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To play Classical works on a modern piano instead of a contemporary forte-piano means making a translation of sorts. As in any translation, one loses part of the original meaning in the process. The modern player, like a translator, faces two problems: relative unfamiliarity with the language, because two centuries of history have blurred the picture, and a modern instrument which ‘pronounces the musical words’ differently. The first problem is unrelated to the instrument, as it is a question of understanding the musical language. We can solve the second problem when we have a ‘native speaker’ who pronounces the language for us: in this case, the eighteenth century fortepiano. Instead of taking Mozart’s and Beethoven’s notation as the complete and unalterable truth, we must take into account that some aspects of their style could not be notated. Treatises of the time support this assumption: for instance, all treatises before 1800 agree that the application of dynamics belongs to the domain of the performer. As a result, early scores show little or no dynamics at all. The dynamics that are notated are, almost without exception, very general.

Pianists of all times have, of course, instinctively understood this: besides dynamics, elements such as timing, rhythm (as opposed to meter), tone colour, tempo, *tempo rubato*, pedalling, balance between the hands, drive and direction, and subtle, speech-like accentuation, cannot be adequately recorded in our musical notation. But the degree to which these unwritten liberties have been exploited has diminished enormously in the two hundred years since Mozart died: with the disappearance of the improvising performer, performance of the Classical repertoire has become less free. Urtext editions have given a further blow to the artistic initiative of many performers: rather than looking for the (often hidden) meaning of the notation, musicians today often seem to literally follow the score while boasting ‘fidelity’ to the text. They take the notation as instructions, rather than descriptions. In this article I will attempt to set parameters for the use of one of these unwritten liberties, namely dynamics.1

1. Understanding early dynamics

*Often no dynamics at all*

In much of the early keyboard repertory until ca. 1750, hardly any or no dynamics are notated, even in scores for two manual harpsichords and organ. In fact, one does not even find dynamics in scores for instruments that are highly dynamic, for instance, the Bach Suites for harpsichord, cello or flute.

Bach’s two part Inventions and three part Sinfonias, written for the clavichord, were specifically meant for students to achieve a singing quality of playing: “Am allermeisten aber eine cantabile Art im Spielen zu erlangen.” Yet Bach did not notate any dynamics.
In early Classical repertory there is a similar lack of notated dynamics. Dynamics were, nonetheless, considered to be of great importance: when Carl Philipp Emanuel Bach summarizes the elements of performance, he mentions dynamics first. Haydn never indicated dynamics in his keyboard sonatas until the six Auenbrugger Sonatas, Hob. XVI/35–39 and 20, published in 1780. Even if it is true that these pieces were written with the harpsichord in mind, this does not explain the similar lack of dynamics in string quartets, symphonies and chamber music from the same period. This did not immediately change with the advent of classicism and the fortepiano, for which composers like C.P.E. Bach, Mozart or Clementi created a powerfully rhetorical, theatrical and, accordingly, dynamic style.

Mozart was one of the first composers to start notating dynamics in the keyboard works. It is very likely that this had to do with the fact that his works were written with publication in mind. But even so, some of his (as well as of contemporaries’) later repertory for the fortepiano still did not have dynamic markings. The Sonata in C Major, K. 330 (1781–83, published in 1784), has very few, and his late Sonata K. 545 (1788) – including a highly expressive second movement – has not a single dynamic marking. The genesis of this sonata, described by Mozart himself in his thematic catalogue as ‘for beginners’, may have something to do with that: it was not published in Mozart’s lifetime and first appeared in print in 1805.

Character

If there are any dynamic markings in early scores, they are often found at the opening of the piece. The only dynamics one initially finds are forte and piano; they seem to indicate character rather than dynamics. C.P.E. Bach explains why these two, seemingly extreme markings, are sufficient, as they carry the possibility of a much broader range of dynamics. In his Klavierschule (1789), Daniel Gottlieb Türk (1750–1813) confirms that “to indicate every single passage which should be played somewhat louder or softer as the previous or next one, is absolutely impossible [...]” Besides, there are many types of p or f; this even applies to the basic
dynamic level of a piece. Particularly interesting is the ‘Anmerkung’ (comment) following this paragraph in which he warns against an absolute interpretation of the indication of a general dynamic level. This is exactly what happened half a century ago when literal interpretation of the $p$ and $f$ markings lead to the (soon outdated) ‘terrace dynamics’.

Many scores before 1800 lack an opening dynamic. Nevertheless, the performer is expected to choose a dynamic which brings out the character. In the language of the early Classical style (ca 1750–1790), for a slow movement, $piano$ and, for a lively allegro the marking, $forte$ is implied. But how loud one really should play depends on the very personal interpretation of the character. Typically, the second motive has a contrasting marking. Similarly, slow movements often have no piano marking.


What if there is an opening dynamic?

It follows that with an unusual opening character, the composer will need to indicate an opening dynamic. In C.P.E. Bach’s Für Kenner und Liebhaber he often asks for a forte opening of a $Larghetto$ or an $Allegretto$, which would normally be played $piano$.


Mozart loved surprising his audience this way, as shown by his letter on the Paris Symphony K. 297, in particular concerning the dynamical effect in his last movement Allegro: “Having observed that all last as well as first allegros here begin together with all the other instruments, and generally $unisono$, mine commenced with only two violins, piano for the first eight bars, followed instantly by a forte; the audience, as I expected, called out ‘hush!’ at the soft beginning, and the instant the forte was heard began to clap their hands.” Mozart uses a similar effect in the presto last movement of the Sonata in A Minor, K. 310 (also written in Paris in 1778) and in the K. 279 and K. 333 Sonatas, where he contrasts an imaginary soloist with the orchestral $tutti$. 
**The performer’s domain**

Not surprisingly, treatises of the second half of the 18th century treat dynamics as the performer’s domain as well. Leopold Mozart leaves no doubt about the responsibility of the performer: “The prescribed piano and forte must be observed most exactly [...] one must know how to change from piano to forte without directions and of one’s own accord [...]” Johann Joachim Quantz says that one of the duties of the accompanist is to understand the dynamics. He recommends the fortepiano over the harpsichord, since it is so much easier to follow the dynamics of the soloist. At the same time: “It may often happen that you must unexpectedly bring out or soften a note, even if nothing is indicated.”

Johann Adam Hiller in his *Anweisung zum musikalisch-ziertlichen Gesänge* (1750) explains why there are no markings of intermediate dynamics. The difference does not need to be as large as piano and forte, because “there are so many intermediate degrees that we do not have enough names to indicate them all. All of these should be within the power of a good singer.”

Türk uses the same argument and adds: “The performer must [...] himself learn to feel and judge which degree of loudness and softness reinforces the character that needs to be expressed. The added piano and forte only indicate the expression roughly and in a general way.” Even at end of the 18th century, Johann Peter Milchmeyer says that the many degrees of dynamics are hardly ever notated and can only be understood fully by a “very accomplished performer”.

**Understanding the musical language**

While in the 18th century the application of refined dynamics is considered to be within the expressive domain of the performer, there are many ways in which composers did indicate dynamics implicitly. Many of these implications are straightforward and in fact described in most treatises, even though modern day performers may not always take the hint. The crucial factor is that understanding the implications for dynamics in the score relies on our understanding of the musical language. Shaping the musical language by way of dynamics is done on three levels: diction or articulation, phrasing, and structure.

**Diction: speaking the music**

In order to ‘speak’ each musical ‘word’ (the musical motive) correctly, we need to design the correct emphasis (both accentuation and length). This accentuation depends on the harmonic tension within a musical motive, its gesture, articulation, and the melodic dissonance and consonance. Furthermore, the motive is placed strategically within the bar, which means that rhythm and meter play a role. Haydn, master of diction, uses this last rhetorical device often. The opening theme of his London Sonata in C Major, Hob. XVI/52 is displaced in the development. The subtle change in accentuation changes the nature of the theme. Other striking examples are found at the end of the expositions of Sonata Hob. XVI/32 in B Minor and Hob. XVI/46 in A-flat Major.

Generally speaking, the first beat receives the greatest weight. In case a motive lasts for more than one bar, therefore containing two downbeats, the performer must determine which of the two beats is the ‘good’ and which one is the ‘bad’ downbeat. There is no Classical repertory in which the bars are not paired in either a good and bad, or in a bad and good bar, or in four bar groups in which the
third is the heavy bar. In addition, four bar groups often occur in development sections where they create a larger flow. Of course composers play with this standard phraseology and exceptions often occur.

Creating a climax: shaping the phrase

Any musical phrase has but one climax. In order to understand where this climax takes place, the performer needs to consider the harmony, the harmonic rhythm, and the melody.

The standard Classical phrase has a regular structure of 8 bars (2+2+4) in which there is a first small highpoint in m. 3, or on the downbeat of m. 4, with the phrase climax in m. 7. While towards 1800 this climax often is identified by the composer with dynamic markings and/or accentuation, there is no such road...
map in the earlier Classical works. The working of the harmony being of prime importance, the performer would understand that the grammar of the phrase necessitates a dynamic development, resulting in a crescendo–diminuendo towards, and from, the highpoint.

The first motive (two bars) of the opening theme of Haydn’s Sonata in C Minor, Hob. XVI/20 consists of four slurred gestures. The first starts on a consonance on the tonic, while the second, one step higher on the scale, is more dissonant and therefore receives more stress; the first bar has a crescendo, although each slur in itself is diminuendo. The third gesture, on the downbeat of measure 2, is the heaviest of the four, with the most expressive and relatively loudest start of the slur and the largest diminuendo towards the end of the slur. Measure 2 is therefore the good bar and measure one the bad bar. The fourth gestural slur on I6/4 is the arrival point, but still less loud than the downbeat. Its release and diminuendo to V7 on the forth beat completes the first two bars of the opening phrase; the second bar has an overall diminuendo.

The next two bars build up in a similar way, through measure 3, and arrive at the first, minor climax of the 8 bar phrase on the downbeat of bar 4, illustrated by the expressive notation of the dissonance on the downbeat (the appogiatura), aided by the Praller on the second eighth note of the bar, which reinforces the release. Bar 5 seems to parallel bar 1, but the ascent of bar five continues in bar 6 and develops into a rhetorical question to end on the 6 – a questioning harmony – on the third beat. All three ascending, questioning figures may be subsequently louder. Together with the rocket upbeat (with great direction but itself diminuendo), this is a perfect rhetorical set-up for the climax of this phrase on the downbeat of bar 7 (the third bar of the 4 bar group 5–6–7–8), after which each following gesture works towards a release of the tension: bar 7–8 is diminuendo.

Structure: shaping the story

The structure of the piece could be termed as ‘the way in which the story unfolds’: how the phrases follow each other, the development of the harmonic tension from one phrase to the next, how the various characters interact (the rhetorical “dialogue”). As a result, the tension – and with that, the dynamics – rises and decreases and may flow away at points of arrival.

2. Implied dynamics

Early fortepiano style

Johann Joachim Quantz’s comments “Of the keyboardist in particular” may have been addressed to his resident colleague C.P.E. Bach. Or perhaps he learned these dynamic strategies from Bach: “On a harpsichord with one keyboard, passages marked piano may be produced by a moderate touch and by diminishing the number of parts, those marked mezzo forte by doubling the bass in octaves, those marked forte in the same manner and also by taking some consonances belonging to the chord into the left hand, and those marked fortissimo by quick arpeggiation of the chords from below upwards, by the same doubling of octaves and the consonances in the left hand [...]”.

Similarly, in early piano repertory the number of notes has an impact on the volume: more notes means louder, fewer notes means softer. Deeper (as well as
more) basses allow for greater volume, and melodies in octaves have a potential to be louder; consequently, it is safe to assume that a Classical composer asks for a louder context when the basses are deeper and the melody is written in octaves. On the first page of the first movement of his Sonata in D Major, Opus 10 no. 3 Beethoven indicates but one crescendo and not a single diminuendo. But when texture and articulation are taken into account, a pattern of flexible dynamics arises from the page.

In measure 2, the double unisons become quadruple unisons, causing a crescendo within the prevalent piano character. The \( sf \) in m. 4 is the climax of a (perhaps minimal) crescendo.

The second phrase climaxes on a dissonant D-sharp syncopation in m. 8 (the last note of line 1) which releases in the next bar. The tension build-up towards the D-sharp implies a crescendo, again within the piano character. This tension comes to the foreground in the forte of the third phrase, where another crescendo is implied when the hands of the pianist diverge: the right hand rising and the left hand descending, a rhetorical gesture often found in the Classical style. The climax of this phrase is in m. 15 (line 2, m. 7). The tonic D chord in m. 16 has less tension than the dominant on m. 15 and can therefore not be the loudest chord. Finally, the fourth phrase has a notated crescendo. Now the performer is asked to develop from the piano to forte character, aided again by the increasing number of unisons, and create three consecutive fortissimo accents, the last one forming a climax on the quadruple\(^15\) F-sharp in m. 22 (3rd line, m. 6).

Ornamentation stressing a dissonance or de-stressing a consonance on a harmonic release is still important in the early Classical style, as shown in many of the works of C.P.E. Bach and Haydn, but increasingly less in the works of Mozart and Beethoven.

In the \textit{Empfindungen}, perhaps C.P.E. Bach’s most important work for solo keyboard, the ornaments must be understood within the context of dynamics. The turn on the first D de-emphasizes a release from the dissonant E-flat to D. The turn on the second D stresses the increasing dissonance of the repeated D on the I\(\frac{6}{4}\) harmony, becoming V7 on the second line and finally releasing to G Minor (second line, beat 2). After 1800 this type of ornamentation vanished little by little from piano scores.
Dissonance and consonance

Before 1800, the natural difference in dynamic level between a dissonance and a consonance was never indicated as it was understood: it reflects the normal accentuation of speech. Every treatise before 1800 mentions that a dissonance is to be played louder than the resulting consonance. Quantz: “The more, then, that a dissonance is distinguished and set off from the other notes in playing, the more it affects the ear.” 16 C.P.E. Bach agrees whole-heartedly. 17 His Sonata in G Major from the fourth Volume of Kenner und Liebhaber opens on the first downbeat with a melodic dissonance on top of the harmonic dissonance (V); the second downbeat has a melodic dissonance on a harmonic consonance (I). Both dissonances are gently louder than their resolutions, but the downbeat of ‘bad’ bar 2 (de-emphasized by an ornament) is more relaxed and therefore less loud than the downbeat of bar 1, the ‘good’ bar. Naturally, the piano indication reinforces this dynamic pattern.

The correct performance of the slur

The rapid decay of the fortepiano tone is perhaps the most audible difference between the fortepiano and the modern piano. On a modern piano the tone has a soft attack, develops slowly, and sings for a long time before gradually dying away. The fortepiano tone has a sharp attack and fades quickly, which makes a natural articulation with the next tone easy and logical. The fortepiano touch is therefore fundamentally non-legato. If a performer on a five-octave fortepiano (all repertory from the period ca. 1750–1800) wants to play a sounding legato, the only way to do it is by playing diminuendo: the dynamic level of each new note then matches the rapidly decaying sound of the previous note.

But this diminuendo performance of the slur is not limited to the fortepiano alone: it is a key feature of the Classical style. In his Versuch einer gründlichen Violinschule of 1755 (published in 1756), Leopold Mozart makes an enormous
effort to impress on the reader the correct execution of the slur: he explains it in various words no less than 11 times within the treatise.

“[...] Now if in a musical composition two, three, four, and even more notes be bound together by the half circle, so that one recognizes therefrom that the composer wishes the notes to not to be separated but played singingly in one slur, the first of such united notes must be somewhat more strongly stressed, but the remainder slurred onto it quite smoothly and more and more quietly.”18

This execution of the slur will make the performance articulated, clear and light; but also the flow of the piece will change, the gesturing will be more outspoken and will gain in local expressive rubato (the beginning of each slur). The result is a colourful classicism rather than a lush romanticism.

The most occurring slur is the two-note slur, the so-called Seufzer (sospiro, sigh). The Seufzer is a key signifier to the entire Classical musical language and plays a prominent role in the music of Haydn, Mozart, Beethoven and all their contemporaries. But even after 1800 the Seufzer, although less in the foreground, can be found in music of all composers. Leopold Mozart’s two elements defining any slur are crucial to the effect of the Seufzer. The first note (often dissonant) is louder and longer than the second, which is (in Mozart’s words) “slurred onto it quite smoothly and quietly, and somewhat late.” This leads to a refined rubato, which in a string of Seufzers may cause an lilting effect, reminiscent of the French inégale. The sweetness and delicateness of this figure explains why Seufzers appear so abundantly in the clavichord works of C.P.E. Bach and early Josef Haydn.


Register

Like the human voice, the early fortepiano has registers; the soprano is delicate, bright, and transparent; the tenor (in which most of the melodies takes place) has a richer tone, the alto and bass registers are increasingly rich and gain in volume as well as length of the tone. The treble does not have a long lasting tone, while its delicacy does not accommodate loud playing. Loudness in the high treble is only possible if the texture allows for it, e.g. a loud and full bass, an active middle voice, a harmonic pattern which allows for ample use of the pedal, and/or a melody in octaves.

In Haydn’s rhetorical Sonata in A-flat Major, Hob. XVI/46 (1768) the high note E-flat on beat three (m. 1) is ornamented from above to soften the interval; the dissonant appoggiatura is played on the beat. The trills in bar two and three de-emphasize the release of the three Seufzer gestures. The sixteenth note gesture in bar 4 starts with a leap of a third from the first to the second note. This is typical for the period: a high note comes after the heavier downbeat and is therefore lifted. Also, in measures 5, 6, and 7 the highest notes are also the lightest notes. The high
C\textsuperscript{III} in m. 9 is lifted from the appoggiatura, again on the beat, and can therefore be performed \textit{delicato}, in accordance with the character of the second phrase.


As indeed in all of his keyboard works, most high notes on the first page of Mozart’s Sonata in B-flat Major, K. 333 do not fall on a heavy beat. Of course, Mozart knows how to create a climax on a high note. This climax will need to take place on a heavy beat and must be sufficiently supported by middle voice and bass. In m. 9 there is a climax on F\textsuperscript{III}, the highest note of Mozart’s piano.


Beethoven, using the same five-octave piano as Mozart until ca. 1800 and therefore bound to the same dynamical restrictions in the treble as Mozart, nevertheless wrote very spectacular and loud passages in the treble. In order to not overplay the instrument, he needed to revert to the same techniques as Mozart.

The Alberti Bass starting in m. 21 of the third movement of the \textit{Moonlight Sonata} provides a powerful \textit{agitato} energy. With the start of the crescendo, the right hand melody is written in octaves. When \textit{sforzandos} are indicated, the bass descends lower and lower, allowing for more \textit{forte}. Modern performance has it that this melody can be performed as a lyrical melody, with a rather suppressed left hand. Indeed, the left hand easily gets too loud on a modern instrument, but on the five-octave Viennese fortepiano, the energy and tension arising from a loud and driving left hand is the key element of the \textit{agitato}. 
3. Touch

In Beethoven’s Sonata in B-flat Major, Opus 81a, (Les Adieux), the 1953 Henle Urtext edition gives continuous dots for the left hand, where originally there were just wedges on the first five left hand figures. It seems that Beethoven intended the diminuendo after the highpoint in m. 19 to be achieved not only by bringing down the volume, but also by softening the touch.

Similarly, when Beethoven’s accentuation, dynamics and pedaling in mm. 37-44 in the third movement are interpreted as lessening the energy, the result is a diminuendo.
In the first edition, the first four quarter notes are marked $ff$, $sf$ and have a wedge. The next four (in the same pedal) are still $ff$ but without the wedge and $sf$. The next four (mm. 40-41) are $ff$ with wedges, no $sf$. In the new pedal these notes will therefore be less loud. The last four have no wedges and no $sf$. The net result is an 8 bar diminuendo, leading to the $p$ of the the next passage (although the character change still makes a dynamical break logical). This notation is ‘completed’, and therefore corrupted, in the 1953 Henle Urtext.

4. Interpreting dynamics

When in early repertory dynamics are lacking or notated very generally, the point of departure should be that the dynamics can be completed through interpretation. But dynamics that are notated may have a meaning beyond what is expected.

**Tempo rubato**

Türk identifies a specific type of *tempo rubato* in his treatise *Klavierschule* (1789), which is indicated with dynamics. He mentions how one of the possible occurrences of *tempo rubato* is when the metrical accent on a ‘good’ note is transferred to an off-beat, or a ‘bad’ note: “These passages would work poorly when the notes are played exactly according to their notated length. The important notes must be played slow and louder, the less important fast and weaker […].”


Exactly this type of passage appears in Mozart’s Sonata in C Minor, K. 475, second movement, which is full of *rubato*. There is little doubt that this is an integral part of Mozart’s style (as well as, in my opinion, the entire Classical style).


**Counter accentuation**

The slur nowadays stands exclusively for *legato*, lyricism, or phrasing; the additional features of the slur signifying dynamics, (harmonic or melodic) stress and relaxation, or rubato may lead to an entirely different understanding. In his discussion of the correct performance of the slur, C.P.E. Bach mentions that the slur can create an accent against the metrical beat. Leopold Mozart shows a four bar passage for which he proposes no less than 34 different bowings.
Mozart explains how the extraordinary bowings in no. 11 change “the entire performance” because the heavier first note of each slur falls on a weak beat.  


This leads to a surprising conclusion, namely that the regular accentuation in a bar may be changed. If the eccentric and striking slurs in the opening of the Scherzo of Beethoven’s Sonata in G Major, Opus 14 No. 2 are performed according to 18th century performance practice, the meter of the first two bars is not 3/8 but 2/8; the first note – the beginning of a slur, and therefore heavy – sounds as a downbeat; the same can be said of the beginning of the second slur, and so on. The last note of bar 2 (C-sharp⁷) is articulated apart from the notes before and after. This note, not belonging to the key of G Major, interrupts the 2/8 pulse. Next, when understood in the 2/8 meter, the first beat of bar 3 is long, and the slur includes the downbeat of bar 4. As there can be no accent under the slur, other than the first note, the 2/8 meter cannot be continued. The listener suddenly understands that he has been fooled by the 2/8 meter and that it really should be a 3/8. The fact that bar 4 has no real downbeat makes it possible to play this trick again in bars 5–8; this Scherzo is a rhythmical joke. It is a scherzo in the real sense of the word, befitting a composer like Beethoven.

This is part 1 of a two-art article. Part 2 will deal with Messa di voce, Crescendo as rinforzando, Decrescendo vs. diminuendo in Schubert, The question of subito piano, and Subito fortissimo.
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Notes:

1 In this article I will not comment on accentuation markings, nor on dynamics which may imply the use of a pedal (like $ppp$, which may indicate the use of the moderator pedal in early romantic works).


9 Türk, D.G. *Klavierschule*, Ch. 6 Part III, §29, p. 348.


11 ‘Gut’ and ‘Schlicht’, translated erroneously by ‘good’ and ‘bad’ instead of ‘good’ and ‘slight’.

12 Exceptions occur, e.g. when repeated accents create a climax or the number of bars is irregular.

13 See further down under ‘The correct performance of the slur’.

14 Türk, J.J. *On Playing the Flute*, Ch. XVII Section VI, §17, p. 259.

15 The prudent publisher of this sonata stayed within the five octave range of the standard instrument of his time. However, new instruments had already been equipped with the F-sharp$\#$ and G$\#$.


19 Possibly the placement of this sf is more subtle than Henle likes to think and is meant for the second sixteenth note in the right hand.

20 Türk, D.G. *Klavierschule*, Ch. 6 Part V, §72, p. 375.

21 Türk, D.G. *Klavierschule*, Ch. 6 Part V, §72. Also see Haydn Sonata in C Minor, Hob. XVI/20. (1771), first movement, m. 14.

22 Bach, C.P.E. *Versuch* [is this the complete title?], Part I (1753), Ch. III: ‘Vom Vortrage’, p. 94, §18.


24 Mozart, W.A. *Versuch* [see above], Ch. 7, §20, p. 136. See also Türk *Klavierschule*, Ch 6, Part II, §13.