in d, BuxWV 155

Buxtehude

28 *Propositio*

33 *Confirmatio*

38

43 (flourish)

Example 18: Praeludium in a, BuxWV 153, mm. 21-35

Buxtehude

Propositio

21

S

A

Confirmatio

26

S

A

31

V

I

A₁

S_i

Example 19: BuxWV 151, mm. 21-35

Buxtehude

23 *Propositio*

CS CS

28 *Confirmatio*

A CS A

33

Example 20: BuxWV 176

Buxtehude

1 *Propositio*
S
A

Example 20a: First fugue, mm. 1-5

31 *Confutatio*
S
A

Example 20b: Imitation and *confutatio*, mm. 31-34

41 *Confirmatio*
S
A

Example 20c: Second fugue, mm. 41-45

54 *Confirmatio*
S
A
?

Example 20d: Third fugue, mm. 53-56

Peroratio

The musical score for Example 20e: *Supplementum*, mm. 71-75, is presented in a grand staff format. The right hand (treble clef) features a melodic line with eighth and sixteenth notes, while the left hand (bass clef) provides a simple harmonic accompaniment of half notes. The piece concludes with a final chord in the fifth measure.

Example 20e: *Supplementum*, mm. 71-75

Example 21: BuxWV 172

Buxtehude

Propositio

Example 21a: First fugue, mm. 1-5

Example 21b: First fugue, mm. 13-18

Example 21c: Last entry and succeeding passage, mm. 27-31

Example 21d: passage, mm. 38-42

Example 22: Related Fugue Themes in NGTs

EXAMPLE 22a: Related Fugue Themes in Bruhns's *Praeludium in G* (Change of Meter)



(a) Subject of first fugue



(b) Subject of second fugue

EXAMPLE 22b: Related Fugue Themes in Buxtehude's *Praeambulum in a*, BuxWV 158 (Ornamentation)



(a) Subject of first fugue



(b) Subject of second fugue

EXAMPLE 22c: Related Fugue Themes in Buxtehude's *Praeludium in C*, BuxWV 137 (Preserved Segment)



(a) Subject of fugue



(b) Subject of chaconne*

* Subject played two octaves lower in the pedals

**EXAMPLE 22d: Related Fugue Subjects from Buxtehude's *Praeludium in g*, BuxWV 149
(Reordered Pitches)**



(a) Subject of first fugue



(b) Subject of second fugue

**EXAMPLE 22e: Distantly Related Fugue Subjects from Lübeck's *Praeambulum in G*
(Preserved Interval)**



(a) Subject of first fugue



(b) Subject of second fugue

**EXAMPLE 22f: Distantly Related Themes from Buxtehude's *Praeludium in fis*, BuxWV 146
(Preserved Intervals)**



(a) Subject of first fugue



(b) Subject of second fugue



(c) Countersubject of second fugue

EXAMPLE 22g: Related Fugue Themes in Kneller's *Praeludium in F*

21

C-D-Bb-A

Bb-A-G

C-Bb-A

(a) Subject of first fugue

C-A

D-Bb

Bb-G

C-Bb-A

(b) Reduction of above subject

68

C-A

D-Bb

Bb-G

Bb-A-G

C-Bb-A and C-D-Bb-A

(c) Subject of second fugue