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ABSTRACT

Transformation of the Keyboard Fantasia in the Classical Period (1780–1800)

A dissertation presented by the Faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of Brandeis University
Waltham, Massachusetts

By Daesik Cha

The fantasia between the 1780s and 1800s was a unique genre that was susceptible to the change of the prevalent musical aesthetics in the German culture of the time. This idiosyncratic art is often approached as a collection of improvisatory keyboard works jumbled together under the broad term ‘fantasia.’ The unconventionality and subjectivity of these works, which boldly defied musical norms of the time, make it difficult for scholars to treat it as a genre in the classical sense. But this dissertation demonstrates that the fantasia in the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century is not “anti-genre” but a genre with its own expressive properties. The \textit{sui generis} nature of this art dictates that, unlike other Classical genres, it be not defined by a fixed set of genre-defining features but by the shared aesthetic principles which served as the foundation for the doctrine of ‘individual originality’ which the fantasia pursued as its ultimate aim. In other words, fantasia composers realized their free and subjective imaginations in conformity with the contemporary aesthetic expectations of the genre.

However, during the Classical period, the aesthetic principles that undergirded the fantasia themselves underwent a transformation. Contemporaneous German theorists sought to reconcile British naturalism with French neoclassicism, and their new thoughts were articulated in the form of criticism of the fantasia as fine art. But then, the fantasia’s naturalistic principles
that had given composers to impetus for unbridled deliberation of original, imaginative ideas became modified by the infiltration of neoclassical elements intended to strengthen the genre’s formal coherence and expressive intelligibility. As a result, the fantasia evolved into two types, the prelude and the episodic, which coexisted in this period. The composers who belonged to the keyboard school of C. P. E. Bach continued the Baroque improvisatory tradition based on voice-leading techniques of figured bass, cultivating the prelude-type fantasia which musically embodied naturalistic ideals of original genius, namely, originality, abundant feelings, and bold imagination. In the meanwhile, younger Classical composers, led by W. A. Mozart, developed the new, episodic-type fantasia in attempts to make naturalistic elements of the genre more congruent with the neoclassical doctrines, which were increasingly predominant in the German musical culture of the time.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

I prevailed upon him to sit down again to a clavichord, and he played, with little intermission, till near eleven o’clock at night. During this time, he grew so animated and possessed, that he not only played, but looked like one inspired.¹

This anecdote told by Charles Burney no doubt refers to an instance of keyboard improvisation by C. P. E. Bach. His contemporaries called this extempore art of inspiration “Fantasia.” According to contemporaneous music encyclopedias, the fantasia was the keyboard genre in which the improviser freely unleashed his momentary inspiration and imagination without observing compositional rules and conventions. The role of genius and compositional freedom were recurring themes in encyclopedic definitions of the genre, which survived the historical change of style from Baroque to Classic. Athanasius Kircher, as early as 1650, describes Stylus Phantasticus, a style of Baroque keyboard improvisation from which the fantasia in the Classical period descended, as “the fantastic style … the most free and unrestrained method of composing; it is bound to nothing, neither to words nor to a melodic subject; it was instituted to display genius and to teach the hidden design of harmony.”² This definition of Kircher continued even eighty years later when Johann Mattheson discussed the fantastic style. Stressing the same characteristics as its key elements and even using the same


wording, he describes it as “the most free and unrestrained manner of composing and singing that one can imagine… however not without a suitable intention, namely, to precipitate and establish astonishment,” and asserts that “there is nothing as opposed to it as order and restraint.”3 And Heinrich Koch’s description of the published fantasia, in Musikalisches Lexicon (1802), does not deviate from these centuries-old views of the Baroque theorists when he writes:

One also gives the name fantasia to pieces actually composed, in which the composer binds himself neither to a definite form nor to a totally clearly connected order of ideas etc.; since the Ideal brought forth by Genius loses nothing of its liveliness through the further working-out towards a more strictly ordered whole, these pieces very often contain far more prominent and striking traits than a piece composed according to forms and the other necessary characteristics of a perfect whole.4

This comment of Koch shows that the fantasia was understood as a genre based on the improvisatory tradition that defies constraints of musical conventions and gives free rein to one’s genius, and that published fantasias in the Classical period closely imitated the style of such an improvisation.

However, this emphasis of the contemporaneous theorists on freedom and originality in the fantasia made it difficult for scholars to approach it as a genre and develop a comprehensive method of analysis. First of all, according to these definitions mentioned above, in the fantasia it was paradoxically possible for the composer to acquire originality and individuality by deviating from genre-defining norms established by his/her predecessors that could inscribe, or assign, the work in the fantasia. In fact, the fantasia in the Classical period, in a protean nature, assumed a variety of forms and styles, ranging from improvisatory amorphous fantasias to highly structured

---


4 Heinrich Christoph Koch, Musikalisches Lexicon (Offenbach am main, 1802), cols 554–5, s.v. ‘Fantasiae.’ Cited in Annette Richards, The Free Fantasia and the Musical Picturesque (Cambridge; Cambridge University, 2001), 79.
cyclic sonata-fantasias, from preludes to autonomous concert fantasies with multiple movements, from ones without a dominant theme to ones based on transformations of a single theme or motif.\(^5\) And even the fantasies that more closely emulated the Baroque fantasia transmitted by C. P. E. Bach varied widely among composers and went through changes more than other keyboard genres.

This anti-generic tendency, a shattering of its own image, was the most prominent feature of the corpus of keyboard works titled “Fantasia” in the Classical period. In this regard, Benedetto Croce’s anti-genre approach to artistic works may at first glance look most adequate for our investigation of the repertoire. In his article “Criticism of the Theory of Artistic and Literary Kinds,” Croce vehemently argues against the concept of genre and any studies of “the universal” in aesthetic objects.\(^6\) In his view, art works are not logical outcomes and thus not reducible to an abstract formula, so that any attempt to codify them in definitions and rules, ignoring individual expression and originality, would impoverish aesthetical understanding and set up erroneous standards of judgment. If we were to follow Croce’s method, we would have to focus our study solely on individuality and ingenuity of each fantasia. Several scholars, especially earlier ones, indeed adopted this approach in their scholarship, which we will discuss later in this chapter.

Nevertheless, even where a musical work negates all generic norms, one cannot assume that its original ideas spring up out of an informational vacuum as Croce insists. For an art work


demands stably conditioned conventions against which to register originality and singularity. So it may not be unreasonable to surmise that Classical musical norms function as the conditioned conventions for the fantasia, and to treat the fantasia as nothing but deviations from those norms. Some music scholars, in fact, approach the fantasia as a negative, shadowy counterpart to conventional genres. When Adorno claims that “organized disunity is the aim” of the fantasia and in it “an uninterrupted development is prohibited,” he presupposes that the distinctiveness of this genre is achieved by the inverse of Classical style, i.e. the absence of Classical qualities of balance, unity, and dramatic development.7

    Although this approach has some merits, it tends to limit our understanding of the fantasia, because the fantasia in the Classical period displays its own, unique characteristics despite the one-sided promotion of freedom and individuality by the contemporaneous theorists. The fantasia does not define itself merely by being a negative counterpart of the Classical style, but it possesses unique expressive properties rooted in the tradition of keyboard improvisation. The dilemma in defining this genre with these characteristics, however, is that they are not always shared but appear selectively according to expressive purposes of the composer, who was endowed with compositional freedom. Though these characteristics can identify a musical work as a fantasia, we cannot take them as genre-defining elements.

    The situation in the literary field of the 19th and 20th centuries that parallels this musicological dilemma prompted literary scholars to rethink the efficacy of the classical theory of genre that classifies a genre with its essential features; and, as a consequence, new theories of genre emerged in the 20th century. Ludwig Wittgenstein’s theory of ‘family resemblance’ has

---

been most influential in the theory of genre, begetting widely diverging interpretations. In his famous analogy between language games and games in general, he proposes a new way of thinking of grouping, arguing that “We see a complicated network of similarities overlapping and criss-crossing…. I can think of no better expression to characterize these similarities than ‘family resemblance’; for the various resemblances between members of a family … overlap and criss-cross in the same way. And I shall say ‘games’ form a family.”

When this theory is addressed to the taxonomic problem of the fantasia, the focus of the study of the genre shifts from the marks that define a group of musical works as the fantasia, to the way they are related, i.e. the aesthetic principle that generates it.

Present-day formalists have developed a theory of genre relying on a generative theory, proposing it as an alternatives to the classical one. They viewed a genre, after the philosophical tradition of German Idealism, as an ideal type rather than as a class. According to their theory, while in a class an array of common characteristics is shared by the denominated, an ideal type is embodied in an individual work, which does not necessarily have to include all the common characteristics. The ideal type or archetype, called the Proteus ideal in Goethe’s morphology, manifests itself in many individual utterances and a variety of forms and styles on the surface, adapting itself to its surrounding and allowing new traits and historical changes. Yet it directs and governs the creative process of a work, enabling it to be identified within a genre.

A few scholars have adopted this approach in the study of the fantasia. In his comment on the chapter ‘Improvisation’ of C. P. E. Bach’s Versuch, Heinrich Schenker argues that the

---


intuitive unfolding of the *Urlinie* is the generative principle of the fantasia which unifies the surface variety of the genre.\(^{10}\) He supports his argument with C. P. E. Bach’s comment on the fantasia “[A fantasia] requires only a thorough understanding of harmony….. consists of varied harmonic progressions which can be expressed in all manner of figuration and motives.”\(^{11}\) Schenker interprets it as a remark that implies that the fantasia was a keyboard art created on the premise that its rich surface elaborations should be governed by tonal principles. However, Schenker’s primary aim in this treatise is not to propose the generative principle of a genre *per se* but that of tonal music in general. His renaming of Bach’s chapter “Improvisation” with “The Art of Diminution,” in accordance with his theory, suggests that in the fantasia he saw an ideal opportunity to demonstrate his theory of *Auscomponierung* of the *Urlinie*. In other words, here he is covertly arguing that all tonal music is fundamentally a fantasia, in which the *Urlinie* unfolds itself through the faculty of human intuition and imagination. Thus, although his theory proves effective in showing, as a tonal theory, the motivic and voice-leading unity in the seemingly disordered fantasia, it alone would not be sufficient in elucidating the fantasia as a genre distinguished from other keyboard music. For, overlooking other musical constituents such as meter, tempo, dynamics, and most of all phrasing and repetition, which bring about idiosyncratic expressions in this genre, his theory recedes to such a high abstraction that this method, when rigidly applied, would deprive the fantasia of its distinct character as a genre.


Another attempt to expound this genre with the approach of the formalism is found in Catherine Coppola’s “Form and Fantasy 1870-1920.” Unlike Schenker, she approaches the fantasia as a genre that has its own formal type. She argues that the fantasia is neither a genre defined merely by expressive freedom and elusiveness nor that which conforms to a formal scheme, but a genre rather unified by shared aesthetic concerns and formal procedures. Coppola describes its ideal type as an episodic form with emphasis on linking areas which combine and order various sections of a broad range of *topoi*, style, and form. A broad consensus among scholars of the fantasia agrees that the unconventional mixture of diverse affects and styles is a prominent characteristic of the fantasias in the Classical period -- a traditional element that Classical composers inherited from Baroque via C. P. E. Bach and his keyboard school. The letter of 10 February 1775 addressed to J. N. Forkel reveals that C. P. E. Bach once considered adding a discussion on this trait of the genre to his *Versuch*, saying “I have a batch of collected things pertaining to the discussion of the free fantasy in my second *Versuch* that I would put in order if I had time and possibly add to them, especially concerning the use of all three styles [church, chamber, and theatre styles].”

Although her method is applicable to many fantasias of this period, many facts also stand against Coppola’s view of the episodic form as the ideal type. Firstly, many of the Classical fantasias do not belong to this episodic type or go beyond the type’s modifications. Besides, if as she argues, we define the genre not by specific features but by its generative principles, it would not be necessary to pigeonhole the fantasia into a single formal type. The fantasias of the

---

12 Catherine Coppola, “Form and Fantasy 1870-1920” (Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 1998).

traditional prelude type, also called preludization, which coexisted with those of the episodic type in the Classical period, are comprised of fragmented ideas not developed enough to form an episode; those fantasias take on amorphous forms. Furthermore, she argues that the fantasia as a unique genre challenged, or threatened, the dominant status of the sonata, but many fantasias composed after the turn of the 19th century, instead of competing, freely adopt formal principles of other Classical genres, particularly of the sonata, so that without discussing those imported formal elements, imposing her ideal type on the repertoire, however well adapted and applicable, would unnecessarily restrict the scope of our research and possibly misguide it.

What Coppola does not take into account is the diachronic dimension of the genre, i.e. the historical fact that the episodic type of the fantasia emerged as one of several historical outcomes of the genre’s transformation that took place in this period. Before around 1780 the term ‘fantasia’ had a rather stable meaning, designating a free, improvisatory kind of keyboard music distinct from the keyboard music in clearly defined forms. However, in the hands of Classical composers the genre went through radical transformations, and a variety of types of fantasia, as a consequence, sprang up. And one of the most important factors that spurred these transformations was the ‘structural’ change in the dominant aesthetics of the time.

20th century structuralism emphasizes, in addition to formal constituents of a work, cultural and social context, aesthetic expectation, and reception as significant elements of a genre to be not deduced or defined, but only historically determined, delimited, and described. Such a reorientation of interest is encapsulated in Hans Robert Jauss’ well-known phrase ‘horizon of

---

expectation.”

Many contemporaneous treatises on the fantasia and the fantasias of this period themselves manifest that the fantasia improvisation, as a matter of fact, operated under a shared set of aesthetic expectations of the time; that even the fantasias composed strictly for publication emulated the style of that kind of improvisation. Around 1780, in the fantasia improvisation, as discussed above, a player or composer of genius was expected, on one hand, to beget *extempore* original, ingenious ideas beyond the constraints of the contemporary genres; on the other hand, to express abundant natural feelings under the aesthetic influence of 18th-century naturalism. In his *Versuch* C. P. E. Bach advises that the performer should “excite and calm many affections in close succession” so as to “master the emotions of his audience,” and the fantasia was executed on the assumption of attentive listening of the audience who would expect such emotive manipulations and readily engage their emotional response. However, the Classical period was a time that a new horizon of expectation dawned in the German musical culture.

Classical thinkers and artists, especially German classics, increasingly raised their voice concerning the separation of two main aesthetic doctrines of the time, namely English naturalism with French neoclassicism, and sought meaningful ways to harmonize them by means of a higher art. For example, Friedrich Schiller proposes the harmonious relationship of human faculties of imagination and reason in an ideal art, as follows:

“From this play of the *free sequence of images*….. the imagination finally makes, in an attempt at a *free form*, the leap to aesthetic play….. For here, for the first time, the legislative faculty interferes with the operation of a blind instinct, subjects the arbitrary

---


process of the imagination to its immutable and eternal unity."\(^{17}\)

This aesthetic, which became predominant in the Classical period, gave rise to a doctrine of variety with underlying unity, altering the horizon of expectation of the genre. Criticizing earlier fantasias for being too esoteric and licentious, critics and composers alike began to draw attention to the significance of the inner unity or thread that could unify the surface variety of the fantasia. Whereas in his *Versuch* written circa 1760 C. P. E. Bach considers freedom from the formal concern as an important characteristics of the genre, the treatises on the fantasia from the late Classical period directly address the issue of formal unity, emphasizing it as an essential element of fantasias with artistic values. Thus, in the Classical period the composer had to confront a challenge to strike a balance between freedom and restraint, in order to achieve formal unity without losing expressive characteristic of the genre. While freely inventing musical ideas with heterogeneous ingredients, he had to come up with a unique formal strategy to unify the semi-independent movements or sections as a whole.

Considering this aesthetic context, it is not surprising to observe that many fantasias of the episodic type, with shared aesthetic concerns, came forth after 1780. Nevertheless, this fact does not allow us to accept the episodic type as the prototypical form of the genre. The composers who sought inner unity in the free and imaginative fantasia did not stop developing the formal strategy by accepting the episodic form as the proto-type of the genre. Instead, they freely concocted unique forms by combining various formal ingredients, while they mixed various affects and styles. They often took Classical forms from other genres as their models.

\(^{17}\)Friedrich Schiller, *On the Aesthetic Education of Man*, translated and edited by Reginald Snell (New York: Dover, 2004), 134
and the sonata form and structure in particular began to exert significant influence on this genre from around 1800 onward.

The 20th-century formalism, often misunderstood by musicologists as a dogmatic theory that advocates the invariability of genres, actually addresses the issue of the historical evolution of genres and the kind of cross-fertilization, namely the phenomenon of ‘hybridization,’ which we observe in the history of the fantasia. Explaining this phenomenon, the formalists invoke the concept of a ‘dominant’ genre (a ‘royal’ genre, in Opacki’s terms). This dominant genre, as “representative for the general poetics” of a given period, transforms other genres when they enter into close “bloody relations” with it.18 This theory is indeed useful in understanding the phenomenon that we observe in the historical transformation of the fantasia. The sonata as the dominant genre of the Classical period generated a powerful force field and exerted great influence on the fantasia, so that the gradual hybridization of the sonata and the fantasia that occurred in this period should not be regarded as a side-effect of the evolution process of this genre but as a major cause of it. Under its transformative influence the fantasia in the later Classical period evolved into the fantasia in sonata form and then the cyclic sonata-fantasia.

This does not mean that the fantasia homogeneously developed with a single force of influence and resulted in merely a kind of deformed sonata, eventually losing its identity as a genre in the Classical period. Classical Composers occasionally took as models of their fantasias other Classical forms such as rondo and strophic variation, and sometimes mixed them with older types of the fantasia, as e.g. Beethoven’s fantasia Op. 77 and Schubert’s Grazer Fantasie.19


19 The Beethoven’s fantasia is a hybrid of free fantasia in C. P. E. Bach’s style and strophic variation form; the Schubert’s is of rondo and the episodic form of Mozart’s K. 475.
Besides, in this period the generic features of the genre that distinguish it from the sonata survived at both local and structural levels. At the local level, composers still maintained idiosyncratic expressive contents of the traditional fantasia and the ingenious mixture of various *topoi* and ideas. And at the structural level, when the composers used the sonata form as the formal model of their fantasia, they did not adhere to the whole demand of the sonata principle; they were expected to apply its formal elements freely and imaginatively.

Therefore, this study will approach the keyboard fantasia in the Classical period as a genre identified by the horizon of shared aesthetic expectations. The structural change of its horizon transformed the genre from wide variation in an amorphous type to that in multiple formal types, which historically emerged in interaction with other Classical genres, especially with the sonata. The main purpose of the formal borrowings, or modellings, however, did not lie in mimicking conventional forms but in using them as means to devise a unique, individual formal design that could govern the imaginative impulses of the fantasia, a characteristic that reflects the historical process of gradual rapprochement of British naturalistic and French neoclassic aesthetics. In other words, the composers in this genre were also endowed with the compositional freedom to freely choose and combine those formal elements. It is in this sense only that it would not be misguided to define this genre by its freedom, ingenuity, and subjectivity -- the elements that contemporaneous encyclopedias highlight as the genre defining characteristics.

**The History of Scholarship**

This dissertation will explore keyboard fantasies written in the Classical period, starting from around 1780 – the time when the Classical style began to permeate this genre and ending
with the fantasias of the 1800s, which anticipate the fantasias overtly taking on Classical form. We have seen above that this genre with its multiple types eludes even the groupings of the modern theories mentioned above that allow for a broader definition for genre than the classical genre classification. Nevertheless, one cannot deny that the traditional style of the fantasia in the Baroque model, i.e. the earlier representative of the genre, if not a genre-defining element, produced family resemblances among the members of the fantasia, and that it provided the musical and aesthetical basis for the further development of the fantasia in this period (1780–1800). For Classical composers consciously incorporated into their fantasias many of the traditional elements, which may have been regarded as outmoded in other Classical genres. Thus, most of the scholars begin their study with discussion of the stylistic development of the Baroque fantasia and its influence on the fantasias of the Classical period.

Until the second half of the 20th century, however, the musicological scholarship of the genre had been lacking in-depth analysis of the fantasia repertoire which could elucidate both the role of tradition in the genre and innovation and generic changes brought about by the Classical composers. The scholarship, which lacked such a comprehensive study, often fell into two extreme views. One school, regarding the fantasia in the Classical period as a continuum of the Baroque fantasia, only discussed the fantasia in terms of the style of the traditional fantasia that Classical composers inherited. Without due questioning and proof, it assumed as characteristics of the Classical fantasia the earlier stylistic manifestations of the genre, i.e. those of the amorphous type epitomized in C. P. E. Bach’s fantasias. The other school emphasized expressive freedom of the fantasia and approached the fantasia merely as an anti-genre that avoids any generic features. It solely focused on the individual peculiarities and idiosyncrasies of each fantasia, setting them against the backdrop of the Classical style.
Heinrich Koch commented on the basic characteristics of the fantasia in his *Lexicon* (1807). His definition of the genre shows that Koch viewed this genre in terms of the tradition articulated by C. P. E. Bach nearly a half century earlier. Koch writes:

In music the word Fantasy means …. an extempore piece which is bound neither by a particular tempo nor by a particular meter in its sections; neither by a particular form, nor strictly maintained character. Rather it is one in which the composer arranges the images of his imagination without an evident plan, or with a certain level of freedom, and thus sometimes in connected, at other times in quite loosely ordered phrases, and sometimes with particular broken chords.\(^{20}\)

As in Bach’s compendious discussion of the free fantasia in *Versuch* (1753), Koch considers the role of the free play of imagination as the essence of this art, setting it above that of formal unity. He is undoubtedly describing the style of the free fantasia of C. P. E. Bach as if it represents the genre of the time. But in reality, by this point in the history of the genre, the amorphous type of fantasia unbound by constraints of tempo, meter, and a formal plan had already become *passé*, and new developments were being made in the hands of Classical composers. Only the composers and theorists, Koch being one of them, who belonged to the keyboard school of Bach were cultivating it.

Koch’s view persisted and predominated in the scholarship of later generations. We discussed above that Theodor W. Adorno characterizes the fantasia as a genre that aims at “organized disunity.” He explains this paradoxical term and explicates the ways the aim is achieved, as follows:

“…on account of its improvisatory nature which is as it were, uncertain of its destination, an uninterrupted course of development is prohibited… Organized disunity is achieved, in that something happens to each section. Technique is a permanent injury. The progress of the ideas which have been introduced unambiguously is hindered to such an extent that the separate sections, which are based upon them, are neither melodically sufficient nor can they propel themselves forward into the next, into something else, as in the

sonata….One the one hand, the latter (the invention) eludes definite melodic shape on account of its improvisatory character; on the other hand, the ideas are not willing to take their leave easily.” 21

Of course, he is not directly dealing with the Classical fantasia here; his main object is the analysis of Arnold Schönberg’s Phantasie für Geige mit Klavierbegleitung Op. 47, and there is no doubt that his view reflects Schönberg’s understanding of the fantasia and his aesthetic agenda. Nonetheless, to us it is important that his words also disclose one of the early 20th-century views of the Classical fantasia, in which the traditional style inherited from C. P. E. Bach took a central place. While according to the composer’s own words Schönberg studied and took the works of masters such as Bach, Mozart, and Beethoven as models of his fantasia, 22 yet as in the case of Koch both Adorno’s descriptions of the genre and the work itself closely reflect C. P. E. Bach’s concept of fantasia.

Adorno rephrases many of the common features of the genre mentioned in Bach’s keyboard treatise Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen: the deliberate confusion and surprise created by the learned mannerism of playing with expectations, the far-fetched harmonic connections, the mixture of heterogeneous ingredients, and above all the freedom from formal conventions. Moreover, scholars of C. P. E. Bach have generally recognized as a formal characteristic of Bach’s fantasias what Adorno describes as the way that the organized disunity is systematized in the fantasia: structurally connecting contrasting sections with a covert harmonic plan, yet remaining fragmented and avoiding overt formal-development. 23

21 Adorno, “Phantasie,” 166.
22 Arnold Schönberg, “Die sogenannten freien Formen,” in Die forbildenden Tendenzen der Harmonie (Frankfurt am Main: Scott, 1957), 162.
23 Likewise, Hugh Macdonald presents Beethoven’s Fantasia Op. 77 as a work of disunity and interruption that makes the notion of unity inadequate as an evaluative criterion for the fantasia. See Hugh Macdonald, “Fantasy
On the other hand, some scholars simply attributed unique features of the fantasia in the Classical period to individual inventiveness of composers. In his Grove article on the 18th century fantasia, E. Eugen Helm refuses to consider the fantasia as a discrete form or genre on the ground that the 18th century fantasias lack distinct characteristics and forms and merely rely on other genres’ forms and styles. For example, on account of a thematic return near its end, he interprets the form of Mozart’s Fantasia K. 475 as the composer’s idiosyncratic innovation based on sonata logic, although its episodic structure, one of the typical forms of the fantasias written in 1780s – made of two outer slow sections and six intervening sections in remotely related keys and styles – makes it difficult to accept his sonata reading. In addition, he dismisses the influence of the traditional fantasia in the C. P. Bach’s style on K. 475 on the basis that it lacks the unmeasured sections of C. P. E. Bach’s free fantasia. Bach’s influence on Mozart’s formal and harmonic methods of intermingling heterogeneous ingredients, however, runs much deeper than mere surface similarities, and our discussion of the topic in later chapters will prove that his view is rather myopic.

The first comprehensive study of the history of the keyboard fantasia became available when Peter Schleuning’s work “The Fantasia” was translated for English speaking lands. In this study, Schleuning surveys not only the history of the fantasia but also its styles and cultural backgrounds from the 16th century to the 20th. His research unravels the radical transformations that the genre went through before the Classical period, which contributes to our understanding

---

24 Eugene Helm, s.v. “Fantasia: 18th Century,” in *Oxford Music Online*.

of the concept of the fantasia that the Classical composers had. His study also shows us the roles
of tradition and its aesthetic associations in the fantasia of the Classical period and their
significance in comprehending its style.

According to his study, in the first half of the 18th century the old forms of the earlier
Baroque fantasia gradually became outdated, or evolved into separate genres, and a new form of
the fantasia began to develop. Until that point in its history the term fantasia had been used
interchangeably with other instrumental genres ranging from organ prelude to viol consort, but at
this juncture the term came to denote only a kind of keyboard improvisation unbound by
conventional formal precepts. The new fantasia absorbed all the freer elements of the old fantasia
(stylus phantasticus) and reconfigured them in new musical idioms, while strictly excluding
imitative styles of the old fantasia such as ricercar and canzona. He also argues that its central
model was J. S. Bach’s “Chromatic Fantasy,” a work that did not merely sum up the freer styles
of the old fantasia but also perpetuated a new kind of expression in this genre, namely, the
special kind of recitative borrowed from the opera seria or the church cantata.26

Scheuning’s study shows that the generation of C. P. E. Bach added new generic features
to the fantasia based on this Baroque model, which scholars in this field relate to newly emerging
aesthetics in the 18th century. In her “The Free Fantasia and the Musical Picturesque,” Annette
Richards, building on Schleuning’s study, introduces in detail the cultural and aesthetical
contexts in which the fantasia developed.27 She postulates that the new fantasia emerged as part
of an artistic movement inspired by the 18th-century naturalistic philosophy, which, reacting


27 Annette Richards, The Free Fantasia and the Musical Picturesque (Cambridge: Cambridge University
against Classical indoctrination, emphasized subjective expressions of the artist. Lilla F. Johnson also recognizes this artistic temperament in the fantasies of C. P. E. Bach and Mozart that she analyzes. Yet, she does not identify the specific cultural links between the fantasy and philosophy, but generally attributes them to Rousseau and Leibniz, two leading figures of 18th century naturalism.  

Richards’ research, however, reveals that it was a branch of the naturalism called ‘the cult of genius,’ which promoted the fantasy as its ideal manifestation. Her study shows that the doctrine of original genius associated with the faculty of human imagination was first advanced by English aestheticians such as Edward Young (1683–1765), and then enthusiastically embraced by the German thinkers and artists of the 18th century, who gave a new impetus to the ideas of the Sturm und Drang, i.e. Empfindsamkeit in Germany. According to Richards, the fantasy was the central species of the musical Empfindsamkeit, which contributed to the general aesthetic development of breaking away from the doctrine of the unity of the affections and instead cultivating an inner process of varying affects.

Her study illuminates the role of these aesthetic concepts in C. P. E. Bach’s fantasies and their influence on the works of his successors, viz. Haydn and Beethoven. She relates the fantasy to a new aesthetic that she calls “Picturesque,” discussed and promoted by the musical and literary figures in C. P. E. Bach’s circle. She views the modus operandi of the fantasy introduced in C. P. E. Bach’s Versuch as analogous to that of the picturesque. She compares the free mixture of various musical affects and styles – one of most prominent characteristics of the fantasy in the classical period – to the multifariousness of the English garden. She also argues that the contemporaneous forms such as sonata and Rondo function as a force that unifies the diverse

---

affects, as the picturesque garden joins together, by a hidden yet conventional overall plan, the diverse natural scenes that create the illusion of disorder and confusion. In an approach similar to Schleuning’s, she examines these aesthetic elements in other composers’ works, referring back to the style of Bach’s free fantasia. However, her definition of the fantasia as one of surface elaborations, or confusions, against the background of sonata or rondo, limited the scope of her study to the works of Haydn and Beethoven where Bach’s direct influence is evident and her aesthetic theory is more readily applicable, excluding all other Classical composers’ fantasias such as those of Mozart. For this reason, in her review of the Richards’ book, Elisabeth le Guin therefore criticizes her theory, saying that it better explains sonatas with unusual features than actual fantasias.\(^\text{29}\)

Even in the fantasia that overtly adopts a conventional form, the creative process analogous to the picturesque, i.e. temporary suspension or evasion of the goal-oriented progress, was not the only way for the composer to achieve individual expressions. In this genre, as mentioned above, composers freely and creatively applied the principle of the model form in organizing sundry musical materials and ideas as a coherent whole, often reconfiguring it or mixing it with other forms. And it is around the turn of the 19\(^\text{th}\) century that these types of fantasia began to emerge to the forefront of the genre.

Both Schleuning and Richards recognize and discuss this phenomenon in their studies. However, instead of recognizing the generic mixture as a process of transformation of the genre, they view this change as a loss of the compositional freedom and therefore of its identity. Since, according to Richards’ aesthetic theory, the fantasia as the musical picturesque should shun

uninterrupted development of its form, elaborating the surface confusion, she dismisses most of these fantasias that overtly adopt Classical forms, and mainly focuses her discussion on those non-fantasia works of Haydn and Beethoven in which elements of C. P. E. Bach’s fantasia function as a force disrupting the normative progress of Classical forms. Schleuning laments the demise of the free fantasia by using one of the voices of some 19th-century music critics, who deplored the infiltration of the sonata form into the fantasia:

The art today, pianoforte music in particular, derives its chief pleasure from perfection in the compositional process – completely antithetical, therefore, to the ingenious sketching of original ideas – it is not difficult to understand …… why, in the face of a new change of taste, the free fantasia genre will experience difficulty in remaining alive.30

Adopting the typical 18th-century view, Schleuning conceptually separates the faculty of imagination from that of reason, or the compositional working-out in this case, and thus calls, as the authentic fantasia, only those improvisatory works intuitively, or freely, generated without showing conscious ordering or those that imitate such a style. The scholars whose views rely on this 18th-century dichotomy, as represented by Kantian philosophy, classify into separate groups the 19th-century fantasias constructed in Classical forms. For when they come to deal with those fantasias, the term ‘Fantasia’ in the 18th-century sense loses its efficacy. For example, Schleuning argues that the close resemblance between Beethoven’s “Choral Fantasy” and the principles of the fantasia dictate the form of the finale of his Ninth Symphony. Yet, in other places he compares Beethoven’s choral fantasy and piano fantasy op. 77 to the ‘salon fantasy’ of the time that consisted of an extempore introduction and variations on a famous melody, and argues that the ‘actual’ fantasia of the work is found only in its free piano introduction, which

Beethoven, as a matter of fact, improvised at the work’s premiere and wrote down later, possibly recalling his own improvisation.\textsuperscript{31} Then, it is not clear what he means by “the principles of the fantasia.” Could he really claim, contradicting his previous statements, that the thematic variations, fugal sections, and poetic programs seen in both the Choral Fantasy and the Ninth Symphony are parts of the fantasia tradition? It shows that Schleuning defines the generic mixture of the sonata and the fantasia merely as insertions of sections of the traditional improvisatory fantasia within the framework of the sonata.

The heart of the shortcomings of Schleuning’s and Richards’ studies lies in their methodology. They approach the history of the fantasia on the premise that the fantasia had a fixed set of principles. In their perspective, these principles, mostly derived from the fantasias of the central figure, C. P. E. Bach, function as a stable frame of reference against which they analyze all the fantasias in this period. Although their methodology has some value, applying a rigid set of aesthetic principles to a genre where subjective imagination and freedom were rigorously promoted would not yield the desirable results. The term fantasia never had a stable meaning as the two scholars assume. Though the fantasias in this period betray common characteristics and norms in accordance with which creative ideas and expressions of the fantasia can be explained, the keyboard fantasia constantly evolved from its very genesis in a historical process by which some family characteristics persisted, while others were revamped or eliminated.

Although it is rare to find scholarship that approaches the fantasia from this diachronic perspective, scholarship on the Classical sonata has frequently discussed the genre in terms of its

generic transformation. In his book “Beethoven: The ‘Moonlight’ and Other Sonatas Op. 27 and Op. 31,” Timothy Jones shows that in this period, not only did the fantasia make use of the sonata, but also the imaginative language of the fantasia gradually infiltrated into the Classical sonatas and symphonies, which had a tendency to distance themselves from the Classical models of Mozart and Haydn – that Beethoven brought about a radical change in the history of music.³² He points out that the boundary between the fantasia and the conventional genres was clear in the 18th century; in other words, as just as the fantasia was not expected to assume balanced Classical form, prototypical features of the fantasia, such as far-fetched harmonic connections, formal license, and recitative were not meant to appear in the Classical sonata. In Jones’ view, with his Op. 27 Sonata quasi una fantasia, Beethoven, who in his earlier sonatas had already ventured to synthesize these two styles to an unprecedented degree, opened up a new possibility of representing the free style of the fantasia in the fixed framework of the sonata.³³ In her dissertation “Fantasien für Klavier nach 1800,” Gudrun Fydrich discusses the evolution of the fantasia and the philosophical and aesthetic contexts that promulgated it.³⁴ She chiefly attributes this change to the emergence of a new aesthetic understanding in regard to the role of furor poeticus in the creative process of art. According to her study, the 18th-century


³³ Robert Schumann viewed this appearance of the fantasia in the sonata form as a turning point of the history of the genre signifying not only the end of the fantasia in C. P. E. Bach’s style but also the Classical era. Yet, many researches indicate that in the time of Beethoven and Schubert the distinction between the two, though much blurred, was still maintained; many of the characteristics of the fantasia in Bach’s style continued to be materialized exclusively in the fantasia of this period. Therefore, it would be more plausible to say that the appearance of Beethoven’s Sonata quasi una fantasia did not betoken the end of the process of integration but its beginning. See Schleuning, 14.

denoted a musical work as a fantasia of imagination only if it was produced intuitively without revealing a conscious working-out in accordance with compositional rules. This notion was challenged by many aestheticians and music theorists at the end of the 18th century, and a new kind of understanding ensued, which prompted the evolution of the fantasia. She argues that, from this period on, thinkers and artists began to reject the notion of the fantasia as *creatio ex nihilo* and came to believe that the imaginative power of musical inspiration, as a concept distinct from ‘fancy,’ does not merely function in conjuring up original ideas on the spur of moment, but it also operates in configuring them in an artistically determined form, and that as a result of such working-out of the faculty of imagination the fantasia comes to acquire true artistic value. Thus the formal aspect of the fantasia, which had been ignored in the 18th century, began to advance to the forefront of artistic consciousness.35

In her study, Fydrich sets forth the centrality of Beethoven in this process of integration, describing Beethoven as a torch bearer who brought about a radical change to the course of music history. She declares that as the free fantasia in C. P. E. Bach’s style became obsolete at this juncture of the music history, Beethoven reinterpreted and integrated the improvisatory elements of the fantasia with other Classical genres and thus broke down the barrier between them, which gave unprecedented expression to both the fantasia and the conventional genres. In her study of fantasias of Schubert, Schumann, and Chopin, she traces the historical development

35 Under this notion the fantasia improvisation gradually became viewed as learnable and learned to a certain degree. Most of the contemporary treatises on improvisation treat the fantasia as an art that resides between the intuitive invention and the reproduction of something learned and practiced, that is to say, consciously acquired theoretical knowledge and earned experience, and emphasizes the significance of unity and coherence even in this free art. Czerny’s “A Systematic Introduction to Improvisation, Opus 200” summarizes the improvisational practice of his time and reveals the change in the concept of the fantasia since the time of C. P. E. Bach’s Versuch. We will discuss later this change of emphasis in the 19th century treatises on the fantasia. See Carl Czerny, *A Systematic Introduction to Improvisation on the Pianoforte: Opus 200*, translated and edited by Alice L. Mitchell (New York: Longman, 1983).
of Beethoven’s integration and innovation, a historical process which, in her view, culminates in Liszt’s B-Minor sonata.

Although Fydrich’s study of the change of aesthetic consciousness lends rare insight into the evolution of the fantasia, her historiography is problematic in several ways. Although Beethoven played a significant role in importing the fantasia elements into the sonata, his contribution to the development of the fantasia was not as central as she claims it to be. Modern musicological scholarship has shown that the process of the integration began twenty years earlier, around 1780, before philosophers and theorists consciously articulated it into words. James Webster’s discussion of Haydn’s Capriccio in C major, Hob. XVII:4, which was published as Fantasia, shows that Haydn’s work already points to a possible way of integrating the improvisatory style with sonata form. In their article on Mozart’s C minor Fantasy, Cliff Eisen and Christopher Wintle demonstrate the unique way that Mozart harmonizes the naturalistic idioms of C. P. E. Bach with Classical aesthetic doctrines of balance and unity. In his MGG article “Fantasie,” Dagmar Teepe draws attention to the fact that after 1780 C. P. E. Bach himself modified the style of his fantasia, reconciling it with the more moderate, balanced Classical style as a response to the criticism of formless expressions of his earlier fantasias.

Contemporary treatises on keyboard improvisation also attest that the free fantasia in Bach’s style and its aesthetic principles were still extant and influential in the first half of the
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19th century. In his treatise “A Systematic Introduction to Improvisation, Opus 200,” Czerny includes a discussion of improvisation in the style of C. P. E. Bach’s free fantasia, while categorizing it under the heading of ‘Preludizing.’ In practice the distinction of the ‘free’ fantasia from so-called ‘bound’ types of the fantasia was probably not as critical as contemporaneous theorists, whose grouping Fydrich and other scholars borrow, make it out to be. For the free fantasia, defined as free of meter, often displays implied metric regularity and a unified style, as in the case of Bach’s last free fantasia ‘Empfindungen,’ while bound types of fantasia contain many elements of the free fantasia such as unmeasured sections of cadenza and recitative. Thus, in this dissertation we will not do away with the categorical distinction of free and bound fantasias. In addition, many of the fantasias composed after 1800 show that they have close musical ties to the style of the earlier fantasia. At the opening of his Fantasy Op. 77, Beethoven incorporates many of the generic features of the free fantasia, which should not be solely attributed to his sheer inventive power. Two of Schubert’s fantasias written around 1820 clearly carry over the episodic form of Mozart’s fantasias, which in turn were modelled after Bach’s free fantasia.

Lastly, the historical process of integration was completed after Schubert. Though a few of the characteristics of the fantasia of earlier generations are still somewhat detectable, the difference between the fantasia and the sonata or other genres such as impromptu, prelude, and ballade is so insignificant in the Romantic period that it seems not so meaningful to discuss the process of integration or the concept of the fantasia in Romantic composers’ works. This view is supported not only by their music but also by Romantic composers’ own ambivalence toward the nomenclature of fantasia as shown by their hesitation to label their works ‘fantasia.’ It is well known that Schumann originally titled his Fantasy, Op. 17 “Grosse Sonate” and Brahms
vacillated between intermezzo and fantasia. Though Liszt modeled his B-Minor sonata after Schubert’s “Wanderer Fantasy,” at the end he simply decided to call it Sonata.

**Proposal of Four Types of Fantasia**

The scholarly field of the fantasia still lacks a comprehensive study that covers a broader range of the fantasia repertoire in the Classical period and explores the historical transformation of the genre in depth. While musicological scholars generally recognize an increasing tendency toward integration between free and structural styles in this period, scholarship on the fantasia rarely discusses the subject in a way that includes its dynamic relationship with Classical forms, the mutual influence of the two, and the eventual transformation of the principle of the fantasia. This process of integration does not necessarily mean, as Schleuning interprets in his survey, that the free style of the fantasia was annexed as prelude, interlude, or cadenza to the main bodies in Classical form and style. Furthermore, in my dissertation, in opposition to Adorno’s view that “organized disunity is the aim” of the fantasia, I argue that in the new types of fantasia that emerged after 1780 Classical composers ultimately sought to achieve variety within unity and balance, (i.e. to harmonize English naturalism with French neoclassicism), as the aesthetic doctrine of primacy of unity advanced around 1780, and that it is not necessary to limit expressive purposes composers aimed to accomplish in the fantasia to the aesthetic principle of the picturesque, as Richards claims in her book.

The course I propose here has peculiar problems of its own. Firstly, though the contemporary historical, theoretical writings on the fantasia reveal many crucial points, we cannot exclusively depend on them as analytical tools, as Richards, and Fydrich do in their studies. The process of integration took place despite the definition of the genre that 18th-century
theorists give us. I intend to show that the Classical composers in this genre came up with many formal strategies that were later consciously articulated and systematically used. Therefore, I will need to tread both historical and ahistorical paths. Secondly, I will need to consider the highly subjective orientation of each fantasia in investigating those formal devices. Since the fantasia was still expected to be free from conventional norms, it is theoretically possible that each fantasia has its own way of mixing various styles in terms of coherence and balance, while at the same time fantasias in this period undeniably share, as a genre, common characteristics and generative principles. Thus, the ways composers sought to achieve unity in this genre, as Schenker claims in his commentary on Bach’s Versuch, were as diverse as the formal possibilities of tonal music.

However, the fantasias in the Classical period can at least be categorized according to the model forms that they utilized for their formal strategy. The types into which the Baroque fantasia was transformed can be identified in four ways, depending on the dominant aesthetics operating in them: 1) amorphous prelude, 2) episodic, 3) Classical-form, and 4) cyclic sonata-fantasia. Possibilities of the generic mixtures were theoretically unlimited in this genre, but these four types will cover its main transformations in the Classical period.

1. Prelude Type

This type of the fantasia carries on the Baroque practice of free keyboard improvisation, which was codified in C. P. E. Bach’s Versuch. As in Bach’s fantasias, in this type the composer freely develops improvisatory ideas, often using them in fragments, and invents a variety of idiomatic keyboard figures without establishing a distinct theme and form. This type of the fantasia somewhat changed during the Classical period when new topics from other Classical
genres, particularly from Classical operas, were added to the repertoire. However, in this type, as shown in Adorno’s comment, the ideas do not get developed enough to form a semi-autonomous section or episode; they appear and disappear in a transitory manner. In addition, like the Baroque fantasia paired with a fugue, this kind of fantasia remains within the scope of the prelude, whether published as an introduction to a fugue or as an independent work. Fantasias of J. C. Kellner, E. W. Wolf, J. W. Hässler, and J. G. Müthel – composers in the circle of C. P. E. Bach –, Mozart’s K. 394, and J. Wölfl’s fantasia belong to this type.

2. Episodic Type

Around 1780 composers began to develop ephemeral ideas of the prelude type into semi-autonomous sections and order them in formal unity. The result of this process of transformation was the episodic type, which Coppola regards as the proto-form of this genre. In this type, several episodes or sections, which often take on Classical forms, are grouped together, and the composite work is unified by framing and linking passages. However, the fantasia as a whole is distinct both from its component episodes and from unordered collections. For example, Mozart frames his K. 475 with a section that is itself a fantasia in the first type and functions as both an opening and a closing, and he orders them with intervening sections in various styles and forms in a symmetrically corresponding structure, joining them together as a convincing whole. These sections gradually became expanded in the hands of Classical composers to the degree that many fantasias of this type are no longer adequate to function as a prelude. While Mozart’s earlier
fantasias K. 396 in C minor and K. 397 in D minor\textsuperscript{39}, which belong to this episodic type, are still in the scope of the prelude, his K. 475 with expanded sections and its own drama, as Tovey says, would dwarf the work that follows it, if it were played as an introduction.\textsuperscript{40} This type was exclusively developed between 1780 and 1800. We can include in this type fantasias of Mozart, Haydn, Neefe, and Eberl, C. P. E. Bach’s Empfindungen, Dussek’s Op. 55, and Schubert’s fantasia D. 993, which he models on Mozart’s K. 475.

3. Classical-Form Type

The Classical Movement type, which emerged around the turn of the century, includes the fantasias whose ingredients composers embedded in the syntax of Classical forms. These fantasias, though consciously modeled after Classical forms, rarely adhere to the formal principles of their models. Instead they often modify the model or mix several diverse formal elements. In spite of the increasing level of integration, the distinction between the fantasia and the standard genres existed for the first three decades of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. Fydrich does not discuss this point in her study, overlooking the fact that fantasias in this period did not merely exploit the subjective expression of traditional forms, but also carried over specific family traits of the 18\textsuperscript{th}-century fantasia. In this type fall Reicha’s Op. 59-2 (1805) and Op 61 (1807), Beethoven’s Op. 77 (1809) and “Choral Fantasy” Op. 80 (1808), Schubert’s “Die Grazer Fantasie” (circa 1818), and Neukomm’s E-minor Fantasia (1816).

\textsuperscript{39} In the first edition of K. 397 the piece ends on a dominant 7th chord, described as a ‘fantasie d’introduction …….Morceau détaché’; ten measures were added later by August Eberhard Müller.

\textsuperscript{40} Some scholars argue that K. 475 should be understood as an introduction to the sonata in C minor that follows it, before they were published together in succession and the manuscript of K. 497 shows that for the two outer section of K. 497 Mozart used a motive from the sonata after completing the sonata first. We will discuss this issue later.
4. Cyclic-Sonata Type

In this type, each section of the fantasia assumes a movement of the three- or four-movement sonata structure, according to which its sections are arranged. However, this type of fantasia distinguishes itself from the Classical sonata in several ways. First of all, those sections are teeming with traditional fantasia elements as in the Classical type. Secondly, they are constructed in a through–composed form: the movements, though they are often autonomous, are connected with recurring linking passages or *attacca*. Lastly, musical materials of those movements are generated by transformations of a main theme or motif, which works as a unifying force – an attribute that separates the type from the sonata *quasi una fantasia*, whose movements are also linked by *attacca*. These fantasias influenced Romantic composers’ keyboard works, adumbrating the Romantic sonata and cycle of character pieces. Though Schubert’s *Wanderer Fantasie* (1822) is most well-known of this type, the first published work in this style was J. N. Hummel’s Fantasia in Eb/G major Op. 18 (1805), which Czerny regarded as the epitome of this type in the Classical period. Besides Schubert’s *Wanderer Fantasie* and Hummel’s Fantasia Op. 18, Schubert’s F-minor Fantasia D. 940 for four hands (1828), Düsseldorf’s F-major Fantasia Op. 76 (1810), Woržischek’s C-major Fantasia Op. 12 (1822), and Kalkbrenner’s Op. 68, *Grande Fantasie “Effusio Musica”* (1826) can also be categorized in this way.

The fantasia repertoire written in the Classical period is vast, and the investigation of its metamorphosis necessitates lengthy analysis of many fantasias in their entirety. Therefore, I will devote my main discussions mainly to the first two types of fantasia, prelude and episodic, and
issues related to them, and briefly summarize, in the concluding chapter, the remainder of the
genre transformation as manifested in two other types.
Chapter 2. The Fantasia as Art of Original Genius:
A Study of the Fantasia in the Prelude Type and Its Aesthetic Principles

He has relied on himself, and with a genius
Edward Young

The term “tradition” may sound contradictory for a genre that promoted unhampered expressive freedom and individuality. According to the theorists of the 18th century, the fantasia was a unique improvisatory art in which the composer unleashed his original genius, preferring the muse’s untrodden regions rather than the familiar paths of tradition. In fact, published fantasias of the Classical period are replete with unconventional and bold ideas impermissible in other Classical genres. However, this does not imply that the fantasia was creatio ex nihilo. As C. P. E. Bach describes in his essay, this genre required mastery over tonal harmony and skills of keyboard playing. Moreover, recent musicological studies have shown that not only was the fantasia improvisation, to a certain degree, learnable and learned but also took on a specific kind of historical style that evolved from Stylus phantasticus. In other words, the free contents of the fantasia could be characterized by a set of acquired schemata, sensibilities, dispositions, and taste of the time.

1 Edward Young, Edward Young’s Conjectures on Original Composition, edited by E. J. Morley (Ithaca: Cornell University Library, 2014), 34.

2 For a comprehensive historical survey of the fantasia, see Peter Schleuning, The Fantasia, 2 vols.
As discussed in the introduction, what makes the investigation of the genre more challenging than those of other Classical genres is that from the 1780s onwards, these shared assumptions, initially based on the Baroque tradition of free improvisation, began to be undermined by a younger generation of Classical composers, and new types of fantasia that sprang up do not appear to share stylistic norms with the traditional type. In other words, in the Classical period, aesthetic principles of the genre were being radically transformed and as a result multiple types came to exist. Nonetheless, for our inquiry it is important to first establish the legacy of the Baroque tradition in this genre. Although fantasias of new types appear formally and stylistically distinct from the traditional fantasias, in actuality, they carried on a great deal of aesthetic principles of the traditional type, and absorbed many of its specific improvisatory idioms. In addition, we should not forget that between the 1780s and 1800s, the fantasia based on the Baroque model coexisted with newly-fashioned, more Classical fantasias until its demise around the turn of the century. The composers who belonged to the keyboard school of J. S. Bach, or were associated with C. P. E. Bach, cultivated the fantasia in this traditional style, more specifically the style transmitted and developed by C. P. E. Bach before 1780. These fantasias closely adhere to contemporaneous theorists’ definitions of the genre as described in Koch’s dictionary, and thus reveal the musical norms of the genre as received at the beginning of the Classical period (in the 1780s). And it was this improvisatory tradition on which the Classical generation of Mozart and Haydn pioneered a new path.

---

3 From a certain perspective, one could even argue that the new type which we call the episodic type in this study shares the same aesthetic fundamentals with the traditional type, that is, the rigorous pursuit of expressive variety and originality and it is only after 1800 that these fundamentals got undermined.

4 The reason that surface features in fantasias of the new types often look unrelated with those in traditional fantasias is that composers of the new types exploited up-to-date versions of improvisatory idioms. Our analysis in the next chapter will show that many of them actually follow the compositional norms of the traditional type.
Table 1. Chronology of the Fantasias in the Prelude Type Discussed in this Chapter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Key</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1753</td>
<td>C. P. E. Bach, H. 75/iii (Wq 63/6)</td>
<td>in C minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1783</td>
<td>C. P. E. Bach, H. 277 (Wq 58/6)</td>
<td>in Eb major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>H. 278 (Wq 58/7) in A major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1784</td>
<td>J. C. Keller</td>
<td>in A minor, <em>Fantasia con expressione</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1785</td>
<td>E. W. Wolf</td>
<td>in B-Flat major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. P. E. Bach</td>
<td>H. 279 (Wq 59/5) in F major</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1788</td>
<td>J. G. Müthel</td>
<td>in G minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1789</td>
<td>J. C. Kittel</td>
<td>in F major <em>Grave</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>J. W. Hässler</td>
<td>Op. 17 in E minor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Historical Roots of the Fantasia in the Prelude Type and Its Definition**

Several composers published fantasias in the Baroque style of fantasia improvisation between the 1780s and 1800s (See Table 1 and Appendix 1). These composers, whose fantasias we will discuss in this chapter, mostly born before 1740, belong to late Baroque or pre-Classical generations and show direct or indirect connections with and influences of J. S. Bach. These composers, who subscribed to the keyboard school of Bach, modelled their fantasias after the style of his keyboard fantasia in *stylus phantasticus*, whose prototype is exemplified in Bach’s “Chromatic Fantasia.” This kind of fantasia, which consists of the amorphous form of free improvisation, free from standard patterns, as in a cadenza or instrumental recitative, usually

---


6 In his essay *Versuch*, C. P. E. Bach acknowledges that he learned most of his keyboard skill from his father. J. C. Kittel studied with J. S. Bach in his last two years, and in turn taught his nephew J. W. Hässler, who also belonged to the circle of C. P. E. Bach. J. G. Müthel (1728–1788) was the last pupil of J. S. Bach and enjoyed a lifelong friendship and correspondences with C. P. E. Bach. J. C. Kellner studied with his father J. P. Kellner, who was J. S. Bach’s friend and played an important role in the dissemination of Bach’s keyboard works. E. W. Wolf contacted with C. P. E. Bach and admired his works. For more detailed information, see Schleuning, *The Fantasia*, Vol. 2, 10.
functioned as a prelude to a fugue in the Baroque period, following the old tradition of organists’ extemporization called praeambula. C. P. E. Bach developed the fantasia into an independent genre, distinguishing his fantasia, with its compositional freedom, from the Baroque fantasia- prelude whose musical scope was limited by demands of a main work that followed it. Nevertheless, the fantasias in this style, published between the 1780s and 1800s, closely emulate the Baroque fantasia-prelude in scope, style, and form. In addition, some of them, paired with a sonata, as in the cases of J. C. Kittel’s and J. W. Hässler’s fantasias, assumed the traditional function of prelude, and even independently conceived fantasias in this style were occasionally attached as a prelude to a fugue or sonata. For example, Clementi, in his “Clementi’s Selection of Practical Harmony for Organ and Pianoforte,” published C. P. E. Bach’s independent fantasia in G minor (Wq 119/5) coupled with Bach’s fugue in the same key, though Bach, who clearly distinguished the fantasia from the prelude, would not have approved of it. In this dissertation, we call these fantasias based on the Baroque model ‘Prelude Type.’

Prelude-type fantasias share not only common historical roots but also several particular musical characteristics. These fantasias show that the generation after J. S. Bach incorporated all the free elements of Baroque keyboard improvisatory genres: rhythmic freedom of the French

---

7 C. P. E Bach, Essay, 431.

8 The Selection of Practical Harmony is the result of Clementi collecting manuscript music during his frequent trips across continental Europe (1780–1784, 1784–1785, 1802–1810). It is in 4 volumes (1801, 1802, 1811, 1814) and contains works by 25 composers (other than Clementi). For a modern edition, see Muzio Clementi, Selection of Practical Harmony, for the Organ or Pianoforte, Bibliotheca musica Bononiensis, Sezione IV (London: Clementi [etc.], 1803; Bologna: A Forni, circa 1970).

9 In his Versuch, Bach argues that “… a prelude which prepares the listener for the content of the piece that follows …. is more restricted than the fantasia. The construction of the former is determined by the nature of the piece which it prefaces; and the content or affect of this piece becomes the material out of which the prelude is fashioned. But in a fantasia the performer is completely free, there being an attention restrictions.” C. P. E. Bach, Essay, 431.
unmeasured prelude, free keyboard figuration of toccata, and formal and harmonic freedom of the keyboard prelude. In addition, the composers of this generation frequently encompassed, as a normal feature of their fantasias, the instrumental recitative in the heightened style of *recitativo accompagnato*, which J. S. Bach introduced for the first time in his “Chromatic Fantasia.” Thus, Schleuning considers this fantasia, which contains all these elements, as the central model for the fantasias of later generations.\(^{10}\)

It is undeniable that the style of J. S. Bach’s “Chromatic Fantasia” significantly contributed to the development of the fantasia in general and exerted influence over later composers’ fantasias, especially those in his keyboard school.\(^{11}\) Nevertheless, one cannot take J. S. Bach’s “Chromatic Fantasia” as an archetypal work by which all characteristics of the fantasia could be explained. Its direct influence was exerted primarily on the fantasias in the prelude type, and even these fantasias betray new features which were developed after J. S. Bach and thus absent in this fantasia. Moreover, it is noticeable that although J. S. Bach composed, and also improvised, several types of fantasia ranging from those in the free style of prelude and toccata to the strict styles of *ricercare* and Baroque sonata,\(^{12}\) the composers of the prelude-type fantasia discussed in this chapter absorbed only the freer elements from Bach’s fantasias, strictly


\(^{11}\) Schleuning’s study, “The Fantasia,” shows that many of later composers hand-copied the chromatic fantasia for didactic or compositional purposes.

\(^{12}\) In the Baroque period, the term ‘fantasia’ was often used synonymously with other instrumental genres such as toccata, prelude, ricercare, variation, and sonata.
excluding imitative and formally-defined styles.13 This fact indicates that these composers had an aesthetic agenda on which they made conscious musical decisions and that a new stylistic assumption in regard to the fantasia surfaced after the time of J. S. Bach.

Scholars in this field generally attribute new developments of the genre in the second half of the 18th century to C. P. E. Bach. In contrast, some of J. S. Bach’s other pupils, e.g. his eldest son, W. F. Bach, continued incorporating the imitative style in their fantasias.14 But all of the fantasias of the prelude type composed after 1780, including even works of two direct pupils of J. S. Bach, J. C. Kittel and J. G. Müthel, manifest a strong affinity with the style of C. P. E. Bach’s free fantasia – free play of improvisatory ideas avoiding the learned style and conventional formal patterns, as theorized in his essay “Versuch über die wahre Art das Clavier zu spielen.” Furthermore, C. P. E. Bach developed the fantasia into a central species of empfindsamer Stil (sensitive style) whereby a variety of feelings and affects were freely expressed and mingled. Following this new path, the composers who belonged to his keyboard school cultivated in the fantasia a free flow of highly subjective and emotive expressions.

**Aesthetic Principles of the Prelude Type**

I argue that the aesthetic impulse that drove these developments, the free play of musical imagination and the exploration of natural human feelings, has its philosophical roots in the cult of original genius, a branch of naturalism that developed in 18th-century Europe. This philosophy

---


14 For an example, see W. F. Bach’s Fantasia in A, minor, F. 23. In this fantasia composed around 1770, W. F. Bach mixes free sections without measures with a strict, imitative section *prestissimo* in the style of two-part invention.
idealized individual ideas, feelings, and inspirations in art as opposed to communal ideals and creative processes called imitatio.\textsuperscript{15} Although this mode of genius originated in the Hellenistic world, it resurfaced at the end of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century as a new mode of artistic expression encapsulating the revolutionary ideas fomented around the time.\textsuperscript{16} In a sense, the fantasia of the prelude type, which closely observed the doctrines of the cult of original genius, can be regarded as one of the blooms that this artistic revolution yielded. Therefore, in order to look at the artistic temperament behind this type from a proper perspective, I think it is worthwhile to take a detour to two worlds before and after the revolution from which the prelude-type fantasia germinated.

Before the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, the notion of genius was based on the Platonic world view\textsuperscript{17} that “all perfect things are superior (or prior) to those that are imperfect.”\textsuperscript{18} A man of genius in this period did not feel himself confronted with the imperative of originality. Although people of the time also appreciated and praised artistic originality, they valued more what was believed to substantiate their communal ideals, often looking back to Classical antiquity for their models. Thus, a man of genius would frequently confess that he was following a model which had proven excellence and had authority over him, and that the ultimate aim of his art lay in regaining the status of his paragon by emulating his art.\textsuperscript{19} In music-making, his activity would depend on a good


\textsuperscript{17} According to C. S. Lewis, this axiom was first found in Plato’s \textit{Timaeus} and later reconciled by ancient Christian scholars with the Christian doctrine of \textit{Logos}.


deal on the method called *imitatio*, building on the model works that were available to him.\(^{20}\) The new musical composition created through this process intrinsically possessed the features of many different periods and produced a unique effect as whole. For example, since ancient classics were absent in musical art, Renaissance audiences who had experienced and observed the ingenuity of Josquin’s counterpoint, music-word settings, and musical rhetoric, received and perceived him as an authority whose music stood out as a symbol of musical perfection. The humanists such as Glarean praised Josquin as a Virgil of music\(^ {21}\) and viewed his music as having reached the pinnacle of Classical perfection.\(^ {22}\) And Palestrina acknowledged emulating Josquin’s music as his model, proving Josquin’s status as a classic in the Renaissance period.\(^ {23}\) Therefore, Palestrina’s music, through which Renaissance counterpoint was transmitted to later generations, bears witness to the genius of Josquin.

This mode of genius that had brought to life and realized the communal ideal began to be questioned in the 18th century, due to a profound change that had occurred during the previous century. The fantasia in the prelude type emerged as a musical genre impregnated by a new mode of genius.

New scientific discoveries challenged traditional interpretations of nature. In the old world, nature had been a work of God to be understood by His *logos*, but from the 17th century...


\(^{22}\) Macey, “Josquin as Classic,” 7.

onwards nature began to be viewed on its own terms. Nature as independent of religion captured both scientific minds and the cultural imagination of the time. Scientists began to conceive reality in terms of mechanical laws of nature as opposed to spiritual ones. The burgeoning field of human reason, which formerly had been regarded as a lower faculty of the mind, now emerged as a central agency of knowing reality, “separating out individual processes of nature from their environment, describing mathematically, and thus explaining them.” On the other hand, the contemporaneous cultural mainstream increasingly portrayed nature as a venerable object or an object of awe, which had previously been valued as a medium of God’s wisdom and goodness that had created it. This love or worship of nature developed in the 18th century into a kind of naturalism that exalted Nature as the absolute in which all realities are grounded, and as a place of infinity and sublimity that incites quasi-religious admiration. This naturalism, imbued with pantheistic overtones, stressed, beyond rational ideas, the values of feeling, intuition, and inspiration emanating from Nature.

As a corollary of these developments, the prevalent psychology of the time demanded a new mode of genius. Theorists of the 17th century revived the concept of genius proposed by Longinus (circa the 1st or 3rd century AD) in his ancient treatise “On the Sublime,” which had

24 In the old world, between two parts of the rational faculty Intellectus was considered higher than Ratio, what is called reason today. Intellectus was a shadowy replica of angelic intelligentia that comprehended things by understanding their essence or simply by seeing the self-evident truth. The very fact that this order was reversed during the 18th century points for the revolutionary change of the world view. See St. Thomas Aquinas, *The Summa Theologica*, vol. 1, trans. Father Laurence Shapcote, Great Books of the Western World, vol. 17, ed. Mortimer J. Alder (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1990), and also Samuel Coleridge, *Biographia Literaria: the Collected Works of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, Biographical Sketches of my Literary Life & Opinions*, vol. 7, ed. James Engell and Jackson Bates (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985).


26 The author of this treatise is not known. Medieval manuscripts, without historical basis, attribute it to several different Roman authors. See Donald Russel, introduction to his own edition of *On the Sublime*, by Longinus (1964; reprint, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), xxii–xxx.
been largely ignored in the old world, that is, before the 17th century. Longinus advocated originality as an essential quality of genius, and elevated a man of genius as a god-like creator, prioritizing individual creativity over collective values. On the basis of his concept, theorists of the 18th century formulated a new notion of genius.

This new mode of genius, called original genius by Edward Young (1683–1765) and William Duff (1732–1815), underscored three significant elements of art: originality, natural feeling, and creative imagination. Firstly, the art of a genius was supposed to beget unprecedented original ideas, spontaneously proceeding from Nature without any assistance of learning. The original genius was often set against the ‘imitative’ genius of the old world, which theorists of the 18th century regarded as inferior. It was believed that whereas a man of imitative genius could only earn a modicum of originality by imitating works of authority and realizing communal ideals, a man of original genius could, by solely relying on his innate capacity, achieve true artistic excellence, unforeseen and novel. Thus, Addison declares “An

---

27 Peter Kivy, 49–52.


29 Edward Young, Edward Young’s Conjectures, 10–20; see also William Duff, An Essay on Original Genius (London: Printed for Edward and Charles Dilly, 1767).

30 For this reason, Alexander Pope, an influential figure on later theory, raved about Shakespeare as a supreme genius in the preface to his edition of Shakespeare. He claims that “If ever any author deserved the name of an Original, it was Shakespear…. The poetry of Shakespear was inspiration indeed: he is not so much an Imitator, as an Instrument of Nature.” See Alexander Pope, “Prefaces to the Works of Shakespeare,” in Alexander Pope: The Major Works, ed. Pat Rogers (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 183–194.

31 Kivy, 33–34.
imitation of the best authors is not to compare with a good original,”32 and Kant, in a similar spirit, states that “[original] genius is entirely opposed to the spirit of imitation.”33 In the 18th century, this aesthetic doctrine implied that a man of original genius denies not only the automatic authority of Classical antiquity but also that of the artistic conventions of the time by inventing “new work, the model of which [the artist] owes to none.”34 Accordingly, an anti-generic tendency of originality became one of the central characteristics of the fantasia in the prelude type. Furthermore, this tenet also accentuated the spontaneous appurtenance of creative ideas, i.e. inspiration or afflatus, that suddenly and effortlessly spring from original genius, a theory which later developed into organic aesthetics in the Romantic period. And theorists of the second half of the 18th century conceptually set such artistic inspiration against conscious workout or plan.

The advance of artistic individualism also awakened the significance of an inner sensibility of the artist to subjective feelings in 18th-century art.35 As the meaning of nature shifted from an allegory of God’s providence to nature itself as the absolute, the faculty of human feeling, which had been employed as an aid to other purposes of art, came forth as a principal subject. The subjective feelings and their inner processes, in place of objectified

---


34 Young, *Conjectures*, 27

emotional responses to religious or literary themes, came to command central importance in artistic expression and to be pursued for their own sake. The art of a genius of the new kind was expected to touch “the depth of sentiment which lies beneath.” In this historical change, the impassioned expressions of the sacred art which had been part of the Christian meditative tradition, were transported to the secular. Thus, not only should the art of an original genius bring out the depth of subjective feelings, but also the feelings themselves ought to convey such solemn and sublime sentiments as those of the sacred art. Later we will see that the prelude-type fantasia exploits these kinds of emotion, particularly those of meditative *lamento* and *Passionaria*.

One of the reasons why subjective feelings and passions were not encouraged in the art of the old world can be found in the definition of ‘imagination’ of the time and its role in art. Before 18th-century naturalism emerged, imagination had been understood not as artistic creativity or vision but mostly as ordinary perception, i.e. the mechanism of the mind that unifies the imagery impressed on the human consciousness by external sensations. And it had been feared that

---

36 Young, *Conjectures*, 43

37 For example, the morbid and passionate poems of “Night Thoughts” by Edward Young, who was a proponent of the 18th-century naturalism and, when imported to Germany, hailed as a harbinger of German Empfindsamkeit, were not in fact expressing a ‘Romantic’ attraction to morbidity but illustrating Christian doctrines of immortality. Nevertheless, his emotionally charged expressions themselves drew more attention and responses from his contemporaries than the ultimate message he aimed to convey by them. The pathos of his “Night” verses that touched the region of melancholy were intended to aid religious contemplation, but this kind of religious feeling began to gain huge popularity in its own terms and be transferred to secular realms of art in the 18th century, stripped of its theological context. And in his late years Young himself asserted that the ultimate duty of original genius lies in producing pathos through his art, obeying the religion of Nature. See Edward Young, *Night Thoughts*, ed. Stephen Cornford (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).


imagination as an independent faculty, that is, a conveyor of human aspirations, desires, and passions regarded as lower and irrational parts of the human mind, might disturb the rational judgment of the mind when it is freed from the control of its higher faculties, e.g. *ratio* (reason) and *intellectus* (understanding). However, as British empiricists such as Hume emphasized the roles of sense perception and emotion in knowing reality and morality, the thinkers in the second half of the 18th-century came to view in more positive terms the imagination independent of pre-conceived rational ideas, and to recognize its creative power that could connect things seemingly unrelated. In this change, ‘imagination’ acquired a new meaning: an activity of the mind that does not merely relate sensory inputs by mechanical laws, but creatively transforms simple ideas into something unique and fantastic. This new definition of imagination accentuated the active agency of the mind in artistic creativity. Thus, the naturalists, unlike Locke’s passive picture of the mind as a *tabula rasa*, promoted original genius as a god-like creator who reigns, with the creative power of imagination, “arbitrarily over its own empire of chimeras,” which had been feared as a begetter of anarchy.

British Naturalism and Its Import on German Musical Culture


42 Young, *Conjectures*, 18.
This naturalism was a pan-European phenomenon in the 18th century, but first found its dominant voice and expression in the British culture of the time.\textsuperscript{43} It was British theorists who once more brought the treatise of Longinus into prominence and spread the concept of original genius.\textsuperscript{44} As they also extoled Edward Young’s passionate poems “Night Thoughts” as a work of sublime and original genius, his contemporary British writers celebrated subjectivism and emotionalism of this very kind (e.g. Thomas Gray (1716–1771)’s ‘graveyards’ poems and Laurence Sterne (1713–1768)’s “The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman” and “A Sentimental Journey through France and Italy.”) In the same vein, British painters of the time such as Alexander Cozens (1717–1786) developed imaginative drawings of landscapes, which had been mostly backgrounds to portraits of landowners or human stories. This artistic tradition in which the artist fantasized and idealized nature culminated in the works of British landscapists in the early 19th century, e.g. John Constable (1776–1837), J. W. W. Turner (1775–1851), and Samuel Palmer (1805–1881). In addition, the English landscape garden, i.e. the picturesque garden that romanticized nature or stylized naturalness, popularized the aesthetic movement of naturalism on the continent.

In the second half of the 18th century, unlike France, where rationalism and its associated neoclassicism predominated, German speaking lands eagerly embraced the aesthetics of British naturalism as its new artistic impetus. The English garden popped up in many German cities, and German writers and artists developed literary and artistic movements equivalent to British genres of naturalism. For example, in response to British sentimental novels, which had won great


\textsuperscript{44} See Doran, \textit{The Theory of the Sublime from Longinus to Kant}, and Kivy, \textit{The Possessed}. 
popularity in the 1750s, German writers such as Lessing and Klopstock, who belonged to the close circle of C. P. E. Bach, advanced the literary style called Empfindsamkeit, which made the fashionable appeal to natural feelings and sentimentality of the time. Next generation of German writers further intensified the expression of subjective emotion, often extremes of an individual troubled by the rational order and tradition of the society; this literary movement of German naturalism was named Sturm und Drang. As Goethe’s “Die Leiden des jungen Werthers” begot the pan-European phenomenon known as Werther-Fieber, this aesthetic currency reached its zenith in Germany.

Although the impact of British naturalism was visible in many artistic fields of the German-speaking lands, its direct import into German musical culture has been strongly doubted; in other words, it has been argued that the parallel musical movement to Sturm und Drang, in which individual subjectivity and passionate emotion were given free rein, was absent in the 18th century or its influence on musical composition remained limited. Some scholars attempted to identify musical representatives of the movement in operatic and symphonic works of Classical composers such as Gluck, Haydn, and Mozart. But their researches show that its applications were confined to theatrical sound effects in stage works, whose text in Sturm und Drang already provided emotive topics to music, and to sections of symphonies in a minor mode with dramatic or sentimental effects. Other scholars argue that the influence of British naturalism


on German music was only encompassed in the music of Northern German musicians, championing C. P. E. Bach as the leader of the movement. Bach was in close contact with Lessing and Klopstock, German writers who brought in British naturalistic aesthetic by translating British sentimental novels and emulating their styles, and contemporaneous theorists of Bach hailed his music as expression *par excellence* of imagination and feelings. However, even his music, regarded as the primary example of *empfindsamer stil* equivalent to the literary style of *Empfindsamkeit*, was mostly articulated in fixed forms of music based on French neoclassical aesthetics. This is because even the musical aesthetics of north Germany in the second half of the 18th century was predominantly rationalistic and neoclassical, finding its primary musical voice in the styles imported from France and Italy where neoclassicism that emphasized intelligibility, simplicity, form, and balance prevailed.

This quandary was created by the fact that Britain, a country where naturalism was initially fomented, did not provide concrete models of musical art, unlike the literary and visual arts. British picturesque music of the time, which consisted of vocal works with pastoral and bucolic text, lacked the artistic temperament of the aesthetic movement, i.e. that of original genius. The musical culture of the country rather relied on foreign resources, i.e. mainly Italian musical styles and German musicians. Thus, contemporary British theorists ironically extolled as

---


an original genius Händel, a German composer whose music was based on German Baroque tradition and Italian classical operatic style.

However, it was the Baroque fantasia of free improvisation in which composers in northern Germany found ideal opportunities to realize the newly imported, British naturalistic aesthetics being fostered in their cultural soil. In the hands of these composers, who followed the lead of C. P. E. Bach, the fantasia in *stylus phantasticus*, initially based on the tradition of Baroque keyboard improvisation, was transformed into the fantasia in the prelude type that conformed to naturalistic aesthetic principles. The prelude-type fantasia was, in fact, a pure German phenomenon. In this historical process, British naturalism did not function as a model that propagated specific artistic conventions, but as a guiding aesthetic spirit that determined the general direction of the genre’s musical development. Thus, in the musical conventions of the time, composers found musical substance for the transformation of the fantasia, turning it into a genre that amalgamated various musical styles and impulses in creative and original ways.

In the later part of the 18th century, German theorists increasingly recognized and received this prelude-type fantasia as an art of original genius. They viewed the fantasia, rather than merely as an improvisatory genre, as free play of imagination and originality, which were intrinsic properties of original genius. Reviewing C. P. E. Bach’s fantasias in his “Für Kenner und Liebhaber” (published in 1785), Friedrich Cramer, a music critic who ardently promoted Bach’s fantasias, attributed harmonic ingenuity of the fantasias to his genius, saying:

He sometimes slowly steals from one key to another, sometimes as it were vaults across through a *salto mortale*, how he prepares the bold modulations, and changes tempi, as

---

his genius thinks fit for a free fantasia.\footnote{Cited in Richards, \textit{The Free Fantasia}, 41.}

This passage tells us that without concerning external laws, a genius, in this genre, could make decisions according to its own creative impulse, revealing the imaginative temperament of the new mode of genius; especially the phrase \textit{salto mortale} underscores the audacious nature of its musical imagination. Koch, a theorist in the close circle of C. P. E. Bach, also defined the genre as an art of original genius. In accordance with the concept of original genius of the time, he emphasized the immediacy of original ideas in his definition of the fantasia, and considered the genre as a sketch of such instantaneous inspired ideas. Thus, he argued, any rationalistic attempt to unify the ideas in a coherent form would be inimical to this art:

\begin{quote}

since the Ideal brought forth by Genius loses nothing of its first liveliness through the further working-out a more strictly ordered whole, these pieces very often contain far more prominent and striking traits than a piece composed according to forms and the other necessary characteristics of a perfected whole. \footnote{Koch,“Fantasie”}.
\end{quote}

This remark concerning the fantasia, which accentuates the significance of immediacy of inspiration, shows that Koch conceived this genre in naturalistic terms.

The discussion of Sulzer, a teacher of Koch, on artistic imagination and inspiration, reveals more direct aesthetic influence of and close link to British naturalism.\footnote{Richards also recognizes this tie between the two schools and examines it at length. However, she advocates the prelude-type fantasia not as a pure naturalistic art but as a combination of the sensual and the rational. We will discuss this topic in the next chapter.} And he designates, as Koch does, the fantasia as the first sketch of such ideas formed at an inspired moment.\footnote{Johann Goerg Sulzer, \textit{Allgemeine Theorie der schönen Künste}, 2nd edn. (Leipzig, 1792–4), s.v. “Fantasiren; Fantasie,” cited in Richards, \textit{The Free Fantasia}, 76–77.} When Sulzer describes inspiration as
so in a dream at night, when all distraction suddenly ceases, the image that veiled while awake stands before our eyes as clear as the broadest daylight, so, in the sweet dream of inspiration, the artist sees the desired object before his vision, he hears sounds when all is silent, and feels a body which is real only in his imagination.55

his notion betrays the aforementioned new concept of imagination, a creative force of the mind that engenders a new artistic vision, and its non-rational origin, that is, subjective human faculties of heightened perception and emotion. These were essential elements in the British concept of original genius that Edward Young espoused in his “Conjectures on Original Composition.” Sulzer frames his discourse in a dichotomy between the non-rational and rational, a typical 18th-century view, describing the state of inspiration with the metaphor “a dream at night” which represents its sub-conscious, non-rational genesis, and setting it against the state of being “awake,” a more conscious and rational mind, which, as Sulzer and Koch alike thought, “distracts” or hinders the non-rational faculties. Although in other places, as mentioned above, he argued that the non-rational should be later worked out and tamed by the rational in order for an art work to obtain the status of “fine” art,56 Sulzer, here, acknowledges that thus awakened ideas are as vivid as the real, and artistically viable, which does not necessarily mean that they are, in fact, the rational as Richards interprets it.57

Contemporaneous theorists, between the 1780s and 1800s, unanimously described the fantasia as a musical art of original genius that embodied the ideals of British naturalism.


57 Richards, 57–59.
Nonetheless, defining the genre in such terms would demand musical evidence from the repertoire itself as well as clarification of an issue involving the relationship between theoretical writings of the time and musical phenomena. One should remember that while an accepted theory could function as a starting point of musical creation, its end result sometime could provoke a new thought or theory. For this reason, a music theory is formulated only after the practice already has taken place for a while and after its theoretical implications dawn on our consciousness. Fantasias composed in this period (the 1780s – 1800s) show us the same kind of phenomenon. As mention at the beginning, while the theorists of the time and the composers in the keyboard school of C. P. E. Bach sustained in the genre the naturalistic aesthetic imported and developed in German speaking lands before 1780, the younger generation, led by Viennese classics, was already fermenting it into a new type that betrays more aesthetic reconciliation between British naturalism and French neoclassicism. And the developments made by their hands came to be articulated by theorists after 1800. Therefore, unmitigated naturalism should be applied to the fantasia in the amorphous prelude type that embodied the aesthetic ideal of original genius.

Even explaining the characteristics of this prelude-type fantasia in naturalistic terms would invite challenges and ask due caution. As mentioned before, British naturalism only provided concrete models on literary and visual arts but not on musical art, and even these arts, when they were transplanted to German soils, gained new characteristics and unique tinctures. For example, as discussed above, sentimentalism and subjectivism of British naturalism, which captured German writers in the 1770s, developed into a German literary movement, *Sturm und Drang*. While in the British literature the fixation on morbid feelings was balanced out by contemplative feelings, wit, and humor, the German counterpart mainly focused on extreme
macabre, subjective feelings. Goethe, who was once a vehement proponent of both British
naturalism and German *Sturm und Drang* and acknowledged his indebtedness to British writers,
later observed and criticized the German literary movement, saying “a kind of tender-passionate
aesthetic…because the humorous irony of the British was not given to us, usually had to
degenerate into a sorry self-torment.”

Therefore, although the prelude-type fantasia
occasionally portrays the same kind of violent and dark feeling of the German *Sturm und Drang*,
any attempt to approach the genre as a musical equivalent of *Sturm und Drang* or any other
naturalistic art would prove futile, Though the fantasia in the prelude type shared a common
aesthetic orientation with other naturalistic movements, its contents did not represent their
specific elements. It followed the fundamental principles of British naturalism as its guiding
spirit that provided a new *modus operandi* for fantasia-making, but its expressions ultimately
belonged to musical art itself. In other words, the genre basically evolved along the lines of
development of the concept of absolute music, i.e. beauty free from extra-musical associations,
and it was generally understood as such in the Classical period as his “Critique of Judgment”
Kant summarizes:

They represent nothing – no object under a definite concept – and are free beauties.
We can refer to the same class what are called in music *phantasie*, i.e. pieces
without any theme, and in fact all music without words.

Musical Characteristics of the Prelude-Type Fantasia

---

58 Cited in Daniel Heartz and Bruce Alan Brown, s.v. “Empfindsamkeit,” in *Grove Music Online*.


60 Kant, *Critique*, 30.
The practice of the genre was rooted in the tradition of Baroque fantasia improvisation, and its expressive ingredients were derived from its contemporary musical language. However, as the concept of original genius gave a new artistic impetus to German culture in the mid-18\textsuperscript{th} century, the composers in the school of C. P. E. Bach realigned the genre with its aesthetic characteristics, promoting it as its ideal musical manifestation. They refashioned the fantasia with several new features in line with three attributes of original genus: inspired originality, abundance of feelings, and creative imagination. These newly acquired characteristics were continuously cultivated by them even in the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century by them, and thus provide us a key to comprehending the prelude-type fantasia.

First of all, under the hands of the composers in Bach’s school, the fantasia took the form of a revolt against French neoclassicism. It took on a free form that eschewed the formal patterns of Classical genres, maximizing the expressive potential of highly subjective ideas. The fantasia in the Baroque period included various kinds that freely assumed forms of other genres, but the composers in Bach’s school dropped all other kinds of the fantasia but \textit{stylus phantasticus}, the style of free improvisation of Northern German organists, which mainly consisted of pyrotechnics, improvisatory harmonic progressions, and passages aimed at grand sonic effects of Baroque keyboard instruments. These composers modified even the function and content of this style. The fantasia in \textit{stylus fantasticus} only served, in Baroque period, as a prelude or introduction to the following fugue strictly controlled by rules. But these composers saw in this style expressive possibilities for subjectivism that British naturalism endorsed, and made the fantasia in this style as an independent genre – a development attributed to C. P. E. Bach. In addition, they eliminated the learned style from the fantasia, which Baroque keyboard works in this fantastic style often incorporated. Excluding all the traits that betrayed conscious working-
out, the composers turned the fantasia into an ideal *locus* for display of original genius whereby inspired and intuitive ideas were expressed without any constraints of norms of the time. In this sense, the fantasia in the prelude type was an anti-genre.

At the same time, as discussed in writings of Edward Young, this art of original genius was expected to bring out the depth of human feelings, often touching the melancholy region of sorrow and lamentation. And historical documents reveal that the contemporary audience actively engaged their own emotions in listening to the fantasia performance. In this aesthetic context, in the fantasia composers imported the most *pathétique* expressions mainly from two sources: sacred *passion* music and opera. The composers in Bach’s school transferred, to the fantasia, a subjective and personal art, religious and public sentiments, particularly those of the *Tombeau*, a composition commemorating the death of Christ or a notable person, and even fantasias in major keys often express individual, contemplative feelings of sorrow and death, partly recitative-like and partly imitating plucked string instruments. Schleuning’s research shows that many passages of the fantasia in the *lamento* style were directly quoted or derived from sacred works with the topic of death. For instance, C. P. E. Bach’s last fantasia *Empfindungen* (1787) opens with a funeral march with measures, distinguished from following sections without measures, which closely resembles the opening of his father’s funeral motet, BWV 118. The middle section of his fantasia called “Gloomy” (1753) reappeared later in his song “Jesus in Gethsemane.” At the end of his fantasia (c. 1750), Johann Ernst Bach quotes the contemplative chorale “O grosse Liebe” from J. S. Bach’s Johann Passion. The *pathétique*

---


62 Schleuning, 11–12.
opening of Mozart’s fantasia in C Minor, K. 475, though this works ultimately belongs to the second type, also betrays the expressive formula of the *topos* death in the 18th century, i.e. a triadic motif on the descending chromatic bass, which was used a half century before by Pergolesi for the scene of Mary’s lament for the crucified Christ.

In a similar vein, after 1750 composers began to include in the fantasia sorrowful, sentimental arioso movements or sections, taking operatic arias as their model. Influenced by British naturalism, Johann G. Sulzer (1720–1779) contended that melodies should be the primary matter of music and ultimately suit the primary goal of the fine arts to awaken in the listener a vivid feeling and sentiment true and good.63 It is inconclusive whether or not C. P. E. Bach whole-heartedly subscribed to this aesthetic thought. But we can easily speculate that as the aesthetic aims of the fantasia overlap that of the fine arts defined by Sulzer, Bach, who formed a close musical friendship with Sulzer at a *collegium musicum* in Berlin, the so-called *Monday Club of Berlin*,64 implemented their theory in this genre by dropping the imitative style and at the same time aestheticizing melodic effects in the arioso movements. This new feature, however, prompted Jesse Parker to approach the fantasia as a song without words verging on wordless instrumental drama in his dissertation “The Clavier Fantasy from Mozart to Liszt.”65 Indeed, it is not difficult to imagine that in the field where subjective, imaginative expressions, free from the conventional formal principles, were encouraged, the composers freely employed programmatic
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65 Jesse Parker, “The Clavier Fantasy from Mozart to Liszt: A Study in Style and Content” (Ph. D. Diss., Stanford University, 1974), 17–43.
or dramatic elements, using them as a starting point in the creative process. Nevertheless, no matter how audible those vocal and dramatic elements are in the fantasia, it is not acceptable to regard the feature not merely as one of its several constituent elements but as a genre-defining aspect. For the musical style of the fantasia as a whole testifies against his view. It is undeniable that the sentimental arioso, in fact, appears frequently in the prelude type, but it was not as indispensable an element as numinous expressions of ombra; C. P. E. Bach himself predicates the fantasia with the adjective “dark” in the letter to Forkel (10 February 1775), complaining of the fantasia’s unpopularity. Therefore, relatively short fantasias such as E. W. Wolf’s fantasia in B major (1785) and J.C. Kittel’s fantasia in F major (1789), though filled with brooding harmony or tragic gestures, do not include any arioso section. In addition, in the prelude type the composer would not fully articulate a melody in a song form, but would creatively reconfigure its setting by sliding into a new section imperceptibly through its open end or by making a surprising turn to a section with contrasting topoi or feeling.

Although the tendency towards pathos-laden expressions of lamento was prominent in the fantasia, one emotive topic neither dominated over nor determined the structure of the whole piece. Unlike literary Sturm und Drang, extreme sentimentalism never held full sway over the genre, despite being somewhat influenced by it. In the fantasia, various natural feelings, even including the topos of Laune (wit and humor) and their free flow and change were celebrated and materialized by musical idioms. The fantasia was the central species of the musical Empfinsamkeit, which contributed to the general aesthetic development of breaking away from the doctrine of the affections and instead cultivating an inner process of varying affects. The

---


Baroque theory of the doctrine of the affections, known as *Affektenlehre*, a theory based on the idea, derived from ancient rhetoric, that musical figures could represent affects or passions and a musical work should express a single affect throughout, was challenged by naturalistic theorists of the 18th century who thought it unnatural and mechanical. In recent years, even its application to Baroque music has been doubted, for many successful Baroque works actually express multiple affects in a single movement and the attempt of Mattheson, an 18th-century theorist to identify the affective quality of each passage proved to be futile.

Yet, even a Baroque piece with multiple affects like a sonata of D. Scarlatti would not display as diverse affects as the fantasia, and would, as a whole, maintain its chief mood. As discussed above, in the Baroque period the central topic of the text dictated the emotive content of vocal music, and that of pure instrumental music was also determined by its conventional movement type. In the fantasia in the prelude type, the composers emphasized the expression of a variety of deeply-felt passions within a work, and attempted to intensify its expressive effect by imbuing each passage with an emotive character and juxtaposing contrasting moods in rapid change. This characteristic is one of several elements that separate the fantasia in the prelude type between 1780s and 1800s from the Baroque fantasia in *stylus phantasticus*. Thus, quick, kaleidoscopic changes of affect, as within the middle section of Kellner’s *Fantasia con expressione*, from tragic lament to sentimental arioso then to joyful passage work, would not have been permissible in the Baroque fantasia, even the freest kind.

And the juxtaposition of contrasting affects displays not only the expressive freedom that this genre acquired, but also the new mode of imagination that dawned in the second half of the 18th century. Before its emergence, if imagination in a philosophical sense had been controlled
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68 Werner Brown, “Affekt,” in *Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (MGG), 2nd ed.
by human understanding or mechanism of external percepts, the musical imagination had been
ddictated by the text or musical norm. However, this genre, defined by expressive freedom,
allowed the expression of subjective and creative imagination that put together, within a work,
the expressive characters incongruous according to the musical convention of the time. For
example, C. P. E. Bach’s fantasia in A minor, H. 278 (1783), even after an opening
introduction,69 wanders with ephemeral ideas, constantly shifting its style, – from instrumental
recitative to toccata-like passages then to tragic overture in F# minor and to lamento with a
descending sigh figure – and never completing ideas nor confirming their key areas. Through
these transient passages, Bach indeed creates a dream-like effect not permissible in other
instrumental genres of the time. In the middle of the piece, however, Bach creates a maximal
contrast from surrounding passages. He introduces here a harmonically and formally stable
section with half and perfect cadences, and imbues this section following the lamento passage
with a character of a capriccio, developing it in two remote keys of B-flat and F major from the
tonic A major.

The new mode of musical imagination was not limited to this kind of ingenious use and
deployment of various styles, but, as seen in Bach’s fantasia, also manifested itself in harmonic
progressions of the fantasia. Since Rameau’s harmonic theory had been proposed, root
progressions of chords by fifth were generally accepted as a norm. Key modulations of the tonal
music in the second half of the 18th century were also mostly based on motion by fifth, though
third-related or stepwise modulations were occasionally found. In contrast, based on voice-
leading techniques of figured bass, in the prelude-type fantasia composers freely made bold,

69 In other genres of the time, such an introduction was normally expected to be followed by a more stable
and thematically defined section.
often chromatic, tonal progressions via harmonic devises such as *ellipsis* and evasion, and ‘imaginative’ far-fetched harmonic connections by unexpectedly modulating to a distant key, intentionally evading the conventional modulation to the dominant or subdominant. Considering this genre characteristic, it does not appear surprising to find a tritone modulation from D minor to G# minor via the diminished seventh chord of D minor in J. W. Hässler’s fantasia in E minor, the last fantasia in the prelude type (1803). Perhaps the prelude-type fantasia reveals that composers in J. S. Bach’s circle did not fully accept the precepts of Rameau and of functional tonality in general. According to Kirnberger, a pupil of J. S. Bach, C. P. E. Bach reported that he and his father were “anti-Rameau,”70 We can speculate that French composers in the second half of the 18th century did not cultivated the fantasia, partly due to their whole-hearted subscription to Rameau’s theory.

In sum, we can characterize the prelude type with three prominent features: amorphous form, expressive variety, and harmonic ingenuity. The fantasia of this type was perceived and developed as art of original genius, i.e. the musical embodiment of the naturalistic aesthetics newly imported to the German culture in the second half of 18th century. However, one should not forget that this art, which accentuated individuality and imagination to the utmost by the musical standard of the time, was, in fact, founded on the improvisatory tradition of figured bass, inherited from Baroque composers, in particular from J. S. Bach. Therefore, we will start the next chapter with a study of musical prerequisites and idioms of the traditional improvisation as incorporated in fantasias of the prelude type. Then, we will examine new expressive characteristics added by composers in the generation of C. P. E. Bach guided by the spirit of
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British naturalism, and discuss unconventional forms of these fantasies and issues around interpreting them.
Chapter 3. Fantasias of the Prelude Type

The “expressive freedom” of the fantasia in the prelude type, often used as a genre defining element by 18th-century theorists, would disappoint modern listeners if they expected iconoclastic art of the early 20th century from it. From that perspective, most daring expressions in fantasias would appear tame and limited. For the fantasia was not an art that promoted unconditional freedom, lawlessness, and irresponsibility, though it frequently creates such an illusion. The musical imagination of the 18th-century fantasia was free yet circumscribed by the principle of tonal harmony. If ‘freedom’ was a word used to characterize the genre, ‘correctness’ of harmonic progression was a thing required as a prior condition for the freedom. The prelude type whereby spontaneous execution of inspired ideas was duly emphasized did not exempt the composer from this sine qua non. Thus, C. P. E. Bach, in his essay, posited “a thorough understanding of harmony” as a prerequisite of the fantasia, which took precedence over formal concerns.¹ Even far-fetched harmonic connections frequently employed in this genre are rationally explainable by harmonic rules of tonality, and even at most inspired moments in which genius transcends the ordinary world of experience, the faculty of reason must have been fully awake.

This rationalistic aspect of the fantasia, however, does not imply that as several scholars argue, the fantasia in the prelude type was an art with underlying symmetrical order and
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¹ C. P. E. Bach, Essay, 430.
structural unity, i.e. central elements of French neoclassicism. To prevent such a confusion, we need to draw a distinction between the methods used for the fantasia and the aesthetic purpose that they ultimately serve. In the fantasia, tonality supplied the expressive means of conveying one’s musical imagination, functioning as its musical syntax. As equivocation and paradox in Edward Young’s poems were expressed in observance to and mastery of rules of English, the imaginative musical language of the fantasia was built upon harmonic rules of 18th-century tonality. Yet, the rationalistic principle of tonality neither begot a unifying form nor determined the artistic end of the fantasia. Although a basic harmonic formula governed by tonic centrality underlay the prelude-type fantasia, it operated merely as a tonal scaffolding that held together diverse elements and key areas, remaining in the background without interfering with musical events happening in the foreground. Thus, unlike the Classical sonata, the fantasia in the prelude type never dramatizes the structural arrival at the home key and rarely modulates to the dominant or subdominant key. The prescribed rule of tonality ultimately served its aesthetic end to create original and subjective expressions which were regarded as musical anomalies at the end of the 18th century. Although the published fantasia in this type was not the spontaneous exertion of momentary inspiration but certainly necessitates the process of an artificial construction, it purported to offer the listener such a more sinuous and naturalistic effect. For the sake of this improvisatory nature, it adopted a free form that allowed sudden turns and free changes, less concerned with structural unity than other Classical genres.
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2 Mitchell affirms the view of Richards, when in his introduction to C. P. E. Bach’s Essay the argues “The improvisatory character of this type pf composition is achieved not by a meaningless wandering from key to key, by an imaginative manipulation of details that fit persuasively into an unified whole.” See William J. Mitchell, Introduction to Essay on the True Art of Playing Keyboard, by C. P. E. Bach, 22.
Prerequisites of the Prelude-Type Fantasia

In regard to improvising a fantasia, C. P. E. Bach in his essay recommends that first the improviser should use a figured bass as a harmonic skeleton to guide his improvisation.³ According to historical documents, published fantasias closely followed the improvised fantasia in many aspects, and the style of published fantasias in the prelude type shows that they were, in fact, free elaborations on such a figured bass as shown in the case of C. P. E. Bach’s fantasia in C minor, H. 75/iii, one of 18 Probestücke from the 1st edition of Versuch (see Ex. 1).⁴ In other words, they were bass-oriented rather than relying on the top voice, one of several features that separate them from the other types. They were replete with passages of keyboard embellishment on a stepwise, chromatic, or sequential improvisatory bass, which we will discuss shortly. However, it is doubtful if before improvising a fantasia the improviser actually prepared a pre-determined figured-bass plan as Mitchell and other scholars assume.⁵ It was only for a didactic purpose, that is, to explain unique harmonic procedures of the fantasia that Bach introduced, in the form of a figured bass, the framework of the fantasia in C minor mentioned above as well as the fantasia in D major at the end of his essay. In other parts of his essay, he clearly states that the improviser should be able to harmonize any progression of the bass without making voice-leading mistakes, and have enough craftsmanship to correctly modulate to various keys at
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⁴ In this work, Bach provided figured-bass harmonization underneath its elaborate realization except in the middle arioso section.

command. Thus, in actual extemporization of the fantasia, which sometimes lasted for many hours according to some historical reports, the improviser should have made decisions at the spur of the moment in accordance with his mood or sudden inspiration, freely modulating to various tonal areas both close and remote. Most of the published fantasias we are dealing with exhibit the wild harmonic daring of the improvised rather than docilely following more expectable harmonic structures as in the two examples mentioned above: the fantasia in C minor moves to the key of E major, the relative key of the tonic in the middle, while the fantasia in D major emphasizes modulations to the dominant and the subdominant. In terms of the harmonic structure the fantasias in the prelude type have only “a few rules of construction”\textsuperscript{7} in common.

Although fantasias of this kind explore unusual key relationships and bizarre harmonic regions, they all observe the tonal principle of centrality of the home key. That is to say, no matter how far the fantasia traversed, negating conventional key relationships, it should eventually return to the tonic key and conclude with it. Thus, the improviser or composer should strategize, establishing the principal key at the opening of the fantasia as well as effectively concluding its imaginative musical journey in the principal key – another prerequisite of the fantasia for which he could not solely rely on momentary inspiration but should consciously plan with knowledge and understanding of tonal principles. Thus, Bach’s essay advises that when the improviser does not have enough experience or has a time limit, he should not dabble in too remote keys.\textsuperscript{8} Here he assumes that the tonic should be reestablished through due musical

\textsuperscript{6} It is not difficult to imagine that the improviser of the time displayed this level of craftsmanship, considering that most improvisers of the time were both accomplished composers and keyboard players.

\textsuperscript{7} Bach, 430.

\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., 431–32.
procedures. Of course, in actual fantasias we occasionally meet at the end a sudden chromatic modulation from a remote key to the tonic, but Bach’s suggestion was a more normative one in the prelude-type fantasia.

Let us first examine how composers establish the principal key in the opening of their fantasias. C. P. E. Bach argues that at the opening the fantasia should stay for a while in the principle key so as to orient the listener’s ear to it by “impressing the tonality upon his memory.”

Example 1  C. P. E. Bach, Fantasia in C Minor, H. 75/iii (1753)

Thus, at the opening of his fantasias, he often prolongs normative progressions of principal chords of the key such as the tonic, dominant, subdominant, and diminished 7th with various introductory figures of broken chords, scalar runs, and arpeggios. For example, Bach opens up the Probestück in C minor (Ex. 1) with a broken chord of the tonic and a varied arpeggio of the
same chord. Then the bass moves a half step down to the leading tone, harmonized with the diminished 7\textsuperscript{th} chord elaborated with the similar figuration. Bach resolves this diminished 7\textsuperscript{th} chord back to the tonic chord at the end of the third line and articulates the opening section with the caesura that follows the resolution. To emphasize the tonic and leading tone relationship and thus confirm its tonal orientation, Bach extends the simple harmonic progression, i-vii7-I, i.e. a

Example 2  C. P. E. Bach, Fantasia in F major, H. 279
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prolongation of the tonic, spending a good deal of time in “impressing the tonality.” This example typifies his opening strategy, which was consistently employed throughout his career. Bach maintained similar methods in the fantasias from his Kenner und Liebhaber written thirty years after the Probestück in spite of many stylistic changes he made in those fantasias.9

Similarly, his fantasia in F major, H. 279 from the book five of his Kenner und Liebhaber, while showing us one of Bach’s more sophisticated and less clear-cut openings, yet observes his typical method (See Ex. 2). Two dissonant chords immediately follow the opening arpeggio of the tonic, introducing a foreign tone Db to the home key F, but the returning tonic undermines them as passing dissonant chords over the tonic pedal. Then the expected course of harmonic progression ensues, moving from I to IV-V7. However, in this fantasia Bach obfuscates the end of his own opening formula. He does not resolve V7 to I as in his other fantasias, but instead, by raising F a half tone to F#, turns the expected tonic to a diminished 7th chord that tonicizes the supertonic (See the 3rd line of Ex. 2). The running figure on the tonicized supertonic lands on a diminished 7th chord on B-natural (in the fourth line), which cries out for a resolution to V. Its last cry is, however, answered by a short silence (caesura), and then, eliding the expected V, it abruptly moves to A minor to the tonic F, ushering in the middle section. Nevertheless, the entire harmonic progression of this opening (I- - IV-V7-vii7/ii-ii-vii7/V-(V)) and the expectation of the resolution to V that Bach creates at the end would not fail to serve Bach’s very purpose of the opening to firmly engrain the principal key in the listener’s ear.
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9 For example, in almost identical fashion to the Probestück, Bach starts the fantasia in Eb major, H. 277, adorning a simple harmonic progression, I-V7/IV-IV-vii7-V-I with arpeggio figuration; he articulates the end of the opening, separating it from the middle.
Bach’s dictum, however, was not universally accepted by his followers. In some fantasias in this type, composers wield an opening tactic that deliberately obfuscates the tonal orientation of their fantasia and thus threatens the expected tonal stability by making their fantasia sound as if it enters in medias res. Of course, no fantasia in this type starts with a chord other than the tonic and moves away from the home key without spelling out its tonic and dominant (V) relationship. But these composers relegate the I-V progression of the tonic key to part of a harmonic sequence or development, often on descending bass steps. Their openings, instead of prolonging basic harmonic progressions of the home key over a considerable time, confine them to the first few bars, and then immediately move away from the tonic key, which never returns until the fantasia reaches its ending.

The opening of J. C. Kellner’s fantasia con expressione in A minor (published in 1784), which otherwise closely resembles the style of C. P. Bach’s fantasias, epitomizes Bach’s opening strategy that is different from Bach’s theory (See Ex.3). As expected, Kellner opens his fantasia with an I-V6 harmonic progression over the chromatic motion of bass from scale degree 1 to the leading tone, continuing it with an improvisatory figure of arpeggio as Bach’s fantasias typically do. However, by m.3 he has already introduced an unexpected harmonic turn, diverting from the expected resolution of the V6 of m. 2 to I. The upward arpeggio figure of m. 2 lands on c1 as if it returns to I, yet the tone (c1) rings alone in the air without supporting harmony. A new chord, A4/2 enters abruptly at the last 16th note of the first beat and begins a modulation to D minor, raising c1 of the top voice a half tone higher to c#1 and naturalizing the bass G# of the previous bar to G. With the dotted rhythmic figure of French overture that ushers in the new chord, it journeys through three key areas, D minor, C major, and F major just in two measures (mm. 3–4). Though the bass motion seems erratic and fragmented because of register displacements, the
bass in the first four measures consists of consistent chromatic or stepwise descents; it outlines a downward motion from scale degree 1. Kellner surprises us again by introducing f# dim at the downbeat of m. 5 instead of the expected F that could resolve the preceding chord, vii6 dim of the key of F major. He does not resolve the f# dim either; at m. 6 it becomes enharmonically spelled as d#4/2 dim, which functions as a beginning of a new sequence. The point to be made here is that Kellner, from the very outset, brings out elaborate harmonic developments and confusions of the tonal identity of his fantasia - a characteristic of this genre-, which C. P. E. Bach would introduce only after a tonally stable opening.

Example 3  J. C. Kellner, Fantasia in A minor, mm. 1–9
J. W. Hässler uses a similar, disorienting opening tactic in his fantasia Op. 17 in E minor (See Ex. 4). In the opening of his fantasia, the composer briefly alludes to the home key in the first two measures with an upward broken chord of I with *acciaccatura* and an eighth-note figure introducing V. In the second phrase (m. 4) that follows a broken chord of the minor dominant (m. 3), the composer already obscures its tonal orientation by chromatically inflecting its chords (Bb6–A6) and articulating the phrase with the major subdominant 6th. Then the opening

Example 4  J. W. Hässler, Fantasia in E minor, Op 17 (ca 1803), mm. 1–11
accelerates its harmonic rhythm by omitting the eight-note figure over a chromatically descending bass. It makes a pause on d♯⁰⁴/₃ at m. 8, which may tempt some to interpret it as vii⁰⁴/₃ of E minor, the tonic key. Although one may argue that a basic tonal structure underlies this cryptic progression on the surface, the pervasive chromaticism, the weakened role of the dominant, and no fifth-based tonal progression after m. 2 would baffle one’s ear in attempting to identify the principle key of the opening in a definite tonality. Thus, although after a pause, the bass lands on Ab harmonized with V7 of Db major (remember this piece is in E minor) via common tones (m. 9), the arrival at the key (bVII of I) at the end of the opening appears not as surprising as it could have been if it were a tonally stable opening.¹⁰

Such a non-sequitur progression of keys in the opening may legitimately raise the question of the usefulness in applying the concept of tonic centrality to this genre. However, the ending of the prelude type leaves no such doubt or any tonal ambiguity. Some later fantasias in other types end in a remote key from the opening,¹¹ but all fantasias in the prelude type conclude themselves in a definitely defined home key. Whereas some of them, as discussed above, blur the tonal identity in the opening and most of them avoid an obvious reference to keys closely related to the principal key in the middle, all the endings of the type show that composers carefully designed the return to the tonic, even considering its length, as C. P. E. Bach recommended. That is, in this type the composer spends a good deal of time re-establishing the tonic before the final

¹⁰ This kind of opening that weakens the centrality of the home key from the beginning is more prevalent and influential on fantasias in other types than C. P. E. Bach’s opening method of firmly “impressing the tonality.” While in the beginning of Mozart’s K. 475 in c minor, he constantly shifts the tonality over a chromatically descending bass, Beethoven’s fantasia Op. 77 resists identification of its tonality altogether. We will discuss the openings of Mozart’s fantasias in later chapters.

¹¹ For example, Beethoven’s Op. 77, which starts in G minor is concluded in B major, and Hummel’s Op. 18 opening in Eb major has the key of G major as a closing.
Example 5    The Closing of C. P. E. Bach’s Fantasia in C Minor, H. 75/iii

The ending of Bach’s Probestück whose opening we analyzed above provides us a good example of such an ending strategy (See Example 5). Throughout this fantasia Bach carefully keeps away from harmonic progressions based on the fifth. Yet, as the work approaches the ending section, it begins to move in a harmonic sequence of diminished chords in the circle of fifths (e⁰⁴/₂ – b⁰⁶/₅ – f#⁰). The bass of the last chord, f#⁰ moves a half step higher, ushering in the cadential V6/4; a rapid run bursts out at this point, outlining the melodic minor scale of I as if cadence so as to eschew an abrupt ending. And once the home key is regained, the composer restrains from introducing harmonic diversions that might confuse the tonal identity, enforcing the tonal center with normative harmonic progressions.
it were in a *cadenza* over V6/4. However, Bach does not resolve the chord immediately to V5/3 but makes the bass move further upward in chromatic steps, delineating harmonic progressions of bVI – vii6/5 of V – P – vii7. When it reaches the diminished 7th chord of I, Bach no longer evades the harmonic resolution of a dissonant chord; the vii6/5 chord proceeds to the expected I6. The subsequent harmonic progressions draw on a typical cadential formula of tonal music: I6 – tonicization of iv–vii7 of V–V6/4–5/3–I.

If gradually solidifying the principal key at the end is a popular tactic in this type, a sudden transition to it at the beginning of the end is another ending device occasionally found. When C. P. E. Bach in his essay advises the performer to introduce the dominant pedal before the close, he assumes a gradual transition to the home key in which a pedal point could be “effectively introduced.” Yet, some fantasias of this kind abruptly bring back the home key and employ a dominant pedal to enforce the key thus introduced. In his fantasia in F major (1789), J. C. Kittle, a student of J. S. Bach, uses this kind of ending tactic (See Example 6-b). He opens his fantasia in a similar way to Bach, extending a simple harmonic progression of I–V–I and articulating the end of the section with a perfect authentic cadence in the dominant key (Ex. 6-a). But, after the opening, the dominant harmony or key virtually disappears; only the key of the minor dominant gets briefly alluded to over its dominant pedal in mm. 15–16. It rather wanders around in remote keys such as B minor (#iv of I) and G major (II of I). The opening material resumes after the second fermata as if it were to recapitulate the opening (mm. 29–31). But it is a charade; the key (G) of this passage cannot justify a recapitulatory function in the 18th century! Thus, an instrumental recitative in Adagio interrupts the course of the false recap (mm. 32–33), and this recitative, infused with chromatic tones, suddenly leads to V7 of the home key at its end.

---

12 Bach, 432–433
Example 6-a  The Opening of J. C. Kittel’s Fantasia in F major, mm. 1-4

Example 6-b  The Closing of J. C. Kittel’s Fantasia in F major, mm. 28–40
Example 6-b (cont.)
Kittel prolongs for a considerable time the hastily launched dominant of the home key over the dominant pedal, firmly reestablishing the principal tonality in our ear. What follows the pedal point are typical cadential progressions in the tonic: bVI – V6/4 – vii07 of V – V 6/4-7 – I.

**Improvisatory Traits and Harmonic Ingenuities**

We discussed above that the fantasia was initially an 18\textsuperscript{th}-century keyboard genre of free improvisation and that the prelude type of the published fantasia in the Classical period closely stylized such improvisation. If the construction of its beginning and ending was somewhat restricted by the rules of tonality, the middle body of the prelude-type fantasia provided a true haven for free expression of improvisatory ideas. Here the improvisatory nature of the type was manifested in several ways. First, instead of developing a main theme or motif in upper voices as in other types of the fantasia and Classical instrumental genres, a variety of new figures and ideas are freely displayed over the figured-bass patterns used for the traditional fantasia improvisation. Second, the composer often would fragment his musical thought, nonchalantly moving to the next, and through ingenious harmonic schemes he would knit these ephemeral thoughts together, without violating harmonic rules of tonal music. In addition, he would shun a goal-oriented development in the middle, unlike at the ending, and explore myriad harmonic and stylistic territories in a free manner.

To understand the improvisatory style of this kind, it is important first to know the figured-bass practice upon which the actual fantasia improvisation was based. The composers of this type, who mostly belonged to the earlier, Baroque era, unlike those of other types, had musical training in the figured-bass tradition and were undoubtedly masters in constructing and realizing a figured bass. C. P. E. Bach, in his essay, introduces a few ready-made bass patterns
which one, especially the beginner, can easily utilize in his extemporizations. These bass patterns, however, reveal more than just Bach’s didactic methods for the fantasia improvisation; they in fact exemplify the bass patterns frequently fashioned in this type. They can be grouped into three kinds of bass: basses out of a diatonic or chromatic scale, pedal points, and basses with modulatory chromatic inflections.

As discussed above, in the prelude type composers often deploy a tonic or dominant pedal at the beginning or ending to enforce the centrality of the home key. It is also common to find static passages with pedal points in the middle body, often in a distant key, starkly contrasted with their mercurial surroundings. For example, with a dominant pedal, Hässler in his fantasia Op. 17 in E minor creates, in the key of D major (bVII of I), the only stable area in the middle (See Example 7). The fantasia, after the rather obscure opening discussed above, constantly shifts its harmonic color and key: first through arpeggios over an ascending chromatic bass (mm. 9–11), followed by a circle of fifth (mm. 12–15), and then through a sequence over a descending chromatic bass (mm. 15–18). These passages are transitory and stabilize no key areas. As the following B7th chord makes a feigned gesture to the home key (mm. 19–21), which is met by a sudden modulation to a remote key, F# minor, it begins to slow down its harmonic rhythm. But it is only when it reaches V7 of D major that it finally stabilizes and fully confirms its key area (mm. 27–32). He prolongs and embellishes V7 of D major over a dominant pedal (mm 29–30), emphasizing it with the maximal dynamic level of this work, ff. The harmonic progressions over the pedal (V7 -6/4 -7/6/4 -8) exert a typical improvisatory prolongation of V with neighboring chords. He tries to conceal the stability of this distant key area by avoiding an obvious cadence on I and making the following passage perpetuum mobile. But one can easily

---

Example 7  J. W. Hässler, Fantasia in E minor, Op 17, mm. 15–33
recognize that in this broken-chord passage, dense chromatic progressions have disappeared, and its fundamental harmonic structure outlines a static progression from V7 to I. After this passage, the kaleidoscopic harmonic change resumes and continues until it reaches the ending. It is obvious, then, that Hässler strategically deploys the dominant pedal to maximize the contrast of the stable section at the heart of the work from the unstable surrounding. This is a design frequently found in fantasias of the prelude type; for example, Bach’s Probestücke and Kellner’s
fantasia\textsuperscript{14} discussed above have a similar design. Hässler’s pedal, on the one hand, shows its 
\textit{extempore} nature by being freely engaged and elaborated in the improvisatory style, and, on the 
other hand, manifests the unconventionality of the genre by supporting and stabilizing a distant 
key area in a way that other Classical genres would not allow.

Another improvisatory figured-bass pattern that frequents the prelude type is a bass 
fashioned out of the scale of a key. The practice of \textit{Regola dell’ Ottava} (the rule of the octave) 
was in the 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries used as an introductory method for the beginner in 
improvisation as well as composition.\textsuperscript{15} Heinichen advised this practice as the basis of 
improvised preludes,\textsuperscript{16} and J. S. Bach’s famous C-Major prelude in his Well-Temper Clavier 
book 1 epitomizes such an improvisation. The rule of the octave guides the beginner to 
harmonize an unfigured scalar bass with correct voice-leading. In essence, it sets up the scale 
degrees 1 and 5 of the octave as stable positions, harmonizing them with I and V respectively, 
and assigns a variety of dissonant or unstable chords on the steps that precede the stable 
positions, thus emphasizing a motion to I or V. The figure-bass examples that C. P. E. Bach 
introduces in his essay for a didactic purpose, in spite of their harmonization being more 
sophisticated than that of the \textit{Regola dell’ Ottava}, observe the fundamentally same harmonic 
norm as the rule.

\textsuperscript{14} Kellner’s fantasia in A minor stabilizes the key of Bb major (bII of I) at its center.

\textsuperscript{15} For an example of a theory book that introduces this practice, see Johann Adolph Scheibe, \textit{Ueber die 

\textsuperscript{16} Johann D. Heinichen, \textit{Johann David Heinichen's Gründliche Anweisung (1711): Comprehensive 
Instruction on Basso Continuo with Historical Biographies}, translated by Benedikt Brilmayer and Casey Mongoven 
In many prelude-type fantasias, the actual practice of this kind of bass, highly fluid and unpredictable, often goes beyond the basic prescriptions of ‘the rule of the octave.’ For in this type, composers typically play with generic expectations of harmonic progression to beget individualistic and original ideas. Yet, some fantasias, such as J. G. Müthel’s organ fantasia in G minor (1788) showcase instrumental embellishments rather than the display of harmonic ingenuity, and thus reveal the harmonic conventions of the time, which C. P. E. Bach advises the beginner to follow in extemporizing (See Ex. 8). Müthel’s free fantasia exhibits generic harmonic progressions based on the fifth, and embellishes them with neighboring tones and chords in an improvisatory manner, frequently introducing a pedal point and a stepwise bass. His harmonization of bass steps also exemplifies that of 18th-century harmony textbooks. For

Example 8   J. C. Müthel, Organ Fantasia in G minor
example, when a cadenza-like passage after the long opening modulates to the subdominant, C minor, he first introduces the new key on a descending bass from scale degree 4 to 1. He harmonizes these four steps with vii04/3–i6–V6/5–i respectively, that is, in the way prescribed by the rule of the octave.

In the opening of his fantasia, Hässler utilizes this traditional improvisatory device in a more unconventional manner. This opening, mentioned above, which also moves on a descending bass, deliberately obscures the kind of normative harmonization that Müthel uses in his fantasia. We discussed how he weakens its tonality at the end of the second phrase with chromatic inflections. However, if we ignore distracting details for the time being, we can see that at the outset Hässler employs fairly conventional harmonic progressions (Ex. 4). For in a descending bass out of a minor key it is common to harmonize scale degrees 7 and 6 with two parallel 6th chords as he does in this opening. Yet, an unconventional progression appears ironically when the bass reaches scale degree 5, a bass note which is supposed to function as a stable point according to the *Regola dell’ Ottava*. He introduces a dissonant 6/4 chord on scale degree 5, and, without resolving it to the expected V or -7, he makes the bass march further down two chromatic steps, harmonizing them with diminished chords in succession (vii07 of V–vii04/2), weakening the traditional role of the dominant and thus its tonal center.

The chromatic bass that Hässler engages at the end of this example (Ex. 4) shows a typical device of the 18th-century improvisation, which was regarded as a hallmark of the fantasia. Not only did the practice of a chromatic figured-bass facilitate an extempore performance but also provided the composer opportunities to display ingenious harmonic ideas. For example, the chromatically descending bass from B (mm. 6–8) lands on Ab at m. 9, making a sudden common-tone modulation to the key of Db on the far flat side in the tonal spectrum.
Then, the composer arpeggiates block chords of V7-6/4-7 of Db over an Ab pedal – an archaic figuration that composers of other types abolished in their fantasias; for these arpeggios, he temporarily suspends the metric regularity of 4/4 to emphasize their free, improvisatory nature. However, at the end of the bar (m. 9) he diverts the harmonic direction by raising the bass a half step up to A-natural and harmonizing it with two emphatic block-chords of F6/5, i.e. V6/5 of Bb, instead of the expected tonic of Db. Following a two-beat rest, the bass marches again a half step up to Bb, but Hässler evades a resolution of the F7 chord to Bb by turning the B chord to B7 (m. 10). As measure ten progresses, we realize that it is a transposition of measure nine a step up. The only difference between the two is that the composer resolves the last chord, of measure ten, V7 of Cm to tonic of the key in the succeeding phrase (m. 11). The bass in this passage (mm. 9–11) outlines upward half steps from Ab to C, and, in no more than three measures, it ushers in four key areas (Db minor-Bb major-Eb minor-C minor). This kind of improvisatory arpeggio and key change in such quick succession is rarely found, or unthinkable, in other Classical genres or even in their most radical development sections. And this passage of Hässler does not even function as a transition or development to a stable section as in a sonata or rondo, but the succeeding passages of this fantasia continuously wanders in various keys and figuration, privileging the transitoriness of musical idea.

Kellner employs in the middle section of his fantasia an improvisatory passage similar to the Hässler’s example (See Ex. 9 and Table 2). This section (mm. 39–53) is made of improvisatory elaborations on two contiguous chromatic segments of the bass: the first chromatic line moves upward from F to Bb (mm. 39–44), while the second, connected to the first, from Ab to C (mm. 45 – 52). It is noticeable that Kellner marks the end of each chromatic segment with arpeggios of block-chords as in the Hässler’s example. However, while the arpeggiation of block
Example 9  J. C. Kellner, Fantasia in F major, mm. 38–52
Table 2. Formal/Harmonic Outline of Kellner’s Fantasia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Cadence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opening</strong></td>
<td>1–9</td>
<td>arpeggios-passagework-arpeggios</td>
<td>a C F modulatory Cm</td>
<td>IC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>trio passagework</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>HC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17–19</td>
<td>arpeggios passagework</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>evaded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>arpeggios</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22–23</td>
<td>passagework</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section:</strong></td>
<td>24–26</td>
<td>recitative</td>
<td>eb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27–30</td>
<td>arioso</td>
<td>ab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31–36</td>
<td>march and song</td>
<td>F#</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36–41</td>
<td>passagework</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42–44</td>
<td>arpeggios</td>
<td>(Db)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44–45</td>
<td>recitative</td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46–49</td>
<td>passagework+recit</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51–53</td>
<td>Arpeggios</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Db</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cadence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>evaded</td>
<td>PAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Ending** | Measure: 53–59 | Style: passage with a dotted-figure | f | |
| | 60–61 | arpeggios | a | |
| | 61–64 | closing | a | |
| **Key:** | | | | |
| **Cadence:** | | | DC | PAC |
chords makes an one-time appearance in Hässler’s fantasia, Kellner repeatedly engages, throughout his fantasia, the arpeggio passage, deploying it in harmonically and structurally crucial passages. The chromatic ascent of the bass begins in the key of Eb minor three bars earlier than the first arpeggio passage. As the bass reaches G-natural in m. 41, the composer, using common tomes, prepares for modulating a half step lower to the key of D minor. And the ensuing arpeggio passage, in cadential progressions of D minor, vii43-p-vii7/V-V6/4-5/3 on chromatic bass steps from G to A (mm. 42–43), anticipates a cadence on D at its end. But, instead of satisfying the expectation thus built, Kellner surprises us by raising the bass a half step further to Bb and introducing a G-Minor 6th chord on the note through an ellipsis.\footnote{Nonetheless, the composer’s choice of the G chord is not random or implausible. Here he is using the harmonic progression called ellipsis, that is, the omission of a mediating chord. In this case the expected D chord is the omitted chord that normally would precede the G chord.} The following recitative rather confirms the key of G minor, interrupting the normative harmonic progression in the key of D minor. Yet, at the end of the recitative the composer once more introduces another ellipsis (mm. 45–6). The tail of the recitative chromatically inflected ushers in a seventh chord on Ab remotely related to the G-Minor 6th chord. From this point (m. 45) the second segment of the chromatic bass embarks.

The second half of this section (mm. 46–52), unlike the previous one, develops more straightforwardly in a harmonic sequence, although the surface is rendered irregular and rugged by heterogeneous ingredients. The harmonic sequence on half steps of the bass from Ab to C outlines alternations of a seventh chord and a diminished 7th chord: Ab7 - A\(^{o}7\) - Bb7 – B\(^{o}7\),\footnote{Kellner spells the diminished 7th chord on A in mm 46–7 with F# instead of Gb, as if it were F♯56, i.e. the diminished 7th chord of G minor. Here he seems to confuse us not only with various manner of figuration but even with the spelling of the chord. But considering the harmonic pattern of the sequence, Gb should be the correct choice.} leading to cadential progressions of the key of F minor. And the composer, using the arpeggio...
passage whose harmonic resolution was diverted earlier (mm. 43–44), closes the section with a perfect authentic cadence on F (mm. 51–53). Yet, he disguises the predictability of the harmonic progressions by interrupting the flow of broken-chord figures on the two diminished 7th chords by reintroducing the end of the recitative and a static block-chord of the dominant 7th on Bb (mm. 48–49). The tail of the recitative attached at the end of the broken chord, which ushers in the Bb7 chord as its pick-up, makes the entry of the Bb 7 in a normal harmonic progression rather surprising or dramatic as at the end of the first half (mm. 45–6), for the recitative separates the Bb7 chord from the preceding chord on Aø7 that functions as the diminished 7th chord of the Bb (m. 48).

In this example, Kellner’s fantasia progresses in a harmonically fleeting manner, constantly shifting its key. It alludes to many keys, but clarifies only two key areas, that is, D minor and F# minor, at the end of each chromatic segment of the bass, and confirms only the key of the latter. This kind of transitory, kaleidoscopic change of tonality in quick succession, often not fifth-based, is one of conspicuous characteristics of the prelude type. As discussed above, in this type the composer freely unfolds his/her harmonic ideas, frequently in far-fetched harmonic connections, without a definite structural goal. Yet, the background harmonic structure of this section hints at an ‘underground’ development of harmony in a more predictable pattern, although the surface progressions are much obfuscated by omissions and interruptions (Table 2). The first half of this example modulates in downward half steps from Eb to Db. The key first begins in Eb minor (mm. 39–40) and modulates a half tone below to D minor (mm. 41–44). The succeeding G minor, in which the recitative is unrolled, interrupts the pattern of chromatic key-modulation, but the seventh chord on Ab, V7 of Db, which the recitative ushers in, indicates that the key development resumed its due course. In the second half, the key moves up stepwise from
Db to F. The dominant chords on Ab and Bb (mm. 46 and 49) in a harmonic sequence, though tonic chords confirming their key areas are omitted, implicates a key progression from Db to Eb, and the last key, F minor, gets fully pronounced with its cadential progressions: vii\(^7\)/V–V64–53–I (mm. 50–3).

Furthermore, the cadence on F at the end of this example (mm. 52–53) serves the significant structural function of demarcating the end of the middle section of the fantasia, as if it were the dominant preparation in a sonata. As in his Versuch C. P. E. Bach recommends “formal closing cadences… are employed at the end and once in the middle,” Kellner only makes a single cadence in the middle. Since the first cadence of the fantasia on C (mm. 7–8 in Ex. 3), extended with a fermata, was struck at the end of the opening, cadences have been deliberately avoided throughout the middle section up to this point. Feigning a modulation and evading a cadence were some of the expressive means that composers frequently employed in the fantasia. Kellner deploys this single cadence at the end of the middle, emphasizing its structural significance by placing a fermata on it. In this context, we could regard the harmonic sequence in the second half of the example as a development toward the recapitulation or the home key.

However, Kellner problematizes the form of his fantasia. First of all, the key of F minor, in which the middle section ends and the ending ensues, is not a key closely related to the home key, A minor, and a key not expected at the beginning of the recapitulation of Classical music (See Ex. 10). Moreover, Kellner, in the ending, undermines the effect of home coming by delaying the actual return to the tonic and instead, in nonchalant manner, he continues elaborating fragments of various improvisatory figures in F minor (mm. 54–7). He ‘quietly’ brings back the home key simply by cancelling the flat on B at the very end of the passage in F minor (m. 57). The home key is regained by the last arpeggio passage that makes an imperfect
cadence in the tonic (mm. 60–1), and the following three measures are an extension and resolution of this evaded cadence. In contrast to other Classical genres, Kellner, in this fantasia, thus downplays the return of the home key, as if reluctantly following the norm of tonal centrality imposed by the musical culture of his era.

Example 10  J. C. Kellner, Fantasia in A minor, mm. 51–64
Mixture of Styles and Feelings, and Harmonic Adventure

Late 18\textsuperscript{th}-century theorists unanimously characterized the fantasia as a \textit{sui generis} art of expressive freedom that nullified stylistic and categorical distinctions of genres, which the age of reason, the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, rigorously promoted. In this anti-generic tendency, the fantasia shunned any overt formal schema that could define the genre like the sonata; as seen above, it satisfied minimal requirements for tonal music, namely establishing the home key in its beginning and ending sections. On the other hand, the expressive freedom also meant that in this genre, which promoted the rich variety of styles and feelings, the composer could freely import expressive idioms from other genres without any stylistic restriction or consideration of stylistic unity. Observing the imperatives of original genius that gave aesthetic impetuses to the fantasia, in this genre composers employed most sentimental styles that touch the depth of human feelings, and sought ingenious ways to intermingle them with the improvisatory idioms of the traditional fantasia. In the prelude type, the immediacy of original ideas was more pronounced and valued than in other types, so that it captured fleeting moments of ideas and feelings rather than presented their perfected, worked-out version.

Passages in the middle section of Kellner’s fantasia provides us a good opportunity to look into such a heterogeneous mixture of styles (See Ex. 11). In this short section, not more than fifteen measures, Kellner’s fantasia journeys through at least five different styles with distinct \textit{topoi}: toccata or prelude (mm. 22–23), \textit{recitativo accompagnato} (mm. 25–26), sentimental arioso (27–30), march (mm. 31–32), and song (mm. 32–36). The run in m. 22 leads to the improvisatory, arpeggio passage, which performs a modulatory function throughout the work. The harmonic progression from G#o42 to E7 creates an anticipation of a cadence in the key of A,
Example 11  J. C. Kellner, Fantasia in A minor, mm. 22–36
but the cadence is evaded by F#o65 replacing the tonic of A major (mm. 22–3). In the following measure (m. 24) this diminished chord proceeds to Ebm64 through common tones Eb and Gb (the enharmonic of F#), where a passage in a new style, topos, and key proceeds. This new passage (mm. 24–6) is distinct from the preceding one in several aspects. The forgoing passage, in the style of toccata, consists of instrumental figures of broken chord and arpeggio - legacies from the Baroque fantasia, which give the performer opportunities to show his/her finger dexterity and indulge in pure harmonic sonorities of the keyboard. On the other hand, in the new passage the composer expresses a tragic feeling in the style of recitativo accompagnato. It opens up with a rhythmic figure of funeral procession, solemnly announcing the topos of death (mm. 24–5). After a following short silence, a solo voice softly utters a short motif with a tritone downward leap, as if imploring for mercy (m. 25). It gets answered by a stern orchestral voice in a rhythmic figure of funeral march. This dialogue between the two forces is repeated a step lower, and then an affetuoso passage in the style of arioso ensues. Moreover, the sudden shift to the extreme flat-side of key at the beginning of the recitative passage intensifies the contrast between the improvisatory and recitative passages. We mentioned that the harmony that progressed toward a cadence on A is diverted at the end of the improvisatory passage (mm. 23–4). The key that follows it is, a tritone above, Eb minor, which the beginning of the recitative passage alludes to over a Bb pedal (mm. 24–5): V64 -7/ Eb minor. The naturalized G and added Db at the beginning of m. 25 turn the Eb minor 64 chord into a dominant 43 on the same in the bass, a chord which, functioning as V43 of Ab, brings a modulation to Ab minor (with seven flats!). The overall effect of the juxtaposition of the recitative passage with the toccata-like one is an unwarranted invasion of otherworldly music, which negates the effect of stylistic unity and proposes as an alternative multiple dimensions of its stylistic horizon. And the composer asks the
performer to emphasize this otherworldliness of the recitative by adding a new tempo/expressive mark *Adagio spirituoso*.

Kellner’s daring musical imagination does not cease here. As mentioned above, in this type of the fantasia composers configured the spontaneous emanation of original ideas, ‘untouched’ by musical reason, emulating the style of free extemporization; its result was a mosaic display of fragmentary ideas. The ‘pathetic’ recitative only lasts for two measures. As the dialogue between the two forces gets repeated a step lower, it modulates from Ab minor to a distant key, F# major, interpreting the tonic of Ab as the supertonic of F#, and gives way to a new chain of thought. The subsequent sentimental arioso with the mark *Affetuoso* first proceeds with repeating twice a simple phrase in the harmonic progression of I-V-I (mm. 27–28), and then begins to develop on upward steps of the bass. When the stepwise bass reaches A# in the middle of m. 29, however, the top melody begins to quickly collapse from high a#1 in the local tonic. In the next measure (m. 30), it lands on the low e-natural, which changes the tonic of F# into a diminished chord on A#. Then, the arioso fades away, only leaving a bare skeleton of a B minor chord, the d-natural of the upper voice on the bass B, which hints at a modulation to B minor. But the bombastic rhythmic figure of a triumphant march enters on F6, a harmony that does not belong to the diatonic scale of B minor (m. 31). Instead, the following march figure with trills announces an arrival at the key of Bb major, at which a sanguine song (mm. 32–6) commences in a mood that much contrasts with those of the recitative and arioso passages. Even in this relatively stable passage, whose harmonic progressions are cadential, I-ii6-V7-I of Bb major, Kellner does not complete his musical thought in a conventional song form. He simply repeats twice a two-bar phrase and moves away, via a broken chord of the seventh chord on G attached at the end of its repeat, to another toccata passage with instrumental figures. There is neither any
trace of a gradual transition between these contrasting passages nor a conspicuous theme or motive that relates all these ideas to one another. By doing so, the composer maximizes the artistic effect of unconventional juxtaposition of divergent ideas regarded as incompatible in other Classical genres, and by boldly configuring these incomplete thoughts, the composer stylizes the ‘momentariness’ of musical inspiration.

These highly subjective expressions, however, were not solely attributable to personal inspiration and expression, but Kellner’s choice of styles and keys falls within the stylistic parameters of the prelude type. For instance, the dramatic recitativo accompagnato, engaged in 25–6, is an expressive item that frequently appears not only in the prelude type but also in other types of the fantasia, and the modulation to a key a tritone distance away is not as extraordinary in this genre as in other Classical genres. In addition, the tonality of F#, which Kellner chose for the Affetuoso passage, was a key of gloom associated with the topos of death in the 18th century and thus with this genre that aestheticized ‘dark,’ sentimental and sorrowful feelings. C. P. E. Bach wrote his last fantasia Empfindungen in F# minor, which opens up with a figure of funeral procession similar to the beginning of Kellner’s recitative passage. Although not many composers took the key of F# as the home key of their fantasias, in this genre we frequently encounter the passages in the key associated with the topos. For example, C. P. E. Bach introduces the same kind of funeral procession at the beginning of the middle section of his earlier fantasia H. 279 (See Ex. 12). What is remarkable is its tonal context: the modulation to the key of F# took place after the fantasia barely left the home key, F major in the opening. The

---

3 Such examples are not rare in the fantasia. In mm. 18–24 of his fantasia Kittel makes a modulation from F minor, via a chromatic bass, to B minor. Hässler’s fantasia modulates from C minor to F# minor in mm. 10–16, while C. P. E. Bach’s Probestücke from F minor to B major in mm. 20-22. In the arioso of his fantasia in C minor (H. 277), Bach juxtaposes Gb major with C minor.
passage begins in Bb minor, the minor subdominant of the home key F, and then through an *ellipsis* it modulates to C# minor, in which the funeral figure gets an emphatic dynamic *ff*. It evades the resolution of V65 of C# minor by substituting for the expected C minor chord the C#43 that functions as V43 of F#. However, the extended C#s of the top voice of the fading funeral procession get harmonized with an A7 chord, obscuring its tonal orientation. But the broken-chord passage that enters after the *fermata* at the end of the funeral procession and announces the arrival at the key of F# major, progresses in V64 - 7 - ii⁰⁴² of the key. After another fermata at the end of the broken-chord passage (in the second line of Ex. 12), Bach makes the run figure enter abruptly with a seventh chord on G, which ushers in a new passage in C major, a tritone away from F# but the dominant of the home key F.⁴

Here, as in the example over the chromatic bass from Kellner’s fantasia (Ex. 9), Bach disrupts the familiar progression from the tonic to the dominant by inserting the F# passage that contrasts with its surrounding in style and key. One could surely argue that this elaborate confusion on the surface is controlled by an underlying or hidden design from the tonic via the subdominant to the dominant, F–Bb–(C#–F#)–C. But a question still remains: does the fantasia in the prelude type have a coherent design that governs not only a local area but also the whole work? We have seen in another example from Kellner’s same fantasia (Ex. 11) that the composer could celebrate the aesthetics of variety and contrast in some passages, without showing any

⁴Another example of such a passage is found in the middle of Hässler’s fantasia analyzed above (Ex. 8). We saw that the return of the tonic chord is evaded with a quick modulation, via C# minor, to F# minor in mm 19–22, in which a new idea, also reminiscent of funeral music, unfolds (mm. 22–26). The French-overture passage in the middle of C. P. E. Bach’s A-major fantasia (H. 278) also refers to the key of F# in the similar affective context. This passage consists of three phrases that modulate in the sequence of minor thirds, and it gets repeated a third below after the *capriccio* section. The key of F# first appears at the end of the second phrase, and later at the end of third phrase.
particular concern for their immediate formal connections. As discussed above, the composers and theorists of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century, including C. P. E. Bach and some theorists in his circle, valued such passages as free expressions of genius, and suggested that the genre should be evaluated in such terms. In other words, to them the fantasia in the prelude type did not necessitate a unifying design, or such an aspect was not important or germane in understanding this genre. However, composers and theorists of the 19\textsuperscript{th} and 20\textsuperscript{th} centuries thought otherwise. They believed that the fantasia with artistic significance should not be a mere patchwork of various unrelated ideas but possess inner unity in structure, that is, the ‘hidden thread’ that connects a variety of ideas on the surface as a coherent whole.\textsuperscript{5}

\textbf{The Debate on the Hidden Thread and the Form of the Prelude-Type Fantasia}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{5} I argue that their belief reflects the change in the evaluative criteria of musical criticism that was related to the transformation of the fantasia. We will discuss this topic in the next chapter.}
Historically, the musical terms that could be construed as ‘hidden thread’ appeared in describing the fantasia far before British naturalism was imported and the prelude-type fantasia surfaced as a result. When Athanasius Kircher, in 1650, said that the fantastic style (stylus phantasticus) served the didactic purpose to “teach the hidden design of harmony,”⁶ his words might imply that there existed a dichotomy between its surface appearance and underlying structure; that the harmonic daring and extravaganza of the early Baroque fantasia were a controlled enterprise. However, he did not clearly define what constitutes his term ‘hidden design.’ It could be interpreted either as the harmonic rule that governed unusual harmonic progressions or as the global tonal plan that controlled local diversions. Considering the harmonic craftsmanship and relatively expectable modulatory scheme that the Baroque fantasia betrays in this style, one can say that both interpretations are viable. Yet, when we apply the term to the prelude-type fantasia, the latter interpretation becomes problematic. We will observe later that shorter fantasias, mostly published for didactic purposes, indeed feature conventional tonal schemes that circumscribe and direct local developments. On the other hand, longer prelude-type fantasias often defy the control of such tonal designs by exploring the unconventional tonal relationship of keys in their middle body which then occupies a major proportion. In these fantasias, harmonic progressions related to the tonic only appear in their opening and ending sections. This shows that under the new aesthetic milieu of the second half of the 18th century, the prelude-type fantasia, into which the Baroque fantasia in stylus phantasticus had evolved, acquired new characteristics that cannot be explained by the old trait of the genre.

---

⁶ Kircher, Musurgia Universalis, 1:585. His definition of the style is quoted at the beginning of the introduction.
However, theorists of the early 19th century associated the term ‘hidden thread’ with formal aspects of the fantasia as well, vesting it with a new meaning. In this context, our first question lies not in the applicability of the concept of the hidden thread to this genre but in the definition of the term itself. While the old definition of the term only deals with harmonic aspects of the fantasia, in hands of these theorists it began to denote an underlying formal pattern that begets structural unity and coherence in the fantasia; such a pattern assumed either a familiar form derived from conventional forms or an ordered plan of ideas, often in symmetry. In his introduction to *Fantasieren auf dem Pianoforte*, Carl Czerny emphasizes the significance of coherent formal design even in an extemporaneous performance of the fantasia, saying:

“The art of improvising consists in the spinning out, during the very performance, on the spur of moment, … of each original or even borrowed idea into a sort of musical composition which, albeit in much freer form than a written work, nevertheless must be fashioned into an organized totality as far as necessary to remain comprehensive and interesting.”

According to his treatise, fantastic flights of fancy, to which the improviser gives free rein, should be expressed “in rational form” and molded into “a magnificent whole.” He claims that the improviser, with a formal plan based on Classical form, should control his/her extemporization, a concept that theorists of the 18th century regarded as most injurious to this free genre. In the same vein, Robert Schumann, who used Classical sonata form as the formal thread of his fantasia in C major, Op. 17, thinks that the expressive freedom of the fantasia should be realized without sacrificing “purpose and order,” and an “inner thread … should also

---

7 Czerny, *A Systematic Introduction to Improvisation on the Pianoforte*, 1

8 Ibid., 74

shine through the fantastic disorder if it wishes to be otherwise acknowledged in the realm of art.”

Richards, along that line of thought, formulates her theory, i.e. the fantasia as the musical picturesque. She argues that as in the picturesque, the fantasia was “an art predicated on the tension between the formed and deformed, between underlying coherence and surface disruption.” Against the theorists who criticize the style of fantasia for being “without order and a suitable sequence, or gradual progression in our emotions” and therefore being on the margins of rational communication in music, Richards attempts to defend the genre, quoting words of J. A. P. Schulz, a contemporaneous theorist of C. P.E. Bach, that the disorder of the fantasia “would never be real disorder but has its foundation in order.” Through her analysis of C. P. E. Bach’s fantasias, she tries to show that even his freest fantasia, e.g. fantasia in C minor, H75/iii, has a musical discourse controlled by a hidden thread, i.e. a familiar formal plan which provides an underlying rationalistic order.

Although it is a difficult task to translate from terms of visual art to terms of auditory art, her challenging enterprise of applying the aesthetic of the picturesque to the fantasia indeed bears fruit in the scholarship of this genre, elucidating some important aspects of the fantasia that otherwise could have been ignored, e.g. musical fragments that resemble ruins, and freely mixed


11 However, she separates the free fantasia from the fantasia infiltrated by the sonata

12 Richards, 14.

13 Richards, 36–37 and Schleuning, 8.

14 Quoted in Richards, The Free Fantasia, 39.
ideas that reminds us of the topology of wild nature. Her study shows that the picturesque and the fantasia in the late 18th-century shared a similar aesthetic temperament or origin. Nonetheless, it is problematic in several ways to attempt to explain formal characteristics of the prelude-type fantasia in terms of her theory that relates specific precepts of the picturesque to the fantasia more than as potent analogies, a method which is restricting and one-dimensional. First of all, many of the statements of theorists from the late 18th and early 19th centuries, e.g. Czerny and Schumann, to which she refers as the historical evidence supporting her theory, as a matter of fact, reflect the new aesthetic view of the time on musical imagination that was proposed as an antidote to both unbridled naturalism and ruthless mechanical rationalism.15 Thus, those theories, which are more relevant to later types of the fantasia, often contain covert criticisms of the prelude-type fantasia. When Czerny says “a fantasy well done is akin to a beautiful English garden, seemingly irregular, but full of surprising variety, and executed rationally, meaningfully, and according to plan,”16 not only does he use the picturesque garden (English garden) as an analogy, but also his words “well done” indicate that he exploits the term in illuminating his critical criteria, which underline the significance of formal plan and unity. Schumann viewed the demise of the free fantasia as the beginning of a new era,17 and believed that in this new era musical imagination ought to be configured in a coherent, concrete form.18 And he suggested that “composers should take the fantasias of the Classical period as their model.” Undoubtedly he had in mind not fantasias in the prelude type but those of Viennese classics in episodic and Classical-

---

15 We will discuss this topic in the next chapter.

16 Czerny, A Systematic Introduction, 2.

17 Cited in Parker, 44–5.

18 Ibid.
form types. Therefore, his words “inner thread,” “purpose,” and “order” should be understood in this context.

In addition, Richards neither clearly explains how the familiar forms that underlie the prelude-type fantasia as its background structure control and interact with its surface variety or wandering, nor clearly defines what musically constitutes the ‘hidden thread.’ For example, Richards identifies the hidden thread of C. P. E. Bach’s Probestücke in C minor with the familiar ternary division of the work in which a Largo aria in the relative major is placed between two outer unmeasured sections contrasting with the middle in many aspects.\(^\text{19}\) Above of all, this partition is not hidden at all but is rather too obvious and unproblematic to engender any tension with the surface. It is doubtful that we can accept this three-part form as the thread of the work’s formal narrative at all. The thread of a trio form presupposes an intelligible linear pattern of harmonic and thematic development, which makes a concept of digression possible. But the two outer sections of this work that consist of non-repeated transitory passages and unconventional, chromatic or non-fifth based harmonic progressions defy any attempt to identify the work as a trio. According to her definition of the term ‘hidden thread’ predicated in rational order, what we are supposed to search for is not a non-sequitur patchwork but an underlying narrative or pattern which connects and relates seemingly incongruent ideas to one another. But she does not provide us any comprehensible explication of coherent linear progressions of those mercurial ideas. In this respect, one could only say that the aria in the middle merely stands out as a maximal contrast from the surrounding.

After analyzing C. P. E. Bach’s fantasia in C major (H 284), David Schulenberg also expresses doubts about the existence of such a hidden thread, saying “more mysterious parts

\(^\text{19}\) Richards, 46–9.
consist of little more than one thing after another…. Coherence resides in a principle of progression by non-sequitur which stretches the idea of formal connections to its limits.”

Against the scholarly attempt to find the kind of hidden-thread that Richards proposes, Hugh Macdonald makes even a stronger stricture in his article “Fantasy and order in Beethoven’s Phantasie Op. 77.” He contends that the undue emphasis on structural unity as a central element of evaluative criteria has misguided many scholars to look for a ‘logical’ formal design in a free work like Beethoven’s fantasia. In Macdonald’s opinion, the composer here expresses the ideas of “disunity, diversity, illogicality, inconsistencies, and contradictions.”

Macdonald believes that musical critics should measure the excellence of a work by historically authentic criteria, “wedded indissolubly to its own time,” which could unravel its true raison d’etre. In other words, as understood and discussed in the time of Viennese classics, the fantasia, whose style, according to Macdonald’s view, Beethoven’s work exemplifies, should be appreciated and evaluated purely in naturalistic terms but not in rationalistic terms.

In this dissertation, we approach the prelude-type fantasia in the same aesthetic terms as Macdonald’s, i.e. a free art of original genius. It is, nonetheless, not because the method of musical analysis should solely rely on its historicity as Macdonald contends. Some new features of a genre, of which composers themselves are often not fully aware, could escape the eyes of contemporary theorists and have to wait until later generations to be articulated. Although at the time of Viennese classics no theorists described formal plan and coherence as essential elements of the fantasia, their fantasias already betrayed an increasing degree of structural unity and


\[\text{21} \text{ Hugh Macdonald, “Fantasy and Order,” 141-50.}\]
reconciliation with other Classical genres. These new developments only came to be verbalized by theorists in the late Classical or early Romantic period. In addition, it was a poor choice for Macdonald to pick Beethoven’s fantasias to prove his argument against formalistic approaches. As Beethoven’s fantasia progresses, it gradually develops into a highly ordered form of Classical theme and variations, as if erecting the creative process of composition, from *fantasieren*, i.e. searching for compositional ideas via development to a polished work. Thus, the historically authentic method, which Macdonald adamantly insists upon, could be used only for the prelude-type fantasia that adhered to the genre definition of the time. Furthermore, it would be also legitimate to look into the formal structure of a fantasia, although formal unity was not the primary concern of the prelude-type fantasia. The reason does not lie in the critical dogmatism that Macdonald criticizes but in the fact that though the formal design in the prelude type is neither its primary emphasis nor the decisive factor in its excellence, it at least functions as a buttress or a leash that prevents the fantasia from being shattered into a mere collection of random fragments, i.e. an undesirable variety or contrast of ideas.

I propose as an alternative to these two extreme approaches of Richards and Macdonald, i.e. presupposing a hidden thread (formal unity) and denying the role of a formal plan all together, a practical way to look at the form of the prelude-type fantasia. We can easily imagine that it was inevitable that as the spirit of free improvisation that the ideals of original genus gave impetus got captured in a written or published form, composers had to modify, or even sacrifice somewhat, unreserved flights of musical fancy that the real improvisation, sometimes hours long, entertained. In the composed fantasia of the prelude type, thus, the composer, in observation of

---

22 In fact, the analytical method, in some ways, should be distinguished from the critical method. Analysis sheds light on the actual state of the work, whereas criticism deals with its ideality; that is, not all analytical facts immediately represent its ultimate artistic purpose and ideal, though they could serve it one way or another.
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tonal centrality and in consideration of its length and space limit, should consciously design a formal plan that served its ultimate aesthetic purpose and yet restrains the range of expressive freedom within an adequate scope, and we can observe that three kinds of formal design are employed in published prelude-type fantasias. 1. In some fantasias, composers employs normative harmonic progressions of a given key to guide and control the elaborate confusions of sundry ideas -- a device often used in shorter fantasias, either imitating the style of Baroque prelude in *stylus phantasticus* or composed for didactic purposes. This is a historically authentic, didactic method, which C. P. E. Bach explicates in his essay. For beginners of the fantasia extempore, he advises the beginner to first construct a figure bass with modulations to close keys, then launch modulations to remote keys as temporary digressions from, or suspensions of, the expected course of harmonic progression. In this way, a variety of improvisatory figures and harmonic confusions on the surface could be controlled by the primary development of tonality in the underground. Of course, the interrupting key area should not be elaborated so long that it undermines the harmonic relationship between structural areas. 2. Even if the fantasia wanders around multiple key areas without making any overarching pattern in its tonal progressions, the composer could introduce a limited number of heterogeneous ideas and repeat them occasionally. 3. In other fantasias of the prelude type, composers would pattern harmonic and thematic ideas in sophisticated ways that formalize, or stylize, free improvisation without lessening the musical effect of naturalistic aesthetics. In these fantasias, the composer would not borrow a formal logic from a conventional genre, but forge a unique and unprecedented, *ad hoc* form. This pattern would take the form of a revolt against the symmetry, clarity, and predictability that French neoclassicism promoted. It would deliberately shun designs and linear expectations of other Classical genres, thus accentuating the type’s anti-generic, free nature.
Let us begin our investigation with the overall harmonic structure of a fantasia by Ernst Wilhelm Wolf, a friend of C. P. E. Bach’s, in Bb major published in 1785 (See Ex. 13). This short fantasia does not feature any dominant themes or motifs, but only displays purely instrumental passages in the Baroque fantastic style. As in many short, didactic fantasias, Wolf arranges the passages according to a skeleton harmonic plan made of more normative progressions. This work has a clear three-part division: the first section that consists of runs is a prolongation of tonic (mm. 1–7); the last section with a dotted rhythmic figure and arpeggio is made in noncomplex cadential progressions of the home key, vii/V-V64-7-I (mm. 18–24); the middle section has arpeggios in intervening chromatic progressions (mm. 8–17). The question that we could ask is whether or not the middle section, the longest of the three, is connected with the two outer sections by a harmonic design, with which we could make sense of the harmonic progressions of the middle. The middle section, Adagio, opens with the submediant following the broken chord of tonic (mm. 7–8), and then suddenly progresses, with an elliptical leap, to a dominant 7th chord on Db, implying a distant modulation to the key of Gb (m. 9). Yet, in the next bar this Db 7th chord moves, with common-tones Ab and F, to the Bb65 chord that functions as V65 of Eb minor. The following harmonic progressions outline a chromatic key sequence from Eb minor to Gb: eb-e-f-gb (mm. 10–15). However, when it reaches the dominant of Gb major, i.e. returns back to the initial Db7 chord (mm. 9 and 15), it again evades the resolution of the chord to the tonic and makes a common-tone modulation to the key of Eb minor. Here, we see a possibility to interpret the chromatic sequence from Eb to Gb as a filling of the harmonic aperture made by the ellipsis at the beginning of the middle section. And if we take as the minor subdominant of the home key the key of Eb minor, which frames the harmonic progressions of this passage (mm. 9–17), this strange harmonic wandering begins to make a good deal more
Example 13  E. W. Wolf, Fantasia in Bb major, mm. 5–24
sense to us. In this fantasia, the key of Gb major stands as a maximum contrast to the home key Bb, and functions as an interrupting force. But through the harmonic progressions, the composer gradually elucidates the harmonic identity of the Gb major as the relative major of the minor subdominant, the key of Eb minor. According to this interpretation, one could argue that this improvisatory fantasia is guided by the fundamental harmonic progressions of I-vi-iv-III/iv-iv-vii7/v-v-I, which could be regarded as a hidden thread in the Baroque sense of the term.

Yet, we cannot help raising our skeptical eyebrows about the universal applicability of such a hidden thread to the prelude-type fantasia, for perhaps it was only possible to construct or perceive a thread due to the short size of Wolf’s fantasia. And when we scrutinize the harmonic structure of prelude-type fantasias longer yet without any recurring themes or motifs, we observe that their long extended middle section, replete with unconventional tonal progressions, makes it difficult to accept this kind of tonal design as a hidden thread. Kellner’s fantasia in A minor, whose individual sections we have analyzed, belongs to this category. This fantasia is made up of many free improvisatory passages, and even the middle section that includes vocal elements, as seen above (Ex. 11), only displays fragments of various ideas in quick succession (Table 2).

One immediately noticeable feature in harmonic progressions of this fantasia is that after establishing the home key in the opening, the composer deliberately evade introducing keys close to the tonic such as the relative major, the subdominant, and the dominant. Rather the foreign keys of Eb and Bb, a tritone and a half step away from the tonic are prominently materialized. Even in the closing, it returns to the home not via the dominant key but via the distant key of F minor, which moves, through a common-tone modulation, directly to the home key (Ex. 10). Except in the opening, the relative key is introduced just one time at the beginning of the middle section, but even then the composer refuses to present it in its usual major mode.
(m. 9 in Ex. 3). The only times that close keys are alluded in the middle section are in two arpeggio passages (mm. 21–23 in Ex. 12 and mm. 41–43 in Ex. 9), wherein the composer makes modulatory gestures to the tonic and the subdominant. Both the passages institute cadential progressions whose resolutions are evaded. One may question whether or not these two key areas function as structural pillars to which we could meaningfully relate other passages. The fact that the composer introduces cadential progressions points to such a possibility. But these key areas, surrounded by foreign keys, enter rather abruptly and briefly, and the relationship between these keys and surrounding foreign keys is too tenuous for us to determine a pattern. In addition, the composer emphasizes more the arpeggio passages in other keys (Cm, G, Fm) less close to the tonic, A minor by articulating them with a firm cadence (m.8, m. 19, and m. 52), and key progressions of the recurring arpeggio passages (Cm-G-Am-Dm-Fm) do not make up a comprehensible tonal pattern. Thus, it would not be acceptable to interpret the tonal progressions between the arpeggio passages as structural developments and the intervening areas as long digressions. Besides, the tonality of this fantasia freely progresses, sometimes by fifths, other times by steps or chromatic steps, and occasionally even by a tritone or a third, without creating any linear expectation as a whole. It would be more reasonable to interpret the briefly mentioned, key areas of the tonic and the subdominant in the middle not as central parts forming a hidden thread but merely as anchors that check, by occasionally bringing back tonal areas closely related to the home key, the harmonic imagination of the composer from completely drifting away from the tonal center. Hence, it would be acceptable by no stretch of the imagination to apply the concept of hidden thread even in the Baroque sense to Keller’s fantasia. With the repeated arpeggio passage that briefly alludes to the home key area, Keller simply clues various ideas together, preventing the fantasia from disintegrating into a jumble of shards.
Hässler’s fantasia in E minor has a free, unconventional harmonic structure similar to Kellner’s, in which the keys close to the tonic are avoided and only the keys of the tonic and the subdominant are briefly alluded in the middle section (See Table. 3 and Ex. 14). As mentioned above, the composer deploys the only harmonically stable passage at the heart of the piece and ironically in the key of D major remote to the home key, E minor (Ex. 6). Except for this D-Major passage, this fantasia moves in a kaleidoscopic change of harmony until it reaches the closing section. Yet, unlike Kellner, Hässler, in this fantasia, presents two salient motifs and generates a variety of expressions by developing and combining them with various materials. These two main motifs, Motif X and Motif Y, pervade many passages of the fantasia except the arpeggio passage at the beginning of the middle (mm. 9–10) and the cadenza-like passage (mm. 30–32). He opens up the fantasia with an upward run and Motif X made of a three-note pickup and a downward octave leap and repeats this phrase several times in the following measures (mm. 1–14). Then the composer spins Motif X and its abbreviated version in the circle of fifths in mm. 15–18, which leads to a caesura on the dominant 7th chord of the home key in m. 19. After a short break, Motif Y that consists of a broken chord pickup and a half step enters (mm. 19–21), and soon the composer transforms it into a new idea, combing it with the head of Motif X (mm. 20–25). Even in the ensuing, long toccata-like section (mm. 27–48), Motif Y, in the left hand, continuously accompanies broken-chords in the right hand except the cadenza-like passage mentioned above.

This motivic saturation undeniably shows that this work is structured in a high degree of motivic unity, which Wolf’s and Kellner’s fantasias deliberately avoid. But we have to remember that our primary quest is to determine whether this fantasia is not just made of a succession of parts derived from the main motifs, or has a hidden thread in the sense in that
Table 3. Formal/Harmonic Outline of Hässler’s Fantasia Op. 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Opening</th>
<th>Middle</th>
<th>Ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>1– 8</td>
<td>9–10</td>
<td>27–48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>runs+trio (Motif X)</td>
<td>arpeggios</td>
<td>toccata (Y)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>modulatory</td>
<td>D-b-E-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadence</td>
<td>HC (m. 19)</td>
<td>V7/D mod.</td>
<td>DC (m. 68)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>9–10</th>
<th>10–14</th>
<th>15–19</th>
<th>19–22</th>
<th>22–26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>runs+trio (X)</td>
<td>Trio (X’)</td>
<td>Passagework (Motif Y)</td>
<td>Trio (X’+Y’)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>b-flat</td>
<td>a-flat mod</td>
<td>V7/e mod.</td>
<td>f#</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>toccata (Y)</td>
<td>Passagework (Y)</td>
<td>trio (X’+Y’)</td>
<td>runs+broken chords</td>
<td>closing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>D-b-E-D</td>
<td>V7/D mod.</td>
<td>V7/a mod</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadence</td>
<td>V7/e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>55–61</th>
<th>62–68</th>
<th>69–70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Passage A</td>
<td>Passage A’</td>
<td>Passage A”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>V7/a mod.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadence</td>
<td>PAS (m. 70)</td>
<td>V7/e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>62–68</th>
<th>69–70</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Passage B</td>
<td>Passing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>V7/e</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadence</td>
<td>DC (m. 68)</td>
<td>PAC (m. 70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Richards uses the term, i.e. an underlying formal plan or coherent musical narrative by which all parts and materials are interwoven or at least guided. At first glance, the reiteration of the passages of Motif Y and Motif X’+Y’ (mm. 19–26) after the long toccata-like section in mm. 49–61 seems to indicate the possibility of such a formal plan. At the first time, the evasion at the end of the Motif Y passage in the implied tonic (mm. 21–22) launches the Motif X’+Y’ passage in a remote key, F# minor. But after the toccata-like section, the two time evasions at the equivalent places (mm. 51 and 55) brings back the Motif X’+Y’ passage a fifth below in B minor, a key closer to the tonic, which we can interpret as the minor dominant since it moves to V7 of the home key at the beginning of the ending section m. 62. Here we see a vague reference or hint of a sonata logic: the secondary area gets reiterated a fifth below, preparing a final closure. But to apply to this work the sonata logic as the hidden thread of this fantasia would be a stretch of the meaning of the term that would significantly undermine its efficacy as an analytical tool. If we were to make a sonata reading, we should regard all the measures up to the entry of motif Y as the introduction of a sonata (mm. 1–19); passages A and B together as the exposition (mm. 19–26); the toccata-like section as a development (mm. 26–48); the passage with dramatic runs and leaps at the end of the toccata-like (mm. 45–48) as one equivalent to the dominant preparation of a sonata; passages A’ and B’ as the recapitulation (mm. 48–61); the ending as a closing section. This analysis problematizes many aspects of the sonata form. Not only do the main areas in the recapitulation appear in unorthodox keys, but also the areas with main ideas that have 7 and 13 measures are disproportionately short in comparison with other areas; for example, the introduction alone is 19 measures long. Furthermore, passages A and B are literally composed of repeats of transitory, fragment ideas; they barely confirm their key areas before they move to the next. As mentioned above, ironically the composer introduces the
tonally stable area in the toccata-like section, the development according to the sonata reading. If this fantasia has a conventional form hidden in the background as in Richards’ theory, the form is hidden far too deep, in an abstract space, to claim any significance in relation to its surface structure as well as our aural experience of the piece.

Instead of searching for such a deep structure, we can attempt to make a reading on its musical narrative with more obvious features. Two most prominent elements in this fantasia are Motifs X and Y, which constantly appear in this fantasia, in tandem with various improvisatory figures. Let us see if developments of these two motifs make a recognizable pattern. A long upward run ascends to b2, scale degree 5, on which motif X first enters (mm. 1–2). The first entry outlines nothing else than repeats and a downward octave leap on scale degree 5, supported by a harmonic motion from i to V6. The overall effect of this phrase is a poignant portrayal of desiring or yearning. The composer refuses to close or resolve this open-end phrase with an answering phrase, but insistently repeats this formula of upward motion and open-end in the subsequent phrases until it reaches the entry of Motif Y (mm. 3–19); even the arpeggio passages follow this pattern (mm. 9–10). With these phrases the fantasia explores many key remote areas, wandering on steps and chromatic steps of the bass. However, what is truly remarkable is that the extended last phrase (mm. 13–19) brings us back to the harmony where we left off at the end of the opening phrase, that is, the dominant of the home key, and that Motif Y enters on the same scale degree as the opening entry of Motif X. Although Motif Y stresses c2 and slight b1, in the context of the first inversion of the dominant 7th, the note b1, the scale degree 5, is the structural tone and c2 is the upper neighbor of b1. And the end of the first entry of Motif Y exactly corresponds to the end of the first entry of Motif X (m. 2) not only in harmonic content (the first inversion of V) and scale degree (5) but also in their pitch register (d♯1, f♯1, and b1). Motif Y is
an emphatic version of the open-end, or the crux, of motif X. In the Motif Y passage, the expressive outcry for resolution, or a question for an answer, is intensified by the downward 32\textsuperscript{nd}-note pickup and the \textit{appoggiatura}, and another upward phrase attached at the end of repetition of Motif Y (m. 22) makes this entreaty even more desperate and dramatic. At this time, the composer seems to finally give an answer with Motif X+Y, for it moves in the scale degree 1 and tonic of a key (mm. 23-25). Yet, this is a uniquely strange answer: not only is it supported in a first-inversion chord, but also its key, F\# minor, is very foreign to the home key, E minor, to whose tonic the open-end of Motifs X and Y asked for a resolution. The end of the passage becomes liquidized into the dramatic toccata section, whose predominant key is D major (mm. 25–26).

The subsequent section dramatizes this unresolved yearning in \textit{stile brillante} (mm. 26–48). While the right hand thrills the audience with pianistic pyrotechnics, the left hand expresses the outcry of Motif Y with its variations as if it constantly wanders, searching for an answer or resolution. At the end of the section, the outcry reaches its climax, which is also the climax of the entire work (mm 45–48). The roaring upward runs followed by a sudden two-octave plummet, and a bouncing huge upward leap in the dominant 7\textsuperscript{th} of D major make the outcry most passionate and dramatic; the last leap in m. 48 leads this instrumental drama to e\textsuperscript{3}, the zenith of this entire work.

After a caesura, the composer reiterates the passages of Motif Y and Motif X+Y, bringing the narrative back to its initial question (mm. 48–61). At this time, however, he repeats the Motif Y passage one more time a fifth higher (mm. 52–55) in order to make the Motif X+Y passage enter in the key of the minor dominant of the home key and thus prepare for the return to the home key. It is noticeable that the composer aligns the end of this motif X+Y (mm. 57–8) in the
almost identical content of harmony, that is, the first inversion of the dominant, and the same scale degree and level of register as the ends of initial motif X and Y (mm. 2 and 20). In other words, after all the imaginative journey the music returns where it left off. And at the end of the middle section (mm. 60–1), finally the long sustain scale degree 5 of the top voice steps down to the scale degree 4, supported by the first inversion of the subdominant of the home key (mm. 60–61). The closing section brings the top voice down to the scale 1 and resolves the tension built up.

If we mean by the “hidden thread” a linear development dictated by a conventional formal proposition, we can conclude that this work as well as the prelude-type fantasia in general lacks such a thread. The only background structure that one could vaguely perceive is an ABA’ form with an introduction deliberately made asymmetrical and disproportionate. This background form, which sits still as a mere scaffolding, does not interfere with the surface events, which stresses, instead of structural inevitability, suddenness and bizarreness. A Schenkerian analysis of this work would inform us that this fantasia comprises a long prolongation of scale degree 5 supported by the dominant, and a sudden, descent or collapse of the voice in the last minute, which takes place in the last ten measures. The return of the dominant of the home key also does not imply a covert, rondo logic, but it is chiefly employed, as in the case of Kellner’s fantasia, to highlight the harmonic distance of the middle passages in F# minor and D major from the home key, E minor, by being juxtaposed against them. On the one hand, the open-end of recurring unresolved dominant invites explorations to distanced harmonic territories, engendering a unique harmonic topography, and on the other hand it points to where the home lies. ‘Wandering from home’ is indeed a potent metaphor in understanding the prelude type. The fantasia of the prelude type has a form that artificially reconstructs and
modifies the inspired flights of original genius. This form does not necessitate the intimate interplay between the surface and the background in formal unity, but aims at portraying stylized musical wandering and strangeness by privileging unconventionality of original genius.

Example 14  J. W. Hässler, Fantasia in E minor, Op. 17
Chapter 4. The Emergence of the Episodic Type and Its Aesthetic Principle

“We see them uniting the youthfulness of fantasy with the manliness of reason in a splendid humanity.”

From On the Aesthetic Education of Man of Friedrich Schiller

In a dark-lit room the improviser sits on the bench of a keyboard, surrounded by enthusiastic music lovers, an enchanted night with music about to begin. The keyboardist breaks the silence with evocative, pathos-laden tones. The opening lamento, charged with pathétique feelings, deeply moves the listeners, and sighs and tears are not scarce, while daunting musical ideas that spontaneously spring up fill them with surprise and awe. Abundant thoughts and feelings pour out, as the improvisation freely migrates from tragedy to comedy and from a sentimental aria to a dazzling instrumental passage. Glimpses of a vision! The imagination of the listeners soars to fill the sky.

Historical documents show that C. P. E Bach was initially reluctant to publish this kind of fantasia,\(^1\) i.e. an art of original genius, which we discussed in the previous chapter. Although we can speculate about several reasons for his reluctance, the main reason, I argue, lies in the fact that the fantasia in the amorphous form, regarded as a musical anomaly in the 18\(^{th}\) century, was cultivated mainly in intimate, private musical settings. In the public sphere of the time, as

mentioned in previous chapters, the position of the fantasia was generally limited to the function of prelude that introduced a main piece. Before 1780, only C. P. E. Bach and his followers insisted on and developed the fantasia as an independent genre. However, publishing the fantasia as an autonomous genre meant not only bringing forth a private utterance as a primary form of public art but also fixing spontaneous improvisation of an evanescent nature into a text that could be reproduced and scrutinized. And the fantasia as public art and a printed form invited criticisms in the musical discourse of the second half of the 18th-century. These contemporary criticisms reveal as we shall see, not only the aesthetic hegemony of French neoclassicism in the German musical culture of the time, as some scholars argue, but also the changing view of the German aesthetic, which was increasingly reconciling the two opposing schools of French neoclassicism and British naturalism. I argue that as a response to this new German aesthetic, a new type of fantasia emerged around 1780.

**Criticisms of the Fantasia in the Prelude Type and Imperatives of Musical Unity and Intelligibility**

As the fantasia in the prelude type, under the influence of English naturalism, came forth as a new mode of improvisation, and its printed forms appeared in public not as an introduction but as an independent art, the fantasia type invited polarized critical responses from contemporaneous critics and theorists. While some of them passionately defended the old type as a pristine embodiment of inspiration from original genius, the majority cast doubts on its viability as a primary form of artistic expression. The main criticism of the fantasia in the

---

2 Besides, many fantasias in the prelude type published as an independent piece simply assumed didactic purposes. See Schleuning, *The Fantasia II*, 10–11.
prelude type was that it lacked formal coherence, i.e. its parts were not artistically connected with each other. Many contemporary critics decried the unreserved flights of musical imagination in the fantasia, pejoratively labelling them as ‘fantastical’ or ‘bizarre.’³

On the other hand, some contemporary critics defended the genre by arguing that such criticisms only reveal the myopic vision of the critic and that it should be understood on its own terms, that is, those of naturalistic aesthetics. Cramer rejected as merely outdated theoretical views the criticisms of the fantasia in C. P. E. Bach’s style, and dismissed them as tokens of those critics’ “Kleinkreisigkeit und Eingeschränktheit des Geistes” (smallness and limitedness of their spirits).⁴ He argued that sudden changes of idea, style, and feeling in the prelude type should be appreciated as “the poetic work of original genius, both freely emitted like the utterance of a madman, yet subtly and supremely artful.” He claimed that those ideas could be only “appreciated by a few and are intelligible to only a few.” To him the fantasia has an artistic value as esoteric art. In a similar vein, Charles Burney tried to defend Bach’s style that was accused of being irrational, pointing out that “his flights are not the wild ravings of ignorance or madness, but the effusions of cultivated genius.”⁵ His words indirectly acknowledge such irrational expressions as legitimately artistic objects of a learned musician or even of genius.

The critics that belonged to the school of rationalism, in contrast, argued that the very mode of the expressions, no matter how learned they are, is intrinsically incompatible with fine


The fact that this very esoteric artfulness highly esteemed by the naturalistic camp was what the other camp blamed as the fatal flaw of the genre, shows us the critical distance between the two camps that divided the contemporaneous critics. For example, G. J. Vogler, a contemporaneous music critic, who belonged to the neoclassic camp, in a public critique (1780) of Bach, disparaged this feature of esotericism in his style, belittling it as “forced artificiality.” Vogler called Bach “Fantast,” a composer who could not distinguish genuine musical imagination (musikalischer Fantasie) from a high fever. He reckoned that Bach’s mistaken efforts to create something “entirely new” made him wander astray from “the well-planned.” According to Vogler’s view an artistically viable fantasia requires not only “entirely unique” ideas, but also a consideration of musical form. J. F. Reichardt, in the Musikalisches Kunstmagazin of 1782, raised a similar concern, in which he argued that a “most unnatural mixture of juxtaposed affects” had been negatively affecting the new music of the time. Later in the same journal (1791), he claimed that such an extreme mixture would only be suitable to expressing the madness of Ophelia in Hamlet.

Both Richards and Schleuning, two leading modern scholars of the fantasia, disapprove of the contemporaneous criticisms of the prelude type. They argue that the critics’ misunderstanding and ignorance of Bach’s fantasia style were the root of their criticisms.

---


7 Ibid.


9 Ibid., 2/2 (Berlin, 1791), 39.
Schleuning contends that the strong antipathy towards the genre, which existed not only among general critics but also among men in Bach’s closest circle, is ascribable to their failure to comprehend the new instrumental aesthetics of Bach’s fantasias.\textsuperscript{10} Similarly, Richards depicts both contemporaneous and modern critics hostile to Bach’s style as conservatives who, stubbornly holding onto outmoded ideas (i.e. neoclassicism of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century and the formalism of the current day), were and are ready to disregard anything that appears to violate their \textit{status quo}.

There must have been indeed music theorists, around 1780, who measured the prelude type of the fantasia against evaluative criteria that were out of date. Nevertheless, one cannot solely attribute the contemporary criticisms of the fantasia to the critical conservatism or the misunderstanding of the unprecedented musical novelty. In order to fairly assess them, we ought to consider, beyond the seemingly conservative attitude of the critics toward the genre, various cultural and aesthetic impulses that underlay their criticisms. The disapproval of the genre by some critic originated in the fact that by the reigning cultural standard at the end of the 18\textsuperscript{th} century the highly subjective expressions of the fantasia in the prelude type were deemed too private to be presented in public realm. Schleuning, in his study, recognizes the private orientation of the prelude-type fantasia, and argues that its radical expressions, or experiments, intended to be understood only among people in an inner circle, made it nearly impossible for the genre to be accepted by a larger public. However, Schleuning does not seem to realize that the very fact that around the 1780s critics included the fantasia in their public discussions (which

\textsuperscript{10} Schleuning, \textit{The Fantasia II}, 6-8

\textsuperscript{11} Richards, \textit{The Free Fantasia}, 34–41.
had been unthinkable beforehand) signifies that the fantasia had already begun to infiltrate the public domain of German culture. Besides, around 1780 the public music of the time in other Classical genres increasingly embraced more subjective and freer expressions, which the fantasia epitomized. Thus, when the critics criticized the private nature of the prelude type, they, more often than not, did not deny its intrinsic values and expressive potential, but simply repudiated its extremity.

The reviews of newly published fantasias in the 1799 editions of Allegemeine musikalische Zeitung (AmZ) exemplify this changing view. These criticisms reveal that although in the late 18th century there still existed a clear distinction between private and public music, this initially private genre, with formal modifications, began to be accepted as public art of the time. Writers of these reviews criticize the fantasia composers for presenting meandering ideas in their fantasias without the “slightest connection, order, without once an actual idea as the foundation.” Undoubtedly they are referring to the prelude type of fantasia whose unpredictable changes of musical ideas without formal considerations were promoted as art of original genius. They, however, do not reject altogether as mere nonsense the bold and original ideas of the fantasia. According to their view, the fantasias, without doubt, might be more proper in intimate venues, but they could be also appropriate for “general entertainment” if they possessed “a natural underlying connection, despite apparent diversity on the surface.”

In addition, these criticisms also indicate the shift in the aesthetic view of the 18th-century rationalistic theorists from the rigid doctrine of Affektenlehre to the aesthetics of variety in unity. The ‘apparent diversity’ was the very quality that earlier theorists in the rationalistic camp

---

12 See the reviews of a “Fantasia” by Gottfried Rieger, AmZ 2/8 (November 1799), cols. 154–5, and a Capriccio by Luigi Lodi, AmZ (October 1799), cols. 27–9.
believed should not be expressed in instrumental music because it would risk confusion and disorder. Besides, when English naturalism was first introduced, between 1750 and 1770, in the German speaking lands many music theorists were neither as indifferent to nor dismissive of it as Richards and Schleuning claim, but enthusiastically welcomed it and absorbed its aesthetic ideas into their theory. Many writings of the rationalistic theorists of the time, even of those who disapproved of the prelude type, show their serious consideration and understanding of the British naturalistic aesthetics with its advocacy of a powerful overflow and multiplicity of sentiment and ideas in art, which they attempted to incorporate in their music theories. For example, both Sulzer’s and Koch’s definitions and descriptions of the genre reveal their deep comprehension of the old type and its aesthetic principles. They acknowledged the fantasia as spontaneous and bold strokes of original genius, and regarded expressive variety in such an art as a natural human need, that is, “part of the inner activity of the [human] spirit.” Nonetheless, they did not favor the genre that embodied its ideal, and rather showed a strong aversion to it. Considering inventive and spontaneous activities of original genius as mere sketching, they concluded that for any work to attain the status of ‘fine art,’ the composer should work out those diverse ideas according to a unifying concept of its ideal.

This view, which mixes the English aesthetics of original genius with the French neoclassic doctrine of unity, not only reflects the personal opinions of the critics but also the

---


14 Sulzer, Aesthetics and the Art of Musical Composition in the German Enlightenment, 46.

15 Ibid., 43–48.
general direction of the development of German instrumental aesthetics in the late 18th century. The German theorists and composers of the time integrated the newly imported English naturalistic aesthetics into French neoclassic doctrines already surefooted in German soil. It is this synthesis of German musical craftsmanship,16 French neoclassicism, and English sentimentalism that gave birth to German Classicism, and, with it I argue, the emergence of the new fantasia type was a fruit of this development.

In their treatises, German theorists of the time argued that although expressing imaginative ideas and abundant feelings of original genius is the ultimate purpose of musical art, those elements should be integrated into an intelligible language and a unifying form. And they acknowledged as the musical means of this goal some of the instrumental idioms that had been deemed as unsuitable for music of original genius. For example, Karl Ludwig Junker (1748–1797), called a “sentimental music critic,”17 filled his theoretical essays with the passionate effusions of terms typical of British sentimentalism, such as originelle Genie, “inexhaustible imagination,” and “outpouring of his autonomous hearts.”18 Music’s ultimate goal, he proposes, is the “awakening of passionate sympathy” in the listener – a commonplace motto among British sentimentalists.19 Thus composers should first immerse themselves fully in their feelings – the statement that C. P. E. Bach repeats in the chapter on the fantasia. However, Junker’s true contribution to the development of German music theory lies not in his enthusiastic exclamations

---

16 See Bellamy Hosler, Changing Aesthetic Views of Instrumental Music in 18th-Century Germany.


18 Cited in Hosler, Changing Aesthetic Views of Instrumental Music in 18th-Century Germany, 169.

and whole-hearted embrace of the new theory of emotions but in his practical application of it to the form of music. Against the traditional theories that viewed emotions as the constant states of human mind, the British empiricists of the 18th century proposed a new theory that human emotions have a constantly changing and fleeting nature, which is succinctly articulated by Hume when he says:

Tis difficult for the mind, when actuated by any passion, to confine itself to that passion alone, without any change or variation. Human nature is too inconsistent to admit of any such regularity. Changeableness is essential to it.20

In Junker’s theoretical system, this dynamic nature of human emotions and music’s power of arousing them in the listener have, in his words, an “isomorphic” relationship; in other words, he believed that music’s imitation (mimesis) of the motions of feelings would induce the identical emotions in the listener. However, he went on to claim that “only by means of the transitory can passions be aroused in music—only by following a feeling through to its climax.”21 To him change and variety are essential elements of music, but the emotive content of music can be communicated only through the solid, dramatic structure that orders musical motions in a coherent pattern.22

Johann N. Forkel, a music theorist (1749–1818), further developed the music theory based on the isomorphic relationship between the dynamic nature of emotions and musical form.23 Forkel built his theory on the concept of “mannigfaltige Modificationen” (multiple

---


22 See Hosler, 172–73.

modifications) probably derived from ideas of his mentor Lord Kames, another British theorist, who observed that “passions are seldom uniform for any considerable time; they generally fluctuate, swelling, and subsiding by turns, often in quick succession.”24 Drawing upon the British naturalistic theory, he explained the term ‘modification’ as follows:

[Feeling] swells and subsides through infinite and incomprehensible degrees of strength and weakness. This waxing and waning of feeling is commonly called modification. 25

Although this notion of ‘modification’ is essentially in the same vein as the dynamic theory Junker applied in his theory, it had different theoretical implications for Forkel. Forkel’s theory emphasizes a more subtle and complex nature of human emotions and music’s capacity to express them. First of all, he recognized music’s potential to portray almost imperceptible shadings of feeling beyond the clear, standardized musical figures of affects advocated by French neoclassicism. Against the neoclassic aesthetic tenet that only words, with their concrete meanings, ultimately can make music’s emotive communication fully intelligible, Forkel argues that in this respect music can surpass words, for music “only becomes the real language of the infinite gradations of the feelings at that point where languages can no longer reach, and where their ability to express ends.”26 Not only did Forkel’s theory raise the status of instrumental music to that of vocal music but also encouraged the instrumental music to exercise, without relying on ready-made musical/emotive stock, its own compositional complexity in representing emotions or passions. Thus, under his term ‘harmony’ he included and defended, as legitimate


musical means of expressing ‘manifold modifications’ of feeling, not only complex thematic developments but also the learned, contrapuntal style,\textsuperscript{27} which had been rejected as a “gothic and barbaric”\textsuperscript{28} invention antithetical to natural feelings and therefore had been strictly excluded in the prelude type of the fantasia.

Forkel, despite the fact that his theory stresses the significance of feelings and related psychology in art, regarded his contemporary sentimental music (around 1780), particularly the fantasia, as symptomatic of the decline from the 18\textsuperscript{th}-century musical pinnacle of the High Baroque. Though he belonged to the close circle of C. P. E. Bach, he appraised J. S. Bach’s chromatic fantasia much higher than C. P. E. Bach’s fantasias in the prelude type.\textsuperscript{29} With few exceptions, the critics and theorists of the time in general viewed the type’s outpouring of ideas without order and formal connections as a fatal artistic flaw. They esteemed formal coherence and intelligibility as indispensable elements of fine art, and these neoclassical doctrines were ubiquitous, except in a few cases, in the German aesthetic thoughts of the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century.

As mentioned above, many theoretical works in this period (1780–1800) can be summarized as attempts to harmonize in musical art the feeling and creativity that British naturalism emphasized, with the aesthetic components of reason and intelligibility in French neoclassicism. It is important for us to understand the ways in which the German theorists synthesize the two opposing aesthetic thoughts, because they allow us to recognize the aesthetic ideals of the German instrumental music that helped transform the fantasia in the period. Earlier

---

\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 185.

\textsuperscript{28} Jean-Jacques Rousseau, \textit{Dictionnaire de Musique} (Paris, 1768), s.v. “Harmony.”

\textsuperscript{29} Forkel, “Ueber eine Sonata,” 20.
in the mid-18th century, Moses Mendelssohn had already addressed the challenge of reconciling those contrasting elements in art when he wrote in his *Briefe über die Empfindungen* (1755) that “all ideas of beauty must be contained within the boundaries of clarity if we are to perceive a multiplicity without arduous reflecting.”

However, at this time the aesthetic theories of British naturalism about human emotions and subjective creativity had not yet been fully explored or understood in the German speaking lands, and thus his words implied a more neoclassically oriented reconciliation. When Mendelssohn called for “clarity,” he presumably meant ordering ideas in a conventional form, while lucidity of emotive content could be achieved by using comprehensible affective signs from the Baroque doctrine of affects. However, we saw above that the later German theorists of the late 18th century recognized music’s autonomous power to portray subtle, ever-changing feelings beyond static, rationalistic affective categories defined either by musical conventions or by words. Intelligibility, a central doctrine of French neoclassicism, then, began to have different aesthetic and musical implications. Modifying neoclassic aesthetics with the naturalistic elements, the German theorists argued that good instrumental music ought to convey multiple feelings in an ever-changing motion, yet had to present them comprehensibly. They emphasized the importance of the lucid communication of emotive contents by means of of main themes that represent the predominant emotions of the work, and they believed that developments, or transformations, of main themes or motives musically conveyed the ongoing changes of feeling.

---

I argue that this aesthetic theory of the instrumental music guided the development of the
fantasia and ultimately brought about a crucial change in the genre in the last quarter of the 18th
century.

The New German Aesthetics and the Episodic Type of Fantasia

The transformation of the fantasia genre driven by the new German aesthetics was led by
a group of Classical composers younger than those of the prelude type, who had been mostly
trained at the end of the Baroque era. Although these composers, namely Mozart, Neefe, and
Schubert professed the influence of C. P. E. Bach in their music, they did not whole-heartedly
subscribe to the keyboard school of Bach. To begin with, they composed fantasias in a style
idiomatic for the piano, a newly developing keyboard instrument, rather than for cembalo or
clavichord, which the composers of the prelude type thought as ideal for the fantasia. Under their
hands and with this new instrument, the fantasia took on new features which distinguish their
fantasias from those of the prelude type.

In fantasias of the prelude type, to repeat once again, composers avoided both introducing
and developing a main theme, for according to the precepts of naturalistic aesthetics, such
thematic/motivic workout would hamper the spontaneous overflow of feelings and ideas. Hence,
the fantasia in this style consists of successions of incomplete and fragmented ideas, which, since
they are often not repeated, only give us glimpses of passing feelings in close succession. In
contrast, following the new instrumental aesthetic, composers of the new type presented a clearly
articulated theme, often with a Classical phrase-structure, and developed the thematic idea at
considerable length to form a semi-autonomous section in Classical form. Thus they chose the lucidity of emotive communication over the free treatment of musical ideas.\footnote{Yet, it does not mean that in their fantasias they recapitulate and develop the themes as main ideas as in the Classical sonata or rondo. Only the opening theme was recapitulated at the end, and the middle body of their fantasias is filled with various different themes and styles. For in this type the principle of variety and unconventionality still took precedence over that of formal unity. However, the increasing demand of formal unity brought about new types of fantasia at the turn of the 19th century. Fantasias of these types freely borrow formal principles of other Classical genres, showing the higher degree of rapprochement between the fantasia and other Classical genres.}

What I call the “episodic” type of the fantasia is also distinguished from the “prelude” type in its concern for finding smooth ways to connect those semi-autonomous sections. While the prelude type, boasting its expressive freedom, boldly aestheticizes sudden juxtapositions of styles that did not belong together according to contemporary conventions, the episodic type features a musical form in which composers deliberately shun such juxtapositions except for special purposes. This new characteristic also found its counterpart in the German music theory of the late 18th century. Music theorists and critics of the time, except for a few defenders of the old fashion fantasia, viewed sudden changes of emotive content as inimical to the natural succession of human feelings. For instance, Koch believed that such changes would only provoke laughter in the listener.\footnote{See Koch, “Music and Feeling,” in \textit{Aesthetics and the Art of Musical}, 144–156.} Invoking the neoclassical notion of ‘nature,’ they argued that the nature of human feelings demands a “middle-thing,” or a transition, that can ‘naturally,’ i.e. with reasonable causes, mediate various emotional states.\footnote{Hosler, \textit{Changing Aesthetic Views}, 172–75 and 181–184.} Congruent with this aesthetic doctrine, composers of the episodic type began to insert transitional passages which linked the change of feeling from one state to another. In such transitions, thematic or motivic development played a prominent role, as in a developmental section of a sonata. Indeterminate, free changes in
the direction of musical interest, a hallmark of the prelude type, is no longer applicable in the fantasia of the episodic type. In the new type, composers, rejecting the free improvisatory passages of the prelude type, adopted uninterrupted, goal-oriented, transitions or developments typical of the Classical style—elements which were once regarded as inimical to this genre.

Finally, there was a consensus among the German theorists of the time that the unity of diverse parts constituting a whole was the most important prerequisite of fine art of the time. For the contemporary critics and theorists, unity was the guarantor, the *sine qua non* of perfection and beauty. Sulzer, though he valued the fantasias of the prelude type as sketches of unpredicided inspiration, ultimately believed that

when we can form no idea of unity, and when we cannot feel how variety we see fit together, the individual parts of some object may please us, the whole will never be able to awaken in us any pleasure.\(^{34}\)

According to this view, even the composer who could produce ingenious ideas ought to know how to select and use them in such a way that the diverse parts form an unalterable whole in a coherent and orderly fashion if his/her composition was to succeed. Forkel for his part sees not the fantasia but rather the sonata as a musical art form that embodies this aesthetic ideal when he says:

> A sequence of most animated ideas, which follow each other after the principles of an inspired imagination, is an ode. Just such a sequence of lively, expressive musical ideas, when they follow one another as prescribed by a musically inspired imagination, is a sonata in music. Indeed, inspiration alone cannot produce musical ode (sonata). Especially with moderate affects [inspiration] would be an unsuitable leader, without the guide of art, that is, without suitable sequence and order of emotions. It would lead the composer, like the poet, off the track, permit visions, it would connect emotions which bear too little relation to each other, and it would generally perhaps produce beautiful

\(^{34}\) Sulzer, in *Aesthetics and the Art of Musical Composition*, 44–45.
fantasias or poetic rhapsodies, but not sonatas or odes.\textsuperscript{35}

Undoubtedly, when he mentions “beautiful fantasias,” he has in mind fantasias in the prelude type, which Kant called “free beauty.”\textsuperscript{36} As analyzed in the previous chapter, in the prelude type composers followed only a few compositional rules of order in its opening and ending. However, fantasias in the new episodic type show composers’ increasing concern for formal order and coherence.

It is noteworthy that in response to criticisms of the fantasia such as those cited above, C. P E. Bach himself moderated his sentimental art in his fantasias published after 1780, whereas his followers continued to hold onto the aesthetic principles of the fantasia previously established by Bach. Adopting more Classical balance and formal clarity, he restrained the expressive freedom of the genre, which in his earlier fantasias he extravagantly emphasized. For example, Bach’s fantasia in C major, Wq 61 no 6/H 291, from Book 5 of \textit{Kenner und Liebhaber} (composed in 1784) betrays an increasing tendency toward sectionalization of ideas. In his earlier fantasias he aestheticized the mercurial change and juxtaposition of ephemeral ideas, but in this fantasia he develops each idea to a considerable length and even demarcates each section with a cadence or caesura. In addition, instead of foregrounding the aesthetic principle of variety by constantly introducing new ideas, he constructs the fantasia in a recognizable ternary-form as a whole by repeating ideas or section in a roughly symmetrical fashion. He also introduces a recurring main idea, namely, the opening broken-chord figure. Throughout the work, the idea functions as a bridge that connects various sections, thus lessening the surprise effect of a sudden

\textsuperscript{35} Forkel, “Ueber eine Sonate,” 27.

\textsuperscript{36} Kant, \textit{Critique of Judgment}, 30.
juxtaposition such as those that his earlier fantasias exploited. All of these developments are encapsulated in his last fantasia in F# minor, H. 300, titled by himself “C. P. E. Bachs Empfindungen,” which was posthumously published. Two prominent themes, the opening funeral march reminiscent of the opening of his father’s Funeral Motet, BWV 118 (See Example 1-a and 1-b), and the sentimental operatic ‘aria,’ are developed and interwoven with recurring sections of arioso-recitative and toccata-like passage work. They form a roughly symmetrical pattern that makes us suspect that a sonata logic lurks behind it. 37

Nevertheless, the fantasia of the new type carried over fundamental characteristics of the traditional type, e.g. traditional vocabulary of keyboard improvisation, pathos-laden expressions, and imaginative mixtures of feelings and styles. By retaining these traditional elements, composers of the episodic-type fantasia were able to renovate the genre but insure that even in their renovation the anti-generic tendency of the genre continued. The composers of the episodic type refused to utilize any conventional overarching formal schemas, although they locally introduced them; instead they invented ad hoc forms to unify a variety of ideas into a coherent whole. The genre was thus still defined by expressive freedom and individuality. At this time, transformation of the genre was led not by C. P. E. Bach but by W. A. Mozart. It was not the sectional style of C. P. E. Bach’s late fantasias but that of Mozart’s, steeped in the Classical

37 Nonetheless, we should say that these fantasias of C. P. E. Bach in his later years essentially belong to the old world. In them, Bach refused to incorporate the Classical style, maintaining their genre identity as an anti-Classical art, i.e. a naturalistic art. In those fantasias, Bach fills the content of sections with free improvisation of the prelude type. Their themes are never articulated in a Classical phrase structure, but freely flow in the style of arioso or recitative. The figuration of passage works is that of the Baroque keyboard music in stiylus phantasticus. Furthermore, although a sharp juxtaposition of contrasting sections is carefully avoided by a cadence, a caesura, or a short bridge at the end of each section, the fantasias still lack Classical goal-oriented transitional/developmental sections that connect two different ideas or sections. They shun the kind of Classical dramatic structure which we witness in Mozart’s K. 475, but underline instead non-linearity of musical ideas. Thus the overall aural impression they make is a clarified and ordered yet free patchwork of sundry materials.
style, that emerged in response to contemporary criticisms of the fantasia, and the new aesthetic expectation of the genre. His episodic-type fantasias provided models for Classical composers of both his and following generations, including e.g. Neefe and Schubert, who, in turn, creatively applied Mozart’s innovative style and opened new paths for further transformation of the genre.
Example 1-a  The Opening of C. P. E. Bach’s Fantasia in F# minor, H. 300, mm. 1–2

Example 1-b  The Opening of J. S. Bach’s Funeral Motet, BWV 118, mm. 1–6
Chapter 5. Mozart’s Transformation of the Fantasia: the Episodic Type

Mozart composed his major fantasias in the first half of the 1780s. Except for K. 394 in C major, which follows J. S. Bach’s style of the Baroque fantasia,¹ his fantasias from this period manifest his bold stylistic innovation in the genre. Particularly his two mature works, K. 397 in D minor and K. 475 in C minor, establish the episodic-type of fantasia by introducing _il filo_ (the hidden thread)² as a device that governs local variances and digressions.

In this period, Mozart was boldly transforming the naturalistic conventions of this genre by creatively adapting to it elements of the Classical style and its sophisticated formal logic, while the composers in C. P. E. Bach’s keyboard school continued to cultivate the prelude type. Mozart’s later fantasias redefined the fantasia style of the time, yet his achievement does not imply that Mozart’s works are fruits of his personal invention and originality alone, that is, singular works that defied the norms of the fantasia tradition.³ Metrically free preludes from the 1770s reveal that Mozart was trained in, and familiar with, the Baroque tradition of keyboard improvisation, specifically J. S. Bach’s style. Furthermore, the historical circumstances that surround the creation of his mature fantasias from the early 1780s do strongly suggest that he

---

¹ Like a Baroque fantasia, this work, in fact, functions as a prelude to the subsequent fugue.

² See the discussion of “The Debate on the Hidden Thread, and the Amorphous Form of the Prelude-Type Fantasia” in Chapter 3.

³ In his Grove dictionary article on “Fantasia.” Eugene Helm treats Mozart’s fantasias as such. See Helm, “Fantasia: 18th Century.”
was first fully immersed in the tradition of the prelude type, studying and experimenting with C. P. E. Bach’s fantasias, which Mozart presumably encountered while attending Sunday musicales at the home of Baron van Swieten. The fantasia fragments from the period that preceded his mature fantasias demonstrate that through several experiments he gradually developed a style consistent with the new German aesthetic standards of his time. In other words, he endeavored to find a unique mode for the fantasia that could embody naturalistic ideals of the prelude type, while in keeping with contemporary expectations of instrumental music, namely, expressive intelligibility and formal unity as the *sine qua non* of musical art. At least two of his successors, namely Neefe and Schubert, who modelled their fantasias after Mozart’s K. 475, followed the musical principles of his fantasia. Despite the undeniable presence of a direct influence from K. 475, their fantasias reveal each composer’s individual and unique mode of expression, for the fantasia of the episodic type is not defined by a fixed formal pattern but rather by a set of aesthetic principles that guide the mode of presentation, while allowing the creation of highly individualized and original works.

**Transformation of Mozart’s Fantasia**

Mozart’s transformation of the fantasia unfolded in three stages. In the first stage, he learned and exercised the style of J. S. Bach as codified in C. P. E. Bach’s *Versuch*. The non-metrical preludes from the 1770s, K. 284a (K. 395) and K. 624 (Ahn. 1), and the prelude of K. 394 in C major, which were published as fantasias, belong to this category (See Appendix 1). In spite of their rhythmic freedom, they do not display the characteristics of the prelude type but those of the Baroque improvisatory tradition on which Mozart’s early training and his own didactic method were founded. In the second stage, he studied and emulated the new fantasia
style of C. P. E. Bach, and experimented with its idioms, mixing in his own. Fantasia fragments from the early 1780s, K. 383 C (Ahn.32) in F minor and K. 396 in C minor, document this stylistic development. In them, we witness Mozart’s endeavor to absorb into his own style the new idioms of the prelude type, to which he was likely introduced at the house of Baron van Swieten. In the final stage, he boldly asserted his own style, devising a new type of fantasia, the episodic, that conformed to the German aesthetics of the time. His K. 397 and K. 475 are the consummation of his stylistic development.

Recent musicological research has verified that even before works of the Bach family were introduced to Mozart by Baron van Swieten, he had been acquainted, to a certain degree, with J. S. Bach’s and C. P. E. Bach’s fantasias or at least their improvisatory principles. In his article on Mozart’s early preludes, Robert D. Levin shows that in the 1770s Mozart improvised in the Baroque tradition, i.e. J. S. Bach’s improvisatory style, as codified in the last chapter of C. P. E. Bach’s Versuch, “The Free Fantasia.” The unmeasured preludes that Mozart composed for his sister, Maria Anna (Nannerl), inform us that in keeping with the method described in C. P. E. Bach’s treatise, he improvised and embellished on harmonic progressions derived from figured basses, and he taught his sister the same Baroque practice. These works from 1770s, however, do not show, as Levin argues, that Mozart mastered C. P. E. Bach’s precepts and understood the new naturalistic aesthetics that C. P. E. Bach was cultivating in the genre of the fantasia. Mozart’s unmeasured preludes are certainly rhythmically freer than his later fantasias, which are mostly bound by meters, but they lack the expressive freedom that defines the prelude type of fantasia. The free mixture of various affects and styles, the sudden juxtaposition of contrasting

---

sections, and unconventional harmonic progressions—in short the attributes which C. P. E. Bach
and his followers were cultivating in their fantasias in the 1770s—are absent from these preludes
of Mozart. He fills large portions of them with simple instrumental figures such as runs, broken
chords, and arpeggios, and employs conventional harmonic plans avoiding elliptical harmonic
shifts and modulations to remote keys.

Mozart’s four short preludes, K. 284a, typify his approach to keyboard improvisation in
the late 1770s. These preludes were formerly considered as a single work, “Fantasia and
Capriccio in C major,” K. 395/300g. Earlier scholars and publishers treated the first three
preludes as a single fantasia that introduces the last piece, named “Capriccio” by the composer
himself, treating the work as if it were a fantasia with disparate sections, i.e. of the episodic type.
But recent scholarship on this topic has proved that they are four individual preludes, which
Mozart composed at the request of his sister Nannerl. The composer built the first prelude on a
tonal progression from C major to B♭ major as his sister specifically asked him to do (See Ex. 1).
This tonal plan appears as unconventional as tonal progressions of the fantasia in the prelude
type and the kindred modulation employed at the opening of his K. 475 (from C minor to B
Minor). But, the modulation in the first prelude does not produce as startling as effect as the
modulation in K. 475 or in C. P. E. Bach’s fantasia, for Mozart carefully prepares, and in a way
normalizes, it with harmonic progressions passing through the circle of fifths. The prelude shifts
to the parallel minor at m. 5 as soon as the tonality is established, and at the end of the C-Minor
area (m. 7) it begins to make a modulation to B♭ major with an upward circle of fifths. It

6 Ibid. 208. See also Robert D. Levin, “Mozart’s Solo Keyboard Music,” in Eighteenth Century Keyboard
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Example 1  W. A. Mozart, Prelude in C major, K. 284a/i (formerly K. 395/300g)
Example 1 (cont.)
progresses from f#o65 (viio65/V of C minor), via c#o7 and g#o7 to d#o7, the last chord in the circle, which turns through enharmonic spelling into f#o7. By lowering the bass a half tone, he turns the diminished 7th chord on F# into a F7 chord, that is, V7 of Bb. Through these conventional progressions of harmony, Mozart makes a gradual transition to a distant key, quite unlike the approach we find in the naturalistic type of C. P. E. Bach.

This work rather exemplifies J. S. Bach’s style of the Baroque prelude as instructed in C. P. E. Bach’s Versuch. Furthermore, in the figuration patterns of this prelude Mozart does not strive for any greater imaginative and original expressions than in the harmonic progressions. The pseudo-motivic work with which this prelude opens soon disappears as it reaches the minor tonic at m. 5. What ensues is a non-metrical, free passage of embellishment with generic instrumental figures such as runs and broken chords. The opening motif briefly returns, with regular measures, in the key of Bb major but the figures of broken chords soon take over, expanding the cadential progressions of Bb major that conclude the prelude. There is no trace of an attempt for ingenious mixture of styles or imaginative engineering of motivic fragmentation that were typically found in the prelude-type fantasia.

Nevertheless, contrary to Levin’s argument, we cannot conclusively determine from these preludes of the 1770s Mozart’s improvisational style in the 1770s. Although they do allow us to observe his training in and understanding of improvisation, it is questionable whether they reflect his actual practice of the time, as all the preludes were written specifically for a didactic purpose – to develop his sister’s improvisational skill. With his primary purpose and the level of his sister’s keyboard skill in mind, Mozart probably chose more fundamental improvisatory idioms

---

7 In this dissertation, the term ‘prelude-type’ has a definition distinct from ‘prelude.’ See “Historical Roots of the Fantasia in the Prelude type and Its Definition” in Chapter 2, 31–36.
just as C. P. E. Bach did for beginners in his Versuch. He could have improvised more elaborately and creatively when performing. What these preludes surely tell us is that Mozart was disciplined, and disciplining, in keyboard improvisation based on the figured-bass tradition, and was familiar with the extempore precepts introduced in Bach’s treatise. His Fantasia in C major, K. 394 (“Fantasia and Fugue”), another work written for his sister, although it was composed later in 1782, shares stylistic similarities with the preludes of the 1770s (See Example 2-a and 2-b).  

In a letter of 1782 to his sister, Mozart writes, “I ask you to promise me not to take back your promise, and let no man see them. Learn them by heart and play them.”  

It is clear that he composed it solely for his sister’s improvement and enjoyment—not for public performance.

Except for these preludes written for pedagogical purposes, there are no other sources that allow us to look into the world of Mozart’s keyboard fantasia or fantasieren in the 1770s. The earliest non-didactic examples of his improvisational style are found in three incomplete fantasias from 1782. They exhibit a musical style distant from that of the earlier preludes and fantasia of K. 394 and more akin to the prelude type of fantasia based on naturalistic aesthetics. Perhaps one might surmise that Mozart practiced this style of improvisation in the 1770s, but that no documentary proof of this has survived sources; perhaps he did not feel it necessary to write down his improvised fantasias. What motivated him, then, this time (1782) to jot down his improvisations and leave them unfinished as if experimenting with the new style? In the years

---

8 Mozart begins K. 394 with an opening formula typical of a Baroque prelude: an upward broken-chord figure attached to a phrase slowly descending by steps (ex. 2-a). As in K. 284a/i, Mozart makes a gesture of quasi-motivic working out in the first eight measures and then fills the remainder of the fantasia with instrumental flourishes. Its harmonic progressions are mostly conventional. A few passages in the middle of the work move in a harmonic sequence on bass steps or chromatic steps, betraying the Baroque practice of figured bass (Ex 2-b).

Example 2-a  W. A. Mozart, Fantasia in C major, K. 394, mm. 1–10

Example 2-b  W. A. Mozart, Fantasia in C major, K. 394, m. 46
1782–3, when Mozart attended Van Swieten’s Sunday musicales and was introduced to the fugues of Baroque masters, the composer exercised the fugal form in many unfinished pieces. Likewise, it would probably not be mistaken to assume that with the fantasia fragments Mozart experimented the new idioms of the genre developed by C. P. E. Bach and his keyboard school, since the Baron too, in the Sunday meetings, advocated Bach’s new compositions. And we can assume that Baron van Swieten, an enthusiast and subscriber of C. P. E. Bach’s music, most likely personally owned the scores for some of Bach’s free fantasias and encouraged Mozart to explore them.

The relationship between C. P. E. Bach’s and Mozart’s fantasias is exceptionally complex. When we compare Mozart’s two last fantasias, K. 397 and K. 475, with Bach’s fantasias, we could argue with Lilla F. Johnson’s observation that Mozart’s style is “radically different” from C. P. E. Bach’s,\(^\text{10}\) for the similarities between the two composers’ works appear limited to a few improvisatory passages of arpeggio and cadenza. Even in those passages, Mozart’s fantasias show a far more balanced and controlled—in a way, more “classicalized”—style than Bach’s, and the overall form and style of Mozart’s fantasias, highly structured, does not seem to bear direct influences of Bach’s free-style improvisation. Thus it is understandable that Richards does not include Mozart’s fantasias in her discussions on the musical picturesque, which, according to her thesis, the style of Bach’s free fantasias epitomizes. Nonetheless, we should not consider Mozart’s fantasia as a decisive break from the tradition which Bach’s fantasias embody. As some scholars argue, Mozart followed the path marked by his

\(^{10}\)Johnson, “The ‘Kenner und Liebhaber’ Fantasias,” 64–69.
predecessors, especially by C. P. E. Bach.\textsuperscript{11} The historical context of Mozart’s fantasias raises the strong possibility that his fantasias from the 1780s were affected by his acquaintance with C. P. E. Bach’s fantasias; and indeed in-depth musical analysis of these pieces and of his fantasia fragments reveal the presence of Bach’s influence. In his fantasias, Mozart actually carried over many elements of the fantasia tradition found in Bach’s works, rewriting them with up-to-date idioms. Above all, instead of merely mimicking Bach’s stylistic traits, he learned the fundamental aesthetic principles of the genre from Bach, and boldly reformed it according to more modern standards, which we discussed in the previous chapter.

Mozart’s major fantasias were composed during or after the years 1782-1783, the period in which he frequented Baron van Swieten’s Sunday musicales. Baron van Swieten, an important music patron in the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century and a personal acquaintance of C. P. E Bach, owned a large number of works by Baroque masters, including Händel, J. S. Bach and his sons. Swieten enthusiastically promoted these works and encouraged young composers to study them by having them performed weekly in his musical salon. These occasions exposed Mozart to J. S. Bach and C. P. E. Bach’s works and rejuvenated his interest in their music.\textsuperscript{12}

According to Mozart scholars, this contact with the old masters’ works, occasioned by the Baron’s musicales, made roughly two major impacts on his compositional outlook. In her article “Bach, Mozart, and the ‘Musical Midwife’,” Michelle Rasmussen shows that the musical


experience at the Baron’s home kindled in Mozart an enthusiasm for learning from the Baroque fugue and its contrapuntal procedure. It prompted him to diligently study fugues of Baroque masters and even to transcribe some of fugues the from Bach’s *Well-Tempered Clavier* for chamber ensemble. The letter to his father in which Mozart asks him to send six fugues of Händel reveals also that in this period Mozart himself was collecting fugues by J. S. Bach and by Emanuel and Friedemann Bach. At the same time, this contact with the new musical styles of J. S. Bach’s sons at the Baron’s musicales occasioned Mozart’s reconceptualization of rondo and fantasia, the genres that J. S. Bach’s sons strived to modernize. It is well known that Mozart mastered the Classical concerto form by studying and renovating the concerto style of J. C. Bach, known as the “London” Bach. In his salon Van Swieten ardently promoted works of C. P. E. Bach in addition to those of Händel and J. S. Bach, and the Baron later organized the Gesellschaft der Associierten, a group of noblemen who sponsored concerts of works by C. P. E. Bach and Händel; Mozart himself occasionally directed the concerts of this group. All these facts point to the likelihood that Mozart encountered C. P. E. Bach’s fantasias at the Baron’s

---


palace, which motivated him to study their new style. Indeed, Mozart’s two unfinished fantasias, K. 396, and K. 397, and a fantasia fragment, K. 383 C (Anh. 32), which originated in this period (1782–3), suggest that Mozart exercised and experimented with what he had learned from C. P. E. Bach’s fantasias. However, we do not know which fantasias of C. P. E. Bach Mozart actually

Example 3  W. A. Mozart, Fantasia Fragment in F minor, K. 383 C, mm. 1–14
studied. Most of Bach’s fantasias in the prelude type that were transmitted to us first appeared in his Kenner und Liebhaber collections 4–6, which were composed and published later than Mozart’s unfinished fantasias.

In fact, Mozart’s unfinished fantasias composed in 1782, stylistically distant from the preludes written for his sister, display the characteristics of the prelude type of fantasia, which Mozart presumably learned by studying C. P. E. Bach’s fantasias. Among the fantasias of 1782, the fragment of Mozart’s K. 383 C (Anh. 32) in F minor comes nearest to the style of C. P. E. Bach’s fantasias. It opens with an arioso (a style that falls between recitative and aria), which is the hallmark of C. P. E. Bach’s keyboard recitative (See Ex. 3). Mozart unfolds his improvisation in a free form with relatively unrestrained rhythmic and melodic patterns, yet imbibes it with a
singing effect of metric regularity rather than of free recitation. Particularly the sudden
interruption of melodic and rhythmic flow with an edged and emphatic, short motif at m. 3
reflects the quintessential idiom of C. P. E. Bach’s free fantasias. In K. 383 C Mozart shuns
melodic repetition and periodicity in favor of expressive freedom and spontaneity.

In the Fantasia in C minor, K. 396 (385f), another unfinished fantasia from the same year,
Mozart fuses C. P. E. Bach’s style with the style of earlier preludes and the Classical style, as if
searching for a way to reconcile them (See Example 4). At its opening, as in K. 384, he utilizes,
instead of a free, non-repeating arioso or recitative as in K. 383 C (Anh. 32), a typical melodic
formula of the Baroque prelude—a long upward arpeggio, or upbeat, followed by embellishments
of melodic steps in the upper register. He repeats it as a main idea until a new idea in the relative
major embarks after the caesura on the dominant at m. 16, a procedure foreign to the prelude
type in which, as noted above, for the sake of variety, freedom, and spontaneity composers avoid
a dominant theme and its working out. At the same time, in this work Mozart also avoids the
overt melodic periodicity and rhythmic uniformity of his preludes by freely varying the main
idea and its phrase length. For example, the first two statements of the melodic formula hint at a
Classical periodic structure of antecedent and consequent phrases. The ‘antecedent’ phrase
consists of two sub-phrases; the first sub-phrase with an upward tonic arpeggio and dotted
rhythm (mm 1-2) is answered by the second sub-phrase with syncopations, which progresses
back to the tonic and yet leaves the upper voice on scale degree 5. The second phrase, derived
from the same melodic formula and in almost identical harmonic progressions (i-iv-V-i) with the
previous (i-vi-iv-V-I), brings down the upper voice to scale degree 1, enclosing the two phrases
as a self-contained period. However, what is noticeable here is the length of the two phrases.
Example 4  W. A. Mozart, Incomplete Fantasia in C minor, K. 396, mm. 1–17
Atypically for the Classical style, the first phrase is three and half measures long, whereas the next phrase stretches only two and half measures. The following phrases are as irregular as the first two, strangely disjointed at their ends and elided with the next. The asymmetrical phrase structure of this section – in measure length $\{3 \frac{1}{2} + 2 \frac{1}{2}\} + \{1 + 1 + 2\} + \{1 + 1 + 3 \frac{1}{2}\}$ shows that Mozart deliberately avoids a Classical grouping of two four-bar phrases, making the fantasia appear more spontaneous. The constantly varying and freely flowing rhythm with subtle inflexions enhances this effect of free improvisation, turning into an arioso or *parlando rubato* a section that could have been mechanical thematic repetitions as in his earlier preludes and in K. 394.\textsuperscript{16}

In contrast to the preludes from the 1770s, which do not show interest in the affective dimension, Mozart’s incomplete fantasias from 1782 accentuate the *topoi* of pathetic *lamento* and sentimental aria – central emotive contents of the prelude type. The opening arioso of K. 393 C, with its *Adagio* tempo and its F-minor tonality, exemplifies the style of sorrowful lament and portrays the *topos* of death (Ex. 4). Perhaps it is not a coincidence that five years later Mozart employs the same key for the death scene of the commandant in his opera *Don Giovanni*. This *topos* of death is also the primary emotive subject of K. 396 in C minor. Its opening, which, as discussed above, has a musical character of arioso similar to that of K.383 C, moves slowly with dotted and syncopated rhythms and in the key of C minor – the expressive characteristics which the introduction of the first movement of Beethoven’s sonata *Pathétique* also employs. In his fantasias, however, Mozart tends to place, after the pathos-laden opening, a sentimental “aria”

\textsuperscript{16} Yet, these seemingly, freely developing passages are, in fact, based on an identical, underlying simple bass pattern (C-Ab-F-G-C), which is repeated throughout the section. We will see later that developing this device, Mozart generates a global form out of a simple bass pattern in his mature fantasias.
instead of a march-like theme as in Classical sonatas and symphonies. We saw that this kind of insertion of a sentimental aria is a prominent characteristic of the fantasia in the prelude type—a development commonly attributed to C. P. E. Bach. In K. 396, the section in Eb major that follows the opening prepares for an entry of the violin part, but Mozart stopped writing from the entry point, so we do not know what would have ensued. Nonetheless, considering his fantasia style in general, we can safely presume that it would have been an operatic song in empfinsamer Stil or something in the same vein. The opening arioso of K. 383 C is followed by this very kind of passage. Here, a melodic fragment with an appoggiatura floats over the metrically regular accompaniment of the bass with triplets (mm. 7–8 of Ex. 3). Mozart adopts a similar formal strategy in the fantasia in D minor, K. 397 as well as his later fantasia in C minor, K. 475. He opens K. 397 with slow lamenting arpeggios, a typical kind of figuration in fantasias of the prelude type; the overall effect is that of the Baroque tomeau (See Example 9). After a caesura at m. 11 at the end of the arpeggio introduction, a slow sentimental aria enters, pervaded with heart-aching, chromatic inflexions (See Example 7).

At the same time, even these fragments, though indebted to C. P. E. Bach’s style, are not derivative but adumbrate the later development of his fantasia. In other words, they show that by creatively responding to new musical stimuli Mozart was finding his own voice in this genre, which he crystalized and perfected in his later mature fantasias. In these fragments, the composer tames the free, improvisatory nature of the genre’s wild mannerisms, which are characteristics of the prelude type, with a form more balanced and thought out, and controls it with a more global harmonic plan. We observed in the previous chapter that in fantasias of the prelude type, the composers aestheticized sudden contrasts of different affects or styles and privileged musical wandering by deliberately breaking formal balance and proportion, stylizing the momentary
inspiration of original ideas. Mozart, by contrast, avoids this kind of precipitous change in mood or affect in his fantasias, carefully preparing for the transition from one emotion to another. For example, the opening arioso of K. 383 C, which introduces non-repeating fragments in the manner of C. P. E. Bach, lasts for only four bars, and from m. 5 already begins to punctuate the arioso and prepare for the aria-like section (Ex. 3). Instead of allowing the more structured new idea to come into direct contact with the freer arioso, he inserts a short closing passage in mm. 5–6 which helps the listener anticipate a new idea. At m.5, he first introduces a metrically regular dominant pedal of sixteenth notes in the bass, which resembles the bass in the following section (mm. 7–8), and repeats a fast, ascending figure of thirty-second notes over the bass pedal (mm. 6–7)–a typical transitional passage for a Classical sonata.

In terms of harmonic/formal organization, Mozart’s fantasias appear looser or less conventional than any other his keyboard works, but this is not to say that they lack formal control and unity. Mozart directs improvisatory local events with a global and unifying formal plan. Schleuning argues in his book Fantasia II that K. 393 C represents Mozart’s actual improvisation, which, according to his speculation, would have been much freer than his published fantasias.17 He regards the unfinished fantasia as a first draft in which Mozart freely jotted down his spontaneous thoughts without any editing. As discussed above, the fantasia comes closest to the heart of C. P. E. Bach’s fantasia style, and its opening arioso may be regarded as one of the freest passages in all of Mozart’s keyboard music. But a second look at this fantasia tells us that the work is neither as unrestricted as C. P. E. Bach prescribes in the last chapter “Free Fantasia” of his treatise nor as free from a formal concern as Schleuning claims.

First of all, this fantasia fragment (K. 383 C) has a rather conventional global tonal scheme: F minor–Ab major–C minor/major. In the opening arioso, Mozart firmly establishes the home key, F minor, as Bach advises in his *Versuch*. Bach’s fantasias, however, after establishing the tonic at the opening, often decisively move away to remote key areas. For example, as discussed in the previous chapter, the opening of Bach’s fantasia in A major (H. 278) is immediately followed by a passage in B minor, and the fantasia in F major (H. 279) modulates from the tonic to A minor and from there to B major a tritone away from the home key. Compared to the harmonic daring of those fantasias, K. 383 C appears less adventurous and more conventional. After the caesura following the half cadence of the opening, a new aria-like passage, as in the second theme group of a Classical sonata, enters in a closely related key, the relative major (Ab). The section that follows the aria-like passage (mm. 9–14 of Ex. 2) consists of repeated cadential gestures in Ab major. What we encounter at the end of the section, however, is a half cadence in C major/minor, i.e. a modulation to the dominant. As we will see below, the way that it modulates to the key of C is original but the tonal plan is not. This modulation from the relative major to the dominant appears frequently in Classical sonatas but is too conventional to be used in the prelude-type fantasia.

Furthermore, it is significant that the modulatory passage to the dominant at the end of the section clarifies the formal function of the seemingly random interruptions of cadential progressions in Ab major. In other words, Mozart contextualizes local digressions within a structural plan – a feature from which the fantasia of the prelude type abstains. The flow of the aria-like passage is interrupted by a fleeting tonicization of F minor in m. 9. The following cadential gesture (mm. 9–10), with rising phrases and a trill on V of Ab, more emphatically cries out for a resolution to I of Ab. But what enters at the place of the expected tonic is an
interrupting short phrase on an F7 chord in the same register as the previous interruption. Here Mozart is using the harmonic progression *ellipsis*, i.e. a harmonic leap – a device often engaged in fantasias of the prelude type. In the prelude type, however, the ellipsis ushers in new tonal areas, whereas Mozart’s fantasia resumes the cadential progressions in Ab. The subsequent passage on V6/4 (m. 11) begins with an eb³ in a high register, hinting at a still-present urge for a resolution to the tonic of Ab, but soon falls down to the middle register and is again interrupted by another *ellipsis* (mm. 11–12). This time it is a Bb minor chord that frustrates the cadential gesture, which can be interpreted as ii of Ab but also the tonic chord of the unresolved dominant 7th on F of m. 11. This dominant 7th is reiterated at the end of the last attempt at a cadence to Ab, again interrupting its resolution (m. 13). Here, however, it is immediately repeated a step higher on the dominant 7th of C major/minor. The long expected Ab chord finally appears at the end of this short sequence (m. 14), but the following progressions (It6-V) of the half cadence in C reinterprets the chord as bVI of the new key. This ingenious, surprising modulation belongs to the very kind of harmonic manipulation that C. P. E. Bach and his followers often use in the fantasia. Yet, whereas the composers of the prelude type treat these manipulations merely as local events, Mozart relates this harmonic digression to the overall structure of this fantasia.

As discussed in the previous chapter, in the fantasia of the prelude type the background structure does not interfere with surface events, but merely sustains the tonal centrality, which was the minimum requirement for this otherwise free genre. In Mozart’s fantasias the background structure, however, begins to interact with the foreground, and the foreground begins to dramatize the background events. Thus, Mozart creates formally more coherent fantasias. The short stepwise ascent from the F7 to the G7 in m. 13 implies, and at the same time emphasizes, the underlying progression from the subdominant to the dominant key. As discussed above, the
entry of the V7 of Bb minor at this point does not sound as surprising as its initial entry does. For Mozart has implied the constant presence of the key in the Ab-major section with the interrupting phrases (at mm. 11, 12, and 13). In other words, the key of Bb minor, which has been embedded in the tonal context of Ab, is called out independently at the end. In this last section (mm. 9–14), Mozart toys with the dual tonality—an unconventional idea which Mozart engages again in the opening of his later fantasia, K 475.

In the two unfinished fantasias (K. 383c and K. 396) Mozart incorporated several elements of the Classical style and attempted to harmonize them with traditional idioms of the fantasia. In K. 383 C, he connects two contrasting ideas with a transitional passage, arranges them in a conventional tonal scheme, and controls local digressions with a global plan (Ex. 3). In K. 396 he introduces a main theme which he uses as a basic motif for improvisation and development (Ex. 4). Nonetheless, these pieces belong essentially to the prelude type, for each section of these fantasias, although more expanded and developed than that of the prelude-type fantasia, still lacks a complete musical form and contains only fragmentary ideas. These sections are basically transient passages that consist of a patchwork of ideas, which the prelude-type fantasia aestheticizes as a token of artistic freedom.

**Mozart’s Fantasias of the Episodic Type**

It is in the D-minor fantasia, K. 397 (written in 1782) that, for the first time in the history of the fantasia, individual episodes present a clearly pronounced theme and even take on Classical form. Therefore, Mozart’s K. 397 is a historical landmark in the transformation of the genre, although this piece still features many characteristics of the traditional fantasia. In the C-minor fantasia, K. 475 (composed in 1785), Mozart further developed the style established in K.
The fantasies from the last stage of his development reconcile this genre’s naturalistic ideals with intelligible forms, without losing genre identity, a synthesis which German music philosophers and theorists of the time had previously proposed only in theory.

Mozart’s fantasia in D minor (K. 397) shows a sophisticated approach to unifying diverse musical elements and expressive contents with a high degree of formal coherence, thus bringing this naturalistic genre closer to the ideal of 18th-century neoclassicism than it had ever come before. Following the genre’s principle of variety, Mozart casts the fantasia in three stylistically distinct sections. The opening with slow arpeggios presents the style of preludizing or introduction, which belongs to the improvisatory language of the traditional fantasia. The following section carries a sorrowful aria and passages with a chromatic ‘sigh’ motif, reminiscent of a sentimental scene from a Classical opera. The final section, marked allegretto, contrasting with the first and second sections not only in tempo but also in meter and emotive content, is a happy contradance in duple meter. Even in Mozart’s time, this kind of stylistic mixture, even when it did not engender a sudden change, was acceptable only in the fantasia. C. P. E. Bach also frequently inserts in the middles of his fantasias an aria section which, in contrast to its modulatory surroundings, is tonally stable and features a distinct theme, as in the Probestücke in C minor analyzed in the previous chapter (See Chapter 3 Ex. 1 and 5). Bach, however, deliberately eschews casting the aria section in a traditional formal pattern, whereas in K. 397 Mozart casts each main section in Classical form. Even the opening, which imitates a free improvisation, assumes a role analogous to that of an introduction in a Classical sonata by ending on a half cadence.

Mozart closes the two main sections of aria and contradance with conventional tonal progressions (I–V–I), thereby creating symmetrical balance, while refraining from harmonic
wanderings which characterize the prelude-type fantasia. The introduction ushers in a sentimental aria in the home key, and the unstable, developmental passages that ensue from the outburst of the aria in mm. 16–19 make a transition to a return of the aria theme in the dominant.

Example 5  W. A. Mozart, Fantasia in D minor, K. 397, mm. 29–38

at m. 29 (See Example 5). The transitional passages, which reappear after the cadenza-like flourish at the end of the aria (m. 34), modulate back to tonic. Mozart recapitulates the aria theme in the home key at the end of the aria section, shaping the section into a ‘monothematic’ ternary form, AA’A.

The contradance theme of the following section is structured in a typical antecedent-consequent period in which the antecedent phrase moves to the dominant and the parallel
consequent closes it in the tonic (See Example 8-a). The following middle passage of the section expands the authentic cadence of the theme through prolongation of the tonic; the cadenza-like passage on the dominant 7th at the end leads to a restatement of the dance theme, which prepares for the final cadence of the section.

Furthermore, although in this work Mozart unconventionally introduces various affects in accordance with the aesthetic principle of the traditional fantasia, he avoids the immediate juxtaposition of sharply contrasting ideas, a musical effect on which fantasias of the prelude type frequently capitalize. With the closing gesture at the end of the aria section and the fermata that follows (See Example 6), the composer prepares for the entry of a new idea – a kind of transition prefigured in K. 383 C. Instead of introducing an *ellipsis* – a hallmark of the prelude-type fantasia – Mozart makes an overt connection between the two contrasting sections by allowing the resolution of this dramatic cadential gesture at the end of the aria section to fall at the beginning of the subsequent section; and by placing a fermata between the two sections he provides time for listeners to make ready their ears for a new *topos*, namely, the style of a contradance.

Example 6  The Bridge to the Contradance Theme of K. 397, mm. 52–54
Mozart stopped writing the fantasia after the last fermata at m. 97, leaving it incomplete. We are not sure whether Mozart was thinking about introducing a new section, or if he planned on treating this fantasia as a prelude to a fugue or sonata in D major; it is also possible that he may not have been able to find a satisfactory way to close this fantasia. No matter what his intention was, it is more important for the purposes of our enquiry that we recognize the formal development of the genre manifested in this fantasia, whose last section, though not finished, is, like the aria section, built in a semi-autonomous ternary form, ABA’+ coda.

Although Mozart adopts overtly Classical forms, in the two main sections of K. 397 he retains many improvisatory elements of the traditional fantasia. The crucial difference between his use of these elements and that of the prelude-type composers is that Mozart not only makes use of their expressive potential, but also assigns them formal functions in his fantasia. I have

Example 7  Aria Theme and Chromatic Passage of K. 397, mm.12–24
already noted that the opening arpeggio, a typical improvisatory figure of the fantasia in the prelude type, works strictly as an introduction to the following section. Metrically free cadenza-like elaborations occur (m. 34, 44, and 86) only at cadential points expected to resolve to the tonic of the home key and thus dramatize its return. The only exception is found in the passage (m. 34 in Ex. 5) in the middle of which the tonal direction is diverted from D minor to G minor, the subdominant of the home key.\textsuperscript{18}

As in the traditional fantasia in \textit{stylus phantasticus}, Mozart saturates the outer voices with chromatic tones. The chromatically descending bass first appears in the passage (mm. 20–22) following the open end of the theme on V (See Example. 7). We showed in the previous chapter that the 18\textsuperscript{th}-century keyboard improvisation, following in the figured-bass tradition, was guided by the bass, and chromatic steps were among the most often-used bass patterns. The chromatic bass in this fantasia descends, exactly as prescribed in Bach’s \textit{Versuch}, from scale degree 1 to scale degree 5 of the key (A minor) to which the passage belongs (mm. 20–22 in Ex. 7 and mm. 35–37 in Ex. 5). While fantasias in the prelude type use this figure independent of any large-scale formal concerns, Mozart limits his use of the chromatic bass only to the bridge between the main theme and the following transitional passage. Likewise, the aria section of the fantasia, which is permeated with melodic chromatic tones, lacks the sort of chromatic progressions which composers often exploit in the fantasia of the prelude type (Ex. 7). Although these melodic chromatic tones add much expressivity and poignancy, they do not appear to have any structural significance.

\textsuperscript{18} The structural significance of this passage will be explained below.
Edward Laufer’s Schenkerian analysis of Mozart’s fantasia in D minor reveals yet another dimension of the functions of the chromatic tones. He argues that the local chromatic elaborations in mm 16–19 (Ex.7) bring about a significant structural consequence in the voice leading of the fantasia, which is deceptively simple and straightforward but built with a sophisticated, underlying formal logic. Laufer points out the ubiquitous existence of a voice leading pattern in the middleground throughout the work. According to his analysis, all three sections of this fantasia are derived from the same voice-leading pattern, which he calls the ‘motto’ (middleground motif or voice-leading pattern), and which is gradually revealed as the work progresses, attaining its complete form in the unproblematic contradance theme (See Example 8-a and 8-b). The motto appears in the middle ground of the top voice in this section, which ascends stepwise from F# (scale degree 3) to A (scale degree 5) and descends by steps to D (scale degree 1). Laufer argues that this commonplace voice-leading pattern underlies not only the stable final section, but also those of the other sections, including even the seemingly free introduction, which contrast with the final section in style and affect.

We saw in the previous chapter that the fantasia of the prelude type occasionally has a recognizable formal pattern, but that its background formal pattern neither interacts with nor controls surface events. The primary aesthetic purpose of the prelude type lies in the expressive freedom from large-scale formal concerns in favor of unfettered execution of spontaneous ideas. In contrast, Laufer’s analysis shows that in Mozart’s fantasia, not only does the motto govern events in the middleground, but also that audible features derived from it infiltrate the foreground of the work. Supporting this view, Karl Schnürl, in his article “Spiel mir das lied von

Example 8-a  Contradance Theme of K. 397, mm. 55–70

Example 8-b  Laufer’s Schenkerian Analysis of the Dance Theme and the Motto

---

20 This graph is copied from Edward Laufer, “On the Fantasia,” 104.
“Tod!,” observes the parallelism between the voice-leading patterns of the opening arpeggios and the contradance theme (See Example 9). The improvisatory arpeggios turn out to be carefully articulated, subtly signifying connections with other themes. According to Laufer’s analysis, this arpeggio introduction even anticipates subsequent events. Its descending voice, at m. 8, stops over Eb (scale degree b2) harmonized with N6, and the event in mm. 34–35 of the middle section of the aria (Ex. 5) recapitulates and dramatizes this voice-leading pattern to Eb.

Example 9  The Introduction of Mozart’s Fantasia in D minor, K. 397, mm. 1–11

Laufer’s analysis tells us that the aria section restates the motto, unmistakably articulating the stepwise ascent of the top voice from scale degree 3 to 5, yet several events of this section interrupt the completion of the projected voice-leading of the motto, and Laufer interprets the chromatic elaborations in mm. 16–18 (Ex. 7) as one of the digressive events. They add, in the middleground, a neighbor note (scale degree 6) to scale degree 5 and extend the area of the scale degree 5, so that the melody, in the given temporal framework, could not complete a descent to
scale degree 1. The following passages are an attempt to complete the voice leading left incomplete. As anticipated in the introduction, the upper voice makes an emphatic structural digression to Eb at the end of the cadenza-like passage m. 34 (Ex. 5); the following transitional passage brings back the top voice to E (scale degree 2) at its end (m. 43) (See Example 10). The final entry of the aria theme offers a ‘corrected’ version of the voice leading, heading for the final arrival on scale degree 1, but the interrupting Eb, harmonized with N6 as in the introduction, again diverts the stepwise descent from its goal, which is achieved only in the final section (Ex. 8-a and 8-b).

Example 10  Retransition of the Aria Section of K. 397, mm. 41–43

It is undeniable that Laufer’s analysis reveals important aspects of the voice-leading pattern, and thus the formal strategy, of Mozart’s fantasia in D minor. Nevertheless, one significant question remains: how could the facts uncovered by his analysis contribute to our genre study? Unreservedly applying his analytic method to our inquiry would be problematic in several ways. One should remember that with this analysis Laufer does not necessarily intend to illuminate genre specific-features but only those particular to K. 397. According to the Schenkerian evaluative premise, a voice-leading pattern which relates surface-level pitch
configuration to middleground or background would be found in any ‘well-written’ tonal music. For example, when Schenker attempts to demonstrate his theory of Auscomponierung of the Urlinie by analyzing the fantasia included in the last chapter of C. P. E. Bach’s Versuch ‘Improvisation,’ he shows that the piece is structured with a high degree of voice-leading unity at all levels. But Bach’s fantasia belongs to the prelude type, and I explained that this type is characterized by its expressive freedom and by its avoidance of predictable formal pattern. We cannot define types of the fantasia only by voice-leading patterns. What we principally investigate in this genre study is the aesthetic impulse behind each type of the fantasia and its musical embodiments that distinguish one type from another as well as from other genres of tonal music. For our enquiry, we should also examine, and relate to the voice-leading pattern, emotional content, formal organization, texture, and instrumental figuration of the fantasia—dimensions that Schenkerian method does not consider. From this perspective, one could argue that the covert voice-leading unity that Bach’s fantasia displays was not an essential characteristic of the prelude-type fantasia but rather a feature contingent on individual excellence.²¹

One could argue that Laufer’s analysis, applying the concept of ‘motto,’ elucidates aspects more genre-specific and somewhat different from Schenker’s analysis of Bach’s fantasia. As indicated above, his analysis indeed shows that various ideas of K. 397, distinct from one another in style and affect, share an identical voice-leading pattern, or ‘motto,’ which is close

enough to the surface to be recognizable and audible. One may even contend that this feature reflects the way in which Mozart improvised in the 1780s. Nevertheless, Laufer’s analysis does not take into account a few unique musical and historical features of Mozart’s mature fantasias. We saw earlier that Mozart was trained in keyboard improvisation in the traditional method based on the figured-bass practice. Although we cannot regard K. 397 as a figured-bass improvisation or as a stylistic replica of one, this Baroque practice still affords us insight into the ‘hidden’ design of Mozart’s fantasia and into his improvisational practice.

Above all, in K. 397 and K. 475, Mozart, as in the fantasia of the prelude type, employs the bass as the primary voice with which he controls harmonic and tonal direction. This means that in these fantasias the bass takes precedence over the top voice, on which Laufer’s analysis principally focuses. Of course, Mozart does not simply follow the traditional practice of building the whole fantasia on a single figured-bass as in the fantasia of the prelude type and in his own earlier preludes. He integrates the figured-bass practice into Rameau’s functional tonality in an ingenious way. I have concluded that Mozart utilizes the old practice for his mature fantasia, K. 397 and K. 475, in an original, creative way by devising a bass line that functions as the structural basis of the fantasia recurring underneath the diverse surface like a ground bass or basso ostinato. Thus, for the purpose of our study, our analytic focus will be on the bass line of his fantasias rather than on the top voice, as Laufer’s does. However, the concept of a fundamental bass line that I propose here is similar to that of Laufer’s ‘motto’ in that it functions as a structural motif deployed on both local and global levels. As in the case of the motto, local events constantly allude to the fundamental bass line, yet, instead of literally repeating it like an ostinato bass, Mozart presents it in varied versions. However, the fundamental bass line differs from the motto in its global-level function. Although the repeated denial and attainment of the
motto’s resolution to scale degree 1 begets a temporal process, the motto recurs only on a local level rather than developed on a global level. From this perspective the ubiquitous presence of the motto can be regarded as atemporal. On the other hand, the fundamental bass line is also expanded on a global level to give a sense of development and connection to seemingly independent sections and impart a temporal narrative thread to the fantasia. At the beginning, Mozart presents the bass line in an incomplete form, and then gradually reveals a complete form through multiple diversions and corrections. In the middle sections, he controls the progress of this gradual revelation itself in the tonal progressions that the bass line implies. With this bass-line, Mozart steers his fantasia down a carefully premeditated path, dramatizing arrivals at structural goals. What we will now investigate in this study is this narrative thread created by the fundamental bass line, which controls the temporal unfolding of the fantasia and bestows formal coherence upon it.

Since the term ‘ground bass’ and ‘fundamental bass’ have specific musical associations, in this study we will call ‘Grundsatz’ the kind of fundamental bass line on which Mozart bases the narrative thread of his fantasias.

We can re-examine K. 397 with this analytic method. According to Mozart’s formal strategy the fantasia reveals the most normalized version of the Grundsatz in the last section (See Figure 1). The duple dance theme of the last section in Classical form, in fact, betrays most normative harmonic progressions by the Classical standard in this work (Ex. 8-a). The bass of its antecedent phrase conspicuously outlines a motion from D via G# to A, while that of the consequent a similar yet more elaborate motion from D via G - G# - A (A-B-A) to D. What is remarkable in this piece is that these two bass motions appear throughout this work. For example, the latter functions as the harmonic basis of the arpeggio introduction; the only
difference between the two sections is that in the introduction Mozart harmonizes the bass G with bII6, a substitute for the subdominant (Ex. 9). Furthermore, it is not a coincidence that two statements of the aria theme betray a similar harmonic structure and bass motion with the

![Figure 1: Grundsatz of K. 397](image)

phrases of the dance theme (Ex 7 and 8-a). The first statement of the aria theme delineates at its end a bass motion identical with the antecedent phrase of the dance theme from D via G# to A (mm. 18–19), while the end of the last statement of the theme in the tonic expands and dramatizes the very bass motion of its consequent phrase from the dance theme D via G and G# to A (mm. 45–54), crying for a resolution to the bass D with the tonic.

Mozart even deploys these fundamental bass lines in creating the narrative thread of the fantasia on a more global level. The bass line of the aria theme outlines harmonic progressions from the tonic to the dominant in the antecedent phrase, and from the tonic via the subdominant and the dominant finally to the tonic in the consequent phrase. The first statement of the theme is open-ended in V on the bass A (m. 19) as in the antecedent phrase of the dance theme, and the subsequent chromatic passage leads to the middle statement of the theme that begins in the dominant key. It is noticeable that the passage is articulated by a caesura on the bass G# at the end of m. 28 and that the aria theme enters on the bass A (m. 29 in Ex. 5). This middle statement of the theme first progresses in the key of the minor dominant. But as the bass G# harmonized
with vii7 of A minor (m. 31), instead of resolving to i of the key, surprisingly moves down a half step to G, which ushers in vii07 of D minor, the fantasia suddenly turns towards the tonic key, and Mozart dramatizes this turn with the emphatic upward motion of the chromatic motif derived from the theme to c3, where the free cadenza passage bursts out.

However, another harmonic ellipsis from c#07 to f#07 takes place in the middle of the cadenza, and what enters after this progression is the bass G in the key of the subdominant. These sudden changes using diminished 7th chords may appear merely as the kind of local harmonic digression frequently seen in the fantasia of the prelude type, but the bass progression to G in this section and the tonal progressions from the minor dominant via the tonic to the subdominant that it entails are parts of the carefully designed formal plan that the composer summarizes locally in the last section. Accordingly, the second cadenza passage that follows the subsequent chromatic sequential passages brings the bass, via G#, to A. As mentioned above, the last statement of the theme locally hyperbolizes the bass motion to A via G-G#, a bass note whose final resolution overlaps with the beginning of the last section. On a more global level, we can interpret the last statement of the aria, or even the whole middle section, as a structural upbeat centered on the bass motion G-G#-A, and the last section as a structural downbeat. To emphasize the structural function of the last section and make a formal balance between earlier sections and the last as a whole, Mozart attaches to the last section a long coda that we could basically regard as a prolongation of the tonic.

This compositional, or improvisational, strategy also offers us a crucial key to unlocking the hidden logic of K. 475, Mozart’s only completed keyboard fantasia with six diverse sections. As in his D-Minor fantasia, Mozart’s develops this piece from the kernel of a primary idea, i.e. Grundsatz (See Figure 2). The structural motif of the work that recurs throughout the work
delineates nothing else than deviations from the anticipated course of the Grundsatz. Einstein, in his book “Mozart, sein Charakter, sein Werk,” points out the significance of the ‘right’ beginning in Mozart’s music.22 The beginning of Mozart’s fantasia, however, contains more than just ‘right’ materials at a high inventive level from its outset. It sets up the structural motif that carries all the seeds potential for later development. In other words, in K. 475, Mozart uses as structural motifs the digressions from the Grundsatz made at the outset, which he normalizes as the work progresses, and he forms out of this gradual return to the due course a coherent musical/dramatic narrative. We saw in the previous chapter that the fantasia of the prelude type also features such digressions, but in the prelude type they are mostly a local gesture that does not necessitate a proper resolution. Mozart’s fantasia, on the other hand, returns to where it left off and ‘corrects’ the digressive progression. The picturesque garden that aestheticizes temporary lostness and eventual return, whose principle Richards takes as the generative principle of the genre, is indeed a potent metaphor for the form of Mozart’s fantasia. The prelude type, to which she applies this aesthetic principle of the picturesque, lacks such an underlying formal logic, i.e. a hidden filo (thread) that unifies a variety of ideas in a rational way. In this type, sundry materials are loosely patched together as a single work in a tonal framework that remains in the background without interfering with events on the surface. On the other hand, local events in Mozart’s fantasia are tightly controlled by a global plan, and they are related to more structural events.

Let us first examine the Grundsatz of this fantasia, which is revealed at its end. Mozart recapitulates the opening theme of lamento to close the fantasia, which is a highly unusual feature in the genre of the time (See Example 11). He states the theme over the bass mostly moving stepwise, following the figured-bass tradition in which he was trained as an improviser. The bass first moves in the harmonic minor scale of the home key from C to F’, and then in chromatic steps from F’ vis F#’ to G’. And after embellishing the bass G’, scale degree 5, with its neighbor tones Ab’ and F, he resolves it down to C’, making a final cadence (See Figure 2). He harmonizes the bass notes in the following harmonic progressions: i–V–VI–V/VI–N6–vii07/V–V6/4–VI–ii6/5–V5/3–i. We can simply summarize the progressions of this passage as a harmonic motion from the tonic to the dominant that leads to the final cadence, via the submediant, the mediant, and the Neapolitan 6th.

We observe in the Grundsatz three distinct harmonic traits, which Mozart engages repeatedly throughout the work and even develops in a more global scale. Firstly, instead of the subdominant, it prominently features a harmonic progression from the submediant (Ab chord) via the mediant of the tonic, or V of Ab, to the Neapolitan 6th (Db6), which stands in chromatic relation to the tonic (mm. 168–70). Mozart tonicizes the submediant over chromatic steps of the bass in mm. 168–69, and makes it progress to a Neapolitan 6th chord (Db6) on the bass F’ in m. 165, which substitutes the subdominant that usually precedes the final cadence of tonal music. Although this contains the normative fifths progressions (Eb–Ab–Db), we will see later that Mozart puts to good use the harmonic relationship between these two harmonic areas (Ab and Db) throughout this fantasia, relegating the subdominant as a passing tonal area. Secondly, the Neapolitan 6th on the bass F’ does not resolve immediately to the dominant but moves through a vii07 of V on the bass F#’ (m. 170–171). Mozart deploys this chromatic bass motion F’–F#’–G’
Example 11  W. A. Mozart, Fantasia in C minor, K. 475, mm 162–173

Figure 2  Grundsatz of K. 475, as a Functional Bass

Seg. 1  Seg. 2  Seg. 3

Cm: i  V₆  VI  III₆  bII₆  vii⁰/V  V₄  VI  i₆  V  i
(mm. 170–172) at structurally significant places, constantly re-harmonizing it as if searching for a correct answer, which he reveals here at the end. Lastly, the cadential 6/4 chord at the beginning of m. 172 does not progress directly to the dominant 5/3, but its due progression gets interrupted by a double-neighbor figure in the bass harmonized by bVI and ii6/5 (m. 172). After analyzing the form of the whole piece, we will come to realize these progressions constitute more than mere passing gestures.

Mozart opens the fantasia with the same thematic material but with extraordinary harmonic boldness passing through distant keys, which obfuscates its fundamental form (Grundsatz), giving rein to the greatest freedom and unhampered imagination that the fantasia of the prelude type promoted (See Figures 3-a and 3-b). In this utterly original and wandering opening, Mozart displays daring and imaginative modulations and kaleidoscopic changes of affect, which make one skeptical about interpret the ending, firmly rooted as it is in the home key, as a ‘symmetrical’ resolution in a Classical fashion. In addition, the opening glides off on a chromatic *lamento* bass instead of on the stepwise bass of the ending. Such a bass is rarely found in Mozart’s keyboard output, but it is not so unusual in this genre in which, as discussed earlier, opening a fantasia with improvisatory elaborations on a chromatically descending bass is one of its common features. All these features point to the style of the traditional fantasia. Nevertheless, this opening should be distinguished from the fantastic language of the prelude type in two respects. First, Mozart’s fantasia K. 475, like his K. 396, presents a melodically self-

---

sufficient theme with a definite expressive character; and second, it features a thematic development, a characteristic which the fantasía of the prelude type would avoid. In the prelude type, the composer, on account of the improvisatory nature of the genre, would fashion a *reverie* from passing fragments which, as if they were sketches, vaguely touch upon their affective content, counting on the listener’s imagination to fill the gap.

**Figure 3-a**  Grundsatz and the Elaborate Bass Structure of the Opening of K. 475

![Grundsatz and Bass Structure](image1)

**Figure 3-b**  Figured-Bass of the Opening (mm. 1-25) of K. 475

![Figured-Bass](image2)
Example 12  The opening of K. 475 (mm. 1–25)
Example 12  (Cont.)
On the other hand, as the new German aesthetics of the time demanded, Mozart’s fantasia clearly enunciates a primary theme that plainly delineates a tragic pathos, and develops it in its original and inverted forms throughout the opening section. The theme ascends to scale degree 6 (Ab) via F# and G, then plunges back, leaving the Ab ‘hanging’ in the air, which gets resolved by the bass in the next measure (See Example 12). It is conceivable that Mozart derived this theme from the fugal theme of J. S. Bach’s “Musical Offering.” However, our analysis will show later that this is not merely a borrowed theme but outlines a microcosm of the structure of the entire fantasia. Secondly, the utterly unconventional and seemingly far-fetched harmonic wandering of the opening, which evokes the harmonic language of the prelude type–free successions of ingenious harmonic ideas with minimal formal concern–is nonetheless circumscribed and controlled by an underlying formal logic derived from the Grundsatz. Several scholars, including Adorno, view goal-oriented development and compositional orderliness as inimical to the genre whose primary aesthetic goal after all is “organized disunity.” But this view is only applicable to the fantasia of the prelude type, and a higher degree of formal unity and a directed course of development are integral parts of the musical idioms of the episodic type.

On the surface, the opening section, immediately after establishing the home key, seems to harmonically meander, without a clear direction, through the keys of Db and B♭, which stand in chromatic relationship to the tonic C minor. However, Mozart clearly marks their harmonic distance from the home key and controls them with a hidden thread, i.e. an underlying tonal plan rooted in the harmonic framework of the tonic. He underlines die Ausweichung (digression) from the boundary of the home key by changing other musical parameters such as texture, figuration,
and dynamics, while he constantly refers the foreign areas back to the Grundsatz. For example, after the initial statement of the theme in mm. 1–2, the composer feigns to repeat it a whole tone below as if literally transposing it to the key of Bb minor in a sequence (Fig. 3-a and 3-b). But its second statement actually delineates tonicization of the major substitution of the subdominant (vii0⁴3/IV-IV6); in other words, it still remains within the boundary of the home key. According to the Grundsatz, the next structural goal should be not the bass Bb but Ab, and the bass of the opening in fact moves down to Ab and lingers on it for a while, emphasizing it as a structural point. However, at the opening Mozart does not harmonize the bass Ab with the Ab chord that functions as the subdominant of the home key as in the Grundsatz. Instead, he turns it into the seventh chord that functions as the dominant 7th of Db major and makes a gesture of modulating to a new key, Db major with its cadential progressions, as the Grundsatz hints at the Ab-Db relationship. As the bass arrives at the Ab, the theme with ascending leaps first outlines V64 of Db major and moves to V7 of Db. Mozart, in order to signal this Ausweichung to a harmonic region, changes the left-hand figuration of unison into Alberti bass (mm. 6–7), and thus its mood.

At the end of this passage, Mozart makes another departure from the expected course of harmonic development. Neither does the bass Ab go down to G as in the Grundsatz nor do the cadential progressions resolve to the tonic of Db major. Leaving these chords unresolved, the bass moves up through chromatic steps from Ab to B, during the progressions of which the

---


composer inverts the theme (mm. 8–9). The bass B ushers in another foreign key, B major (enharmonic of Cb), whose arrival the composer announces by changing the figuration and the texture; the right hand now plays block chords and the left hand carries the theme. If the opening had continued progressing in this way, it could have been difficult to argue for the sense of distance of the foreign keys from the tonal center, and for the underlying form that controls the digressions. But Mozart again brings down the bass in chromatic steps, and this time the bass goes all the way down to scale degree 5 (G) (mm. 10–14). The section marches through first V65 of B minor and then a dominant 7th on A that implies the key of D. However, as the bass reaches Ab, at which the opening descent (mm. 1–7) was interrupted, the composer brings back the chords from the home tonality. The dominant 7th chord on A progresses to a F-Minor sixth chord, the subdominant of the tonic, via a harmonic ellipsis, a hallmark device of the traditional fantasia (mm 12–13). This surprising progression leads, in the next measure, to the first entry of the dominant 7th of the home key on the bass G.

It seems that with this sudden progression the fantasia returns to the path where it left off at m. 8, defining the long intervening area as a temporary digression. Nonetheless, the Grundsatz tells us that the entry of the dominant 7th at m. 14 took place too soon and too abruptly. The bass should first have gone down to F, a tone on which the subdominant or its substitution should have been introduced, and to then move back up via F# to the G that ushers in the dominant 7th (Fig. 3-b). At the opening the bass also moves further down but to F# via its enharmonic Gb, which the composer harmonizes with V7 of the key of B instead of vii7/V of the home key (mm. 15–17), thus interpreting the previous subdominant-dominant progression (mm. 13–14) as no more than a brief allusion to the home key in the middle of a sequence. The bass however
refuses to descend to the designated F, but after remaining on F# for a while, moves back to the bass G, reinstating the dominant of the tonic (mm. 16–18).

The entry of the thus-arrived dominant area, sharply juxtaposed with the dominant of the key of B, rather sounds like a sudden interruption than a structural arrival. In this dominant area (mm. 18–20), however, the composer seems to offer a pause in the restless harmonic sequence in which the fantasia has been wandering. This relatively stable and peaceful area, without the appearance of the tragic theme, seems to indicate the end of the opening drama and to anticipate the arrival of a new idea in a contrasting affect. But it is a false peace; it was not justly earned. In other words, according to the Grundsatz it cannot be regarded as a structural arrival although locally it could be construed in such a way. This dominant passage rather functions as a bridge to the following area of B minor, in which the opening is concluded. At the end of the prolongation of the dominant (mm. 18–20) it swerves off in a new direction with a rising turn figure. At m. 21, the G-major 7th chord, to which the turn figure leads (mm. 19–20), becomes enharmonically reinterpreted as an augmented 6th, with which it modulates back to the key of B minor. As it reaches the dominant of B minor, a dramatic new theme enters with a galvanizing stentorian voice at m 22, which nevertheless, failing to fulfill its promise, soon fades away at the end of the opening.

Not only does the radical move to B minor make it plausible to interpret the preceding G major area as a bridge, it also hints at dual tonality, which Mozart toys with in the second half of his fantasia fragment K. 383 C (Ex. 3). In light of the tonal structure of the whole piece, C minor should undoubtedly be regarded as the central key of the section and the key of B as an alien tonality that threatens the centrality of the tonic. But in regard to the harmonic structure of the second half of the opening, it is equally possible to interpret the key of B as a stable point of
reference, in relation to which harmonic functions of other key areas could be explained. For not only do its key areas frame the beginning, middle, and ending of the second half, but also, at the end of the tonal contention between the two competing keys, the key of B emerges as a predominant force. We can speculate that it was in order to maximize the effect of this tonal duality or ambiguity that Mozart erased the key signature of the opening that initially he had written in the first three systems.  

Such tonal ambiguity, surprising modulations to distant keys, rapid changes of harmony, and bold chromaticism, as Mozart introduces at this unique opening, were characteristics of the genre that endowed it with unparalleled richness and variety of musical expression, and were tactics that Mozart likely learned from C. P. E. Bach’s fantasias. Yet, when we examine not only the opening but the overall form of K. 475 that binds all of its six sections together, an unprecedented new formal-type one with a higher degree of unity emerges. This new type was, as analyzed above, one that Mozart experimented with and anticipated in his earlier incomplete fantasias; but it is in this fantasia (K. 475) that Mozart firmly established his own unique voice and language not found in his earlier fantasias belonging to the prelude type.

Mozart’s Fantasia in C minor opened up a new horizon in the genre, transforming it and exemplifying a way of reconciling the two opposing aesthetic doctrines: British naturalism and French neoclassicism. The way of building sections and weaving them together indeed shows a stylistic gulf between C. P. E. Bach’s fantasias and K. 475. Mozart creates two stable inner-

---


27 Fantasias in the prelude type, in general, carefully keep away from repeating the same idea although the home tonality returns at the end. As mentioned above, exceptional cases to this norm are found in C. P. E. Bach’s two fantasias in Bb major and C major (H. 289 and H. 291) from his sixth collection of Kenner und Liebhaber, composed and published later than the publication date of K. 475 (December 1785).
sections with the Classical trio form, and has them alternate with transitional/developmental sections, which lead to stable sections (See Table 1). Thus, three stable sections with distinct keys (D major, Bb major, and C Minor) and topoi (sentimental aria, sarabande, and pathetic lamento), instead of tonally and stylistically clashing with each other by being directly juxtaposed as C. P. E. Bach would have done, were presented in a way that modifies the clash and prepares the listener’s ear for the change of mood and feeling. Furthermore, he divides the fantasia into two halves by placing a cadenza at the mid-point of the fantasia, and arrays them in a certain parallel form. The opening, which modulates to B minor at its end, ushers in the aria in Da major—the relative major. The following developmental section culminates in the cadenza, announcing the mid-point of the work as well the furthest point from the home (mm. 82–85). From the key of Bb major, in which the sarabande, the first section of the second half, unfolds, it gradually returns to the home key.

Table 1. Sectional division of Mozart’s fantasia in C minor, K. 475

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Tempo</th>
<th>Meter</th>
<th>Stability</th>
<th>Style/Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>1–25</td>
<td>(C minor)</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Lamento/free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>26–41</td>
<td>D major</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Aria/Trio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>42–90</td>
<td>Modulatory</td>
<td>Allegro</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Developmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>91–129</td>
<td>Bb Major</td>
<td>Andantino</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>Sarabande/Trio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>130–165</td>
<td>Modulatory</td>
<td>Piu Allegro</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Toccata and Recitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>166–181</td>
<td>C minor</td>
<td>Tempo I</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Reprise of Section I</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One could argue that this formal design, in a musical way, typifies the picturesque metaphor of a temporary departure from and an eventual return to a familiar course. However, some scholars argue that the formal plan that controls the harmonic digressions here does not exert enough force to unify diverse ideas of this fantasia into a unity. In his book “The Classical Style,” Charles Rosen comments that this fantasia, “truly abnormal by classical standards,” merely makes an “impression of unity” by alluding to the Classical style.28 This fantasia, with its six different sections in a variety of styles and keys, in fact, has continually frustrated scholars who have attempted sonata or rondo readings of it. If we are to employ the conventional analytic methods used in the formal analysis of other Classical genres, undoubtedly this work appear to be a mere collection of episodes linked by a formal logic that distantly recalls that of rondo. However, as already shown in the case of K. 397, Mozart had a unique and sophisticated way to relate diverse surface materials to one another by means of underlying formal structure. In K. 475, it is the Grundsatz that underlies the harmonic progressions of the six sections and functions as a unifying force. Mozart progressively reveals, on the surface, the kernel of compositional ideas (Grundsatz), from which he generates the structural motif and formal narrative of this fantasia.

As analyzed above, the unconventional opening, by digressing from the Grundsatz, triggers the structural motives that the fantasia unravels in later sections. Let us first summarize four major events that take place in the opening section. 1) In m. 4, the major subdominant substitutes for the minor; 2) in the subsequent Db area (mm. 5–9) the cadential progression of V6/4–7 (Ab7) does not resolve to I of Db major, but instead is diverted to B minor, a foreign

key; 3) in mm 15–16 the bass, unlike at the ending, does not descend to F but to F#, which is harmonized with V7 of B minor instead of vii7⁰ of V; 4) the cadential progressions to the home tonic via the double-neighbor figure (A and F) of the ending is omitted, replaced by V of B minor, thus obfuscating its tonal orientation. In the middle sections, Mozart deals with these structural motives as he does in K. 397; and namely, he gradually normalizes them, dramatizing their resolutions, while on the surface, he disguises this formal progress by introducing new materials and making sectional divisions. In K. 475, the progressive return to, or revelation of, the Grundsatz, in fact functions as a hidden thread.

A sentimental aria in trio form follows the end of the opening which articulated V of B minor. The key choice for the aria, D major, the relative major of B minor, indicates that this aria is born out of the digression to B minor at the end of the previous section. The key areas of B minor and D major stand in an outlandish relationship not only to the home key but also to the Grundsatz, which implies no keys on the sharp side. However, in the developmental section that follows the aria, Mozart covertly restarts the Grundsatz, returning the course of development to where the fantasia started (Figure 4). He camouflages its return with the continuous change of the surface material and feigns it as a mere transition to the F major area where a new theme breaks out. But a close look into the section would reveal that the composer brings back the harmonic progressions of the opening. The passage, which resembles a dramatic movement from Classical opera, progresses first to A minor and is then transposed a step lower to G minor. At this point, it is hard to realize that this key is the minor substitution of the dominant of the opening, since its harmonic context, without any reference to the home key, is clearly against such an interpretation. However, the following progressions make this interpretation plausible. The beginning sequence stops in G minor, and it quickly modulates to F major. The new theme
that enters in F major seems to promise a new aria in a stable form, but it soon changes into its parallel minor and initiates a sequential development at its open end. This modal shift is not just motivated by a tone color change: it is also reversing the substitution of the major mode for the minor mode subdominant that took place in the opening (mm. 3–4).

Figure 4  Grundsatz and the Elaborate Bass Structure of K. 475
Furthermore, the open-end theme of Section 3 quickly leads from the corrected subdominant to a Db major area, which was the first structural goal of the opening (Figure 4 and See Example 13). While at the opening the resolution of V7 to I of Db major is diverted, in this section, as the top voice soars up to f³, the left hand resolves V4/3 and 6/5 to I of Db major, properly tonicizing the Db (mm. 71–74). On the other hand, from the perspective of the Grundsatz this resolution of the dominant 7th of Db could not assume structural significance, for it tells us that the bass is supposed to march down from Ab via G to F, ushering in the substitution of the subdominant. Accordingly, the bass of this passage, after it lingers around Db

Example 13  W. A. Mozart, Fantasia in C minor, K. 475, mm. 62–80
at the beginning of the sequence (mm. 71–74), chromatically descends from Cb, the enharmonic
of B to Ab, a bass note once again harmonized by V7 of Db as at the beginning. From this Ab,
the bass moves away from the Db area and marches down to G (mm. 77-83) (See Example 14).
The composer makes this chromatic descent of the bass to G more emphatic by changing the
figuration and employing octaves in the left hand.

The chromatic motion of the bass from B via Ab to G and the harmonic progressions in
this passage indeed outline those of the opening in mm. 10–14 (Ex. 14). Mozart employs the
identical harmonization on the bass F# at m. 79 with that of m. 16 in the opening, V7–i6/4 of B
minor, and on the bass G at m. 77, the dominant 7th chord of the tonic (V7) appears again as in
m. 14. However, in this sequential passage (mm. 79–83), we notice several important
developments that indicate structural changes. Here, he relegates the tonicization of B minor—a
foreign key whose invasion engendered the tonal confusion at the second half of the opening—to
the role of a passing harmony in a sequence and directs this sequence stepwise from B minor
toward the tonic major, correcting the diversion to the key of B at the opening. The acceleration
of its harmonic rhythm at the end of the sequence (mm. 82-83) makes the structural arrival at the
major tonic more anticipated. Accordingly, a grand gesture of descending broken-chord figures
breaks out on vii07/V of C major, announcing the imminent arrival of V (mm. 84–87). It seems
that finally the bass F# is properly harmonized in the home tonal context. Mozart, however,
suddenly maneuvers the fantasia in a different direction by diverting it from a normative
harmonic resolution. The bass, instead of moving back up to G that would support the expected
dominant, goes down to F-natural, and through common tones the diminished chord turns into a
F7 that functions as V7 of Bb major. Mozart dramatizes this bass motion from the F# to F, and
elaborates this arrival at the bass F by introducing a cadenza-like passage on it.
Example 14    W. A. Mozart, Fantasia in C minor, K. 475, mm. 78–94
The progression to the F7, instead of to a G7, V7 of the major tonic, calls for a two-level interpretation. On a local level, it epitomizes the typical harmonic evasion that the composer of the time would exploit in this genre. The sequence at its end was gaining an impetus to the home dominant, but at the last moment it evades its confirmation and moves away to V7 of Bb major. Yet, on a more global level this progression should be considered as a structural down beat. According to the Grundsatz, at this point the bass is supposed to go down from G to F, ushering in the subdominant area, a move which the bass constantly dodged at the beginning. From this perspective, the bass F# in mm. 84–86 should be regarded as a chromatic upper neighbor of the F, the designated spot. While Mozart emphasizes this structural down beat by placing an elaborate cadenza-like passage on it, at the same time he conceals its structural identity by ironically contextualizing the harmony not as the subdominant of the home key but as the dominant 7th of Bb major.

Some may resist this interpretation that views the bass F as a structural goal, for the subsequent sarabande in two parts proceeds solidly in Bb major and the bass F does not seem to immediately progress via F# to G as the Grundsatz assigns. But, the composer, in this episode, provides several musical clues that reveal his hidden design. He emphasizes the F as a central tone of this episode by making it ubiquitously present and deploying it in formally important places. In the first part of the sarabande (mm. 91–106) (See Example 15-a), the F in the bass plays a normal function as scale degree 5 of Bb major, appearing at the end of the antecedent phrase of the sarabande theme (m. 94) and in the authentic cadence of the consequent (m. 97). Nevertheless, it is important to notice that the composer places F pedals in the middle voice of the sarabande theme and extends them to a considerable length (mm. 91–100).
In their article on the recently discovered autograph of K. 475, Cliff Eisen and Christopher Wintel extensively analyze the form of this sarabande to prove the centrality of the tone F in this section, and even go on to argue that the Fs in the middle voice of the first two bars of the theme (mm. 91–92) and in their corresponding places (mm. 99–100, 119, and 123) should be held not one and half beat as in many editions but for two beats against the one-and-half-beat-long outer voices as written in the newly-discovered autograph of K. 475 (Ex.15-a).29 According to their argument, the editors of its earlier publications misunderstood, or failed to understand, Mozart’s intention to stress the one F, and the form and style of the work itself favors Mozart’s notations in the autograph. Moreover, two passages at the beginning of the second part (mm. 107–111 and 115–118) prolong the F chord over a F pedal in the bass, exposing the central harmony of the section on the surface. Mozart, with these passages, treats the sarabande theme in Bb major between them (mm. 111–114) as a structural upbeat to the F chord, as if it encapsulates the structural function of the F chord and its relationship with the key of Bb major. Both the reprise of the sarabande theme and its extension progress back to the F chord (mm. 119 and 128) and make a deceptive cadence at their ends, unlike the corresponding aria section that articulates its first ending with a perfect cadence (m. 35a). And their cadential progressions make emphatic the bass motion from F via F# to G, that is, Segment 2 of Grundsatz (Fig. 4). It is not a coincidence that at this point of the fantasia Mozart introduces the identical bass motion and similar harmonization with the area of the Grundsatz that lead to the dominant area of its cadence (mm. 170–172 of Ex. 11 and mm. 128–130 of Ex. 15). For this open end of the sarabande also ushers in the dominant area of the home key as in the Grundsatz.

29 Eisen and Winter, “Mozart’s C minor Fantasay,” 36–43.
Example 15-a  Sarabande Section of K. 475, mm. 91–126
The new section thus-arrived at unfolds in a toccata-like figuration of rapid thirty-second notes, modulating in a downward sequence along the circle of fifths (See Example 15-b). This seems to exemplify the typical, toccata-like free passage of the fantasia of the time wherein the improviser showcases his/her finger dexterity (See Example 16). Although the beginning of this section begets such an effect, this passage, unlike that of the fantasia in the prelude type, develops toward a clearly defined structural-goal, and the subsequent recitative passage (mm. 145–165) reveals that the whole section is an expansion of the dominant area of the Grundsatz with the double-neighbor figure over the bass motion G-Ab-F-G (m. 172 in Ex. 11 and See Figure 5). At the beginning of the section, Mozart obscures the tonal design of the section by making it quickly move away from the key of G. The sequence first modulates in downward steps in mm. 130–136 (G minor–F minor–Eb minor–Db major) and later in downward thirds in mm. 136–138 (Db major–Bb minor–Gb major). However, as the bass reaches Eb in m. 139, it begins to prepare for a cadence on Db, interpreting the expected Eb minor as ii of Db major (See Example 16 and Figure 5). Perhaps in this context we could interpret Db major as the governing
key of the second sequence (mm. 136–139). At any rate, Mozart has not stabilized any key up to this point of the section, but finally seems to attempt to settle in Db major. The bass marches in quarter notes toward Ab (mm. 139–141), and the composer emphasizes the arrival of the bass at the Ab by adding a leading tone to the Ab, i.e. G-natural between the Gb and the Ab. We cannot help notice that this bass motion, Gb-G-Ab in mm. 140–141, is identical with that of the Grundsatz, F#-G-Ab in mm. 166–167. And Mozart dramatizes the arrival of the Ab chord by extending it with many passing dissonant chords over the bass Ab (mm 140–141) and making the broken chord of Ab soar up for a resolution (mm 143–145).

These sequential progressions of the section emphatically build up a dramatic tension that culminates in V of Db major, the Ab chord. However, at the last moment, the Ab chord negates its function as V of Db. Once again it refuses to resolve to I of Db, but suddenly veers off to vii°65 of F minor, the subdominant of the home key (mm. 146). The subsequent harmonic progressions from the subdominant to the dominant indicate that the Ab chord is here for the first time presented in the tonal context of the home key. Mozart hyperbolizes the return to the home key area with a recitative passage that breaks out with its full dramatic force. He is observing here a custom of the genre by including a passage of recitative accompagnato. But at the same time, instead of giving it free rein, he assigns it a formal function and controls its harmonic progressions according to a premeditated plan. The bass unexpectedly moved down to G in m. 146, but we know from the Grundsatz it should ultimately go down from Ab to F. Accordingly, the first two dialogues between the solo and the orchestra tutti (mm. 146–150) are harmonized by a tonicization of F minor, the subdominant of the tonic, and at the end the bass appears supporting the tonic of F minor in root position. The following two dialogues, as expected, serve
Example 16  W. A. Mozart, Fantasia in C minor, K. 475, mm. 138–166
Figure 5  K. 475, Grundsatz and the Harmonic Structure of Section 5

Figure showing the harmonic progression of Section 5.

Then, a modal change from G minor to G major 7th in m. 156 ushers in the dominant 7th of the tonic without any tonal ambiguity—its first appearance since it was struck at m. 2 as a part of the main theme. Thus, on a local level we can consider the progression from the Ab chord to the e065 (mm. 164–165), that is, a sudden modulation toward Db major to F minor, as a digression or waywardness, but globally it should be regarded as a return to the designated path. In this context, we can say that Mozart creates a deliberate confusion by momentarily contextualizing the Ab chord as the dominant of Db major in this section, for it is not the transient Db chord but the Ab chord over the bass Ab that functions a structural downbeat.

Mozart’s K. 475 does not merely “make an impression of unity” but follows a sophisticated formal logic that unifies various episodes in contrasting style and affect. In this fantasia, he relates the global-level expansion of its fundamental idea (Grundsatz) with its local-level elaborations, enacting and also dramatizing the musical processes of resolution of the
structural motifs derived from it. The formal design guides the unconventional progressions and developments; in other words, elaborate confusion and expressive freedom on the surface is controlled by the rationalistic formal thread. Yet, this fantasia, which epitomizes the episodic type, is distinguished from the fantasia of the later Classical-form type in several ways. First of all, this fantasia hides on a more background level the unifying formal design. Its aesthetic emphasis is still that of compositional freedom, expressive variety, and a confusing surface. In addition, in his fantasia Mozart refuses to borrow any formal logic from other Classical genres as a form-governing principle, limiting its use within local episodes. For this fantasia he devises a unique formal narrative, unlike those of Classical forms, in which its hidden formal logic is gradually revealed. Undoubtedly he viewed the genre as a locus for musical unconventionality and sheer originality.

**Fantasias of the Episodic Type and Mozart’s Influence**

After Mozart’s C-minor fantasia K. 475 was published in 1785, other fantasias in the episodic type began to appear in the Classical period. It is inconclusive whether or not this transformation of the genre can be attributed solely to Mozart. For, as mentioned in the previous chapter, around the time of the development of Mozart’s fantasia language (1782–1785) C. P. E. Bach was also producing fantasias in a more restrained style with a recognizable formal pattern – a development pointing to the episodic type. However, fantasias in the episodic type composed by later composers show that the fantasia style of Mozart attuned to the new German aesthetics was their model rather than that of Bach which was still fundamentally based on the earlier tradition.
Mozart’s innovations in the genre in which he boldly imported the Classical style into the aesthetic framework of the traditional fantasia were carried on by composers of the Classical generation who were younger than those belonging to the keyboard school of the Bach family. As mentioned above, the composers of the prelude type were trained in the keyboard tradition of the late Baroque. Although the younger composers professed their allegiance to the keyboard tradition established by the Bach family and studied the treatise and works produced by them, they, like Mozart, ultimately renewed and updated the keyboard idioms of the genre according to the Classical standard. Among the fantasias that they bequeathed us, we will examine and discuss in this dissertation two fantasies in the episodic type written by C. G. Neefe (young Beethoven’s teacher), and young F. Schubert.  

The fantasies of Neefe and Schubert show that they continued the fantasy style of Mozart. Schubert, in his Fantasy in C minor, D. 993, directly quotes some of themes of Mozart’s K. 475 and borrows some elements of its formal design, unambiguously showing that he modeled his fantasy on Mozart’s fantasy in the same key. Nonetheless, Neefe’s Fantasy in F minor, though revealing no detectable influence of Mozart’s fantasy, bears more stylistic affinity and resemblance to K. 475 than Schubert’s. His fantasy emphasizes the Classical style even more than Mozart’s, manifesting the historical process of gradual infiltration of the Classical style into the fantasy. On the other hand, the fantasy of Schubert, which can be considered as a work of a young protégé, already discloses, in spite of the apparent attempt to imitate and master

---

30 Haydn’s fantasy in C major, another work in the episodic type, verges on the next type of fantasy that emerged at the dawn of the 19th century. Before theorists and philosophers articulated the new theory of artistic imagination and the role of form in it, Haydn, in his fantasy, found a way to configure his imaginary ideas in a solid form based on sonata logic, without losing its genre identity distinct from the actual sonata. Therefore we will briefly discuss the fantasy at the beginning of the concluding chapter as a work that anticipates the new, Classical-form type. See Hollace Ann Schafer, “‘A Wisely Ordered Phantasie’: Joseph Haydn’s Creative Process from the Sketches and Drafts for Instrumental Music” (Ph. D. diss., Brandeis University, 1987).
the fantasia style of a genius from the past, tendencies of early Romantic composers, reflecting the change of style and taste in the early 19th century.

C. G. Neefe was a self-professed admirer of C. P. E. Bach and his father; indeed and musicologists speculate that Neefe not only introduced to young Beethoven their keyboard music but also taught him keyboard improvisation (Fantasieren) with C. P. E. Bach’s treatise “Versuch.” However, his fantasia shares kinship with that of Mozart rather than of C. P. E. Bach’s. Although he designates the fantasia as for harpsichord and once introduces the Baroque arpeggio figuration in it, its overall style displays the Classical keyboard writing for the fortepiano. In terms of keyboard idiom, Neefe, who also deeply respected Mozart, preferred the more modern style of Mozart over that of Bach. In his article on Neefe, Roland Mörchen shows that Neefe not only played and taught Mozart’s keyboard music but also made keyboard arrangements of Mozart’s operatic music. Thus, even if he did not take Mozart’s K. 475 as the direct model of his fantasia, we can safely assume that Mozart’s keyboard and operatic idioms were integral parts of his keyboard writing. And the resemblance between the two fantasias of Mozart and Neefe goes beyond mere stylistic similarity.

In his fantasia, Neefe, like Mozart’s K. 475, expresses affective contents of the traditional fantasia in semi-autonomous sections, and orders them in a form remarkably similar to Mozart’s fantasia (See Table 2). Like many fantasias of the time, he opens his work with a lamento, but his treatment of the opening is distinctively Mozartian. Unlike C. P. E. Bach, who in the opening


of his fantasia primarily focuses on establishing the home key and its improvisatory nature.\textsuperscript{33} Neefe, following Mozart’s precedent, presents a fully articulated, pathos-laden theme, develops it extensively in the first main section, and recapitulates it at the end (See Example 17). The difference between Mozart’s and Neefe’s fantasias is that Neefe’s main section adheres more closely to the Classical sonata form than does Mozart’s fantasia, whose opening sounds rather introductory than expository. Neefe attaches a short introduction in the style of the French overture to the opening lamento section and a coda in the major tonic after the final cadence of the ending. Besides, unlike Mozart, who conceals motivic and thematic connections between sections, Neefe develops the main theme as a motif in the transition following the minuet section as if it were the development of a Classical sonata. Nevertheless, it would be a stretch to apply sonata logic to Neefe’s fantasia. For the developmental section is short-lived, functioning only as a transitional passage; moreover, as in K 475, dance and aria movements with new themes, which are connected according to the formal formula of the episodic type, succeed in the middle of the fantasia, underlining the primacy of variety in the genre of the time.

We have seen that in K. 475 Mozart achieves harmonic/formal unity by relating the macro level of its plan with the micro-level elaborations filled with unconventional progressions. Neefe’s fantasia betrays neither such a sophisticated harmonic design nor daring tonal digression; it is unified instead accorded with a tonal plan based on more conventional key relationships. Following the conventions of the time, the work abstains from traditional typical

\textsuperscript{33} C. P. E. Bach typically begins his fantasia with an introductory passage with improvisatory figures, and even when he presents a pathetic theme or motif at the beginning, he states it very briefly and moves to an improvisatory passage or arioso.
tonic-dominant and tonic-relative major relationships: the stable key areas of C major and Ab major are virtually absent. At the same time, the fantasia also refrains from bold divergence from harmonic norms. Its local harmonic progressions are as normative and predictable as in any conventional Classical keyboard genre.

We can divide the sections of Neefe’s fantasia into three groups according to its tonal plan (See Table 2). In the first group, the piece modulates from F minor, the key of the main theme, to Eb major, in which key a two-part minuet appears. Although this formal plan may
Table 2  Sectional division of Neefe’s Fantasia in F minor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>I</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Intro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Measure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>Grave</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>Allegretto</td>
<td>Allegro di molto</td>
<td>Allegro di molto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>f-Ab-Eb-Bb</td>
<td>Eb</td>
<td>Eb-Bb-F-c</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Unstable/Stable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style/Form</td>
<td>French Overture</td>
<td>Lamento</td>
<td>Minuet/Two-part</td>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>Closing (PAC)-Codetta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>II</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Measure</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>Andantino</td>
<td>Piu Vivace</td>
<td>Largo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>d-a-Bb-d</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>2/4</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>4/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style/Form</td>
<td>Aria/Trio</td>
<td>Transitional-Cadenza</td>
<td>Closing (PAC)-Codetta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>III</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of Measure</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tempo</td>
<td>Allegretto</td>
<td>Piu Allegro</td>
<td>Adagio</td>
<td>Allegro di molto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key</td>
<td>Bb-Eb-Bb</td>
<td>Bb-Eb-g</td>
<td>f-bb-eb-f</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meter</td>
<td>3/8</td>
<td>3/8-2/4</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>3/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Unstable/Stable</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style/Form</td>
<td>Gigue/Trio</td>
<td>Transitional-Arpeggios</td>
<td>Recap of section 1</td>
<td>Final cadence and Coda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
appear unconventional, the minuet’s entry in Eb major does not sound to our ears as surprising as
the entry of the D-Major aria in Mozart’s K. 475 or the F#-Minor funeral march in C. P. E.
Bach’s C-Major fantasia, H. 279. It is because the modulation to Eb is rendered by a
conventional method, namely, a circle of fifths: Ab–Eb–Bb (Section 1 in Table 2). However,
Neefe concludes the first group in C minor, the minor dominant of the tonic, bringing back the
main theme in a dramatic gesture. It suggests a Classically-oriented tonal plan, and accordingly
the codetta that follows the final cadence in the C minor ushers in, without making any harmonic
ado, a key a fifth below (F major), the parallel major of the home key. The second group is
mainly centered on F major, moving around the keys related to it: F–d–a–Bb–d–F. As Mozart
does in K. 475, Neefe places a cadenza at the end of this group, which is roughly in the middle
of the work, but it lacks the Mozartean irony that embellishes an arrival at a key foreign yet
structural. The harmony over which Neefe’s cadenza is elaborated is V of F major, that is, the
home dominant, the conventional place for a Classical cadenza. The subsequent free
improvisation in F major functions as an extended anacrusis to the Gigue in Bb major that begins
the next group, thus contextualizing the key in the close harmonic nexus of the home tonic.

While Mozart’s K. 475 betrays a musical structure that dramatizes far-fetched digressions
from a familiar course as well as their returns to it, Neefe’s fantasia is built in a more static form
consisting of a close network of keys in the home-key framework. In brief, the fantasia
constantly returns and refers to the home key of f/F, confirming its centrality and defining
functions of other keys in relation to it. The third group outlines a musical journey from the
Gigue back to the main theme section (ending) in the tonal progressions that roughly reverses
those of the first group: from Bb major via Eb major eventually to the home F minor. This
formal scheme reveals a modified symmetry. Neefe creates contrast in the middle group against
the outer groups not by employing foreign keys and styles as in Mozart’s K. 475 but simply by engaging the modal shift from minor to major.

Considering all these features, we can safely consider Neefe’s fantasia a more ‘classicalized,’ or normative, version of Mozart’s fantasia, and can speculate that he modelled his fantasia after Mozart’s K. 475.

Schubert, in his Fantasia in C minor, D. 993 (composed in ca. 1813), also attempts to build upon and emulate Mozart’s work, but the end result is something new, which discloses an amalgam of various musical impulses emanating from both Classicism and early Romanticism. In this fantasia, one can easily picture Schubert as a young composer (around the age of 15) endeavoring to learn from a work of the old master whose music he revered. First of all, he uses the key of his model (C minor) and even derives his themes from it (See Example 18 and Ex. 10). Schubert’s pathetic opening theme, stated in unison and answered by a phrase an octave higher in the dominant, is unmistakably inspired by Mozart’s (mm. 1–5), while the main theme of the middle sections with a dotted rhythmic figure closely resembles Mozart’s sarabande theme (See Example 19 and mm. 86–89 in Ex. 15-a). Even in terms of form, Schubert heavily relies on Mozart’s ideas. He reiterates the opening section left open in its initial appearance and closes it at its end; he also places semi-autonomous stable sections in the middle, and connects them with transitional passages. In these ways, he observes the formal principle of the episodic type.

Of course, the opening section, compared to Mozart’s, is rather disappointing, revealing the immaturity and deficiency of Schubert’s compositional technique to convincingly institute an opening tragic pathos. His fantasia, instead of bringing forth the expressive character of the opening theme breaks away from it too rashly, just after its first statement, and fills the
remainder of the opening section with rather freer improvisation based on an arabesque figure, which wanders, or meanders, in unstable tonal progressions of G major–A minor–E major. The chromatic progression from an A minor chord to a A♯07 chord at mm 9–10, though prepared by chromatic steps in the bass in the previous bar, indeed begets as surprising an effect as *ellipses* in C. P. E. Bach’s fantasia or chromatic common-tone modulations in the opening of K. 475. But this seemingly bold stroke does not lead us to a strange yet imaginative harmonic region as in Mozart’s fantasia. The subsequent passage in cadential progressions, clarifying the harmonic function of the surprising A♯07 chord as vii07 of B64 chord, ushers in E major, a key that stands in the mediant relationship to the tonic. And we cannot regard this mediant modulation as an original idea or novelty, since at the time of this composition (ca. 1812) this kind of modulation had already become commonplace among early Romantic composers.
However, as Jörg Demus points out, Schubert could neither become Mozart nor suppress his musical personality so as to be a mere plagiarist or pedantic pedagogue. This youthful fantasia already evinces his own style and qualities, which he would perfect in his mature years. What is uniquely Schubert’s in this fantasia is his treatment of the middle sections. In the middle of K. 475, Mozart uses two different stable sections in contrasting styles and forms as structural pillars and dramatizes the transition from one to the other. But Schubert’s fantasia does not necessitate such a drama, since he shapes its middle sections, in spite of borrowing raw materials from K. 475, as a strophic lied ohne Worte. Although as in K. 475 two stable sections are introduced here, they are fashioned out of a single theme and its seven repeats, or variations, all identical in form. The transitional passage that links the two sections and modulates from

---

E major to A minor is so brief and static that we should call it an interlude rather than a transition or development. Thus, we can construe the middle sections as constituting a strophic song consisting of seven strophes in two keys separated by an interlude.

Schubert closely models the middle-section theme on imitating Mozart’s sarabande theme (Ex. 19). The dotted figure, the rising top voice, and the chromatic inflections in voices are undoubtedly based on Mozart’s ideas; and its closing gesture (mm. 4–5) too outlines that of Mozart’s theme. However, Mozart’s use of the antecedent-consequent period in balanced eight bars no longer interests the composer from a younger generation. He condenses Mozart’s four-bar antecedent phrase to three bars and converts it into a sub-phrase by articulating it with a deceptive cadence progression, V–vi (mm. 3–4), instead of with a half cadence, and accelerating the entry of the following phrase (m. 4) the equivalent to the consequent of Mozart’s theme. As in K. 475 Schubert increase the harmonic rhythm of the second half of his theme, yet makes it a more compact two-bar phrase by not stretching it at its end as Mozart does. What emerges by the end of the condensing process is an irregular five-bar phrase that consists of two sub-phrases (3+2), and which threatens the Classical balance that Mozart’s sarabande theme epitomizes.

In addition, the resolution of this theme falls on the downbeat of its subsequent statement, so that although the melodic/harmonic formula is repeated in strophic form, the fantasia does not lose forward momentum. Again imitating Mozart’s sarabande, Schubert immediately restates the theme an octave lower, but it is when he stops copying his old master that Schubert’s true talent shines through. The third statement of the theme is such a place. Here he transforms Mozart’s jagged dance theme into a cantabile melody with an accompaniment figure of running sixteenth-note sextuplets. Schubert’s alchemical power of transmuting raw material into a golden song, which he would perfect in his later fantasies, is manifested here (See Example 20). Nevertheless,
Schubert yet lacks the compositional prowess to continuously generate fresh expressions and create a captivating, narrative thread by further developing the thematic idea. Afterwards, he simply repeats this songful melody, only slightly changing the accompaniment figuration. Thus, Schubert’s fantasia does not necessitate ‘Grundsatz’ analysis, which we applied to K. 475. His basic idea, derived from Mozart’s fantasia, is neither elaborated nor expanded (See Table 3). Even the last strophe in a new key, A minor, that follows a short interlude (mm. 26–31) (See Example 21) presents the identical melodic/harmonic formula and figuration, although he modifies the five-bar theme into a four-bar phrase (mm. 32–39). He concludes the lied with a perfect authentic cadence at the end of the fourth strophe (m. 39). The following re-transitional
Table 3  Sectional division of Schubert’s Fantasia, D. 993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th># of m</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Style/Form</th>
<th>Stability</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Cadence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>from c to E</td>
<td>lamento/free</td>
<td>unstable</td>
<td>from K. 475</td>
<td>(open)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>E-a</td>
<td>sarabande/ strophic lied</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>from K. 475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strophe 1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>sarabande</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>5-measure theme x 2</td>
<td>elided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strophe 2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>lied</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>variation of strophe 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strophe 3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>lied</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>modification of strophe 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlude</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>from E to a</td>
<td>transitional</td>
<td>unstable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strophe 4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>lied</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td>modification of strophe 2</td>
<td>perf. cad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retransition</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>from a to c</td>
<td>transitional</td>
<td>unstable</td>
<td>from K. 475</td>
<td>half cadence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>improvisatory/free</td>
<td>stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>c-a-c</td>
<td>lamento/free</td>
<td>unstable/stable</td>
<td>opening theme</td>
<td>final cadence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 21  F. Schubert, D. 993, Interlude of the Middle Section, mm. 26–32
passage with another motif borrowed from Mozart’s K. 475 modulates back to the home key (mm. 39–47) in a way similar to Mozart’s in K. 475. His handling of this motif, that is, making a simple sequence of it, is not as exciting and exceptional as Mozart’s, who molds a dramatic keyboard recitative out of it. Although with the strophic-variation form of the middle section, Schubert endows his fantasia of diverse ideas with formal unity in accordance with the aesthetic principle of the episodic type, his formal strategy is placid and formulaic. This reveals that his interests did not lie in creating an instrumental drama in this work.

This work, as a fantasia of the episodic type, can be judged an unsuccessful attempt to build upon the master strokes of Mozart. It lacks the distinct attributes of K. 475: harmonic ingenuities, variety of ideas, balanced proportion of sections, well-designed instrumental drama, and unifying formal structure. Schubert presents and develops the opening theme too meagerly to establish its pathetic character, and the middle sections of the fantasia are disproportionately long repetitious. Yet, these middle sections offer us a glimpse of what was to come and of what could be achieved. In them Schubert brings forth singing effects of keyboard playing and creates a sense of diversity not by furnishing new materials or indulging in wild modulations but by transforming a single theme in subdued harmonic digressions. In the concluding chapter, we will briefly revisit Schubert’s fantasia world and discuss his later fantasias, in which the vision only promised in this youthful fantasia is materialized.
Chapter 6. Conclusion and a Brief Sketch, the Aftermath of the of the Episodic Fantasia

The fantasia between the 1780s and 1800s was a unique genre that was susceptible to the change of the prevalent musical aesthetics in the German culture of the time. This idiosyncratic art is often approached as a collection of improvisatory keyboard works jumbled together under the broad term ‘fantasia.’ The unconventionality and subjectivity of these works, which boldly defied musical norms of the time, make it difficult for scholars to treat it as a genre in the classical sense. But the fantasias of this dissertation allow us to conclude that the fantasia in the late 18th century is not “anti-genre” but a genre with its own expressive properties. The *sui generis* nature of this art dictates that, unlike other Classical genres, it be not defined by a fixed set of genre-defining features but by the shared aesthetic principles which served as the foundation for the doctrine of ‘individual originality’ which the fantasia pursued as its ultimate aim. In other words, fantasia composers realized their free and subjective imaginations in conformity with the contemporary aesthetic expectations of the genre.

Schleuning showed how C. P. E. Bach and his followers reinterpreted and developed the Baroque fantasia-prelude in *stylus phantasticus* into the art of “original genius” which musically embodied the aesthetic ideals of newly-imported British naturalism. Richards expounded on the naturalistic elements in fantasias, characterizing them as the “musical picturesque.” Both scholars viewed the fantasia in this period (1780–1800) as a continuation of C. P. E. Bach’s style. However, this dissertation has demonstrated that the fantasia of the time was not as stable a
genre as they claim: in in fact, its aesthetic principles themselves underwent a transformation during this period. Contemporaneous German theorists sought to reconcile British naturalism with French neoclassicism, and their new thoughts were articulated in the form of criticism of the fantasia as fine art. But then, the fantasia’s naturalistic principles that had given composers to impetus for unbridled deliberation of original, imaginative ideas became modified by the infiltration of neoclassical elements intended to strengthen the genre’s formal coherence and expressive intelligibility. As a result, the fantasia evolved into two types, the prelude and the episodic, which coexisted in this period. The composers who belonged to the keyboard school of C. P. E. Bach continued the Baroque improvisatory tradition based on voice-leading techniques of figured bass, cultivating the prelude-type fantasia which musically embodied naturalistic ideals of original genius, namely, originality, abundant feelings, and bold imagination. I have shown that this style stood diametrically opposite to the Classical style. In the meanwhile, younger Classical composers developed the new, episodic-type fantasia in attempts to make naturalistic elements of the genre more congruent with the neoclassical doctrines, which were increasingly predominant in the German musical culture of the time. In this type, by combining figured-bass techniques with functional tonality, composers developed each idea into a semi-autonomous section in a balanced form, and devised a hidden harmonic design (il filo) to integrate the unconventional mixture of contrasting affects and bizarre harmonic imagination on the surface. While C. P. E. Bach’s fantasia provided a model for the prelude-type fantasia, W. A. Mozart led the historical evolution of the genre into the episodic type.

As mentioned in the introduction, this transformation, however, was not the final stage of this genre’s evolution; the aesthetic principles undergirding the genre were further transformed, and new styles of the fantasia sprang up in the early 19th century. Even though the episodic-type
fantasia, while still an improvisatory art, adopted many Classical norms of instrumental music, its ultimate artistic *raison d'être*, in the face of the 18th-century dichotomy between improvisatory and worked-out arts, still lay in the fidelity to the naturalistic ideal of creating an original work readily distinguished from the other, conventional, genres. Therefore, its formal design, devised to unify diverse ideas and affects into a convincing whole, was not emphasized as in other Classical genres. In addition, this hidden design did not derive its formal principle from other Classical forms, so that the adaptation of Classical form was limited to local sections while as a whole each fantasia had its own strategy. The aesthetic primacy of variety which this type observed restricted the use of musical ideas to separate sections instead of developing a primary motif or theme in an overarching form—a quintessential device of the Classical style. In other words, the episodic-type fantasia only elaborated musical ideas within local episodes without repeating or relating from one episode to another. The only exception to this rule was the opening theme, itself, which the composer brought back at the end. But as we have discussed, the opening and closing sections with the same theme assume the functions of introduction and epilogue rather than those of exposition and recapitulation in a Classical sonata.

The stylistic distance between the fantasia and other Classical instrumental genres, however, increasingly narrowed after the turn of the 19th century, although it was not to be completely abolished until the end of the Classical period. Fantasias published after 1800 freely took on Classical form and style, whereas the episodic-type fantasia deliberately abstained from such borrowing. Compositions called fantasias of the new types (Classical-form and cyclic-
sonata) show that Classical composers of the generation after Mozart further integrated principles of the Classical style into the fantasia by overtly adopting its conventional forms. In this historical transformation, the episodic type soon became obsolete. Even the fantasias which resemble it boldly expose the borrowed formal designs of Classical form rather than conceal them as in the episodic type. For example, the *Grazer Fantasie* in C major, D. 605A (circa 1818), commonly attributed to Schubert, consists of several sections in various styles, echoing Mozart’s episodic-type fantasias. Yet, those semi-independent sections in unconventional key relationships are joined together not merely by a hidden harmonic thread but also by the recurrence of a main theme in rondo logic. And by making motivic connections between the main theme and other themes as commonly found in Classical sonatas or rondos, the composer endows the fantasia with a high degree of thematic unity.

In this history of the fantasia, we can recognize an evolving pattern from a free improvisatory type to a highly organized one. This situation, however, does not justify us to relegate the episodic type to the reduced status of a transitional form between the earlier and later types of the fantasia; for it has its own set of aesthetic principles and purposes distinct from them. What this change simply tells us is that at the turn of the 19th century the horizon of the genre expectation shifted once more and the fantasia acquired a new set of aesthetic principles by which it metamorphosed into the Classical-form and cyclic-sonata types. Although German
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theorists of the late 18th-century also sought to reconcile naturalistic and rationalistic aesthetics, they viewed human imagination and reason as two distinct faculties. Thus, Kant, who sought to synthesize French rationalism and British empiricism, considered C. P. E. Bach’s fantasia belonging to the amorphous, prelude type as a perfect manifestation of imagination and free beauty. Kant argued that Bach’s fantasia eliminated every constraint of rational rule and conscious working out, and that this separation would lead art to its “greatest perfection in the enterprises of the Imagination.”

However, at the turn of the century, many thinkers and theorists challenged this view and proposed an alternative theory which could replace the 18th-century dichotomy. They abolished the separation of imaginative power and reason, and combined them into a new concept of ‘fantasy.’ They defined fantasy as a creatively productive power that makes it possible to portray the inner spirit in the reality of an external form (Gestalt), and argued that the rational work of reason is inherent in the true concept of imagination. Coleridge called the imagination with such a rational power ‘fantasy,’ conceptually keeping it apart from ‘fancy’ lacking reason. Fantasy in this sense—a term in which the dominant aesthetics of the time is encapsulated—was regarded in the early 19th century as conditio sine qua non of creative art.

---

4 Kant, *Critique of Judgment*, 42


This development had two significant consequences for the course of development of Classical keyboard music. On one hand, the emphasis on the creative power of imagination prompted Classical composers to incorporate inherent characteristics of the fantasia into other Classical genres. On the other hand, the imperative of rational form in the concept of artistic imagination brought about a critical change in the aesthetic principle of the fantasia. It is undeniable that even before 1800 Classical composers imported many improvisatory elements and expressive contents of the fantasia into other Classical genres; but it is after 1800 that in Classical sonatas and rondos, Classical composers introduce not only expressive characteristics of the fantasia but also its formal procedures, closely assimilating them to the fantasia. This infiltration famously resulted in keyboard works bearing the title of *quasi una fantasia*, which displayed not only the *topoi* of fantasia but also embodied a hybrid form of sonata and fantasia. Beethoven’s *Sonate quasi una fantasia*, Op. 27 nos. 1 and 2 (1801 and 1802), and Hummel’s *Rondo quasi una fantasia*, Op. 19 (pub. 1819) are conspicuous examples among them. These works display the typical opening of the fantasia, starting with an improvisatory *lamento* or lyrical song in a relatively free form; and their movements are connected by *attaca* as in the episodic-type fantasia. Furthermore, their formal progressions are frequently interrupted by improvisatory passages such as *recitative* or *cadenza* or by the sudden juxtaposition of ideas contrasting in style and affect, which, as in the episodic type, effects momentary suspensions of the temporal progression of Classical form.

At the same time, the new notion of imagination that prescribed rational working-out for artistic work further blurred the edge of the boundary between the fantasia and other Classical

---

genres. Whereas the imperative of originality forbade 18th-century composers from using Classical form in the fantasia, 19th-century composers no longer regarded that prohibition as an essential rule for the art of original genius, for to them, the fantasia was no longer a *creatio ex nihilo*, i.e. pure invention in which artistic inspiration and individuality stand antithetical to musical craftsmanship. They believed that a true genius wed original, subjective content and concrete, objective form in perfect harmony, and that not only does musical inspiration appear at the spur of the moment but also works in the conscious process of ordering the ideas.

For example, Beethoven adopts Classical variation form to bring order to his Fantasia in G minor/B major), Op. 77 (1809), which starts with ‘organized’ chaos. The work opens with a free play of fragments stylized as in the prelude type; yet as the work progresses, a clearly delineated theme emerges and its variations proceed in a highly orderly manner, even subsuming into the variations several ideas which are left fragmented and given free rein at the beginning. The fantasia aims at the musical effect of a gradual progress from disorder to order rather than that of deliberate disorder or sheer compositional freedom as Macdonald argues. It represents the very process of historical transformation of the genre, revealing the concept of the fantasia in the early 19th century. Although Beethoven’s improvisation practice was based on C. P. E. Bach’s method and this fantasia and historical records show that his keyboard improvisation was rooted in the fantasia tradition, Beethoven could not stay in the world of Bach since new aesthetic demands were in force.

---


At the end of the Classical period Carl Czerny sums up the new practices of the fantasia in his keyboard treatise “A Systematic Introduction to Improvisation on the Pianoforte” (1829). In the treatise he first points out that the 19th-century fantasia is a continuum of the 18th-century tradition of free extemporization, and then adds as a new essential condition of the fantasia the unifying form that “imparts the necessary connection to the whole, and stamps it (the fantasia) with the character of unity,”\(^\text{10}\) Unlike C. P. E. Bach, who minimizes the role of compositional rules in the fantasia, Czerny’s words show that the 19th-century fantasia necessitated a comprehensive knowledge of the rules of construction. For this purpose, he recommends that the improviser uses as formal templates the familiar Classical genres, even including fugue\(^\text{11}\) besides the usual sonata and rondo\(^\text{12}\)—a development which reflected the change of the genre’s aesthetic principle since the time of C. P. E. Bach. However, 19th-century composers applied Classical forms to their fantasias in much more creative and individualistic ways than Czerny’s rather formulaic approach suggests. In their fantasias, they freely fused characteristics of the traditional fantasia with the forms of other Classical genres, developing them into \textit{sui generis} forms and thus maintaining a stylistic boundary between the fantasia and other Classical genres.

Czerny also fails to note a new, critical development of the fantasia that took place in the early 19th century. Some Classical composers of the time began to construct the fantasia in the form of a multiple-movement sonata. In his treatise, Czerny includes Hummel’s Fantasia in Eb

\(^{10}\) Czerny, \textit{A Systematic Introduction}, 83

\(^{11}\) The learned style was strictly excluded in fantasias of the prelude and episodic types, because in the 18th century, a fugue was considered as inimical to spontaneous activities of original genius. See the section of “Historical Roots of the Fantasia in the Prelude Type and Its Definition” in Chapter 2.

\(^{12}\) Czerny, 42–86.
major, Op. 18 (1805), and Kalkbrenner’s Grande Fantasie ‘Effusio Musica’ in D minor/F major, Op. 68 (1823), together with Mozart’s K. 475 and Beethoven’s Sonata quasi una fantasia, Op. 27 in the list of great compositions that could serve as models for improvisation on several themes.¹³ Undoubtedly he saw in these works exemplary ways of integrating a variety of ideas into a “magnificent whole;”¹⁴ in a way interpreting them as episodic-type fantasias. What he did not realize, however, was that unlike other works in the list, the multiple themes of Hummel’s and Kalkbrenner’s fantasias, in fact, are derived from one primary theme or motif. In other words, the composers use the technique of ‘thematic transformation,’ by which means sections of their fantasias in various moods and styles are generated and unified. In addition, they develop and order those sections into a de facto multi-movement sonata. In their hands the fantasia evolved from the episodic and Classical-form types into the cyclic sonata. We observe a parallel development in the Classical sonata, which Beethoven’s Sonate quasi una fantasia and his late sonatas epitomize. On the other hand, Classical sonatas generally avoid the kind of inter-movement thematic connection which the fantasia of this new type features. The ‘cyclic form’ in which a germinal motif or theme appears in a new guise throughout movements is a definitive feature of the new-type fantasia. One of the earliest fantasias in the cyclic sonata type is Hummel’s Fantasia in E-flat major, Op. 18, composed in 1805.¹⁵ In his treatise, Czerny introduces the entirety of this work as exemplary of the fantasia on multiple themes. Possibly

---

¹³ Ibid., 74.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ See Cheok Weng Kam, “Fantasy Style and Generic Mixture in Hummel’s Keyboard Music: Towards a Reappraisal of a Neglected Musician’s Contribution to the Development of Nineteenth-Century Musical Style” (PhD. Diss., Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2011).
Schubert took Hummel’s work as the model for his ‘Wanderer’ Fantasia and F-minor Fantasia for four hands.

The cyclic sonata-fantasia emerged at the beginning of the 19th century simultaneously with the Classical-form type. While the latter dominated the genre in the first two decades of the century, as time passed, the former came forth as the dominant type, particularly favored by pre-Romantic and Romantic composers. It may appear ironic that while Classical music in general became more subjective and freer from the control of musical conventions, the musical form of the fantasia in particular was tightened by the principles of those very conventions. But when we consider the gradual reconciliation of British naturalism and French neoclassicism and the general development of German instrumental music, we can conclude that the process that govern the fantasia transformation was a natural consequence of the German aesthetic development. During the Classical period, the aesthetic imperative that insisted on configuring creative ideas and feelings within an intelligible form precipitated the evolving union of the fantasia and the Classical sonata. If the prelude-type fantasia provided the fundamentals of the genre, we can understand the episodic-type fantasia as taking a decisive step toward the rapprochement. For that type, for the first time, demonstrated the possibility of successfully unleashing one’s original genius within a comprehensible structure.

The consummation of the union of the fantasia and the sonata announced the end of the Classical era and heralded the Romantic era. Realizing one’s imagination and inner life within external, intelligible form constitutes the very essence of Romanticism. In this period, a clear separation of the fantasia from other genres was no longer viable. One result was that the nomenclature of Romantic keyboard works was often exchangeable or confusing. For example, Liszt modelled his Sonata in B minor on Schubert’s Wanderer Fantasie in C major, D. 760.
(1822), absorbing many characteristics of the traditional fantasia; it would have been called a fantasia by the Classical standard. On the other hand, the original title of Schumann’s Fantasia in C major, Op. 17 (1836), which was constructed in loose sonata form, was *Grosse Sonate*; and its autograph suggests that Schumann, like Liszt in his sonata, once considered even recapitulating the first movement at the end. From this perspective, one could regard the fantasia in the Classical period as a major precursor of Romantic instrumental music in general. It is true that the transformation of the fantasia during the Classical period was part of the larger historical development that ultimately gave birth to Romanticism. However, one should remember that each type has its own set of aesthetic principles and its own unique beauty, as does each individual, protean fantasia in all its various incarnations.
APPENDIX

1. Dissertation Repertoire in Chronological Order

1753 C. P. E. Bach, Fantasia in C Minor, H. 75/iii

1768 C. P. E. Bach, Fantasia in D minor, H. 234

1770, circa W. A. Mozart, Prelude in C major, K. 624 (Ahn. 1)

1777 W. A. Mozart, Four Preludes, K. 284a

1782 W. A. Mozart, Fantasia in F minor, K. 383c (Anh. 32) (Fragment)

Präludium and Fugue in C major, K. 394

Fantasia in C minor, K. 396 (incomplete)

Fantasia in D minor, K. 397, In the first edition, the piece ends on a dominant 7th chord, described as a fantasie d’introduction ……Morceau détaché

C. P. E. Bach, Fantasia in E-flat major (Kenner IV/6), H. 277

Fantasia in A major (Kenner IV/7), H. 278

Fantasia in F major (Kenner V/5), H. 279

1784 C. P. E. Bach, Fantasia in C major (Kenner V/6), H. 284

J. C. Keller, Fantasia con expressione in A minor

1785 E. W. Wolf, Fantasia in B-flat major

W. A. Mozart, Fantasia in C minor, K. 475

1786 C. P. E. Bach, Fantasia in B-flat major (Kenner VI/3), H. 289

Fantasia in C major (Kenner VI/6), H. 291

1787 C. P. E. Bach, C. P. E. Bachs Empfindungen (Fantasia) in F-sharp minor, H. 300

1788 J. G. Müthel, Organ Fantasia in G minor

1789 J. Haydn, Fantasia in C major, Hob. XVII: 4 (Op. 58)

J. C. Kittel, Fantasia in F major
1797  C. G. Neefe, *Fantasia per il Clavicembalo* in F minor

1800  L. V. Beethoven, *Sonata Quasi una fantasia* in E-flat major, Op. 27 no. 1

1801  L. V. Beethoven, *Sonata Quasi una fantasia* in C-sharp minor, Op. 27 no 2.

1802  A. Eberl, *Fantasie et rondeau* in B-flat major, Op. 15

1803  J. Wölfl  Op. 3  *Fantasie et fugue*  

J. W. Hässler, *Fantaisie et sonate* in E minor, Op. 17

1804  J. L. Düsselk, Fantasia and Fugue in F minor, Op. 55

1805  A. Eberl, Fantasia in D minor, Op. 28  

A. Reicha, Fantasia in F major, Op. 31  

J. N. Hummel, Fantasia in E-flat major, Op. 18


1808  L. V. Beethoven, “Choral Fantasy” in C minor/major, Op. 80

1809  L. V. Beethoven, Fantasia in G minor/B-flat major, Op. 77

1810  J. L. Düsselk, Fantasia in F major, C. 248 (Op. 76)

1813  F. Schubert, Fantasia in C minor

1818  F. Schubert (attr.), *Die Grazer Fantasie* in C major, D. 605a


F. Schubert  “Wanderer Fantasy” in C major, D. 760 (Op. 15)


1828  F. Schubert, Fantasia in F minor for four hands, D. 940 (Op. posth. 103)
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