

C H A P T E R 5

Tonality and Systems in the Middle-to-Late Eighteenth Century: The Classical Ideal

II. Viennese Symphonists of the Middle Eighteenth Century: G. C. Wagenseil and G. M. Monn

Georg Christoph Wagenseil (1715-1777) spent his entire career in Vienna where he was active as the Viennese court composer (*Kapellmeister*) from 1739 until his death;¹ he studied with the eminent theorist and organist J. J. Fux (himself Imperial *Kapellmeister* from 1698) who recommended him for the position. Under the artistic leadership of both Fux and Antonio Caldara (from 1714, Imperial Chamber-Composer at the Court of Charles VI, as well as assistant *Kapellmeister* to Fux) the Viennese Hapsburgs were notoriously conservative in their musical tastes, for instance, preferring High Baroque *opera seria* to more modern comic opera forms and, wherever possible, fugal, and/or imitative writing in chamber music, as well as in organ music, where such writing was traditionally associated. It is no wonder, then, that, according to Charles Burney who met the composer in 1772, Wagenseil was a great admirer of Handel. Consequently, Wagenseil favored an approach to sonata form that still had strong conceptual ties to earlier eighteenth-century binary dance forms. Yet even with his conservative tendencies, Wagenseil was equally progressive as a practitioner of the *style galant* in Vienna, whose more modern

¹For biographical information on Wagenseil, see John Kucaba, Bertil H. Van Boer, “Wagenseil, Georg Christoph,” in *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, ed. S. Sadie and J. Tyrrell (London: Macmillan, 2001), xxvi: 928-930.

approach to key-centered tonality and its incorporation of chromatic voice-leading, certainly had an influence on later composers, most notably Haydn, and the young Mozart. Wagenseil's influence reached indirectly to Beethoven, who received lessons in Fuxian counterpoint from Wagenseil's student Johann Schenk.

The relevance of Wagenseil's style to our previous discussion of Sammartini lies in the manner by which the modulation from the first harmonic area to the structural dominant is accomplished. In Wagenseil's symphonies, the first hint of dominant harmony, introduced within the bridge, is succeeded only by a cadence towards the end of the second harmonic area; specifically, at the point of the codetta, the final cadential passage formally ending the exposition. As a result, there is usually no extended area prolonging the new harmony; rather, the bridge cadence and succeeding codetta are the only confirmations of the new area. Here, one can easily see the historical connection between the first period of a binary dance form from the early decades of the eighteenth century, where tonic harmony is prolonged up to the double bar – the dominant being reduced to a large-scale half cadence concluding the first half of the form – and its later transformation into a rudimentary sonata exposition.

The Sinfonia in E, WV 393 (1760), is typical of Wagenseil's approach to sonata form (Ex. 5.4 shows the complete exposition of this symphony).² A thirteen-measure dance-like

²In addition to a number of symphonies by Wagenseil published in the *Diletto Musicale* series (Vienna and Munich: Ludwig Doblinger, 1975), Wagenseil's symphonies can also be found in *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich*, xxxi, Jg. Xv/2 (1908); and a selection in Barry Brook, general editor, *The Symphony 1720-1840: A Comprehensive Collection of Full Scores in Sixty*

opening statement, subdivided into three four-measure phrases, is followed by an extensive 32-measure bridge (mm. 13ff) that is articulated by a change in thematic design. The first half of the bridge introduces an A# (the leading tone of the dominant) and the second half, articulated by another design change which effectively divides the bridge in half, moves to II# (m. 25). In m. 31 a B major chord (V) is presented which allows for the dominant area to gradually take shape during the remainder of the exposition. This is succeeded in the next measure by an augmented-sixth chord on G₂, the missing pitch of the prevailing 4# system of the movement.

EXAMPLE 5.4: Wagenseil, Symphony in E WV 393, 1st Mvt. Exposition

The musical score is presented in three systems. Each system contains five staves: 2 Oboi, Violino I, Violino II, Viola, and Basso. The key signature is E major (one sharp) and the time signature is 2/4. The notation includes various rhythmic values, slurs, and dynamic markings. The first system covers measures 1 through 8. The second system starts at measure 9 and ends at measure 16. The third system starts at measure 17 and ends at measure 24. The Viola part features long, sustained notes with slurs, while the Basso part provides a steady rhythmic accompaniment.

The image displays three systems of musical notation in G major. The first system (measures 25-31) shows a treble staff with chords and a bass staff with a steady eighth-note accompaniment. The second system (measures 32-38) features a treble staff with a melodic line and a bass staff with a similar accompaniment. The third system (measures 39-45) continues the melodic and accompanimental patterns, ending with a double bar line.

Wagenseil has thus anticipated Haydn’s use of the augmented sixth in his own symphonies, most notably the expositions of the “Paris” set (nos. 82-87 discussed below). Historically significant is the fact that Wagenseil’s use of the augmented sixth on the flat third degree of the major mode is a direct outgrowth of those *pianoidée* passages in the parallel minor employed by Sammartini (and Vivaldi before him) to signal the arrival of the dominant area.³

³This is not to say that the switch into the parallel minor in Sammartini’s works is endemic, far from it since only

What was once an entire phrase in the parallel minor has here been reduced to a single sonority whose root is the missing pitch of the tonic system. By using the missing pitch in this way, Wagenseil has successfully avoided the harmonic jolt caused by having an entire phrase in the parallel minor. In addition, there is an added benefit in that the augmented sixth, instead of occupying the position of a melodic phrase, has a non-melodic, contrapuntal/voice-leading function as part of a harmonic progression that dramatically drops to the V/V. In the present instance, the G₂ augmented sixth resolves to II⁷ (now heard unequivocally as V7/V) and then to V. Measure 35 is the first decisive gesture that anticipates the new harmonic area; it is still within the realm of the bridge and is not marked off by a formal cadence, what Hepokoski calls an “unachieved medial caesura.”⁴ This area, however, denotes the beginning of an auxiliary cadence that will not be fulfilled until m. 45, the beginning of a five-measure codetta and the first anchoring of the second harmonic area. Until the codetta, there has been no formal division within the exposition; however, we might hear m. 35 as a line of demarcation between “trying to

a few symphonies actually create bridges to the dominant in this manner, the motion into the parallel minor being too overpowering a gesture. However, the very fact that the shift into the parallel minor was used at all, albeit infrequently, as a bridge to the dominant area, indicates that its function, as a possible substitute for, or as an adjunct to, a dominant preparation was a viable alternative.

⁴According to Hepokoski, an unachieved medial caesura is an attempted cadence that is not anchored by a complete harmonic progression in the new harmonic area.; rather, the music is continuous until a formal cadence is finally achieved. See James Hepokosi and Warren Daryc, “The Medial Caesura and its Role in the Eighteenth-Century Sonata Exposition,” *Music Theory Spectrum* 19/1 (1997): 115-54.

leave the tonic” and “trying to arrive at the dominant.” The unceasing rhythmic drive is almost consistently governed by four-bar hypermeasures and associated extensions.

The procedure is very similar to that outlined by Koch in his *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition* of 1782-1793.⁵ Koch’s description of the form of a sonata exposition is germane, as Koch is one of the few Classical-era theorists to analyze this section as a single period, or to discuss an entire movement as a succession of periods. Koch’s description of the exposition simply states that “the first period establishes the tonic and then shifts to the fifth, cadencing there,” and thus provides us with a harmonically construed analysis of form, one that makes no “rules” for the position of the second harmonic area.⁶ Koch provides a model for the creation of a sonata exposition based on the expansion of a relatively short melody that cadences on the dominant. In his example, a five-measure G major opening statement is augmented by a five-measure extension ending with a half-cadence in m. 10. The bridge begins with the upbeat to m. 11, immediately introducing C#, the leading tone of D major. Later, D major will be secured as the structural dominant. The bridge is expanded over the course of most of the exposition and is not completed until the first note of m. 31. The material that is the remainder of m. 31 plus all of m. 32 comprises a codetta, the concluding cadential phrase in the new harmonic area.

Two issues are important here: first, harmonically speaking, the structural dominant is not

⁵See Joel Lester, *Compositional Theory in the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992): 284-299, and Heinrich Christoph Koch, *Introductory Essay on Composition*, Nancy Baker, trans. (a partial translation of the *Versuch*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983).

⁶Lester, *op. cit.*: 294.

fully secured until the arrival of the codetta. Second, thematic contrast is simply not an issue in the organization of the form since the second harmonic area is not articulated thematically. Koch's models were Haydn's sonata-form movements (ultimately derived from Wagenseil and his contemporaries in Vienna), and therefore may be the reason why his descriptions of the process are so generalized: the compositional variety of sonata-form movements composed in Vienna in the middle of the eighteenth century, including those of Wagenseil and Haydn (Koch also cites examples by C. P. E. Bach and other contemporary composers in his treatise), necessitates an inclusive approach rather than a systematic model. Koch's descriptions of principal ideas and subsidiary ideas did not *necessitate* the use of contrasting or lyrical thematic entities, and it was not an integral facet of Haydn's style. In fact, many of Koch's notions about the "Allegro," as he calls it, are completely accurate when examining Haydn and his contemporaries. In Haydn's works, we will find that the issue of thematic contrast plays much less of a role in his works than it does in the works of Mozart or Beethoven. Haydn was more inclined toward the use of innovative expansive procedures, that deliberately denied cadential fulfillment, to prolong tonic harmony, much after the manner of Wagenseil, and which often avoided thematic contrast altogether. However, Haydn's monothematic exposition designs did allow for intermediary cadences to set off sizable areas within what Koch defines as the "first period" (meaning the exposition) but contained little thematic contrast, at least by later nineteenth-century text book models of sonata form. The lack of such contrast precludes the prevalent use of "themes" as a viable analytic strategy since all new material is essentially an extension, or variation, of previous material.

A notable exception to Wagenseil's general procedure occurs in his C major Symphony,

WV 361, from 1757. In this work, Wagenseil's approach to the subdivision of the exposition may be compared to that of J. C. Bach's tripartite expositions; specifically, one period in the tonic and at least two in the dominant or relative major, a division that is also characteristic of the sonata expositions of Mozart and Beethoven. However, unlike J. C. Bach and his later contemporaries, Wagenseil's subdivisions of the second harmonic area are never emphatic; none of the formal periods are set off with articulated cadences, nor are the periods characterized by differing "topics;" namely, characteristic figures that formed the bases of melody types associated with various feelings and affections and used in music discourse, in both vocal and instrumental forms, throughout the eighteenth century.⁷ Thus Wagenseil still remains true to the basic style of thematic unity and continuity of period structure of his Baroque-era predecessors: one period simply moves into the other without a break in the rhythm momentum often making analytical judgements difficult as to where musical periods begin and end, a situation we will encounter again with Haydn's expositions, based, as they are, on Wagenseil's model.

Wagenseil's expositions in which there is a discernable tripartite division of the second harmonic area, usually defines the beginnings of each subarea with a cadence on its dominant (albeit within continuous phrasing), and by an ever more emphatic metrical downbeat. The first period in the new harmonic area appears as a metrically weak period; in the C major symphony it occurs in m. 22 (Ex. 5.5 shows the bridge and second key area of the exposition) and is articulated by a *forte* dynamic and an increased harmonic rhythm. This four-bar period reaches closure with an authentic cadence on the downbeat of m. 26 (thus, the medial caesura, although

⁷See Leonard G. Ratner, *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style* (New York: Schirmer Books, 1980): 9-30.

not set apart formally by a rest, is still one that has been successfully achieved). A transition passage follows, raising V/V (D pedal mm. 30-33), and achieving another, stronger cadence in m. 34, again without a formal break achieved by a rest to articulate the new period. Here begins the eight-measure closing period which, in turn, again raises the V/V in m. 40 in preparation for the final period, or codetta, of the exposition (mm. 41-45). Even though the dynamic marking is at first *piano* and then *forte*, the codetta occupies the strongest metrical position of the exposition. Throughout, the texture has been continuous; only changes in harmonic rhythm and thematic design, although rather slight, signal the start of new periods.

In terms of chromaticism, the entire exposition of this symphony contains only two chromatic pitch classes, F# and G#, and thus no modulation of system; Wagenseil saves the rest of the chromatic spectrum for the development which begins in the usual manner for works of this period, a restatement of the opening theme in the dominant. What is most interesting about Wagenseil's development is its harmonic scheme after the initial dominant. The G (V) simply moves up to A in m. 51 in preparation for a motion into ii, D minor, during which both C# and B β are introduced. After this, the next harmonic area is IV (F), usually the first goal of motion in a development section since IV serves to neutralize the previous dominant harmonic area and to prepare a return to tonic harmony at the end of the development (D minor, in this case, also serves the same purpose since both D minor and F are both subdominant functions). What happens next is surprising: the dominant of F, C major, turns into an Italian augmented sixth (m. 67) which drops down to B major as V/iii, forming the climactic point of the development as the whole harmonic progression switches violently into the minor mediant. In fact, E minor ends the development without any preparatory retransition on the dominant. The next formal gesture is the

recapitulation in the tonic.

EXAMPLE 5.5: Wagenseil Symphony in C WV 361, 1st Movement(mm. 11-45, Bridge and 2nd Harmonic Area)

The image displays a musical score for the Bridge and 2nd Harmonic Area of the first movement of Wagenseil's Symphony in C, WV 361. The score is arranged in a system with six staves, labeled from top to bottom as Oboi (Flauti), Corni in C, Violino I, Violino II, Viola, and Basso. The music is in common time (C) and the key of C major. The Bridge section (measures 11-15) features a melodic line in the strings and woodwinds, with a prominent eighth-note pattern in the violins and violas. The 2nd Harmonic Area (measures 16-19) is characterized by a dense, chromatic texture, with the strings playing a complex rhythmic pattern of eighth and sixteenth notes, and the woodwinds providing a melodic counterpoint. The score includes various musical notations such as clefs, time signatures, and dynamic markings.

Musical score system 1, measures 23-26. The system consists of five staves. The top staff (treble clef) contains a melodic line with a long note in measure 23, followed by rests in measures 24 and 25, and a final chord in measure 26. The second staff (treble clef) contains a complex melodic line with many sixteenth notes and slurs. The third staff (treble clef) contains a similar complex melodic line. The fourth staff (bass clef) contains a steady eighth-note accompaniment. The fifth staff (bass clef) contains a steady eighth-note accompaniment.

Musical score system 2, measures 27-30. The system consists of five staves. The top staff (treble clef) contains a melodic line with a long note in measure 27, followed by rests in measures 28 and 29, and a final chord in measure 30. The second staff (treble clef) contains a complex melodic line with many sixteenth notes and slurs. The third staff (treble clef) contains a similar complex melodic line. The fourth staff (bass clef) contains a steady eighth-note accompaniment. The fifth staff (bass clef) contains a steady eighth-note accompaniment.

Musical score system 3, measures 31-34. The system consists of five staves. The top staff (treble clef) contains a melodic line with a long note in measure 31, followed by rests in measures 32 and 33, and a final chord in measure 34. The second staff (treble clef) contains a complex melodic line with many sixteenth notes and slurs. The third staff (treble clef) contains a similar complex melodic line. The fourth staff (bass clef) contains a steady eighth-note accompaniment. The fifth staff (bass clef) contains a steady eighth-note accompaniment.

The image displays three systems of musical notation, likely for a symphony. Each system consists of five staves: two for strings (violin and viola), two for woodwinds (flute and oboe), and one for the bass line. The notation includes various rhythmic values, accidentals, and dynamic markings. The first system (measures 35-38) shows a complex rhythmic pattern with many sixteenth and thirty-second notes. The second system (measures 39-42) features a prominent melodic line in the woodwinds with a long note in the first measure. The third system (measures 43-46) shows a more rhythmic and harmonic texture with many sixteenth notes in the woodwinds and strings.

Thus, Wagenseil has created a harmonic plan that stems directly from late Baroque concertos in which the penultimate ritornello was in iii (e.g., Bach’s Second Brandenburg concerto has a similar organization; see discussion in Chapter 4), the extreme point of the tonic hexachord which necessitated a system shift up three signatures in the dominant direction. In Wagenseil’s C major symphony, the switch into E minor introduces the sharp missing pitch of the “0” system, D#, as leading tone. The cadence in iii (m. 74) upholds the 3# system, but the

recapitulation in the next measure in the tonic, C, immediately redresses the system to “0”. The importance of this gesture cannot be overestimated for it demonstrates how close in conception was the symphony of the middle-eighteenth century to the ritornello structures of its late Baroque predecessors. Perhaps even more importantly, this very gesture will recur at the end of several first movements of Haydn’s late symphonies where the developments of those works climax on III (or iii) of the key only to be redressed at the start of the recapitulation.⁸

⁸See Channan Willner, “Chromaticism and the Mediant in Four Late Haydn Works,” *Theory and Practice*, 13 (1988): 79-114. Willner’s discussion is primarily analytical in the Schenkerian sense and does not conceive of Haydn’s motion to III in any historical context. Therefore, the author does not connect Haydn’s motion to the mediant to the late Baroque concerto where the practice of placing the penultimate ritornello in iii is most common.

The works of Georg Matthias Monn (1717-1750) are also relevant to this study; Monn (organist of Karlskirche), too, was born and died in Vienna.⁹ Just as Johann Stamitz was considered to be the leading musical figure in Mannheim, Wagenseil and Monn were deemed Stamitz's Viennese counterparts. Monn uses a sonata procedure that is, in some ways, more sophisticated than Wagenseil's, and yet still maintains some common features with his contemporary. Monn's 1740 D major Symphony is representative of his general stylistic traits.¹⁰ In a small nineteen-measure exposition (see Ex. 5.6), Monn establishes D major with a three and a half-measure opening statement. The bridge, beginning in the middle of m. 4, begins to modulate in m. 6 with the introduction of G# and cadences on II# at the opening of m. 10. Monn's arrival at the second harmonic area is achieved differently from Wagenseil's since Wagenseil does not really anchor the new harmonic area until the codetta, and even that is metrically weak. Monn, however, cadences at the end of the bridge (on II#) and begins a thematically contrasting harmonic area half-way through the exposition. It is a procedure he uses in most of his other symphonies as well. Yet, m. 10 does not firmly define the new harmonic area since it is in the *minor dominant*. Initiation of the second harmonic area in the minor dominant is not an unusual occurrence in Viennese symphonies of this period; even Haydn had been known

⁹For biographical information on Monn, see Judith Leah Schwartz, "Monn, Matthias Georg," *The New Grove Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, xvi: 945-946.

¹⁰Monn's symphonies can be found in *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich* xxxix, Jg., xix/2 (1912); also, a selection of Monn's symphonies are in Barry Brook, General editor, *The Symphony 1720-1840: A Comprehensive Collection of Full Scores in Sixty Volumes* (New York: Garland Publishers, 1981), Ser. B, vol. 1.

to use this device in his early symphonies (for example, the expositions of Haydn’s Symphonies H. 51: 1, 2, 4), and certainly Beethoven has numerous examples in his first-period works as well (for example, the first movement of his Piano Sonata in C major, Op. 2 no. 3, has a second harmonic area that begins in G minor).

EXAMPLE 5.6: Monn, Symphony in D, Exposition

The image displays a musical score for the exposition of Monn's Symphony in D major. It consists of two systems of staves, each with five staves (treble and bass clefs). The key signature is D major (two sharps). The first system begins at measure 11, marked with a double bar line and the number 11. The music features a complex texture with multiple melodic lines and rhythmic patterns. The second system begins at measure 16, also marked with a double bar line and the number 16. The notation includes various note values, rests, and dynamic markings, typical of a classical symphony score.

The image displays a musical score for a symphony, likely by Beethoven, in G major and 4/4 time. The score is arranged in two systems. The first system includes staves for Flauti traversieri, Fagotto, Corni ex D, Violino I, Violino II, and Basso. The second system continues the score with a grand staff (treble and bass clefs) and a piano part. The music is characterized by intricate rhythmic patterns, including sixteenth and thirty-second notes, and a strong emphasis on chromaticism, particularly in the piano part. The key signature is one sharp (F#), and the time signature is 4/4.

It is quite possible that Domenico Scarlatti’s keyboard sonatas of the 1730s and 1740s may have been influential with regard to the minor dominant within a major mode piece, since his works were well known throughout Europe in numerous editions. Scarlatti is famous for his musical portrayals of Spanish gypsy music in these one-movement sonatas, several of which have the initial period of their second harmonic area in the minor dominant (one of the most famous of these is his Sonata in D major, K. 96). Invariably, the closing areas articulate the major dominant as they do in the Viennese symphonies and other works later in the century.¹¹

¹¹Not only keyboard sonatas of the 1730s use this device, but Italian *opera buffa* as well. One of the most

Historically, a composers' choice to begin the second harmonic area in the minor dominant can be seen as a further evolution of the older *pianoidée* technique to destabilize the first harmonic area in the tonic through the parallel minor, the modal switch initiating the bridge into the second harmonic area. But using the parallel minor to achieve tension also creates an instability so jolting that it can easily compromise the hegemony of the major tonic. (Incidentally, this may occur in both major and minor modes; for example, see Gluck's overture to his reform opera *Alceste* in D minor with a second harmonic area in A minor and in 6/4 position!, not to mention the most famous example, the minor relative area of the opening movement of Beethoven's C minor piano sonata Op. 13, "The Pathétique".)

Composers found that they could accomplish the same destabilizing effect of switching into the minor tonic as in a *pianoidée*, by operating against the dominant, a harmony of lesser structural weight than the tonic. At the same time, the motion into the minor dominant invited a concomitant shift of system down three signatures, similar to the previous motion into the parallel tonic minor. The minor dominant, and its implication of flats, could easily introduce the missing pitch of the tonic system, the flat third degree. Even so, the motion into the minor dominant for the purpose of creating harmonic tension, with its subsequent release into the

popular and influential operas in the entire eighteenth century was Pergolesi's *La Serva Padrona* (1733), an intermezzo in two acts. The first act finale (a duet) features a move into the minor dominant (this is later recapitulated in the tonic minor), however, the passage in this instance appears *after* the major dominant has been achieved.

closing periods in the parallel major (along with the correction of system back to that of the tonic), had its own dramatic drawbacks, especially if the composer was looking to have the movement's climax occur in the development section. Perhaps even more importantly, the effect of moving into the parallel tonic or parallel dominant minor for an extended period, could easily have become clichéd by sheer repetition from one piece to another. (Even Vivaldi's use of the *pianoidée*, though historically significant, was not all that common when one considers his entire oeuvre.) Wagenseil's solution — introducing the flat third degree as an augmented sixth as a single verticality rather than as an extended melodic period to announce, as it were, the arrival of the structural dominant — was much more practical and definitely more contrapuntally convincing.

As indicated previously, the minor dominant period in Monn's D major symphony that initiates the second harmonic area, effectively delays confirmation of the major dominant until the second half of m. 16, and is not fully secured with a root-position triad until m. 19, the last measure of the exposition. Thus the structural dominant occurs just before the double bar, a reminder of early eighteenth-century binary dance forms that were still influential on sonata-form movements of Viennese composers well past the middle of the century.

Monn's Symphony in B major is atypical in some respects, yet is an excellent example of a piece that could have had a considerable impact on Haydn. In some respects, the procedure of delaying the dominant arrival in Monn's B major symphony is closer to Wagenseil's than that used by Monn in his own D major symphony. Aside from an atypical tonic key, this symphony is also in triple meter, somewhat unusual but not unknown in early Viennese symphonies (although not so unusual in the first movements of symphonies by Haydn). Monn begins with a four-measure statement which is answered by a four-measure counterstatement and followed by an

eight-measure expansion of tonic harmony. A bridge begins in m. 16 and continues for another 12 measures, without securing the dominant cadence in F# major until m. 28, which coincides with the beginning of a four-measure codetta.

In summary, both Wagenseil and Monn delay any strong emphasis of the second harmonic area until the codetta of the exposition. In Wagenseil's symphonic works, such a scheme is accomplished either by avoiding a strong articulation of the dominant in first period or by delaying its arrival in the new harmonic area altogether through the expansion of the bridge; there is hardly a break in the texture of the exposition. Such a seamless quality allows one to hear the arrival of the second harmonic area structurally delayed through an auxiliary cadence. Often, in Monn's works, the dominant is presented in the minor mode initially (a possible influence from Scarlatti as mentioned above), usually with a concurrent thinning of the orchestration to a trio texture, not unlike the thinning of the texture typical of Vivaldi's *pianoidée* ritornello segments. However, in Monn's works, the initiation of the auxiliary cadence is sometimes announced by a bridge cadence and a rest before the harmonic change, a stylistic convention used by both J. Stamitz in Mannheim and by J. C. Bach in London, as well as by Leopold and Wolfgang Mozart in Salzburg. Both Wagenseil's and Monn's works are still very much in the earlier style of the slightly expanded binary form. Lastly, no matter how the missing pitch of the tonic system is introduced, either as a complete thematic statement in the minor dominant or as an augmented sixth to V, its introduction is always a dramatic event of some harmonic significance.

