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Abstract

This study investigates the use of a small-scale musical pattern, known as the Fonte, in the work of early nineteenth-century composers. This pattern, or schema, comprises a two-stage descending sequence, which can frequently be found in minuets and similarly structured movements throughout the eighteenth century. My work demonstrates that this schema remained in wide circulation in the first few decades of the 1800s, suggesting that those years may have had more in common stylistically with the preceding century than traditional narratives of “Classical” and “Romantic” periods make out. Such narratives may lead to an arbitrary division more or less at the year 1800 or to the transitional view of those early years as Romanticism-to-be, dominated by Beethoven. However, in drawing on the works of around twenty composers, I have tried to convey a sense of the vibrancy of musical life in Europe at this time, and, by the common thread of the Fonte, to show a stronger connection, in terms of the elements of composition, to the preceding century.

The idea that the Fonte and numerous other small-scale schemata were available to eighteenth-century composers, and employed by them in conventional configurations, is discussed in *Music in the Galant Style* (2007), by Robert O. Gjerdingen. My research draws heavily on his work, and although I examine only one schema, my findings nevertheless highlight the manner in which Gjerdingen’s theory of shared schemata provides an alternative to the “masterwork”-centred view of music, preoccupied with internal motivic relationships and claims of “influence” between “masterworks” rather than connection to stylistic common property.

This study is divided into two parts, the first addressing some of the theoretical concerns, including a comprehensive description of the Fonte itself as well as a discussion of some of the issues surrounding the role of the listener in schema-based music. The second part presents case studies of the Fonte as used by four composers: Beethoven, Hummel, Schubert and Chopin. These chapters analyse in detail the different ways composers presented the Fonte, giving rise to questions of what effect those differences had and of how the schema itself may have come to change over time.
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Chapter One

Introduction

In his book *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style* Leonard G. Ratner devotes a short chapter to what he describes ‘small two-reprise forms’. Made up of two equal or unequal parts (the first and second reprises) separated by repeat signs, the form can serve as a plan for works on any scale but is particularly clear in short dances such as minuets. Minuet, in this case, refers not to the overall combination of minuet–trio–minuet, but to its constituent minuet or trio. He offers two outlines of its harmonic layout:

- I–I, X–I when the middle cadence is in the tonic
- I–V, X–I when the middle cadence is in on the dominant

In both cases X, chosen at option by the composer, represents the approach to the final close in the tonic.

For the X section, which begins the second reprise, Ratner notes that numerous harmonic possibilities are available, so he turns to Joseph Riepel (1709–1782) for a description. Riepel, who served as chapel master to the Prince of Thurn und Taxis at Regensburg, published in his 1755 treatise *Grundregeln zur Tonordnung* examples of what he deemed to be appropriate options for this part of a minuet. He did not invent these options, but he gave them memorable names that convey their processes aptly. The *Monte*, Italian for a mountain or a rise, represents an ascending sequential progression and the *Ponte*, a bridge, signifies a passage that stays on the dominant; the *Fonte* is a well or source which we must climb down into and which in musical terms means a descending sequential progression. Riepel does not describe these options in words, so definitions may instead be inferred from his numerous examples, with one of each represented in Ex. 1.1:

---

2 Ibid., p. 209.
Ex. 1.1. Riepel’s Monte, Ponte and Fonte

Since Ratner, others have also written on this subject. William E. Caplin has noted that these three options were standard in the eighteenth century, though without reference to Riepel. He mentions that the ‘contrasting middle’ of a minuet (the start of its second reprise) begins frequently with ‘model-sequence’ techniques or by ‘standing on the dominant’. In his 2007 publication *Music in the Galant Style* Robert O. Gjerdingen revisits Riepel’s threefold prescription, writing a chapter on each of the three choices. His findings not only confirm that they were frequently employed after the double bar in two-reprise forms, but that they were used in other contexts as well. Taking this book as a point of departure, my own research prior to this study has likewise offered evidence that the Monte, Ponte and Fonte were not only widely used in minuets, but that they were also presented in a variety of ways.

---


Continuing from this work, I have isolated the Fonte as sole subject matter for the current study, favouring it over the Monte and Ponte for several reasons. To begin with, no recognisable melodic component emerges from Riepel’s examples of the Ponte, so it is less distinct than the Fonte and Monte. In addition to this, its length is constrained only by the exigencies of a movement’s overall harmonic plan, whereas the Fonte and Monte tend to be only a few bars long, divided into two even parts. This makes the Ponte – as Riepel describes it, in any case – arguably the most form-dependent of the three. One is thereby limited in where one might look for Pontes, for the general prevalence of dominant prolongation in tonal music stands in the way of one’s drawing meaningful conclusions about its apparent use outside the context of minuets. Of the two sequences, the Fonte is simply the more widespread, so my choosing it over the Monte is motivated by the practical concern of being able to obtain a healthy sample.

To give the reader an impression of how the Fonte was manifested in different compositions, Exx. 1.2–1.4 provide a small but representative indication from throughout the eighteenth century, from across Europe and from different genres:

Ex. 1.2. J.S. Bach, Brandenburg Concerto No. 6, BWV 1050 (1718), iii: Allegro, bars 22–24

Gjerdingen situates the Monte, Ponte and Fonte within a larger inventory of stock patterns, or schemata, which were not only available to galant composers, but were in fact at the centre of their *modus operandi*. Although his survey ranges roughly from 1720 to 1780, his conception of the galant style is not defined by historical boundaries. Rather, the theory he advances is that ‘a hallmark of the galant style was a particular repertory of stock musical phrases employed in conventional sequences’. Aside from Riepel’s explicit contribution, the repertory Gjerdingen identifies is for the most part built up of figures which

---

8 Sourced from Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style*, p. 65.
may be recognisable to modern ears but have not previously been codified and named in a systematic manner. An initial stimulus for Gjerdingen is found in the work of Leonard B. Meyer, who, in a similar vein, described a pattern that frequently occurs in eighteenth-century music and, to a lesser extent, in that of the nineteenth. His ‘archetype’, in which a paired $\hat{1}-\hat{7}$, $\hat{4}-\hat{3}$ melodic structure is elaborated over a I–V, V–I bass, was extensively investigated by Gjerdingen in A Classic Turn of Phrase, where he surveyed its historical distribution and development.\textsuperscript{11} He has now dubbed this schema the Meyer in honour of his former teacher.

Musical training is put forward as the principal force behind the dissemination of these patterns, whose source Gjerdingen locates in the Italian, primarily Neapolitan, tradition of partimento that flourished in the early to mid-eighteenth century. These pedagogical manuscripts taught musicians to improvise over frequently unfigured basses, a skill which involved being able to recognise what patterns they implied. Giorgio Sanguinetti, author of The Art of Partimento, explains the link between partimento and composition: ‘To play an unfigured partimento, [students] had to memorize a remarkably – but not overwhelmingly – large number of tonal schemata (or paradigms); these paradigms would become a repertoire of compositional routines that made up the basic materials for their works’.\textsuperscript{12}

One Neapolitan maestro who wrote numerous partimenti was Francesco Durante (1684–1755), and the following partially figured extract from his Regole, or rules, shows a Fonte in bars 3–6. I have shown brackets on the score to indicate the sequence’s pattern and transposition:

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
Ex. 1.5. Durante, Regole di partimenti numerati e diminuiti, Illustration No. 34 (ca. 1740), bars 1–6

As part of their education, students in the Neapolitan conservatories would copy figures into their *zibaldone*, their manuscript collection of rules, exercises, notes and sketches, so many partimenti were never published. Skills were largely acquired through lessons and rote learning, which makes tracing and dating partimenti problematic, given that oral transmission leaves no concrete evidence for the historian. Nevertheless, the tradition was already established in the late seventeenth century and remained healthy for most of the eighteenth, with one of its most celebrated proponents, Fedele Fenaroli (1730–1818), being appointed *primo maestro* at the Neapolitan conservatory of Santa Maria di Loreto in 1777. In his fourth book of partimenti, possibly around thirty years after Durante’s *Regole*, Fenaroli wrote the bass for a Fonte. My brackets again indicate the pattern and transposition of the sequence:

Ex. 1.6. Fenaroli, *Partimenti*, Book IV, No. 1, bars 10–17

---

15 Ibid., p. 34.
16 Excerpted from ibid., p. 177.
Fenaroli’s partimenti did get published and in fact enjoyed a spectacular print run from 1775 until as late as 1933, although they have since sat in obscurity until only fairly recently.\textsuperscript{17} Gjerdingen’s assessment is that ‘Fenaroli thus served as a bridge between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, passing on the Neapolitan repertory of galant schemata’.\textsuperscript{18} However, as partimenti were originally accompanied by verbal instruction, their issue in print indicates a shift in the way they were studied. From the 1820s, in fact, Fenaroli’s partimenti began to be published with realisations. Bass lines that had originally been conceived ‘to train the musical imagination became the left-hand parts of “piano pieces” to be read at the keyboard’.\textsuperscript{19} Furthermore, the content of pedagogical texts has not always been incorporated into compositions in a patently recognisable way, so the fact of composers studying partimento does not ensure that the patterns they contain will be reproduced. Gjerdingen’s statement must also be read with the understanding that schemata cannot have enjoyed so long a life as one that bridged two centuries without undergoing changes.

As early as 1765, Riepel tells us that ‘in many areas – even in the main musical centers – [the Fonte and Monte] were discarded long ago, much like fake coinage’.\textsuperscript{20} But there is an abundance of these patterns from this time and even well after, so perhaps he is referring to a specific aspect of his examples. As Jairo Moreno points out, it is unclear exactly what Riepel deemed so old-fashioned, whether perhaps the general contour of the model being transposed, the fact of its sequential transposition, or the combination of both.\textsuperscript{21} Heinrich Christoph Koch (1749–1816) voices a similar sentiment in the second volume of his \textit{Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition} of 1787. Transpositions like that in Ex. 1.7 are of a type that ‘were quite frequently used in older compositions, and to a certain extent have become obsolete; they are rather avoided in modern composition unless they appear in a new form’.\textsuperscript{22} Koch was evidently dissatisfied with directly translating the pattern, as the “improvement” that he provides (Ex. 1.8) varies the melodic content of the transposition:

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., p. 54.
\textsuperscript{18} Gjerdingen, \textit{Music in the Galant Style}, p. 226.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid., p. 479.
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{22} Quoted in ibid., p. 127.
Koch’s comments pertain only to transpositions by step, for the repetition of a pattern at other intervals, such as a third, was ‘sanctioned by current taste’. Of course, ‘current taste’ means the way Koch saw it, and Riepel’s pronouncements, though appearing merely to report the status quo, surely reflect his own perspective too. We should, therefore, never assume the judgements of two Germans on a pattern of probably Italian origin should represent all the tastes held in Europe during that time. In fact, people in other parts of Europe appear not to have concerned themselves with writing about matters of aesthetics and judgement in music nearly as much as they did in German centres, particularly in the north. Italian partimenti, for instance, though they were rich musical resources, had at most only laconic verbal explanations and even then of a primarily technical nature. The predominance of Germanophone music criticism at this time has shaped modern notions of music history, particularly when allied with the influential beliefs of the German Romantics. This calls for us to rethink numerous aspects of our received wisdom about music of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, for the legacy of German Romanticism has held enormous sway over the telling of music-historical narratives in the last hundred years and more. Musicological discourse and analysis have likewise been dominated by its ideology, a notion I discuss in greater depth in Chapter 3.

---

23 Sourced from ibid., p. 128.
24 Sourced from ibid., p. 133.
25 Quoted in ibid., p. 132.
Traditional narratives of music history have not only had a selective approach to repertoire, but have also, by strongly conveying ideas of periodisation, overemphasised the divisions between so-called Classical and Romantic music. There are, of course, many who seek to redress this view and, in so doing, challenge the seeming arbitrariness of the year 1800 as a music-historical turning point. Carl Dahlhaus, for instance, believes it is ‘patently wrong to claim of nineteenth-century composers, whether of light or of serious music, that they abandoned or broke the traditional universal codex of rules that governed compositional technique.’

Likewise, Friedrich Blume maintains that whatever the expressive ambitions of a composer may be, in order to ‘free himself from disordered fantasy and speak a comprehensible language, [he] nevertheless needs the techniques and forms of composition’, one reason why Blume speaks of a single ‘Classic-Romantic’ age.

Could those compositional techniques also have included the galant schemata that Gjerdingen identifies?

This study shows that they certainly did include the Fonte, but of more interest are the different ways in which the schema was realised. For all the similarity of rules, techniques and forms which Dahlhaus and Blume refer to, musical style nevertheless underwent change. Given that the Fonte was evidently still a valid compositional option in the early nineteenth century, how did it then keep up with musical developments? Moreno suggests we can understand criticisms such as Riepel’s and Koch’s as signs of ‘stylistic exhaustion: namely, that the response to a musical feature diminishes when this feature, having become hardened by overuse, turns more and more into a lifeless, monotonous scheme’. One of the chief aims of this study is to demonstrate how composers kept the Fonte from becoming perceived as lifeless and monotonous. Gjerdingen believes the way composers demonstrated originality was not by inventing new schemes but rather through the particular ways they presented existing ones, and thus response to those schemes is not diminished but rather stimulated over and again.

It is true that part of what gives Fonte its relatively long life is its ability to be transformed by variations the way Koch suggests, but the majority of the examples in this survey in fact feature direct melodic transposition. Other changes, such as harmonic ones, are introduced in several cases, but these often still permit the melodic pattern to be transposed with little or no alteration. This fact points to one of the elements of music – in the common-practice era as well as in much music, generally – which the Fonte underscores, and that is repetition. Felix Salzer notes that repetition ‘satisfies the urge to emphasize or the need for symmetry’ in much music and that even where deviations from a pattern occur in the repeated material, the existence of that pattern is nevertheless still communicated and ‘the principle of repetition [can still] assert itself strongly’.\(^{30}\) Though Salzer is referring here to structures of entire movements, his comments are applicable to smaller units as well. On one level, periodic phrase construction and other symmetrical groupings of bars reiterate metrical and often melodic units in most music of the common-practice era; on another level, Salzer’s statement applies equally to the Fonte itself. The change of pitch and mode in a Fonte (down from minor to major) means the repetition is of course never exact, but even where there is melodic alteration, repetition still takes place on other levels, such as that of harmonic rhythm or phrase structure, and often enough end-rhyme preserves the schema’s symmetry. Furthermore, the fact that the schema itself is so widely replicated as a stylistic element points to the notion, in Eugene Narmour’s words, that ‘[i]n terms of cognition, style is simply repetition’, with recognisable elements being learned by dint of their recurrence.\(^{31}\)

Another factor contributing to the Fonte’s success is its attachment to two-reprise forms. Though it can of course be used in different contexts, its long association with the minuet as described above makes it a part of what is inherited from that genre when other small forms such as the scherzo, mazurka, waltz or eclogue come to supplant it in the nineteenth century. These later genres may vary individually in formal arrangement, but they retain many of the features of minuet form, such as a central trio and the roughly two-reprise shape of the sections either side of, and including, the trio. That the Fonte should be retained here is no mere by-product of this inheritance. In the context of a two-reprise


\(^{31}\) Quoted in Vasili Byros, ‘Meyer’s Anvil: Revisiting the Schema Concept’, in *Music Analysis*, Vol. 31, No. 3 (Oct. 2012), p. 307. This new article has only just come to my attention very shortly before I am due to submit this thesis.
form, patterns like the Fonte and Monte at the start of the second reprise give us as listeners a clear indication of where we are in the form. Their sequential construction not only signifies the mid-point of a two-reprise form, but also indicates a digression away from a more stable key area as found commonly in “contrasting middle” or development sections of different movement types.

Yet in his theory of musical schemata, Gjerdingen is concerned with music in the eighteenth century, especially its middle half, and he has a definite societal context in mind – the aristocratic court. Music that was composed of conventional combinations of stock patterns, and presented in tasteful ways that reflected the decorum of court etiquette, constituted an ‘aesthetic commerce’ between musicians and their patrons.\textsuperscript{32} His galant listener is privileged with an insider’s knowledge of those patterns, so in the light of the social upheavals of the late eighteenth century, should we not expect that this system of schematic patterns would have fallen out of use, or at least lost its significance? Before one can begin to answer this question, one must ask whether it needs to be regarded as such an ‘esoteric’\textsuperscript{33} art.

Gjerdingen refers to each pattern as a schema, a term that denotes a mental, abstract representation of phenomena that share features in common. Once anyone has heard several Fontes, he or she can begin to form a schema that will make it possible to recognise new Fontes. Indeed, one of the properties of schemata as described by psychologist David Rumelhart is that they are ‘recognition devices’.\textsuperscript{34} This universal cognitive process opens the repertory to all, and Gjerdingen himself even believes that ‘these schemata were designed to be noticed by anyone who listened to enough of this music’.\textsuperscript{35} But what a listener may notice and what a composer may write are different matters. There is certainly an important interaction between composers and listeners (and players), and these and related issues are discussed in Chapter 3, but this study is primarily an investigation of how the Fonte was used by composers, which, after all, has concrete evidence as its starting point.

Yet the ability of the mind to form schemata is a crucial concept for this study, not only because I rely on the reader’s own schematic understanding (which I will help to form

\textsuperscript{32} Gjerdingen, \textit{Music in the Galant Style}, p. 16.
\textsuperscript{33} Ibid., p. 140.
\textsuperscript{34} Cited in Gjerdingen, \textit{A Classic Turn of Phrase}, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{35} Gjerdingen, \textit{Music in the Galant Style}, p. 15.
in Chapter 2) for my interpretations to be intelligible, but also because it is a mental process which will have occurred in the minds of composers too. There is evidence that partimenti and similar methods were used in many European centres in both the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, but the real test of the Fonte’s survival is in published compositions rather than in educational texts, for although music in the nineteenth century was ‘bound by seemingly incontrovertible laws, [they] were not sufficient to justify a work’s claim to artistic status’. Even if partimenti were studied by the composers whose works I have researched, the Fonte may equally have come to them through absorption from non-educational sources. We can therefore proceed with the aims of this study, irrespective of any social differences between composers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries or in their educational backgrounds.

Nevertheless, the Fonte does appear to be rooted in the galant style, and my discussion will frequently refer to those origins. This study in no way pretends to be able to say how much that entire style may have underpinned the music of later generations, or how much it may have become obsolete, but my findings should begin to make some small steps in that direction by documenting and describing the persistence of one galant schema. I am also in no position to comment on how galant schemata may have variously influenced the different styles of nineteenth-century music. For the music of (only) the Viennese realm, James Webster advocates a single stylistic period from 1740/1750 until well past 1800, with cut-off points suggested either around 1810/1815 or 1827/1830. Certainly the unbroken tradition of the Fonte during these years lends support to his periodisation, and many of the composers I refer to operated in this part of the continent.

But the Fonte goes further than Vienna, so should an Austro-German bias appear to emerge in this study, that is by and large the result of my choice of repertoire. I have favoured instrumental music for the simple reason that I have often stuck to forms that resemble two-reprise form. This serves as something of a control, whereby the changes in the Fonte can be more confidently identified: if the formal structure is still the same, one


can more persuasively argue that the schema, though changed, is still present. The regrettable corollary of this approach is that, even though I have not restricted myself to any one European locality, Italian music is unfairly neglected. However, researching the Fonte in a different generic context, such as the operatic aria, may well indicate a similar presence as in the instrumental music of other parts of Europe.

Vocal music is nevertheless represented in Chapter 6, which focuses on Schubert’s Lieder. The other three chapters in that section examine the Fonte in the music of Beethoven, Hummel and Chopin. These four composers represent a chronological spread, each having been born roughly ten years apart. Undertaking a close analysis of their Fontes enables us to see not only how each composer works a common pattern into his own œuvre, but also to gain a more detailed insight into the numerous techniques that could revivify what might otherwise have become a ‘lifeless, monotonous scheme’.

In Chapter 2, where I describe the Fonte at some length, I draw on the work of a wide range of composers from Onslow to Spohr and Clementi to Berlioz. As this study is concerned with musical style, it was imperative to distance myself from the “great masters” narrative, in which similarity is put down to personal influence and the vibrant compositional scene across Europe at that time is ignored. Instead, lesser-known figures are presented alongside their famous contemporaries. For the most part, I look no further than the mid-1830s, after which time the Fonte can fit in only with difficulty into the changing musical environment. Ex. 2.25 by Mendelssohn shows how changed it may become, and the chapter on Chopin concludes with examples that do not so much give answers about the nature of the schema in those later years as raise questions.
Chapter Two

Description of the Fonte Schema

Given that the Fonte is manifested differently each time it is used by a composer, even in its highly typical realisations, there can be no single model exemplar of it, and if the schema itself should undergo changes through time, it would be contradictory to assign it a fixed definition. However, our ability to identify the pattern at all amongst the great variety of presentations is based on our recognising what stand out as commonly recurring features, and if the schema changes, then there needs to be a form which it changes from. What we recognise as common features are what we synthesise into our mental representation of the pattern, but because this mental abstract, or schema, is for each of us ultimately the product of our own cognition, the notion of an objective prototype is, strictly speaking, impossible, for each of us has a slightly different background of experience. But what one identifies as points in common between instances of this pattern can be the basis for a heuristic exploration of the repertory, in which recurring features either become reinforced as significant components or emerge as dispensable ones. This generally results in an empirical consensus that permits us to proceed with relative confidence that the terms of the schema are mutually understood. The aim of this chapter is to give an overview of what those terms are or, in the case of optional traits, may be.

TONALITY AND HARMONY

Riepel’s examples were not accompanied by an analytical description of their key elements, so Gjerdingen’s definition will be my starting point. In Music in the Galant Style, he provides a visual abstraction of what he deems to be the salient features of the Fonte. Like most of the schemata he describes, the Fonte is cleanly divisible into two ‘stages’ – the pattern and its transposition. Just as abstracting a whole schema involves the ability to ‘partition it off from some larger context’¹, so its bipartite structure provides internally the

¹ Gjerdingen, A Classic Turn of Phrase, p. 134.
separation of harmonic and melodic material that facilitates the perception of its two stages:

Fig. 2.1. Graphic abstraction of Fonte schema²

To begin with, Gjerdingen indicates that the first stage is in the minor mode and the second in the major. This is an important feature because the minor-to-major motion establishes a specific tonal relationship between the two stages, which, depending upon its context may be expressed in different ways. In the following example (a typically galant Fonte that will give the reader a small but clear point of comparison with later instances), the two stages express the supertonic and tonic of the overall key of B♭ major:

² Reproduced from ibid., p. 63.
Ex. 2.1.  Mozart, Allegro, K. 3 (1762), bars 8–22

In the next example, in A♭ major, the first stage presents the submediant, the second the dominant:

Ex. 2.2.  Schubert, Originaltänze, Op. 9, No. 1, D. 365 (1821)

---

Ex. 2.3 is, by contrast, in a minor key, E minor. Its Fonte passes through the subdominant and mediant (or relative major):

Ex. 2.3. Moscheles, *Six Waltzes with Trios for piano four hands*, Op. 33, No. 5 (1814), bars 16–24

However, the Fonte in Ex. 2.4, from a rondo – not a two-reprise form – by Czerny, cannot be thought of in terms of the surrounding E minor harmony: it makes no grammatical sense to call the stages i and iVII of E minor. Therefore, in order to be able to describe the harmonic activity of a Fonte, I assign to it its own key, taken from the tonic chord of the second stage. Though this example is situated within a context of E minor, I will say the Fonte is in D major:

---

To achieve consistency across this study, I will label all Fontes as I have done in Ex. 2.4. Because the harmony of the first stage is built on the scale of the second, it makes sense to speak of the key of the Fonte as that of the second stage. As with the first two examples, it is frequently the case that the Fonte is in the same key as the overall piece or its dominant – in fact the passage in Ex. 2.4 goes on to a presentation of the rondo theme in D major, the movement’s dominant. As shown, the Fonte may also be in a minor key’s relative major and in later years it is sometimes used to initiate a transition into a different key area altogether.

The first stage, then, presents a tonicised supertonic and the second stage the tonic. I will use modern Roman numeral analysis to identify these harmonies in the examples. Note that other chord analyses than the ones I present will frequently be possible, and in some cases may make more sense. However, my aim is always to show how a passage may be read in terms of a Fonte, so in situations where the harmonies are not the usual ones, I will often make them “fit” as close as possible the structure of the schema. My analyses are intended to direct the reader towards the similarities the passage shares with the Fonte schema. In passages with busy bass lines, my preference is to simplify the chord names to their root positions.

---

6 Carl Czerny: Deux Quatuors brillans pour Pianoforte, Violon, Alte et Violoncelle, Oeuvre 224, Vienna: Diabelli, n. d.
Although the minor-to-major shift is essential, there are a few instances where the mode of the first stage is slightly confused by the appearance of both a major and a minor third in succession. In such cases, one could consider that the mode is “corrected” by the drop from major to minor third. In fact, Gjerdingen refers to such examples in the galant repertoire as “chromatic Fontes”, and sees this as ‘more a melodic phenomenon than a harmonic one’. If one understands the major third here as merely a chromatic passing note on the way to the minor third, the minor mode of the first stage is ultimately confirmed. Gjerdingen shows this in examples from Dittersdorf and Haydn, the latter of which I reproduce here:

Ex. 2.5. Haydn, Keyboard Sonata, Hob. XVI, No. 27 (1774–1776), iii: Presto, bars 8–12

The c₃¹ in bar 10 is played over A in the bass, creating the necessary A minor chord. The relationship of supertonic to tonic creates a diatonic relationship between the two stages, but where both stages are major, that relationship does not obtain. By understanding the c₃¹ as “correcting” the c♯₁, we are favouring a version that relates the first stage to the second by the fact that A minor is built from the notes of the G major scale. This would not be true if we assumed the c♯₁ to be correct and the c₃¹ to be embellishing it.

The phrase structure in Haydn’s Fonte is, however, not as clear as it may seem: the left hand’s A (bar 10) completes the first stage, but by analogy to the d₁ in bar 8, the c₃¹ in bar 10 also functions as an upbeat to the next bar and can therefore be understood as already part of the second stage. While the harmonic meaning of the c♯₁ is clear, there is confusion between the treble and bass over the delineation of the two stages:

---

8 Adapted from ibid., p. 133.
In composing this passage, Haydn tapped into the potential of the perceptual grey area where the two stages meet. Though we are continually presented with new stimuli when listening, we do always refer those stimuli to what we have just heard in the few seconds immediately prior. It is for this reason that a harmonic “corrective” to an “incorrect” first stage can come from the second. In Ex. 2.7, by Field, the last melody note in the first stage is g♯1 (bar 50), which forms an E major chord with the left hand – incorrect for the Fonte schema. The following g♮1 begins the second stage, but it can still be heard to “correct” the g♯1 to form E minor. The reason for this is that, despite the colouristic effect of the double appoggiaturas in the left hand in bars 50 and 52, the passage is very much a diatonic one, and g♯ does not belong to the E minor scale outlined in the first stage. Here, then, one can argue that the Fonte’s criteria for minor-to-major modality are met:

Ex. 2.7. Field, Nocturne No. 13 in D minor (pub. 1834), bars 47–52

---

9 John Field: 18 Nocturnes, ed. Franz Liszt, Leipzig: J. Schuberth, n. d. (This Nocturne listed as No. 18 in this volume.)
When the first stage ends in major, should we not describe the harmonic progression as \((V^7)\)–II–\(V^7\)–I, or rather as \((V^7)\)–(V)–\(V^7\)–I? From this description alone, the end of the first stage is described as a secondary dominant of \(V^7\). However, while the abstracted chord progression \((V^7)\)–(V)–\(V^7\)–I spells the tonicisation of \(V^7\), the metric placement of the chords within the phrase rules out this literal interpretation. This is easy to see in Ex. 2.8, by Hummel (where \(vii^6/3\) should be understood as an extension of the \(V^7\) that follows). As there is no \(D^\#\) in bar 42 (which actually sets a precedent for harmonic ambiguity in this passage), the first “proper” chord of the schema occurs on the downbeat of bar 43. The chord it resolves to, already on the weakest beat of the bar, is further dwarfed by the first chord’s agogic and dynamic accent. With the same pattern occurring in the second stage, it is completely counterintuitive to hear the E major chord of bar 42 as the dominant of A major in bar 43:

Ex. 2.8. Hummel, Piano Trio No. 3 in G major, Op. 35, i: Allegro con brio, bars 42–44\(^{10}\)

Even here, then, the E major chord may be understood in retrospect as a decorated E minor, which again preserves the diatonic relationship between E minor and D major. Aside from this harmonic ambiguity, another momentary confusion of the Fonte’s modality may occur, this time in the second stage. A common melodic pattern features a descent from the sixth to the third scale degrees in each stage, and on occasion composers would

flatten the sixth in the second, major stage, producing a sort of mixed modality. For Riepel, the major mode embodied masculinity and the minor mode femininity, so he saw fit to call this particular variant a ‘hermaphrodite’ Fonte. Although Riepel did not himself advocate the variant, he acknowledged that it had ‘a hundred fanciers’ and these fanciers counted many later eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century composers among their ranks, one of whom was Clementi:

Ex. 2.9.  Clementi, Twenty-four Waltzes for the Pianoforte, No. 3 (n. d.), bars 17–24

Even allowing for the hermaphrodite variant, all Fontes are still in a major key. Problems arise with regard to the second stage if one considers the possibility of minor-key Fontes: the diatonic chord built on the supertonic in a minor key is diminished and cannot be tonicised; a minor-minor version (for instance, Ex. 2.10) would neglect the contrast of mode which is so characteristic of the Fonte; and, preserving the whole-tone step between the two stages, a major-minor version would require an augmented second between the third of each chord and would be tonally disjointed – this in fact can produce a mesmerising effect, especially in the hands of Frederic Chopin (Ex. 2.11).

---

11 Quoted in Gjerdingen, Music in the Galant Style, p. 68.

A simple fact of any schema is that it can account for many things because of what they all hold in common. It can therefore be instantiated over and again in different ways – the manner of realisation may differ each time, but enough common features are reproduced. This means those features need to be **reproducible**, without compromising the individuality of the realisation. In music, this means compatibility with the prevailing style system, but the harmonic progression in the Chopin nocturne is too far removed from standard tonal procedures for it to be successfully reproduced. The conspicuous augmented second from b (bar 22) to a♭ (bar 23) presents a voice-leading “anomaly” and therefore makes this pattern insufficiently generic to be successful as a schema. In other words, if

---

composers were to replicate this pattern widely, any individuality in their realisations of it would soon be overpowered by the unusual nature of the underlying pattern itself.

**VOICE-LEADING PAIRS, MELODY**

As indicated on Gjerdingen’s diagram (Fig. 2.1), the melody and bass are normally played out using specific scale degrees from each local tonic: \(4\rightarrow3\) in the melody and \(7\rightarrow1\) in the bass. (Following Gjerdingen’s method, the black circles represent the melodic scale degrees, the white circles the bass. These labels will be used in all examples hereafter.) This configuration of scale degrees represents perhaps the most common, perhaps the most simple, realisation but it does not prescribe a “true form” of which all other forms are variants or deformations, as the schema may be equally well conveyed in a number of different ways. Nevertheless, these scale degrees constitute a crucial feature of the schema, for the melody and bass, pitted in counterpoint against each other, form voice-leading pairs that outline a tritone and its resolution (\(4 \rightarrow 3\) and \(7 \rightarrow 1\) moving to \(3 \rightarrow 1\)). What is essential here is that the end-point of each stage is tonicised (hence the importance of the \(7\)), so these scale degrees may also be placed elsewhere in the texture, as the tritone and its resolution are still present. As is very common, Ex. 2.12 has the \(7\rightarrow1\) in the melody and the \(4\rightarrow3\) in the bass:
Ex. 2.12. Mendelssohn, String Symphony No. 11 in F Major (1823), ii: Scherzo, Commodo – Schweizerlied, bars 14–25

Root movement from $V^7$ also enjoyed currency, as shown in Ex. 2.13, again from Mendelssohn’s early string symphonies. In both this and the previous situations, the contrary motion between outer parts characteristically draws attention to the end of each stage:

---

Although this example has 5–1 in the bass, the 7–1 is in fact in the first violas (4–3 is in the top line as usual). I have found no bass-line that features only 2–1, presumably because it would not strongly articulate the characteristic harmonic progression of the Fonte, and, furthermore, if it were coupled with a 4–3 melody, the result would be rather weak-sounding parallel motion. (Ex. 6.4 has a 2–1 bass as part of a descending line.)

So long as the usual voice-leading pairs are present somewhere in the texture, the uppermost voice may also employ different scale degrees. 6–5 is not uncommon, and 2–3 can be found often enough.17 Examples are scattered throughout this study. A 2–1 melodic line is far less common, doubtless because it would create too strong a close for each stage (See “Comma” at Ex. 2.43). Whatever the upper voice, the expected 4–3 is

---

16 Ibid.
17 A 2–3 melody frequently is part of a larger 4–3 motion anyway. See, for instance, Ex. 7.5.
generally to be found elsewhere in the texture. As a case in point, the $4 \rightarrow 3$ in Ex. 2.14 is in the highest voice (piano right hand), though the solo tenor’s $2 \rightarrow 1$ may be aurally more prominent. Furthermore, the tenor rises to the $3$ after arriving on $1$:


A closer examination reveals that in fact the tenor leaves to the piano the task of finishing what he has begun: it is frequent for the $4 \rightarrow 3$ to be preceded by $5$, and here, both tenor and pianist share that note. As shown in a simplified Ex. 2.15, the melodic line of $5 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 3$ is begun by both tenor and piano and completed only by the piano. The tenor in fact anticipates the piano’s $4 \rightarrow 3$ superficially (his $3$ is unharmonised), as indicated in brackets:


---

It is therefore not at the exclusion of the usual voice-leading pairs that atypical scale degrees are used in the melody. In Ex. 2.16, the ⁷–¹ coincides with a melodic ²–₁, even more emphatically than in the Berlioz song (note the articulation). Though the off-beats are strongly accented, the ⁴–₃ must be understood as part of a horizontal dislocation of vertical harmony and thus the more usual counterpoint between melody and bass is still in evidence. In short, the rhythmic “misalignment” here is the product of unfolding thirds. It is significant too that the ⁴ and ³ are the highest pitches in this Fonte:

Ex. 2.16. Tomášek, *Six Eclogues*, Op. 35, No. 6 (1807–1823), bars 17–18

Of course, compound melody is the technique which permits composers to write Fontes into single-line music (rarer in the nineteenth century, hence this earlier example), where the counterpoint is similarly implied:

Ex. 2.17. J. S. Bach, Suite No. 1 for Solo Violoncello, BWV 1007 (1717–23), v: Menuett II, bars 33–36

---


By way of enriching a melodic line in a texture where there are already accompanying voices, a composer may outline both voice-leading pairs compound-melodically, so that something like \( 4 - 7 - 1 - 3 \) (Ex. 2.18) arises in the single line. This usually results in a doubling-up of the bass component:


\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{Eb: } & (V_5^6) & \text{ii} & V_5^6 & I \\
\end{array}
\]

As will already be evident, the Fonte’s important voice-leading pairs are accompanied by elaborations of varying richness. Gjerdingen notes that the \( 4 - 3 \) is frequently part of a longer \( 6 - 5 - 4 - 3 \) melodic line, such as in Ex. 2.17. This amplifies the descending motion conveyed by the \( 4 - 3 \) voice leading. At or near the beginning of such a line, the melody is often made to leap up before commencing the descent. The resultant rise-and-fall is highly characteristic of Fonte melodies. The leap, if there is one, is not necessarily to \( 6 \), but the melodic contour often assumes roughly the same shape:

Fig. 2.2. Visual representation of common melodic pitch contour

---

Though melodies may begin by leaping up to one of several different scale degrees, a rise to 4 is naturally very common, on account of its being the schematic note that must resolve to 3. This may be manifested at varying levels of octave displacement. In Ex. 2.19, the cello appears to make a nearly three-octave leap (bracketed on the score) up to b♭1 (6); although that note really comes from the g1 at the start of the bar, the open C-string intensifies the rising interval. What is more, the piano’s right hand, which has the schematic melody notes, actually does make a dramatic leap of two and a half octaves from d1 the bar before (not shown) up to g3 (4):

Ex. 2.19. Ferdinand Ries, Grande Sonate for piano and cello or horn, Op. 34 (1810–13), iii: Rondo – Allegro, bars 53–55

Although the g3 could be interpreted as simply an embellishing registral transfer of the g2, in whose register the resolution happens (to f2), the large leap is a gestural intensification of a characteristic melodic contour.

It must be said that plenty of Fontes do not have a pronounced rise and fall in the melody. Therefore, it is not a necessary feature of the Fonte but a common one, for it does occur very frequently. As our schematic understanding of the Fonte represents the salient shared elements from those instances we have previously heard, it stands to reason that it will likewise be influenced by our recognising those features that are present in many, but not all, Fontes. The leap to a higher note is such a feature. That in itself is already a

---

prominent auditory event, but this leap is often made even more noticeable by coming after a point of previous arrival and rest, by landing on a held or repeated note and/or by marking a pause in the accompaniment. These factors make the initial leap recognisable and characteristic. In bar 72 of the following example, the bassoon performs a solo leap up to a repeated note after a clear point of arrival:

Ex. 2.20. Beethoven, Piano Concerto No. 1, Op. 15 (1797), i: Allegro con brio, bars 71–76, (brass and timpani omitted, piano tacet)\(^\text{23}\)

Furthermore, placing the leap at the very beginning of the Fonte can prompt a listener to expect that a Fonte will ensue. This is even more so when the melody outlines the (applied) dominant, because of its harmonic impetus. (The first harmony to be sounded is typically V of ii anyway, but in later years, different harmonies would sometimes precede that dominant.) Transposition of the melodic leap (for instance, bars 74–75 in Ex. 2.20) draws attention to the Fonte’s sequential construction, making it an easy schema to grasp. As will be shown in the chapter on Beethoven, however, a composer could toy with our sense of expectation and its subsequent confirmation or denial in his handling of this transposition. Here, however, we may look at some less complicated examples than those discussed in that chapter. Although direct note-for-note transposition often occurs, when composers came to writing the second stage they often varied the pattern set in the first.

Melodic embellishment is common, but the bass and inner voices may be likewise subjected to change.

An obvious example of melodic alteration in a Fonte can again be seen in Beethoven’s first piano concerto (Ex. 2.21). In the piano’s right hand, the first three beats of bar 169 decorate the model set in bar 167; the left hand adheres even less to the pattern set in first stage:


 Whereas this melody changes the beginning of the second stage, others may change the end of it. One effect this has is of reducing the end rhyme and thus creating a greater sense of moving forward into the next phrase. A simple technique for disguising the end rhyme is register transfer. This can be seen in Ex. 2.22, from a rondo by Hummel, over the barline from 36 to 37. In order to connect the registers smoothly, Hummel composes an entirely different melodic figure in bar 36.

---

The downward transposition in the second stage is described in Gjerdingen’s graphic abstraction (Fig. 2.1) with the words, ‘one step lower’ – a translation of Riepel’s own explanation, ‘eine Stufte tieffer’ (sic). As long as the bass, in moving from one stage to the next, is heard to descend as it does in, say, Ex. 2.22, this phenomenon is easy to perceive, even if the melody does the opposite. The same principle can be applied where the melody is continuous but the bass is displaced. In another of Hummel’s rondos (Ex. 2.23), the in the second stage (in the grey brackets) “should” be an octave lower:


---

As melodic (and rhythmic) variance becomes more elaborate, the Fonte can become more difficult to detect. That is to say, the harmonic progressions may be fairly easily heard, but how the variations in transposition relate to the first stage will often elude listeners during the first few hearings. Examples are discussed in the chapter on Chopin (see Exx. 7.3, 7.5–7.7).

In extreme cases, however, differences between stages can totally obscure any “underlying” Fonte. In Ex. 2.24, for instance, the climb of the two tenors to the \( e_5^2 \) completely overshadows the shape projected by the first stage. Though a Fonte can be described by identifying scale degrees and chords, it is virtually impossible to hear this particular example as a Fonte:


![Ex. 2.24. Schubert, Op. 52, No. 3 (D. 835), “Bootgesang” (1825), bars 21–26](image)

This serves to show that the Fonte is defined by more than harmony and voice leading alone. It should also exhibit a reasonably clear (or at least demonstrable) transposition, and its stages should be clearly delineated from each other (bar 23 gets in the way of this in Ex. 2.24) as should the whole schema from the surrounding context. These factors obtain because the Fonte outlines a clear phrase structure. The discussion now turns to this.

---

PHRASE STRUCTURE

Another element of the Fonte to which Gjerdingen’s graphic (Fig. 1) draws our attention is metric placement. In his accompanying explanation, he describes each stage as containing two events, the first coupling the ❹ and ⓧ, the second coupling the ❸ and ⓪. His “weak” and “strong” refer to the beats of the bar on which each event lands – the end of one and the beginning of the next. This is a condition that generally holds fast, but characterises only the moment when the dissonance resolves to the ❸ and ⓪. Yet as there is usually an earlier sounding of the dissonant event within the stage, that should be the event whose metric weight is assessed, rather than the re-sounding just prior to resolving. This reflects our natural inclination to organise the music we hear according to its rhythmic groupings. This calls for hypermetric beats to be considered in the analysis, assigning to half bars and whole bars the same hierarchy of stresses as the beats within a bar. Given that Fontes overwhelmingly have a clearly articulated symmetrical phrase construction – and that is not merely a characteristic feature of much galant music in general, but an attribute that makes it a style particularly conducive to schematic hearing – I believe the hypermetre is the more appropriate level of the beat against which to be measuring the Fonte. In light of that, I propose to modify Gjerdingen’s definition and say that the first event in each stage falls on a strong beat hypermetrically (usually a downbeat), and the second on a weak one. Even in short Fontes for which hypermetre is too broad a measure, the same relationship is often preserved within the beats of the bar, as in Ex. 2.16.

The stress relationship inherent in each stage can, furthermore, be extended to an inter-stage relationship as well, where the first stage is stronger and “resolves” to the hypermetrically weaker but tonally more stable second stage. These different levels are indicated in Fig. 2.3, where a two-bar hyperbar is assumed:
Even in music which distorts the expected regularity of phrase structures, William Rothstein has demonstrated that an underlying hypermetre can usually be deduced\(^{28}\), and the implied hypermetric alignment of Fontes in such instances still tends to remain true to the model in Fig. 2.3. Naturally, this description is based on the belief that the strong-weak structure of beats in a bar is extrapolated to the level of the hyperbar. Sometimes the end of a Fonte overlaps with the beginning of a new phrase, so in such cases, its final event is brought forward to land on a strong beat. This can be seen in bar 14 of Ex. 2.25, but as the beginning of the new phrase is a far more perceptible musical phenomenon than the end of the Fonte, I maintain that this proportionally lower stress renders the Fonte compatible with the usual stress pattern:

---

In this complex and, indeed, late example, Mendelssohn places the schema’s first event, \( V^7 \) of \( ii \), not on the downbeat of bar 10, but on the weaker third beat of that bar. However, the sense of the Fonte beginning at the start of the bar is conveyed not only by the beginning of a new melodic phrase at that point, but also by the placement of the \( f^\#_1 \) in the cello (labelled ❷), which is picked up in the following bar as a member of the dominant chord just before it moves to \( g^1 \) on beat 4. The same happens in the second stage, where the \( g^1 \) at the start of bar 12 is reiterated as part of \( V^6/5 \) in bar 13 (the \( g \) in the piano’s right hand). This links that harmony already to the start of the stage, despite its falling on the weakest beat of the two-bar hyperbar (thinking of it in 4/4 time). The cello’s \( g^1 \) can thus be understood, at least retrospectively, as ❹—that is, as an advance sounding of the seventh. Also, the ❸ at the end of any Fonte’s first stage becomes the ❹ of the second. In this case, that note resolves to ❸ in the form of the \( f^\#_1 \) in bar 14, an event which coincides with the start of a new phrase.

---

Though there are many exceptions, symmetrical phrases are frequently articulated in eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century music, as touched on in the previous chapter. It is in this style of music that the Fonte and the other schemata in Gjerdingen’s book enjoyed their heyday. They were not only used by composers very regularly, as he convincingly demonstrates, but it is in galant music that they can be most easily perceived by the listener, and this is in large part thanks to the temporal delineation of one phrase from the next through clean articulation. Though composers sometimes obfuscated that clarity, as in Ex. 2.25, the neat division of phrases remained central to the musical language at this time. It therefore follows logically — and empirically this almost always true — that Fontes themselves occupy either entire phrases or an even division of a phrase. For this reason, I cannot agree with Gjerdingen’s decision to identify bars 18–24 in Ex. 2.26 as a Fonte. The stages as he has labelled them do not in themselves present an even division of bars (his dashed line between minor and major shows he is unable to locate such a division), nor do they coincide with the more obvious phrase ending on the downbeat of bar 22. This phrase ending is marked by what Gjerdingen calls a High Drop (in A major), a melodic figure which he himself describes as ‘a conventional sign of impending closure’: 
It will be well apparent by now that the two stages of a Fonte are always of equal length, a criterion which is met by its containment within a symmetrical phrase structure. The first eight bars of Ex. 2.27 close emphatically (bar 96) on the A minor harmony reached already in bars 90 and 91, extending the reach of the first Fonte stage. Although the Fonte pattern continues from bar 97, it does not do so for the full eight bars. It changes in bar 100 and the phrase does not finish with the G major harmony we would expect of this Fonte, but with D major (bar 104). Harmonically and melodically, the Fonte could go from bar 89 to 99, but this is too imbalanced an internal structure to be satisfactorily complete. Yet it must end here, though only through what must be Voříšek’s deliberate manipulation of the expected phrase structure:

30 Reproduced in adapted form from Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style*, p. 245. For the sake of clarity, I have removed Gjerdingen’s annotations of the bars on either side of his “Fonte” and have myself added the annotation of the High ❷ Drop in bars 21–22.
When we look at the phrase which a Fonte sits in, we see that there is more than simply the two events, 4–7 and 3–1. While the schematic events themselves may only occupy a part of each phrase unit, a composer will frequently flesh these out by including material before or after the two events, so Gjerdingen writes that ‘the core events may function as points of reference or as signs of punctuation. In that case, stage refers to the longer utterance into which the event is embedded.’ Because I am discussing many Fontes in detail, I propose to add to his description. Often the 4–7 is sounded more than once in a stage, with other material composed in between, a fact which Gjerdingen recognises by differentiating between, on the one hand, the note-to-note succession of events, and on the other hand, downbeat-to-downbeat. These two types of succession can be seen in effect in Ex. 2.28. Though the chord of resolution comes on the second beat of each stage, it can be understood as simply displaced by its decoration with the accented dominant seventh:

32 Ibid., p. 22.
33 Gjerdingen, Music in the Galant Style, p. 63.
The first instance of the dissonance presented by the dominant-seventh or diminished-seventh harmony always leads us to expect the consonance of the second event. If intervening material is composed, then that first event is reiterated before it resolves in note-to-note succession. As this succession is at the core of the Fonte’s identity, and as it usually coincides with an articulation of the phrase structure, I will describe this important moment as the point of resolution:

Fig. 2.4. Possible succession of events within the stage of a Fonte

---

The first event is not always repeated as it is in Fig. 2.4, but each stage of a Fonte contains the point of resolution as a vital constituent part, which may be preceded or succeeded by additional material that still forms part of the Fonte as a whole. For example, in Ex. 2.29, the point of resolution (in the grey brackets) is marked $f$, while the previous melodic material is marked $p$, making very clear the separation between the two:

Ex. 2.29. Beethoven, Zwölf Menuette für Orchester, WoO 7 (1797), No. 12, bars 8–12

[Ex. 2.29 image]

Generally speaking, I would suggest that a Fonte’s reciprocation of dissonance with consonance and of its melodic rise with a melodic fall (to ❸) can be further brought out by a move from $f$ to $p$ (such as in Ex. 2.30). In Beethoven’s dance minuet, a genre that in principle if not in practice calls for stylistic conformity, he does precisely the opposite by starting $p$ and abrasively countering that with $f$ – a dynamic contrast which he has intensified through scoring. The usual minuet ‘topic’ of noble simplicity and rationality is

---

confounded to the point that this could be heard as an instance of what Melanie Lowe has called ‘topical dissonance’ within a minuet.\textsuperscript{36}

Ex. 2.30. Paganini, Violin Concerto No. 2, Op. 7 (1826), iii: Rondo “La Campenella”, bars 23–30\textsuperscript{37}

Identifying the point of resolution also makes it easy to describe as post-resolution material any music that follows, but is still a part of the Fonte. In Ex. 2.31, continuing the directional impetus of each voice results in the commonly found post-resolution voice exchange, marked by the crossed lines on the example. (Note, incidentally, the overall dominant pedal in the cello. This feature is discussed in Chapter 4.)


The post-resolution voice-exchange may be an indication that the Fonte has been combined with what Gjerdingen has dubbed the Fenaroli schema, in honour of the Italian maestro whose partimenti I referred to in Chapter 1. This schema features the two outer voices in canon or near-canon, often with a $4-3-7-1$ or $2-3-7-1$ melody over a $7-1-2-3$ or $7-1-4-3$ bass. It is typically repeated, so when it is combined with a Fonte, its repetition is transposed down a step. Although the Fenaroli’s four events are usually evenly spaced, Ex. 2.32 shows clearly the combination of these two schemata:

Ex. 2.32. Clementi, Sonatina, Op. 36, No. 2 (1798–1799), ii: Allegretto, bars 9–13

---

In Ex. 2.31, nothing preceded the point of resolution and in Ex. 2.28, nothing followed it, but a Fonte may quite naturally include material both before and after, as Ex. 2.33 illustrates:

**Ex. 2.33.** Beethoven, Piano Concerto No. 1, Op. 15 (1797), i: Allegro con brio, bars 126–133

One cannot say that the Fonte occurs only at the point of resolution, for as this example so clearly shows, what we hear as the Fonte will map itself onto the larger phrase structure. It is an illustration of the powerful organising influence of phrase structure in the music of this time. In some cases, like Ex. 2.34, the four-bar phrases are divided again into two-bar units, meaning an internal repetition of each Fonte stage in the four-bar phrase. Note that although the first sounding of the first stage is harmonically sufficient, the

---

archetypal voice-leading pairs are only placed together in the second sounding, so the point of resolution coincides with the end of each stage:

Ex. 2.34. Beethoven, Septet, Op. 20 (1800), iii: Tempo di Menuetto, bars 9–16

![Musical notation]

In some situations, there are two or more points of resolution in each stage. At times, no one point is any more likely to be the defining point than any other, such as in Ex. 2.32. In other cases, a listener will be more likely to favour one on the grounds of the phrase structure which houses the events. In Ex. 2.35, two points of resolution are nested within each stage but the second one must carry the greater weight as it coincides with the endpoints of the regular four-bar phrases which the stages occupy:

---

Understanding the arrival point of each phrase as the definitive point of resolution only makes sense when the phrase structure projects a straightforward hierarchy. In other situations, this may not be so apparent. In Ex. 2.36, for instance, one may hear the first point of resolution (bars 116–117 and 121–122) as the one that articulates the schema, with the remainder of each phrase constituting post-resolution material because of its transfer out of the initial register:

---

Wherever one hears the defining point of resolution, what is significant is that the Fonte should still be understood as occupying the entire phrase.

**DIFFERENCE FROM OTHER SEQUENCES**

The Fonte is evidently a type of sequence – a very short circle-of-fifths progression – and the transposition of harmony and melody is central to our description of it. Transposition is of course at the core of all sequences, so isolating the Fonte from other types is essential. Though the importance of the minor-to-major progression is evident, I wish to stress that the major stage must be the end point of the pattern. Further transposition beyond this point would constitute an altogether different structure, one that would overshadow any “Fonte” contained within it. If a sequence seems to begin with a Fonte but then continues in the same manner of diatonic transposition, the larger sequence would take cognitive precedence over the “Fonte”. The same applies if a Fonte-like passage terminates a longer sequence. In Ex. 2.37, the harmonic and voice-leading annotations that

---

usually identify a Fonte are shown from bar 120, but a descending circle-of-fifths progression has begun already in the previous four bars. Therefore, while the schema may be perceptually accessible, the larger sequence is understood as the organising structure of this passage. At the end of the sequence, rather than terminate its melodic line in accordance with the established pattern, the first violin in fact accelerates through the expected $b\flat\rightarrow c^1\rightarrow d^1$ to land on 3, thereby eliding the sequence and the reprise of the Trio. This also has the effect of cutting short the last four bars of the sequence (and any possible Fonte) down to two:

Ex. 2.37. Haydn, String Quartet, Op. 77, No. 1 (1799), iii: Menuetto – Presto (Trio), bars 110–127

In this example, there is harmonic as well as melodic sequence. On the other hand, continuation of the melodic sequence without the extension of the harmonic pattern is a means by which composers could slightly conceal the end of a bona fide Fonte. The

following excerpt features a nearly exact transposition of the melodic pattern and bass figuration for another “stage” after the end of the Fonte, but the progression of the harmony to V puts into relief the end of the Fonte. Therefore, though it is disguised, the schema is definitely perceptually valid:

Ex. 2.38. Spohr, Quintet for Piano and Winds, Op. 52 (1820) iii: Menuetto (Trio), bars 171–174 (winds tacet)\(^{45}\)

\[ \text{C: (V}^7\text{) ii V}^7 \text{ I IV V} \]

The effect of many linear intervallic patterns is to prolong a starting chord – of course there are many others whose function is to move between two different chords – but this is not true of the Fonte. It generally achieves a transition to a new harmony, or a retransition to an earlier one and the sequence is therefore tonally anchored in its second stage. This has an impact on its structural function, one of the most important ways in which the Fonte may be distinguished from other sequential progressions. Another of the schemata Gjerdingen presents is the Romanesca. It is also a descending circle-of-fifths progression, albeit a longer one, but unlike the Fonte, it is used as an opening gambit:

The Romanesca begins robustly with the tonic chord in root position, but as the Fonte begins with the dominant (often in first inversion) of the supertonic, it is unsuitable as an opening schema. Another descending pattern in Gjerdingen’s book is the Prinner, which, on the other hand, is deployed to bring phrases to a close. The Prinner therefore comes as a useful riposte to the initiating but inconclusive motion of a structure like the Romanesca:

Neither the Prinner nor the Romanesca are sequences in the same manner as the Fonte, as they have a faster harmonic rate of change, they are not clearly broken into stages (although Gjerdingen points out the Prinner’s \( \text{\#6} - \text{\#5} \) is sometimes separated from its \( \text{\#4} - \text{\#3} \)).

---

47 Reproduced from ibid., p. 46.
and they do not feature a melody that is transposed. They do, however, present a reproducible descending pattern. Perhaps it is because it has no clear stages featuring the transposition of melodic material that the Prinner better articulates the ends of phrases than the Fonte, which is concerned with the reiteration of a (usually new) idea; the Prinner specifically serves to round off a previous idea.

The Fonte does of course offer some sense of closure (in contrast to the Romanesca) through the progression from dominant to tonic and the contrary motion with which and resolve to and . Writing in a chapter on the numerous and varied clausulae, or the different ways of giving a ‘perceived sense of closure and finality’ to phrases, Gjerdingen isolates this particular type of phrase ending and names it the Comma. With a melodic descent of to and a stepwise rise in the bass from to , the Comma offers only a ‘mild close’ suitable for creating a ‘small inflection that, like a comma [in a sentence], sets off a syntactical unit from what will come next’. His application of this linguistic metaphor is drawn from the writings of eighteenth-century theorists such as Vincenzo Manfredini (1737–1799) and Alexander Malcolm (1685–1763). He gives this as an example of the Comma:

Ex. 2.41. Mozart, Sonata in C major, K545 (1788), i: Allegro, bar 4

Because the end of a Fonte is often only as strong as a Comma, it is never used to finish a movement or piece, for which a complete cadence, like the full stop at the end of a sentence, is required. However, one may ask whether the apparently ‘cadential’ progression

48 Gjerdingen, Music in the Galant Style, p. 49.
49 Ibid., p. 139.
50 Ibid., p. 156
51 Reproduced from ibid.
of the last three harmonies in the Fonte, with its ii–V\( ^7 \)–I, could make it an apt schema for concluding a piece when it has root movement in the bass. However, there are several problems with this possibility. First, in a similar vein to the suggestion of apparent tonicisation of V discussed at Ex. 2.8 above, the phrase structure of a Fonte precludes the possibility of the ii serving as a pre-dominant harmony. Second, tonicisation of ii is at best uncommon in a cadence. Third, and most significantly, to achieve a definitive perfect cadence, the pre-dominant harmony should, as William Caplin has persuasively argued, be preceded by I\( ^6 \), which is absent from the Fonte.\(^{52}\) In any case, as the Fonte’s melody usually ends on 3 and here we see the restricted application of the Prinner too – it will never sound resoundingly conclusive.

**STRUCTURAL FUNCTION**

The Fonte is a relatively self-contained unit. Unlike the Prinner, which needs to be joined to an opening phrase, it starts quite independently after a point of harmonic, rhythmic and melodic arrival, and as mentioned, it also rounds itself off at the end of the unit. Yet as the start of the Fonte is not suitable for opening an entire piece, nor for finishing it, its structural identity is instead a “middle” one. One of its time-honoured roles is to initiate (or entirely serve as) the transitional section after the double bar in a minuet or similar dance form, such as those in Exx. 2.1–2.3. Quite often this will mean that the Fonte is in the same key as the key of the minuet itself and will lead straight back to the return of the opening theme. At other times, the Fonte will be in the global dominant or relative major and the music will then proceed in that key area before returning to the theme. As small forms developed in the nineteenth century, double bars were often dispensed with, but the underlying structures remain similar and analogous points of arrival can be found within the music. Many have presumed these small forms locate their ancestry in the eighteenth-century minuet, and the persistence of the Fonte in such pieces – with the same function preserved – further consolidates that connection.

The minuet and other two-reprise forms are by no means the only or even necessarily the most common contexts for the Fonte, but they are perhaps the most predictable. Because this formal relation was evident to Riepel, and because he is corroborated by eighteenth-century practice, it is a solid background against which to investigate the Fonte in the nineteenth century. Fontes can also be found in some sonata-form movements (such as at the beginning of the development) and in rondos where the episodes between statements of the theme are fairly short and do not tend to stray far harmonically from the home turf.

The structural role of the Fonte is one of its important properties. After a point of arrival such as a minuet’s double bar, experienced listeners would be used to hearing a Fonte, and once an initial cue is given, they could expect its continuation. In fact, so common is the Fonte after the double bar in minuets and similar forms that when a passage is heard that bears some resemblance to Fonte but is not completely standard, it is its context that makes schema perception most likely. In locations where a Fonte is seldom heard, any abnormalities have a greater effect of concealing the schema.

The Fonte’s “middle” function no doubt also gives the composer a degree of flexibility in how he or she realises it in the musical fabric, more so than with an opening schema, which needs a declamatory insistence in order to fulfil its role. A Fonte’s characteristic embellishments would also obscure any opening phrase’s necessary clarity.

As with any aspect of the Fonte, however, its structural placement may also be an object of manipulation. In Ex. 2.42, from a string quartet by Ferdinand Ries, a Fonte is in the “right” movement, but in the “wrong” place. Minuets are very often a context for, or one might say the object of, musical wit, not least because it was a very well-known point of reference in the eighteenth century – as an instructional model in composition, as a class-defining dance at court and as a ubiquitous component of art music. The danced minuet, in which dancers in fact generally did not match their steps to the phrase structure of the music, offered ‘aesthetic surprise and delight’, and the art minuet added unpredicatability of its own. With its endemic topic of noble simplicité, irregularity and incongruity make a vivid and humorous contrast, and, as Gretchen A. Wheelock notes, are particularly noticeable because of the minuet’s having several repeats in relatively quick succession,

---

including the da capo. In Ex. 2.42, the Fonte’s “middle” function is a point of reference. On the one hand, it is used, as it often is, to make a shift to the dominant; on the other hand, when one considers the numerous times this eight-bar phrase will be repeated because of the da capo, it becomes one part of the flow of the music. Ries has achieved, whether intentionally or not, more fluidity throughout the minuet simply by reducing the sense of (re)commencement at the opening. He has also placed the Fonte (in bars 2–5!) apparently in cross-rhythm to the two-bar motive established by the first violin (but weakened by the barwise imitation by inversion between the first violin and cello), so phrase rhythm also becomes one of his sources of humour:

Ex. 2.42. Ries, String Quartet, Op. 70, No. 1 (1812), iii: Menuetto, bars 1–8

In Chopin’s Nocturne, Op. 9, No. 2, was he thinking of the Fonte as he composed its opening bars (Ex. 2.43)? We can of course never know, and there is not enough melodic parallelism for me to call it a Fonte, but the harmonies in bars 2 and 4 and the characteristic \(5\rightarrow 4\rightarrow 3\) descent in bar 2 (less evident in bar 4) articulate the ends of the two-bar phrases in the same way as the schema. While the piece begins firmly on the tonic, the passage moves very rapidly onto a key area (ii) that, traditionally, is uncommon so close to the beginning of a piece. This creates the impression of beginning in medias res, reflecting the Fonte’s “middleness”:

---

SUMMARY

I have attempted to present the Fonte schema as a network of many features, not all of which will be present in any one realisation. Instead of considering it in terms of a single fixed prototype, we should understand the schema as an agglomeration of remembered experiences that shared enough features between them that they could all be identified as Fontes. For instance, one Fonte may have a marked rise and fall in the melodic contour, breaking from the texture in order to pronounce this melodic initiation unaccompanied, while another may have nothing like it. Such a feature is typical but not necessary. Likewise, there are no strict requirements about which exact scale degrees are used in the bass or melody, as numerous alternatives can articulate the schema with equal clarity.

A typical Fonte, then, has numerous components, discussed at length above, which I will review here:

- it descends through two stages one step apart, the first in minor, the second major;

---

• a Fonte may be described as being in the key of its second stage, and the first stage is therefore its supertonic. Both stages are tonicised by their respective dominants, usually a dominant-seventh or diminished-seventh harmony;

• each step is underpinned by two-part counterpoint, with 4 and 7 resolving to 3 and 1. These are often in the outer voices, although their placement elsewhere in the texture or the exchange of melody and bass are common techniques that do not impair our ability to perceive the Fonte;

• a sharply rising then descending melodic contour is frequently heard. This often announces the beginning of a Fonte;

• the dissonance in each stage may be sounded more than once. Where it resolves to the consonance in note-to-note progression, this will be called the point of resolution. Material that precedes or succeeds this fills out each stage of the schema;

• the length of each stage corresponds to phrase structure, so each stage is of equal length. Phrase syntax thus has a strong influence upon the perception of the Fonte. Where a stage contains more than one point of resolution, it is in the instance of its punctuating the end of the phrase unit that we are more likely to understand the schematic resolution taking place;

• the point of resolution is generally a progression that can be traced from note to note, with the two events thus occurring on weak and strong beats respectively. However, because it occupies a larger phrase structure, each stage usually begins with an expression of the (local) dominant harmony and resolves at the end of the phrase unit. This downbeat-to-downbeat progression sees the two events then occurring rather on strong then weak hypermetric beats. As the Fonte cannot be extricated from its context in a symmetrical phrase structure, its harmonic activity is generally perceived on the level of the hypermetre;

• finally, the Fonte’s place within the larger context of a piece of music is as a structural “middle”. It comes after a point of arrival – often a cadence – and serves to effect either a transition to a new key area or a retransition to an earlier one. It is often because of its typical context that an otherwise atypical Fonte may still be recognised as a realisation of the schema, albeit an uncommon one.
Chapter Three

Schemata and Listeners

The purpose of the last chapter was to equip the reader with a detailed understanding of the Fonte by describing its numerous features and by showing many different examples. In drawing those examples from a wide range of composers, I hope to have conveyed the extent to which the Fonte was a piece of malleable stylistic common property rather than one of solely personal invention. This paves the way for my close analysis of how four different composers from around the early nineteenth century engaged with the schema. But before we proceed with that part of the study, a number of other issues and concepts should be addressed. If one is well acquainted with the schema, and indeed with other schemata, then one’s listening experience will be different from that of a person who does not share that knowledge. What role, then, can a schema play in one’s cognition of musical events, and if schemata were indeed a significant part of galant music, might we assume they formed part of the galant listener’s consciousness? Could this same consciousness also have been available to later generations?

Although *Music in the Galant Style* is mainly about the patterns taught, learned and used by composers, Gjerdingen also believes it can offer us an insight into past modes of listening, which have been lost or transformed over the intervening centuries. He believes that we can ‘recover something of a galant musical *mentalité* ... through a close analysis and comparison of galant musical behaviors’.¹ Taking the musical text as a point of departure in this endeavour is valuable, in my view, as an acknowledgement of the influence music has in shaping the outlook of its consumers. However, other factors may impact on one’s listening experience, which is true as much of our own approaches to past music as those of past listeners.

Gjerdingen’s beliefs are shared by Vasili Byros, who has also made recent contributions to the same field. While Byros acknowledges that our modern-day habits can impair our ability to notice the patterns of galant music and appreciate their effect, he nevertheless suggests that musical schemata ‘provide a means of access to the past’

precisely because of their cultural contingency. Schemata ‘are “stamps” of their period’, and in recognising their connection to one another, we can begin to grasp their significance in past modes of listening.

While Gjerdingen applies his theory of galant schemata to the middle of the eighteenth century, could it in any way be applied to the early nineteenth century as well? This study points to one aspect of stylistic similarity between these repertories, but there are of course noticeable stylistic differences as well. If this should mean, then, that the theory cannot be mapped so successfully onto the music of this time, it nevertheless provides a context for analysis. When the music of nineteenth-century composers is interpreted from the perspective of schemata, connections are revealed to us that exist both in the works of their contemporaries and in the works of their predecessors. However, as we stand at a great historical distance from our subject, we are able to survey a great range of music in a way that was not available to the denizens of the past. Approaches and attitudes to music also change with time. These factors should connote neither advantage nor disadvantage, but an inquiry into the thoughts and practices of composers and listeners from the past nevertheless has difficulties that need to be addressed and implications for our research that need to be considered.

**SCHEMATA IN MUSICAL COGNITION**

This discussion must begin with an examination of how schemata play a role in the cognition of music. In explaining the concept of a schema, Gjerdingen draws from the definition provided by psychologist David Rumelhart. He states that schemata are, among other things, 'recognition devices' and 'active processes'. Schemata are always at the forefront of human perception, so wherever something appears to be an instantiation of a particular schema, we will attempt to understand it in terms of that schema rather than

---


3 Ibid., p. 241.

through brute processing of raw data.\(^5\) The latter is the innate process of perception that enables us to make sense of totally novel situations which cannot be accounted for with reference to schemata, which, on the other hand, are learned from prior experience and lead us to assess new experiences in terms of those schemata if enough of their features are perceived. Thus by ‘recognition device’ is meant something that permits us to “re-cognise” rather than obliges us to “cognise” for the first time, as it were. For example, if a passage of music begins in a way that is reminiscent of a Fonte, then we will activate that schema. The result of this activation leads us then to the ‘active process’: once the schema has been identified as a possibility, the mind will actively seek the remaining features that would confirm that the passage is in fact an instantiation of the Fonte.

Prediction is therefore an important part of schema-based cognition. Let us consider the role it has by imagining how, as experienced listeners, we might hear the following example for the first time:\(^6\)

Ex. 3.1. Mozart, Keyboard Sonata, K. 331 (1781–1783), ii: Menuetto, bars 15–23\(^7\)

As this is a minuet, a Fonte after the double bar is commonplace. When we get to bar 18, however, it would be a little premature to predict that a Fonte will happen, as


\(^6\) Gjerdingen discusses this example in ‘Mozart’s Obviously Corrupt Minuet’.

\(^7\) *Wolfgang Amadeus Mozarts Werke, Serie XX: Sonaten und Phantasien für das Pianoforte*, Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1878.
several other options are possible, but we would not be surprised to hear one. Specific triggers occur first in bar 19, which may be described both as harmonic and gestural. The unaccompanied melodic rise is highly typical of a Fonte (as I showed in Chapter 2), although as this kind of gesture may equally precede other passages, preliminary confirmation comes rather with harmony. Fontes are usually preceded by a major chord, such as the overall dominant, in which case its third is lowered at the opening of the Fonte. This can be seen in Ex. 3.1, where bar 18 has an E major chord, whose g♯ becomes g♮ in bar 19. This g♮ becomes the minor sixth of the first stage, announcing the change of mode. We would then listen out for the tonicisation that is an essential part of the Fonte and find ourselves vindicated in bar 20, where we hear the V7 chord that will eventually resolve to B minor. Bar 20’s a♯ leads to the b1 in bar 21, but as this happens over I6/4 harmony, it is not a proper resolution. Furthermore, that point falls short of the projected four-bar phrase structure suggested by the continuing left-hand figuration. If we are also familiar with how the Fenaroli can be combined with the Fonte (see Ex. 2.32) we may predict, on the basis of the early point of resolution, that the last two bars of the phrase will again move through F♯ and b (even if we are unable to predict the exact notes) rather than stay only on b. Once the stage comes to an end, we would expect to hear a repetition of those four bars down a step in A major, allowing for some variation in the transposition. This does happen in our example, so our initial predictions have been all confirmed. We have thus made sense of the passage by relating it to our prior knowledge of music that behaves similarly.

Schema-based prediction is of course not always met with confirmation. Incoming aural stimuli may prove the prediction to have been incorrect, in which case that schema is disregarded, and if another cannot be found, innate processes of brute perception take over. However, in cases where expectation is fairly high, denial can be a source of aesthetic interest. Ex. 3.2, in Eb major, provides the same initial stimuli as Ex. 3.1, so we may reasonably expect to hear a Fonte:

---

8 Ibid., p. 70.
This, like the previous example, is a minuet – in form and character, if not in name. It, too, ends on the dominant before the double bar. The music breaks from the homophonic texture of melody and accompaniment with a characteristic gesture that leaps from the B♭ in bar 24 to the b♭ in bar 25; from this leap we then descend to g and e♮. The undulating rise-and-fall that follows may not be typical, nor the imitative writing, but these techniques are used by other composers as well, so are not uncommon. In bar 27 comes d♭1, which lowers the third of the B♭ major chord from before the double bar. Along the lines of Ex. 3.1, this note would represent the flattened sixth in F minor, the overall supertonic, a harmony to which the e♮ in bar 26 already leans strongly. With these numerous cues, we may be inclined to expect a Fonte that might continue something like this:

Ex. 3.3. Beethoven, Piano Sonata, Op. 7, iii: Allegro, with bars 25–41 recomposed

9 Adapted from Ludwig van Beethovens Werke, Serie 16: Sonaten für das Pianoforte, Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1862.
Psychologists agree that a listener’s ‘affect and arousal’ often derive from ‘the interruption ... of psychological tendencies’.\(^\text{10}\) As schema-based prediction is a psychological tendency, the denial of its fulfilment in Ex. 3.4 would arouse an aesthetic response involving surprise or amusement:

Ex. 3.4.  Beethoven, Piano Sonata, Op. 7, iii: Allegro, as originally composed, bars 21–38

The above, then, is a brief explanation of how schematic knowledge guides the listening experience. Prediction and recognition are processes that operate in tandem, for ‘[instantiated] features serve as cues in the selection of schemata, and schemata serve as guides in the detection of features’.\(^\text{11}\) As in the Beethoven example, it may transpire that the features we seek are not there. However, this is relatively uncommon as straightforward realisations occur much more often than deceptive ones. Indeed, if we are able to form schemata at all, it is because they are mostly presented in a regular fashion.

**APPROACHING SCHEMATA FROM A MODERN PERSPECTIVE**

In processing new experiences, we will always refer to our schematic knowledge if it seems to be applicable. Forming schemata in the first place is also an intuitive act, because human memory, according to Gestalt theory, has a tendency to normalise, or average out,
past experiences. This means that if a listener, today or in the past, is attentive and in possession of a good memory, forming schemata should be virtually automatic. However, a number of writers have suggested many people in the modern day have not formed schemata for galant music along the lines proposed by Gjerdingen.

Charles L. Cudworth, after whom Gjerdingen named the Cudworth Cadence, wrote about the ‘mannerisms’ of galant music in a 1949 article and believed that their effect ‘is largely lost on modern ears’. More recently, W. Dean Sutcliffe recalls trying to explain ‘to a sea of blank faces’ at a conference the pattern that Gjerdingen has subsequently called the Quiescenza. It would seem, then, that mere exposure is in general not sufficient for developing a knowledge of galant schemata. Gjerdingen believes that the generations following the ancien régime ‘lost touch’ with galant modes of thought, the result being that galant schemata often go unnoticed today. ‘How did we become deaf to the Prinner?’ he asks. All three of these writers are referring, furthermore, to people who have a keen interest in, and often a professional engagement with, music of the eighteenth century, so have the innate processes of schema formation not had their supposed effect?

One must of course, not make careless assumptions about the way people hear music or how consciously one reflects on the schemata one has internalised. Indeed, Gjerdingen believes ‘these schemata were designed to be noticed by anyone who listened to enough of this music’ and goes on to say that they ‘may sound quite familiar’ to ‘modern devotees of classical music.’ What is at issue, then, is perhaps not so much familiarity with the patterns of galant music – “familiarity” does not equate to recognising a particular schema in any case – but how significant their role is regarded as being in the craft of galant composition and in the aesthetics of the style. Nineteenth- and twentieth-century discourses about music have focused on aspects other than these recurrent patterns, and

---

16 Ibid., p. 59. For the Prinner, see my Ex. 2.40.
17 Ibid., p. 15.
Gjerdingen believes these have clouded our vision when it comes to the eighteenth century because ‘strong habits in the present easily mask differences in the past’.  

He locates the origins of these present habits in the social upheavals that followed the French Revolution. The rupture in the societal fabric of Europe left the ancien régime ‘but a distant memory’:

Having lost touch with galant society and its web of interdependent meanings, gestures, and modes of communication, the Romantics could do little else but reflect their own musical preoccupations onto an earlier music that was now cut loose from the culture that had nurtured it. The once highly contingent, socially located musical behaviors of court musicians came to be received in some quarters as just pleasant patterns of sound. In a nutshell, the Romantics eviscerated galant content and named the hollow corpse “form.”

The nineteenth century was not peopled solely by Romantics, but its ideology, as I mentioned in my introduction, has dominated twentieth-century discourse about music; attempting to confront this received wisdom is one of the reasons behind my selection of repertoire. However, for Gjerdingen to put form at the centre of early nineteenth-century musical thought perhaps favours theorists over the ordinary listeners whom he privileges in the previous century. Jerrold Levinson, for example, has argued that a listener need have no grasp of large-scale structures in order to have a basic understanding of music or to apprehend its aesthetic qualities. Yet Gjerdingen is after more than “basic understanding” and “mere aesthetic qualities”, which perhaps amount to no more than ‘pleasant patterns of sound’. Lost, he says, is a ‘web of interdependent meanings, gestures, and modes of communication’, which was replaced in later years by new approaches to the production and reception of music. These later approaches, such as the preoccupation with large-scale form or with motivic and thematic treatment, would come to be applied to the study of earlier music as well, in the interests of demonstrating how a work conveyed internal coherence through an embodiment of “organic” unity, and when complete unity could not be identified, those works (and sometimes their composers) would be found wanting.
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18 Ibid., p. 4.  
19 Ibid., p. 416.  
21 For example, compare Gjerdingen’s analysis of the slow movement from Mozart’s Symphony No. 40 in G minor, K. 550 (Music in the Galant Style, pp. 123–128), with that of Georges de Saint-Foix in _The Symphonies of Mozart_ (trans. Leslie Orrey), London: D. Dobson, 1947, or of Herman Abert and others selected to accompany the Norton Score in Nathan Broder (ed.), _Symphony in G Minor, K. 550: The Score of the New Mozart Edition; Historical Note; Analysis; Views and Comments_, New York: W. W. Norton, 1967.
The concepts associated with organicism, such as the seed germinating into a flowering plant that eventually decays, the predetermined potential contained within that seed, the interconnectedness of parts to whole and parts to each other that creates their unity, and the belief in the economy of nature have not only guided much description of music, but have also served as a measure of value.\(^{22}\) By this model, unity is thought to obtain in a piece of music if all its parts can be shown to be related to each other or to an originating motive or musical idea and if all details can be shown to be necessary for creating that unity. Galant music, with its string of seemingly disparate utterances embodied in discrete schemata, often falls short of meeting these criteria, which goes some way to explaining the relative neglect suffered by this repertoire. The organic metaphor may be generally regarded as ‘belonging quintessentially to the critical language of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries’, and in music (it is applied much more widely than just to music) it has has been perpetuated in the influential analytical approaches of theorists such as Heinrich Schenker and Rudolph Réti.\(^ {23}\) This long history has prompted Ruth A. Solie to observe in a 1980 article that ‘[organic] unity as a primary criterion for excellence in works of art is hallowed by time and tradition, so much so that in recent decades it has often been taken utterly for granted.’\(^ {24}\) Janet M. Levy, too, has drawn attention to how the organic principle and its associated notions and values found covert expression in many twentieth-century musicological writings, including ones about eighteenth-century music.\(^ {25}\)

When organic values are given full expression, the “inevitability” of the “natural processes” that give shape to a work lead to a view of the composer as somebody who is unconcerned with the mundane practicalities of writing music: as the musical work qua organism ‘grows and takes shape by itself’, the composer comes to be seen as an ‘artistic genius [who is] a kind of vessel for the life forces of art or inspiration’, rather than as a craftsman or a ‘problem-solver’ — as ‘a sort of midwife to this immanent life force, rather than a maker-of-things’.\(^ {26}\) Even where a more down-to-earth approach to musical analysis has been adopted, organic principles such as that of motivic relatedness have still been the


\(^{24}\) Ibid., p. 148.

\(^{25}\) Levy, ‘Covert and Casual Values’.

primary preoccupation rather than, say, attempts to connect a work to contemporary practices in the compositional craft. For example, in one of his lessons in composition for the Englishman Thomas Attwood, Mozart gave his pupil the task of completing a minuet, in which he had sketched out the bass line of a Fonte at the beginning of the second reprise. Daniel Heartz, in describing this lesson, did not mention that Mozart was passing on an important schema, or that he believed that this was a pattern Attwood ought to know well if he did not already. Instead, Heartz focused on motivic connections: ‘Mozart in this case provided the bass for the second strain by varying and intensifying his lovely initial idea so that the descending conjunct thirds across the bar-line became rising thirds by leap (or descending sixths by octave displacement) followed by descending seconds.’

Ex. 3.5. Mozart/Attwood, *Studies* (1785–1787). (The bass in bars 9–16 is Mozart’s, the other parts Attwood’s.)

Of course, this is not to say that such analyses do not offer insights into galant music, as indeed Heartz’s does, or that galant music may not contribute to our understanding of concepts like form. For instance, while a term like “sonata form” may have been unknown
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28 Reproduced from ibid.
to galant musicians, its structural properties can nevertheless often be identified in their compositions. However, other reasons underlie these analytical approaches. Motivic analysis, while it is intent on demonstrating a high degree of internal coherence, also implicitly aims to show that those interrelationships stop with the boundaries of the work. In other words, it seeks to reinforce the perceived uniqueness of each “individual masterpiece” as the inspired creation of a single mind. A corollary of this belief is that similarity between “masterworks” is then assumed to indicate how one composer found “influence” in the “masterwork” of another. Such a view takes little account of the spheres in which composers operated, or, as Richard Taruskin colourfully puts it, is symptomatic of ‘the historical musicologist’s incurably bourgeois habit of fetishizing individuals and ignoring groups’.30

Particularly in recent decades, however, many musicologists have sought to approach music from different perspectives, such as the phenomenology of musical experiences or with the aims and methods of different disciplines.31 Other approaches seek to contextualise music historically, such as when Leo Treitler urges us to ‘show the place of individual works in history by revealing the history contained within the works themselves, that is by reading the historical nature of works from their internal constitution’.32 Gjerdingen’s theory aims to do precisely this, by showing how schemata are “stamps” of their time. This alternative to the “masterpiece”-centred approach places a musical work, by contrast, in a much less particularised stylistic context. He is of course concerned with the eighteenth century, but at least one aspect of his theory that can be applied to the early nineteenth century is the idea that a number of shared small-scale patterns like the Fonte were employed by most composers and can therefore also be seen as characteristics of that period. The presence of such schemata in the music of both centuries presents a challenge to the notion that the individual artwork is entirely unique and autonomous.

This “autonomy” forms a part of Lydia Goehr’s oft-cited ‘work-concept’, a notion which she believes emerged at the beginning of the nineteenth century and which has
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greatly shaped (especially Anglo-American) musical discourse since.\(^{33}\) The work-concept represents an understanding or ideal about what constitutes a musical work and, importantly, what does not. It is a view that separates a work from extra-opus factors, such as its relationship to other music through a shared use of musical schemata. It also seeks to establish one authoritative version of a work, a ‘regulative force [which] tends against “unstable” musical practices’\(^{34}\) like improvisation. However, the partimento tradition, for one, shows us a strong connection between improvisation and composition, with schemata integral to both. Improvisation remained strong in the early nineteenth century but the work-concept steers us away from considering how schemata may have been a part of that process at that time as well.

The preceding paragraphs have outlined some of the ‘habits’ that have shaped much musical discourse of the last hundred or even two-hundred years, but exposing them does not mean that galant schemata will then automatically reveal themselves to us. Indeed, other ways of hearing this music have been proposed, most importantly topic theory, which accounts for the sometimes incongruous contrasts in this music by associating different moments with various “topics” – sometimes musically coded evocations of extra-musical ideas, sometimes meta-musical referents.\(^{35}\) Metaphors of speech, too, may guide one’s listening, and evidence that this mode of reception existed in the eighteenth century is found in many sources.\(^{36}\) As significant as each of these ideas are, they are not mutually exclusive, and they are most convincing when they do not attempt to be totalising. Indeed, Gjerdingen does not wish to ‘force every note into a rigid framework of phrase schemata’, though there are times when he seems to try.\(^{37}\) Nevertheless, his overriding theory remains that schemata ‘formed one of the cores of a galant musician’s zibaldone, his well-learned repertory of musical business, and that in the social setting of a galant court, these


\(^{37}\) Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style*, p. 75. Some of his “Prinners” lack the necessary bass support (his Ex. 6.7) and his “Fonte” in my Ex. 2.26 has, as I have argued, no rhythmic or melodic parallelism. Other terms seem to assume schematic categorisation without being explained, such as “Triadic flourish”, “Opening gambit” or “Coda” (his Exx. 3.18, 26.6 and 17.2 respectively).
schemata formed an aural medium of exchange between aristocratic patrons and their musical artisans. Gjerdingen, then, has a clear idea of who his knowledgeable listeners were, and it is to them that we now turn.

DEFINING THE LISTENER

For Gjerdingen and Byros, the presence of noticeably similar patterns in galant music implies that audiences listened ‘in terms of schemata’. Examining the use of schemata in galant repertoire means to inquire into how people listened at the time, because, as Byros puts it, ‘[i]dentifying schemata in a musical work would ... amount to reconstructing listening habits as much as a compositional mindset.’ Taking a musical text as a starting point, then, we can make assumptions about the experiences or thought processes of both composers and listeners. This is because ‘music is a communicative act’ and as composers themselves are listeners, they are engaged in both ends of the communication. This communication, he adds, also involves composers getting feedback from their listeners, so it is ‘difficult to disproved the hypothesis [that audiences listened in terms of schemata], if not unreasonable to attempt to do so’. I agree that composers and listeners would have been – indeed, needed to have been – relatively well attuned to each other’s ideas, modes of expression and sense of taste, not least because many listeners were also players, bringing them into close engagement with musical compositions. Furthermore, as I mentioned in Chapter 1, repetition and reiteration of musical ideas – which not only happens in the Fonte, but is arguably one of the driving forces of most music – works to increase the communicability of musical content. However, I do believe that Byros’ hypothesis still calls for some discussion.

Although one may make inferences about the nature of the communication surrounding a particular work, one can never do so without attempting to place the work in its original context. This is one of the strengths of Music in the Galant Style, as we are shown

38 Ibid., p. 15.
40 Ibid.
schemata used in the works of almost eighty composers. Coupled with Gjerdingen’s emphasis on aristocratic courts, this creates a social, as well as stylistic, context in which to situate an individual work. Experience of such a context would give listeners the ability to relate contemporaneous works to each other and to make judgements about them according to the values they believe are appropriate to the context. This context gives rise to what literary theorist Hans Robert Jauss calls the ‘horizon of expectations’:

A literary work, even if it seems new, does not appear as something absolutely new in an informational vacuum, but predisposes its readers to a very definite type of reception by textual strategies, overt and covert signals, familiar characteristics or implicit allusions. It awakens memories of the familiar, stirs particular emotions in the reader and with its ‘beginning’ arouses expectations for the ‘middle and end’, which can then be continued intact, changed, re-oriented or even ironically fulfilled in the course of reading according to certain rules of the genre or type of text. ... The new text evokes for the reader ... the horizon of expectations and rules familiar from earlier texts, which are then varied, corrected, changed or just reproduced.\(^{42}\)

Viewed from this perspective, the production of a musical work, like that of a literary text, implies a certain audience. As eighteenth-century music (and to a lesser extent that of the nineteenth) ‘awakens memories of the familiar’ – that is, of previously encountered examples of that style of music – and as it arouses expectations that may be ‘continued intact, changed, re-oriented or even ironically fulfilled’, it may be said to imply a listenership that is conversant with the elements of the style. Although Jauss’ idea that the ‘beginning’ leads the reader to anticipate the ‘middle and end’ is one that is more obviously applicable to narrative structures, it can map well onto a listener’s experience of larger musical forms as well as onto his or her processing of harmonic activity. It could also apply to a listener’s activation of schema-based prediction, although the level of consciousness at which that may take place and the speed at which it happens makes it more passive than what Jauss is describing. Nevertheless, if music was made up, in large part, of common patterns, it would imply listeners’ familiarity with these known ‘textual strategies’ and ‘signals’. To apply Jauss further, ‘[v]ariation and correction’ in the realisation of schemata in part ‘determine the scope, alteration and reproduction of the borders and structure of the genre’,\(^{43}\) or in this case, of galant music.


\(^{43}\) Ibid.
The context in which, or for which, a work is created is what furnishes a reader or listener with the capacity to form context-specific expectations. This context is also evoked by the text. However, “evoking” is not the same thing as “recreating”, so someone who is not familiar with the context will not have access to the same contextual background as someone who is. It also does not follow that even people who are familiar with the context will all have the same experience or reaction to a work. This is evidently so today and no different two or three centuries ago. In *Pleasure and Meaning in the Classical Symphony*, Melanie Lowe undertakes a hermeneutic exploration of the possible experiences of eighteenth-century listeners which makes this point all too clearly.\(^4^4\) One chapter presents three fictional characters hearing Haydn’s Symphony No. 88, which reminds us that people, then as now, make different musical interpretations and judgements based on a range of factors such as their position within the current socio-political context, their previous experience of a range of musical styles and the associations they make with them, the commentaries they have read or heard made by others about (supposedly) related music, or even their attentiveness and mood at the time of hearing. The chapter is an important reminder that one piece may have a different significance for everybody. Furthermore, factors not apparent in the text of a work can influence how it is understood, such as how the ‘semiotics’ of certain kinds of contemporary popular music accrue meaning in function of their consumers.\(^4^5\)

Yet music can also in turn influence the people who listen to it, so while Lowe is right to warn against positing any kind of single, authoritative interpretation of a work, we should still be open to the possibility that the work can reveal to us some indication of its original audience’s *mentalité*. Gjerdingen proposes that we regard schemata as ‘potsherds’ from musicological excavations, from which we might ‘attempt an archaeology of utterances from that distant musical civilization, one whose courtiers share with us relatively few social structures or modes of thought’.\(^4^6\) With regards to the testimonies of Lowe’s imaginary characters, one must also query how much an individual’s description of his or her listening experience accurately reflects the way that individual actually listens. In fact, this may be


\(^4^6\) Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style*, pp. 18–19.
something we cannot ever know, so while I agree with Gjerdingen and Byros that past music can hint to us how it may have been heard, we must be careful not to assume too much of our implied listener.

One problem with the idea of deducing an implied listener from musical works is in knowing how much is implied. Byros believes we should not be content with ‘sheer recognition of a musical pattern’, as it is only when we place that in ‘the context of the larger cultural mentalité of schematic “musical thought”’, including the interrelationships between different schemata, that our familiarity with these patterns becomes more profound.\(^{47}\) Does this mean such an appreciation should entail completely conscious reflection, and if studies such as this one or Gjerdingen’s reveal a great variety of minute differences in the realisations of a single schema, does it mean the implied listener is attuned to these subtleties?

Gjerdingen wisely avoids overcommitting himself, being content simply to recuperate ‘something of’ past modes of listening. Having unrealistically high expectations of the implied listener can lead us to what Wolfgang Iser, also a literary theorist, calls the ‘ideal reader’, or, in our case, ‘ideal’ listener. He uses the term to denote the hypothetical case of a reader who is privy to all the workings of the author’s or composer’s mind, but he warns us that this is a flawed concept. To paraphrase Iser,

‘an ideal [listener] is a structural impossibility as far as [musical] communication is concerned. An ideal [listener] would have to have an identical code to that of the [composer]; [composers], however, generally re-codify prevailing codes in their texts, and so the ideal [listener] would also have to share the intentions underlying this process. And if this were possible, communication would then be quite superfluous, for one only communicates that which is not already shared by sender and receiver.’\(^{48}\)

Although “communication” may take different meanings in literature and in music, or operate on different layers, the idea that communication is involved in the production and reception of music is difficult to deny, especially in the music of the common-practice era.\(^{49}\) While in some literary genres the text very obviously addresses the reader, an invocation not normally matched in music, we may nevertheless consider that a musical work or body of music also assumes communication to a more or less specific listenership
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\(^{47}\) Byros, ‘Unearthing the Past’, p. 121.


\(^{49}\) Indeed, this topic forms the subject matter of the essays in Mirka and Agawu (eds.), Communication in Eighteenth-Century Music.
The content and addressee(s) of that communication are by contrast less easy to define accurately, and less easy again in music than in literature. This concept of the ‘ideal’ listener, then, is flawed not only because it assumes we can know so much about the listener, but, by extension, because it assumes we can know as much about the composer. However, it is not possible to know the nature and extent of a composer’s “underlying intentions” (as Iser put it) or indeed to demonstrate convincingly that intentions were held at all.

When Iser writes that authors (or composers) ‘re-codify prevailing codes in their texts’ and of the ‘intentions underlying this process’, this may paint the picture of a composer who is able to describe every last detail of the decisions undertaken in writing a piece of music. Yet one’s thought process is never made entirely of conscious choices. David Temperley distinguishes between *declarative* thought, which is ‘learned by explicit rules, expressed verbally, and realized in deliberate actions’ and, on the other hand, *procedural* thought, which is ‘learned by experience, [is] nonverbal, and automatic’.\(^\text{50}\) For Riepel, the Fonte, Monte and Ponte evidently constituted declarative thought: he wrote about them. That other galant musicians learned schemata is evident from the simple fact of their using them in their compositions. Putting something down with pen and ink certainly is an deliberate act, but when something becomes second nature, it may fall into the category of procedural knowledge. Those who studied in the Neapolitan partimento tradition developed the skill of realising schemata, not by learning them through verbalisation, but by rote at the keyboard.\(^\text{51}\)

Gjerdingen also conveys how important a professional musician’s awareness was of the work of his contemporaries. Composers may have ‘learned and mimicked’ the works of others, taken ‘models’ to imitate, or ‘absorbed’ strategies from what they heard and played, reflecting both declarative and procedural thought.\(^\text{52}\) If musicians learned to play schemata by getting them under their fingers and if composers also absorbed schematic strategies from other music, this may have constituted procedural thought – certainly unlike the
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\(^{50}\) Temperley, review Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style*, p. 283.


\(^{52}\) Ibid., pp. 48–50.
deliberateness involved in situations where composers apparently borrowed ideas from the works of others.53

In a similar vein, Paul Cobley suggests that as well as the real author of a text, we must also acknowledge the implied author, in whom rests the capacity to articulate what to the real author is only procedural knowledge. Because the ‘thoughts, proclivities and intentions of a “real author” can never be fully known – even, in a post-Freudian world, to him/herself’, the notion of an implied author offers ‘coherence where it cannot be automatically assumed that the empirical author had meticulously planned this all along’.54

All this is not to say that composers were oblivious to their use of schemata, but it does suggest that they will not always have dwelt on how the exact manner of their realisation differed from others. Though all Fontes, for instance, are realised differently, their similarity is, as mentioned above, by far the more obvious point. Consequently, it seems to me that the simple fact of schemata being used would have been more significant to listeners than any minute variations in their execution. Danuta Mirka sees a ‘heightened awareness of the role played by conventions on all levels of musical communication’ in the eighteenth century and believes that the sense of their ‘very conventionality [led] composers to confound conventions by mixing or ‘misapplying’ them in a given piece’.55 This may have been true in many regards, but before a convention can be confounded, its conventionality must be first established then reinforced. As concerns schemata, there were far more standard presentations of the Fonte than there were deviant ones. Such a statement does not, as it may seem, reify one schematic prototype, but rather considers that a range of slightly different presentations (such as 4–3 or 5–1 basses) would all appear to a listener as examples of in essence the same thing. Calling a 4–3 bass a deviation favours statistics over psychology. I doubt very much that most listeners would have considered a 4–3 bass a witty, interesting or surprising take on the Fonte, for if composers may not have been constantly reflecting on how they realised each schema differently each time, why would listeners? It is rather the significant changes (rarer,

logically) that should have raised quite a few more eyebrows, such as when Paul Wranitzky used two minor stages in a Fonte from his string quartet Op. 10, No. 4, which, unlike Ex. 2.10 (also two minor stages), comes after the double bar in a minuet:

Ex. 3.6.  Paul Wranitzky, String Quartet, Op. 10, No. 4 (c. 1790), iii: Menuetto, bars 24–34\(^\text{56}\)

Noticing such a deviation still depends on a listener’s familiarity with the schema, and for Gjerdingen, this was privileged: ‘the galant tradition as a whole ... favors insiders with broad knowledge of the courtly repertory.’\(^\text{57}\) As we have seen, he locates the origins of the style in an aristocratic milieu, reflecting a code of conduct which he describes then as ‘adaptable to city life’.\(^\text{58}\) This is certainly a defensible position, given the economic realities of noble patronage. But need a listener’s schematic awareness, if one has it at all, be so socially exclusive? As a musical education was valued by the members of aristocratic society,


\(^{57}\) Gjerdingen, Music in the Galant Style, p. 265.

\(^{58}\) Ibid., p. 6.
they conceivably gained an affinity with musical schemata through their teachers, but outside of courtly circles (and beyond the ancien régime), many middle-class citizens also prized music as a part of their education and entertainment. In addition, partimenti basses, which we know to contain schemata in a pedagogical setting, were written ‘by and for professionals’, so we can make no assumptions that courtiers acquired schematic knowledge through their musical education just because their teachers may have been trained with partimenti. Furthermore, if the ‘courtly ideal’ was adapted to city life, does that not then mean that the middle classes were as often as not in possession of the same mindset and aesthetic temperament as their courtly compatriots? Indeed, Mary Sue Morrow cautions against too rigid an opposition between courtly and bourgeois as ‘audiences for many eighteenth-century “commercial” [bourgeois] concerts included mostly “courtly” ears.’

Present-day listeners may, apparently, find themselves behind ideological barriers that stand in the way of their hearing the schemata of galant music, but while these will not have impaired eighteenth-century listeners, we cannot automatically assume that they necessarily heard any more than simply ‘pleasant patterns of sound’. As the acquisition of schemata through exposure is, in theory, open to anybody, social class ought not to have been a restriction. Likewise, who is to say that early nineteenth-century listeners could not also acquire schematic knowledge, as the composers of the time evidently had?

Of course, among both bourgeois and noble citizens, a discrepancy in not only schematic awareness, but stylistic competence in general, would have been in evidence – one which was borne out by the ubiquitous Kenner und Liebhaber opposition. Were the less intellectual Liebhaber then ignored by composers who rather sought to please the initiated few? On the contrary, there was a long history of public amateur concerts during the century, if less in Vienna than in many other European centres, and there is documented evidence of composers striving to meet the approbation of either or both. To appropriate
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59 Ibid., p. 61.
60 Ibid., p. 6.
62 Though the terms ‘amateurs’ and ‘Liebhaber’ could refer to performers or listeners, these ‘music lovers’ still stood in contrast to the trained professional. See Matthew Riley, Musical Listening in the German Enlightenment: Attention, Wonder and Astonishment, Burlington: Ashgate, 2004, pp. 88–92. See also Simon McVeigh, Concert Life in London from Mozart to Haydn, Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993; Mary Sue Morrow, Concert Life in Haydn’s Vienna: Aspects of a Developing Musical and Social
Mozart’s well-known words, schemata were used in a way where ‘here and there connoisseurs alone can derive satisfaction [but] non-connoisseurs cannot fail to be pleased, though without knowing why.’

This raises the question of precisely what it means to hear music ‘in terms of schemata’. In Ex. 3.4, above, the interplay between suggestion and denial of the Fonte would not occur to someone who had no conscious awareness of the schema. Although schemata may appear to operate subconsciously, they are nevertheless something we can access consciously. We are able to describe their properties if we put our minds to it. However, the deception that takes place in Ex. 3.7 could be easily described by someone with no awareness of the schema. Although the sudden shift to G♭ major (♭VI) in bar 88 does not fulfil one’s expectations of the Fonte, one can also say, without referring to the schema, that Schumann deviates from the harmonic trajectory that is established in the first stage and made evident by the transposition of the melody:

Ex. 3.7. Robert Schumann, Symphony No. 4 in D minor, Op. 120 (1841, rev. 1851), iii, Scherzo: Lebhaft (Trio), bars 81–9

One of course needs to be familiar with the way tonal music operates, but many people who are not conscious of the Fonte or other such schemata do have an intuitive understanding of the basic concepts of tonal harmony. Because the Fonte does not
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transgress any of the rules of tonal music, it means that schematically uninformed listeners can still make perfect sense of it. This also raises the question of whether a schema can be considered a “vehicle” for other aesthetic content, that is, whether it may be the means to an end, rather than an end in itself (if this is what is implied by ‘listening in terms of schemata’). In other words, listeners may feel the psychological effect of a certain passage without registering the stylistic import of the “underlying” schema.

Galant music may have been accessible, but we should not assume listeners registered the use of schemata. If they had no declarative knowledge of them, people probably noticed not so much the schemata themselves, as their effect – an effect isolated by the frequent points of closure that punctuate galant music, or by their configuration into pairs of reciprocal gestures. A number of the patterns Gjerdingen proposes, however, do not make themselves so apparent. While some, including the Fonte, are very recognisable and easy to grasp – thanks to a clear, often bipartite, internal structure, occasional double presentations, an evident formal function and characteristic harmonies or notes – others are less easily pinned down, such as the Ponte (see Ex. 1.1), or may be subsumed under a more general category, such as “changing-note schema” for the Meyer (see Chapter 1), Jupiter, Pastorella and Aprile.⁶⁶ Some, notably the various clausulae, are reasonably technical. (Clausulae refer to various cadential articulations differentiated particularly by the motions of the bass and/or soprano voices.) There is ample evidence, not only from compositions, but also from pedagogical texts by the likes of Johann Gottfried Walther, Francesco Galeazzi and Johann Friedrich Daube,⁶⁷ that musicians were well versed in the distinctions between various cadence types. But I wonder if terms like “strong close”, “weak close” and “evaded close” (and Gjerdingen does also use this vocabulary) might better approximate the listener’s psychological response to the different types of cadence. Although he believes that ‘the several subspecies [of clausulae] had significance to eighteenth-century musicians and their audiences’,⁶⁸ can all his noble listeners really have had such outstanding aural skills – to say nothing of their ability to appreciate the ars combinatoria of supposedly combined schemata?

⁶⁶ Gjerdingen, Music in the Galant Style. The Jupiter (p. 116), Pastorella (p. 117) and Aprile (p. 122) are proposed as variants on the Meyer and share with it either the first two or last two notes of the melody.
⁶⁷ Ibid., pp. 139 (Walther), 156 (Galeazzi), 158 (Daube).
⁶⁸ Ibid., p. 141. Emphasis added.
We also have access to a wealth of music from this time that makes analysis and schematic abstraction easier for us today than for listeners then. In addition, we are exposed to music from later periods and other cultures and our noticing recurrent patterns in galant music may be symptomatic of a perceived need to make sense of this diversity. Finding similarity within a style and differences between styles are two sides of the same coin, and this preoccupation of a number of modern musicologists may not have occurred so readily to eighteenth-century listeners.

We can surely assume courtiers had their Kenner und Liebhaber just as the middle classes had and, as much as this may sound a truism, it reminds us not to forget the Liebhaber. Mark Evan Bonds laments that we today tend to be ‘reluctant to let philistines into the composer’s workshop and have them looking over the shoulder of the artist. And we are equally reluctant to let these Nicht-Kenner look over our own shoulders as we analyse this music.’ After describing how C. P. E. Bach, Haydn and Mozart sought very specifically to compose music that would satisfy both Kenner and Liebhaber alike, Bonds criticises any analytical approach that only takes Kenner into account as unable to do justice to all facets of the ‘public taste’ (quoting Charles Burney).

Though we may be able to speak with reasonable certainty of a composer’s schematic knowledge, we should take care not to conflate production and reception. Iser explained that the problem with the concept of a so-called ‘ideal’ reader (listener) is that he or she already knows everything that the author wishes to communicate, whereas ‘one only communicates that which is not already shared by sender and receiver’. Not only this, but surely a composer is meant to be more competent with the materials of the craft than the listener. Though later philosophies may find such an assertion tendentious, the ‘aesthetic commerce’ of music in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was generally transacted because the composer could produce art that the listeners could not, for whatever reason, produce themselves. This factor also contributes to the phenomenon of continuing to enjoy a piece of music after numerous hearings.

Of course there is value in detailed analysis – as I myself perform in this study – but we should not focus chiefly on the clever, sophisticated and intellectual aspect of schema
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69 Mark Evan Bonds, ‘Listening to Listeners’, p. 43.
70 Ibid., p. 39.
71 Gjerdingen, Music in the Galant Style, p. 16.
realisation and lose sight of the idea that the many straightforward presentations of musical schemata were more important to the prized accessibility of this art. As Eugene Narmour indicates, ‘many psychologists argue that sophisticated listeners desire complexity through schema discrepancy [for example, nuanced variety in realisation or intricate *ars combinatoria*], [and] other scholars and scientists have argued that naïve listeners prefer simplicity through stylistic repetition and schematic replication [that is, straightforward realisations].’

If we treat galant music as an ‘esoteric’ art, which can only be appreciated if the listener grasps the nuances of its construction, are we not undermining its accessibility? Though not all galant works had ‘a thin texture, a sprightly mood, a clearly defined melody and bass, frequent points of articulation and cadence, and simple schemes of repetition or contrast’, these characteristics must have been a breath of fresh air in contrast to dense polyphonic textures or unrelenting *Fortspinnung* of the High Baroque. And, as Wye J. Allanbrook points out, ‘the prevalence of major keys ... appeared as [a] striking new [trope]’, whereas Baroque composers used major and minor keys in fairly even distribution. This was a style which was not only an accessible one, but one that revelled in its accessibility. Its musical conventions were not a mask that stifled the composer’s “true voice” – a notion born in the Romantic fixation with originality; rather, Allanbrook argues that the ‘relative novelty [of new tropes] evolved not to repress a new musical impulse but to empower it.’ If galant music was an accessible art, that does not square with its favouring insiders.

This accessibility has two ramifications, roughly in line with Mozart’s words quoted above. First, non-connoisseurs, or *Nicht-kenner*, could appreciate galant music in a way that did not undermine, challenge or fail to reflect their social *mentalité*; and second, it means galant schemata could be appreciated by perceptive listeners irrespective of social standing. As I argued in Chapter 2, the ease with which schemata like the Fonte – unlike the Ponte – can be grasped in galant music can be attributed to the clear delineation of the structural units in which they sit and which surround them.

---

74 Ibid.
76 Gjerdingen emphatically does not subscribe to this Romantic notion.
Many Fontes in the early nineteenth century are presented in a manner which is just as clear, meaning they were likewise accessible to listeners. However, it must also be said that in the music of this time, this clarity is frequently not present. Many composers favoured a style which did employ regular phrase structure, but concealed it by means such as continuity of melodic or accompanimental lines, phrase overlap or elision, or the overlaying of alternative rhythmic groupings. It follows that, in such music, perceiving the structural units that contain Fontes or other schemata is less intuitive than in galant music. However, this study amply demonstrates that composers at this time knew and used the Fonte extensively. Does the possibility of listeners not having registered the use of schemata diminish the value of our observing that these patterns are present in the music?

**SUMMARY**

The preceding section considered many of the possible listeners “implied” by music that uses schemata, in both the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. I suggested that listeners would have varied extensively in their knowledge and predispositions, with schematic awareness neither guaranteed nor precluded by one’s social position. The notion of a single implied listener certainly could never account for the diversity that existed – or exists today – among a work’s listening public, and it is a concept which may lead some to make problematic assumptions about a composer’s intentions. Furthermore, identifying the “implied” listener is predicated on one’s being able to define how one hears music. I have explained that it is unclear what is meant by listening ‘in terms of schemata’, especially if Gjerdingen does not expect every note to be ‘force[d] … into a rigid framework of phrase schemata’.

An interpretation of music that highlights the presence of schemata may offer us revealing insights into the music and make it seem quite possible that some listeners registered how they were being used. Gjerdingen claims no more than that, calling his theory of listening ‘conjectural and not necessarily superior [to other modern approaches]. Like “authentic” performance, it is a modern reconstruction of an imagined past’. Byros is
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77 Rothstein, *Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music*. See particularly the composer case studies.

somewhat less cautious. When he says that ‘[i]dentifying schemata in a musical work would ... amount to reconstructing listening habits as much as a compositional mindset’, he does not make an adequate distinction between the realms of production and reception: he assumes that if a composer thought about schemata while writing, then audiences must likewise have thought about schemata when listening. Of course it is reasonable to assume a number of points in common between the mindsets of both listeners and composers, but in this chapter I have argued that we must allow for diversity. However, when Byros states that galant schemata ‘are symptomatic of a larger sociocultural etiquette underlying the European noble court system’, he implicitly binds all denizens of this social context by one and the same mentalité. But just as there was a large range in the musical competence of eighteenth-century listeners, so too must there have been variety in their etiquette and taste (in part influenced by their competence).

Why should we aspire to reconstruct past listening habits? If it is in order to find ‘evidence’ to support the theory of schematic composition, then I believe it is unnecessary. Even if actual evidence could be found to corroborate or contradict the posited existence of these supposed listeners, it would neither validate nor discredit the theory. Peter Schubert writes:

> The cumbersome apparatus that serves as “proof” is flawed and unnecessary. Holding up the valued musical object and pointing out some features that interest him, features that were perhaps inspired by reading the treatises, [the analyst] offers us insight, not “truth.” [...] At worst, [Schenkerian analyses of fifteenth-century chansons] are inconsistent, inefficient or unpersuasive, but never a priori wrong. Even if they contradict what historical evidence we have, they may be intellectually viable.80

And by the same token, he also asks whether an analysis that was later found to be supported by historical documents needed that corroboration to be persuasive? For me, Gjerdingen’s theory of schema-based composition is persuasive whether or not eighteenth-century courtiers were in fact always attuned to the schemata. The current study shows that one galant schema, the Fonte, continued to be used widely by composers in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. The natural extension of this project would be to investigate the possible use of other galant schemata at this time.81 However, they are

79 Byros, ‘Unearthing the Past’, p. 118.
81 Gjerdingen already provides the occasional example throughout Music in the Galant Style. For instance, the Fenaroli schema is shown in the music of Beethoven and Chopin on pp. 238–239.
certainly less obvious there than in galant music, so schematic awareness among listeners would be difficult to demonstrate convincingly. Yet I do not believe that this should be any impediment to further research in this repertoire, nor that one’s inability to find “corroboration” in the listening habits of the day should render schematic analysis of nineteenth-century music any less persuasive.
Chapter Four

Beethoven

The purpose of the next four chapters is to undertake a close examination of how the Fonte forms a component of a composer’s œuvre. All of the composers studied have written fully conventional Fontes, and while some of these are shown, I will focus on those realisations that depart, sometimes quite markedly, from those conventional forms. Although we see some decidedly inventive treatments, many of the techniques used can be noted in the works of other composers of the time as well. Therefore rather than give impressions solely of originality, I wish to draw attention to the many ways in which this musical common property was integrated into the artistic output of these four case-study composers.

There were numerous examples in Chapter 2 of Beethoven’s Fontes, mostly from his piano concertos (Exx. 2.18, 2.20, 2.21, 2.33) but also from an orchestral minuet (Ex. 2.29) and a septet (Ex. 2.34). Naturally, he used the schema in music for smaller ensembles or solo piano as well. This chapter will soon make that evident, but by way of introduction, Exx. 4.1 and 4.2 show straightforward examples from these more intimate chamber repertories. In Ex. 4.1, Beethoven has inflected the schema with the very galant turn of phrase that Gjerdingen has termed the High ❷ Drop (seen in Ex. 2.26), a melodic figure where ❷ in a higher register drops to a closing 4 – 3, here after an intervening fill:

In Ex. 4.2, the first violin provides a simple descant over the usual counterpoint in the viola and cello:

Ex. 4.2. Beethoven, String Trio, Op. 3 (1794), iii: Menuetto – Allegretto (Trio), bars 1–25

---

Many of the Fontes in this study are taken from minuets or comparable movement types such as scherzi. With the growing popularity of the character piece in the nineteenth century, we see that many stand-alone compositions are patently related to the minuet, including some bagatelles (this moniker prescribes no one formal structure). In fact, sketches for Beethoven's Bagatelle WoO 52 (Ex. 4.3) suggest it may originally have been intended for the scherzo of his piano sonata Op. 10, No. 1. Structural similarity is always one indication of how these forms are related, be it manifested in a general ternary shape (minuet–trio–minuet) or only in a binary or two-reprise form like that of the minuet proper (that is, excluding the trio, although the trio likewise has that same form). Another device that links these forms is the reasonably common use of a Fonte after the double bar that ends the first reprise. This connection is preserved in the trio of WoO 52:

Ex. 4.3. Beethoven, Bagatelle in C minor, WoO 52 (1797), bars 104–20

This Bagatelle may, like the first two examples, date from early in Beethoven's career, but he also published two collections of Bagatelles late in his life, Opp. 119 (1823) and 126 (1825). The fifth piece in the latter set presents a very interesting Fonte, which follows the double bar in this short binary piece:

---

What is intriguing in this example is, on the one hand, its tonal relationship to the preceding section, and on the other hand, the harmonies within the Fonte itself. The move from a B major chord, as V of E minor, in bar 16 (second-time bar) to C major may be striking, with its semitone rise from the pitch classes B and D♯ to C and E, as well as the implication of parallel fifths with F♯ moving to G. But this is not simply an unprepared semitone shift from one bar to another. A further connection exists between the key of this Fonte and earlier harmonic progressions. Before that connection is discussed, however, we should first examine the unusual harmonic profile of this Fonte.

Often a Fonte announces itself from the outset through the tonicisation of its supertonic. This is not the case here, and, consequently, we get more the impression that a new section is beginning than that we are entering a transitional passage. A new

---

accompaniment figure in bar 17 gives Janet Schmalfeldt the impression of its being 'utterly new material' and its pastoral character (a descending melody in thirds over an undulating bass) may be what leads her to compare this section with a trio⁶ – a movement which often expresses a rural topic.⁷ The opening melodic gesture of this passage is very Fonte-like, with a leap to a higher note (b⁷–g⁲, bars 16–17) following a cadence and a pause in the accompaniment and a subsequent gradual descent, but such melodic activity is very common in other situations as well. As stated, a Fonte usually begins by presenting the applied dominant harmony of the first stage, but here we have the tonic harmony of the second! The tenor line, which I treat as the virtual bass voice in these bars, betrays no indication of tonicising the supertonic until as late as bar 20. The motion c⁰→d¹ in bar 17 does not convey leading note-to-tonic motion, so is no signal of a Fonte. This raises the question of whether the true Fonte occurs only in bars 20–21.⁸

Ex. 4.5. Beethoven, Bagatelle, Op. 126, No. 5, bars 20–21

In isolation, these bars appear to represent a self-sufficient Fonte, but as I argued in Chapter 2, the stages of a Fonte are heard in line with its surrounding phrase structure, one of the reasons why schemata are particularly noticeable in eighteenth-century music. Such a reading would also disregard the importance of metrical placement in schema perception. Each phrase should begin on a relatively strong hypermetric downbeat. Here, however, bar 20 is far less accented than bar 21 because of its position at the end of a four-bar phrase unit. Though both stages typically begin on hierarchically strong beats, the second stage itself is generally hypermetrically slightly weaker than the first (see Fig. 2.3), and the reading

⁸ Some of the slurs in Ex. 4.4 are editorial. In the autograph, bar 20 marks a new page, from which point Beethoven ostensibly abandons all slurring for a few lines.
at Ex. 4.5 contradicts this. Of course, bars 21 and 17 are not harmonically analogous, but the melodic gesture and metrical structure reinforce the parallelism of the two four-bar stages.

To return to the issue of tonal relationships, the shift to C major in bar 17 which is prolonged until bar 24 in fact marks the culmination of a downward digression by thirds already played out on a smaller scale in bars 1–5 (see Fig. 4.1). The opening G major moves to E minor in bar 3 (such a rapid shift surely contributes to the overall impression of tonal instability) and again in bar 11. From the half cadence in bar 16 (not shown on the graph), we descend again by a third from the key of E minor (not from the chord of B major) to C major, which, as indicated, is prolonged through to bar 24. Fig. 4.1 summarises these shifts, with bar 24 transposed down two octaves and bar 35 (not shown in Ex. 4.4) down one:

Fig. 4.1. Third-relationships in Beethoven, Bagatelle, Op. 126, No. 5

The continuous pedals c and g in the bass here also obfuscate the usual harmonic clarity of a Fonte. These pedals make the prolongation of C major obvious, although a normal Fonte ultimately prolongs the second stage anyway (this aspect is discussed in more detail in Chapter 6). The use of an overall tonic or dominant pedal is a noteworthy feature and one that other composers were writing around this time (such as Ex. 2.31). Beethoven had also used this technique previously, such as in the second of his two Op. 14 piano sonatas:

![Music notation](image)

(In bars 83–86, Beethoven repeats the entire Fonte, a technique that develops currency at this time and which I discuss further in Chapter 7.) The pedal in the first stage could be interpreted as the bass of a V\(^{4/2}\) chord in D minor (ii), but the continuity of the repeated Gs points rather to its role as dominant in the overall key of C major. Although I have treated the tenor voice as virtual bass, the instability associated with a passage of "middle" function is enhanced here by the dominant pedal, which does mean the Fonte ends on a six-four chord. Of course, once the G is sounded, it will begin to decay, but it is interesting to see Beethoven bringing out this pedal by degrees: in bar 83, it is struck on its own on beat one, and in the composer's own arrangement of this sonata for string quartet, the sound of the note will be sustained by the cellist:

---

Ex. 4.7. Beethoven, Piano Sonata, Op. 14, No. 1 (string quartet version), ii: Allegretto, bars 79–87\(^\text{10}\) (key raised a semitone by Beethoven for the arrangement; chord analysis treats tenor as virtual bass)

Beethoven brings out the same dominant pedal in the scherzo of his piano sonata No. 29, Op. 106, “Hammerklavier” (Ex. 4.8), by writing it in descending octaves:

Ex. 4.8. Beethoven, Piano Sonata, Op. 106 (1817–18), ii: Scherzo, bars 14–18\(^\text{11}\) (chord analysis treats tenor as virtual bass)

Donald Tovey says this passage takes place over the dominant, with a 'colouring' of ii.\(^\text{12}\) Technically correct though that is, I prefer to recognise the tonality implied by the Fonte (B♭) and treat the lower melody line as the virtual bass in my chord analysis. Such an analysis

\(^{10}\) Ludwig van Beethoven: Quatuor pour deux Violons, Alto et Violoncelle d'après une Sonate, arrangé par lui-même, Vienna: Bureau des Arts et d'Industrie, n. d.


\(^{12}\) Donald Tovey, A Companion to Beethoven's Pianoforte Sonatas, London: Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music, 1951, p. 222.
is probably not what Charles Rosen had in mind when he cited these bars as an example of 'the same detailed insistence on \( B^\# \) that we found in the first movement'.\(^{13}\) Might that rather be an accidental relationship, given how common a Fonte is in this position, arising from the necessary tonicisation of \( C \) minor in the first stage? One of the most common harmonic plans for this movement type begins with an opening sixteen-bar period that moves from I to V and is followed by a Fonte in I, all of which happens here. In my analysis, the tonic chord (\( B^\# \)) of the Fonte is again a six-four chord (bar 18). This weakens the articulation of the schema's end-point, thereby intensifying its fitness for transitional purpose. The beginning of the Fonte sees the dominant pedal continue the left hand's exact notes from the cadence at the end of the opening period. When transferring these down two octaves over the course of the Fonte, Beethoven "misaligns" the changes of register, which, if conveyed thus in performance, stand in metric conflict with the stages of the Fonte (see the lower brackets in Ex. 4.8). The melodic contour is also slightly unusual in that the line gives the impression of rising rather than falling (\( f^2\text{-}g^2 \) in the first stage, \( e^2\text{-}f^2 \) in the second). These are all ways in which the realisation of this Fonte works against its usual markedness. Furthermore, the repeated four-note motive echoes the opening, which further integrates the Fonte into the surrounding context; but the presence of the schema is a reminder that "motivic development" does not always solely sprout from the initial seed but may be coupled with other, non-organic, compositional processes.

The \( D^\flat \) in bar 17 is a quirky chromatic touch, which is in keeping with the entire movement's highly comic character. This is borne out in its lopsided 7-bar phrases in the opening section, the topical incongruence of the \textit{Sturm und Drang} trio,\(^{14}\) the increasingly flashy \textit{presto} section after the trio, the dissonant tattoos and the absurd coda with its symphonic 4/4 bars – and after all that, its soft and dainty ending. The use of a Fonte in this context of musical humour suggests Beethoven valued the schema not only for its functional capacities, but also for its referential significance. Yet this need not indicate flippancy; moments of musical humour, frivolity, joy or optimism are only deemed flippant by those who foster 'ingrained assumption that profundity and melancholia always go hand


\(^{14}\) On this subject, see Lowe, 'Falling From Grace'.
in hand’.\(^\text{15}\) Allanbrook believes such a worldview was foreign to the musical world of the eighteenth century, and, I would say, to some of the nineteenth as well: witness the exuberant end of the Beethoven’s string quartet, Op. 95, which he evidently deemed an appropriate way to conclude what he himself called his “Serioso” quartet.

Part of the Op. 119 collection was originally composed for Friedrich Starke’s *Wiener Pianoforte Schule* of 1821. Although the publisher C. F. Peters expected the public would not believe such apparently facile pieces could have been written by Beethoven, Starke rather saw that 'what Beethoven with characteristic modesty calls "trifles" (*Kleinigkeiten*) are in fact full of instruction (*lehrreich*) for the performer and demand the most complete penetration into the spirit of the composition'.\(^\text{16}\) A review in Berlin’s *Allgemeine musikalische Zeitung* raves that '[t]hey contain few musical words, but much is said with them – as every initiated person will willingly believe' and Beethoven himself, although he was pitching for sales, said his Bagatelles, Op. 126, were 'probably the best pieces of this kind I have written'.\(^\text{17}\) His first set of Bagatelles, Op. 33, also contain pithy, sophisticated works. In them, Beethoven wrote two Fontes that 'contain few musical words' but say much to the 'initiated', to the *Kenner* who had an appreciation of the craft of composition.

In the first Bagatelle of that set, composed in 1802, a new section begins at bar 32 with four bars in the tonic minor, e♭; four bars after this, we find ourselves down a step in D♭ major, outlining a Fonte’s harmonic structure (Ex. 4.9). For a Fonte, it has an unorthodox tonal relationship to the preceding material that finishes in E♭ major, its formal positioning is suspect, the usual melody that moves from ➄ to ➃ is not present, and bars 36–38 are not transposed.

---

\(^{15}\) Allanbrook, ‘Mozart’s Tunes and the Comedy of Closure’, p. 176.


I called the tonal relationship to the preceding material ‘unorthodox’, but that is only by the established practice associated with the Fonte. If there is one stage that takes its tonal bearings from the overall context, it is typically the second. That is, the key of the Fonte will be the same as, say, the overall tonic or the overall dominant. In this example, it is the first stage that has the tonal link to the wider context. This is a significant difference and could be reason enough for saying there is no Fonte here, but it is in fact reminiscent of a much earlier tradition which did precisely that. In Ex. 1.5, Durante begins his partimento in E minor and moves rapidly into a Fonte that moves from E minor to D major (permitting a modulation to V of III); similarly, with Ex. 2.17, the first reprise of Bach’s minuet begins in G minor and ends with a half cadence on V. He continues that dominant harmony to make the

---

The first stage of his Fonte in G minor and from there he moves to F major for the second stage. The relationship is not quite the same in this Bagatelle, as the overall key is not E♭ minor, but E♭ major. Despite this difference, and whether or not Beethoven was attuned to these historical trends, we can see that the schema had not always been bound to a single tonal position within the structure of a piece, and there is no reason why new variants could not emerge around this time.

Rounded binary form is often home to Fontes, and in its roughly ternary shape of A–B–A, a Fonte normally begins the B section. Rounded binary is a kind of two-reprise form, where the first reprise contains A and the second reprise encapsulates B–A. But translating the "ternary shape" of a rounded binary onto a ternary form proper is incorrect. A larger ternary form is often made up of three binary or rounded binary structures (minuet–trio–minuet), with any Fontes in their usual position within those binary sections. That is to say, Fontes do not traditionally begin a trio, but rather come after its double bar. The new section in Ex. 4.9 amounts to a trio in a ternary form, so structurally it makes little sense for Beethoven to use a Fonte there. However, just as Haydn could use ending gestures at the beginning of a piece, could not Beethoven likewise use a middle gesture at the beginning of a trio, which, in the grander scheme is after all a "middle" itself? He was not the only one to use a Fonte as a new beginning. Franz Anton Hoffmeister opens the minuet of his String Quartet Op. 14, No. 3, with a Fonte, Ex. 2.42 shows Ferdinand Ries doing likewise and Chapter 7 considers the use of the schema as a new beginning in Chopin. The element of surprise was certainly on Beethoven's mind when he wrote this passage, for the transposition of the e♭ minor harmony down into D♭ major comes "late". Were the first four bars to be transposed in a regular fashion, the result would resemble Ex. 4.10 (if not quite so literally):
While what I have labelled as the 'initial melodic line' is a gestural (if not harmonic) sign of an impending Fonte, its repeat at pitch (bars 36–37) is foreign to the schema, so when it leads – not in bar 38 but in 39 – to the cadence in D♭, anyone who may initially have fancied they were hearing a Fonte, only to reject the idea in the second half of bar 36, was vindicated in the end.

Not transposing the initial melodic line of a Fonte is a technique Beethoven used twice within Op. 33, though there are new points of intrigue in this next Fonte, which I discuss below. Ex. 4.11 shows such a melodic line beginning at the double bar, which is then repeated at the same pitch two bars later.
Ex. 4.11. Beethoven, Bagatelle, Op. 33, No. 6 (1802), bars 9–15

Op. 33, No. 6, is in D major, and Beethoven has written a Fonte in A major – rather, it is nearly in A major. Unlike in the previous example, this Fonte's position is typical, one in which the schema is frequently used to usher in a transition to the dominant. Here, however, Beethoven weakens this Fonte's hold on V before that key really has a chance to assert itself. The passage only lasts a very short four bars before the return of the opening theme. One might describe the passage all in terms of D major (see the second line in the chordal analysis of Ex. 4.11), but if one considers the passage to be on A (certainly not in A), then the underlying Fonte schema becomes apparent and its role in this passage becomes a far greater source of interest than the simple description of a cadential progression in D.

Rather than tonicising A with a G♯ in the bass in bar 12, the chord at this point is more forward-looking: it serves as a pre-dominant chord vi in D, preparing the return to the theme in bar 14. This B minor chord, which also happens to continue from bar 11, has the notes B and D in common with vii (G♯–B–D) of A or V7 (E–G♯–B–D) of A, hence the "vii?" on the example. By removing the chromatic element associated with tonicising A, the melody can drop to g♮ in bar 13 without giving any impressions of false relations and the return to D major, especially with A major in first inversion in bar 13, is made more tranquil. This smoother transition comes about with the weakening of dominant tonality occurring simultaneously with the consolidation of tonic harmony. (The dominant tonality is, admittedly, never strongly felt, although B minor highlights it through its neighbour-note role, and expectation of a Fonte in A also contributes.) To return to the theme within four bars of the double bar is rapid even for a functional galant minuet. Where the tonicised end-

19 Ibid.
point of a Fonte is the global dominant, that key needed undoing before a return to the tonic was comfortable. Beethoven knew well the Fonte's purpose was to digress, so to set one up only to arrest the digression places the potency of this outwardly unassuming passage in its unrealised potential.

In the Menuetto of Beethoven’s Piano Sonata No. 11, Op. 22, composed in 1800, the same technique of overlap and tonal weakening can also be seen (Ex. 4.12). As a result, the second stage lacks certain essential harmonic elements of the Fonte, yet other features are highly typical. The octave and then two-octave leaps after the semiquavers reproduce, even intensify, the standard melodic contour; there is strong parallelism between the phrases with exact rhythmic repetition, beginning- and end-rhyme (gestural, if not syntactical); and the harmony and voice-leading of the first stage are all precisely like a Fonte with the applied dominant harmony being the first to sound:

Ex. 4.12. Beethoven, Piano Sonata No. 11, Op. 22 (1800), iii: Menuetto, bars 9–17

![Ex. 4.12. Beethoven, Piano Sonata No. 11, Op. 22 (1800), iii: Menuetto, bars 9–17](image)

As in the previous example, this Fonte is preceded by tonic harmony – a cadence in B♭ before the double bar – and the first stage follows the usual Fonte trajectory for closing on the dominant in bar 16. An F major chord is arrived at, but it is neither tonicised nor reached.

---

by root-position movement, so no such close is achieved. In his description of the eight bars in Ex. 4.12, Tovey has the following to say (in terms of B♭):

‘Two contrasted pairs of bars: dominant of (VI.) answered by close in that key; followed by similar pairs; dominant of (IV.) answered by return via (ii.) to home dominant.’

Rosen, in his *Short Companion* to Beethoven's piano sonatas adds that this passage...

‘obeys all the harmonic conventions: the relative minor preceded by its dominant, the dominant of the subdominant, and the supertonic minor, substituting, as so often, for the subdominant (it is, after all, the relative minor of the subdominant) – to sum up, V of vi to vi, V of IV to ii resolved by a half-cadence on V to prepare the resumption of the main theme in the tonic.’

In addition to the harmonic commentary, Tovey's reference to the 'contrasted pairs of bars' is interesting in the way it parallels the paired construction of the Fonte itself, and Rosen's observation about its harmonic conventionality is valuable for being voiced, though simply explaining the passage by its harmonic activity does no justice to how Beethoven engages with that convention. The Fonte here is given essentially the same treatment as in Ex. 4.11, and we return to the opening theme directly afterwards. In this case, however, no attempt is made to smooth over the seams of the melody in joining Fonte and theme; instead we have a clear half cadence (bar 16), which permits an emphatic end-rhyme with the first stage. Both men analyse the passage in B♭, and while I agree with that, I believe it is not the complete picture. The Fonte projects the key of F major and while it is not given full expression, there is a tussle between the two keys. The half cadence at bars 16 is, as Rosen describes in detail, well prepared by pre-dominant harmonies, but it is worth noting that although the Fonte ends in B♭, it still finishes on F. We end at the harmonic goal of the Fonte, but it now has a different function: as with Ex. 4.11, the dominant harmony is weakened, the tonic harmony strengthened. This is a change that can be felt by listeners, so unlike Tovey and Rosen's plain harmonic descriptions, the Fonte-based explanation captures the psychological effect of the passage.

This example and many in this chapter are some way removed from the standard model. Why, then, should we consider them Fontes at all, especially given that Beethoven

---

21 Tovey, *A Companion to Beethoven’s Pianoforte Sonatas*, p. 87.
also wrote numerous completely straightforward presentations of the schema? Although standard realisations of schemata enable listeners to recognise them and enable them to become stylistic conventions, we can also become inured to them. Over time, composers changed the way they realised the Fonte in order to keep it current. Varying the presentations of the schema stimulated listeners into recognising it was being used – something that risked not happening if listeners became so habituated to standard presentations that they would begin not to notice them at all. Similar to Berthold Brecht's notion of the *Verfremdungseffekt* in theatre, which provoked the audience into self-consciousness, manipulation of musical schemata may well have made listeners more aware of their use, extending their viability as components of musical composition.

This does not mean all Fontes needed to be different – traditional realisations continued alongside the more sophisticated ones – and where some features were altered in one realisation, others, of course, were preserved. One highly schematic feature of Ex. 4.12 is its placement within the movement: after the double bar in a minuet. This gives the Fonte a transitional role and Beethoven further reinforces its “middle” function by associating this passage with earlier “middle” material. The descending dotted rhythm echoes a similar figure (Ex. 4.13, bar 13) which forms a part of the transition between the first and second subjects in the opening movement. It too is marked *sf* and follows a wash of semiquavers:

Ex. 4.13.  *Beethoven, Piano Sonata No. 11, Op. 22, i: Allegro con brio, bars 11–15*\(^{23}\)

\(\text{\begin{music}\musicinput{ex4_13a.png}\end{music}}\)

It is this "middle" function which is revivified in the first movement of Beethoven's piano sonata, Op. 14, No. 1, where an otherwise unchallenging Fonte serves as the second subject:

Because of the position of a second thematic group in sonata form, this Fonte can still be construed as a "middle", this time of a larger organisational structure. On the other hand, its independence as a structural unit – reinforced by its being later recapitulated in the tonic – subverts that traditional "middleness". Similar stand-alone Fontes are discussed in Chapter 7. One aspect of this Fonte which is not typical of the eighteenth century, but which gains currency around this time, is that it is repeated. The implications of this repetition are also addressed in Chapter 7, but here it is worth noting how Beethoven adds variations in the repetition. Its fugato entries and their coordinated arrival at the cadence points introduce an element of dialogue, whose connotations of sociability are fulfilled in the string quartet version.

The schema's "middle" function becomes once more the object of attention in the piano trio, Op. 70, No. 2, this time by giving it an ending function too. Coming after the double bar in this scherzo-like movement is a passage which is thematically very close to the

---

opening material of the movement, but which now contains a Fonte. It plays out in straightforward manner until just before the end, when resolution to the tonic is denied, being deflected instead to V of V:

Ex. 4.15. Beethoven, Piano Trio, Op. 70, No. 2, iii: Allegretto ma non troppo, bars 15–28

However, at the end of this section (which, but for a short coda after the written-out da capo, would also be the end of the movement), the Fonte is played again and this time is allowed to resolve. Thus it is that in this piece, we get the "wrong" Fonte in the "right" place and the "right" Fonte in the "wrong" place:

---

Most of the examples here and in Chapter 2 admittedly come from fairly early in Beethoven's career, but this last example shows a Fonte from his "middle" period, and Opp. 106 and 126 were written in his last decade. To end this chapter, I will show a final example from his "late" period. In the second movement of his string quartet, Op. 132, composed in 1825, a gracious descending figure like a curtsy or a bow (bars 5–6, Ex. 4.17) is repeated and varied extensively in the outer sections of the movement.

Ex. 4.16. Beethoven, Piano Trio, Op. 70, No. 2, iii: Allegretto ma non troppo, bars 43–56

26 Ibid.
Ex. 4.17. Beethoven, String Quartet, Op. 132 (1825), ii: Allegro ma non tanto, bars 1–6^{27}

Although a musette brings new material to the start of the trio, the bars following this melody begin with a Fonte that has the same contour as the "curtsy" figure, displaced back by one crotchet beat (Ex. 4.18). A single melodic line flows through the Fonte, broken up only by register transfers as it is passed between viola and first violin. Like in Ex. 4.12, each stage of the Fonte is divided into pairs, the schema's bipartite structure being applied onto each of those two parts:

Ex. 4.18. Beethoven, String Quartet, Op. 132, ii: Allegro ma non tanto, bars 140–149^{28}

Four bars after this has ended, the Fonte is repeated in varied form. The viola is given all of the melodic line, with which the second violin chimes its unison agreement. Beethoven takes full advantage of the schema's transitional function as he repeats this again immediately, this time in A major, the tonic key of both the trio and the outer sections. Two Fontes back-to-back in different keys is a rare occurrence:


^{28} Ibid.
The Fonte is played six times in all, with the instruments and lines distributed differently each time. The final Fonte ends with all the quartet in accord:


This movement is gentle, if quietly motoric, so when Roger Fiske stated that 'nothing could be less like a scherzo in spirit', I am surprised he did not compare it with a minuet. The graceful "curtsy" after the unison, chromatically inflected ascent of the first four bars, the refined perfect cadences (such as bars 22, 119), the rustic topic in the trio, the elegant turn figures (as can be seen in bar 148) and the Fonte are all reminiscent of the courtly air of the minuet. Joseph Kerman recognises its stylistic antecedent in eighteenth-century dance when he describes the trio's effect of 'spiritualizing tawdry allemande clichés

---

into a strangely insubstantial distillate of popular lyricism. One of these 'clichés' is of course the Fonte, but Harold Truscott, as others before him, sees further connections between the trio and an early piano piece, Beethoven’s *Allemande*, WoO 81. It is also in A major, the second violin's first entry (not shown in my example) begins the same as the start of the Allemande, the opening period is followed by a Fonte played out in continuous semiquavers, from which the move to the end of the phrase is identical to Op. 132 (compare Ex. 4.18, bars 147–148):

Ex. 4.21. Beethoven, Allemande, WoO 81, bars 13–18

The melodic connections are noticeable, and whether this points to "self-borrowing" or not, Beethoven's decision to write a movement that has the hallmarks of his earlier style, both in its turns of phrase and its use of the Fonte, validates that style in the mid-1820s. More importantly, and contrary to Kerman's rather unsympathetic words, I believe the reworking of those features by such techniques as contrapuntal and motivic development, metric manipulation and ensemble interaction is a sign of Beethoven 'keeping his art as fresh and vigorous ... to the end'.

This sentiment finds agreement in the words of Harold Truscott, who writes:

Much nonsense has been written and spoken about Beethoven the revolutionary, the iconoclast, who threw away the standard materials and conventional forms of classical speech to make way for new and more significant things. This is a non-existent Beethoven, a fictional character. What stands out from any serious examination of the real, historical, Beethoven is that he was at pains throughout his life to retain all these

---

conventional forms of speech but to find new life in them. One of them is the perfect cadence, another is the simple ornamental turn.34

Another is the Fonte.
Chapter Five

Hummel

In a passage where certain significant elements of the Fonte are not literally present, its context may have the effect of overriding these absences and implying that the passage nevertheless has a strong connection to the schema. In many of the examples that follow, Hummel places in very typical contexts relatively atypical Fontes, yet it would be unthinkable to deny the Fonte is the underlying structure. These typical contexts are the numerous sets of dances he wrote for the glamour events of Viennese high society, pieces composed in a very conventional, accessible form. Not surprisingly in these triple-time dances – some are minuets, others Deutsche Tänze – many Fontes come up immediately after the double bars. With such a stable constant as this musical location to orient the listener, the schematic ideal of the Fonte is able to be, in Matthew Pritchard’s words, ‘gracefully complied with, wittily put off, or even entirely misdirected, according to taste and opportunity’,¹ without ever jeopardising the identity of the pattern. In these dances where Fontes are most obviously at home, the opportunity for wit or misdirection is optimal. Because it was very common for eighteenth-century minuets to employ either the Fonte, Monte or Ponte (from Riepel’s threefold prescription) after the double-bar, this position then became, in Gjerdingen’s words, ‘a point of maximum predictability’.² Well-versed listeners would have known these patterns were commonplace here. Against this backdrop of familiarity, Hummel could cast passages that, while atypical, would unmistakeably evoke the Fonte schema.

In Ex. 5.1, for instance, composed for dances in Vienna’s Apollo-Saal in 1811 and arranged here for piano, the double bar is followed by a Fonte whose stages do not present an obvious dominant:

² Gjerdingen, ‘Mozart’s Obviously Corrupt Minuet’, p. 66.
Bars 9 and 11 do not have a leading note, nor is there even a 5 in the bass. The usual 4→3 voice leading is absent (the 4 in the rising upbeats to those bars cannot be heard as moving to the 3) and the unison texture deprives us of literal harmony. Yet the context provides the basis for understanding and stimulates us to “fill in the gaps”: listeners will substitute default values where the context suggests they are the most likely. The first and third notes in bars 9 and 11 belong to the dominant harmony and the downbeat-to-downbeat progression in each stage presents a simple 5→1. The implied dominant harmony in each stage would be imagined by the listener.

The aforementioned ‘maximum predictability’ was nonetheless balanced by ‘requiring maximum propriety’. The character of a Fonte, whether one thinks of it affectively, rhetorically or gesturally, is one of grace and balance. The schema displays a level of reciprocation characteristic of galant musical utterances. Gjerdingen notes a ‘trend toward using a pair of musical events that could function as a call and response, or question and answer’, an effect which is conveyed in the Fonte by the way the second stage reciprocates the gesture of the first: a lower phrase answers a higher one, a stable major tonality calms an edgy minor, the brief flirtation with a foreign key is redirected to the reassuring ground of the home key (usually the case in short pieces) and the even phrase lengths provide structural balance. It is furthermore interesting to note that in the numerous dances that Hummel composed for fashionable Viennese soirées, the vast

---

4 Gjerdingen, A Classic Turn of Phrase, p. 7.
5 Gjerdingen, ‘Mozart’s Obviously Corrupt Minuet’, p. 66.
6 Gjerdingen, Music in the Galant Style, p. 85.
The majority of his Fontes are written in the trios rather than in the titled dance movements. The significance of this observation is that trios often stand as a more lyrical contrast to the lively outer movements – a context more suited to the graceful Fonte.

All the points listed here describe the Fonte in Ex. 5.1 perfectly, especially seeing that through a p dynamic and delicate articulation, Hummel has made provisions for a sensitive performance. By contrast, he is almost certainly being ironic when, in the same set of dances, he writes a Fonte – in the usual spot – that appears to contravene so many of these characteristics. Ex. 5.2 (from the upbeat to bar 9) is ff and ascends in octaves from the depths of the bass, and the absence of the seventh (D) precludes any smooth resolution of a tritone. The aspect of character is ‘wittily put off’ here in another regard as well, for the dainty opening of this trio – solo, marked p and staccato, descending from a high start, and heard twice before we reach the Fonte – is countered by the total opposite in bar 9. This would have had an even more powerful effect when scored for orchestra, which we can only imagine from the present text, Hummel’s own arrangement for piano:

Ex.5.2. Hummel, Deutscher Tanz, Op. 39, No. 2 (1811), 3rd Trio, bars 1–16

This principle of reciprocation may be noticed within each stage as well, as the ascent to a higher note is rejoined by a descent to a point of rest with the mild tension of the seventh chord resolving gently to its tonic. Ex. 2.30, by Paganini, is a clear instance of this, reproduced here in Hummel’s own arrangement for piano (Ex. 5.3). It is even intensified by the ff flourish that begins each stage (bars 33 and 37) being given a soft and lyrical answer:

---

7 I showed a similar example at Ex. 2.31.
8 Johann Nepomuk Hummel: Tänze Componirt für den Apollo-Saal, Vienna: Kunst und Industrie Comptoir, n. d.
The notion is also borne out in the melody’s descending riposte to the initial, high up at a\(^2\). The gestural signal of beginning with a high held, which then descends helps to keep the Fonte schema active here, as having the local tonic (rather than dominant) begin each stage means the harmonic signal is not usual. However, it became more common around the early nineteenth century to begin Fontes with non-dominant harmony. In the previous chapter, I showed how Beethoven beginning a Fonte with local tonic harmony (Ex. 4.9), and the next two examples show Hummel using pre-dominant harmonies at the start of each stage:

Ex. 5.4. Hummel, *Polonaise*, Op. 70, No. 4 (1814), Trio, bars 7–12\(^{10}\)


\(^{10}\) Johann Nepomuk Hummel: 6 Polonoises favorites pour Piano-Forte, Op. 70, Vienna: Artaria, n. d. [ca.1815].
The pre-dominant role of the opening harmony in Ex. 5.4 can only be retrospectively attributed, most obviously once the second stage has been sounded. What I have labelled as IV of ii in Ex. 5.4 is also simply a continuation of the G major harmony (the global dominant) reached at the end of bar 8. This gives the impression that this harmony is being extended (as in a Ponte), so it comes as something of a surprise when it becomes a Fonte. In bar 9, the D minor harmony is touched on briefly in passing (labelled (i^6), beat 3), but it is not evident yet that this is our goal. The melody’s d\textsuperscript{2} is not preceded by a c\#\textsuperscript{2}, so it is not tonicised; the significance of this chord is rather in the F\# which weakens the key of G and brings us back to the C major scale which was temporarily abandoned before the double bar.

To launch straight into the D minor tonality of the first stage, Hummel would have needed to use a B\# instead of a B\#. Gjerdingen has pointed out how flattening this scale degree (making ♭6 in the new key) has the effect of ‘negating the third of the key of the dominant’\textsuperscript{11} (often, as here, the previous harmony), which is a strong signal that a Fonte has begun: ‘By cancelling a characteristic pitch of the previous key [here the B\# in G major], the Fonte thus initiates a digression into a minor key [B\# becomes B\♭, the lowered sixth degree of D minor]’.\textsuperscript{12} This note is usually introduced as a ninth over a dominant-seventh chord, so presenting it as a component of IV reveals an alternative realisation of the schema.

In a similar vein to the Polonaise, the Fonte in Ex. 5.5 begins by continuing the B minor harmony at which we have just arrived, although there is a different relationship here between the Fonte’s key and that of the previous cadence. B minor’s F\# needs to be lowered to F\#, however, to fit into the scale of A minor. Hummel chooses the harmonic minor scale for this, so when the F\# appears in bar 34 in the left hand, it forms an augmented second with the previous G\# and also moves by a semitone down to E\#. This is part of a larger descent, where the bass connects the initial B with the E in bar 34 by means of a fifth-progression. Exactly the same progression is used again in the next stage, where we see the very unusual phenomenon of a literal transposition of the first stage. This infuses the whole passage with striking modal mixture:

\textsuperscript{11} Gjerdingen, ‘Mozart’s Obviously Corrupt Minuet’, p. 70.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
More modal mixture can be seen in the next extract, another of from Hummel’s wonderful Op. 125 études. In Ex. 5.6, although the opening left-hand figures that begin each stage (bars 8 and 12) outline the dominant (in fact, dominant-ninth) harmony, as is normal, that of the second stage introduces some coloristic peculiarities that may throw the listener a little off course: the ♭6 in bar 12 is fairly common in the “hermaphrodite” variant of the Fonte, but the ♭3 in bar 13 seems to put us in a minor key altogether, so when the g♭5 is adjusted to major in bar 14, it comes as something of a surprise. Note also the lengthy post-resolution material in bars 10–12. When Hummel comes to the repeat of this in the second stage, he uses it in fact to move away from the Fonte and towards new material in C minor:

---
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Whatever the interpretation of the opening harmonies of Exx. 5.4 and 5.5 – and I would argue that they are understood as part of the Fonte because of their being contained within the phrase structure – and whatever the effect of the minor colour in Ex. 5.6, the points of resolution which they move towards still behave normally. However, Hummel provides us with much food for thought when the points of resolution themselves do not reflect the schema.

Fontes move from minor to major, although I showed in Chapter 2 that what at first appeared to be a major first stage could be “corrected” to minor by quickly lowering the third (see Exx. 2.5–2.8). This technique is used in bar 10 of Ex. 5.7, from a later set of society dances, although seeing the same thing happen again in bar 12, at the end of the second stage, may seem to confuse the logic: if the d♯² in bar 10 “corrects” the d♯², then ought not the c♯² in bar 12 likewise “correct” the c♯², meaning that A minor is the intended key for this stage of the sequence? As the Fonte is a pattern-driven schema, it would follow that the order of “wrong-note-corrected-to-right-note” should be preserved, and then this would challenge the claim that this is a Fonte:

However, this assumption ignores phrase structure. The quaver at the end of bar 10 is in fact the upbeat to the second stage, just as the first was introduced by the e⁰ in bar 8. As in Ex. 2.8, the “correction” in bar 9 is retrospective. Bar 12 continues the upbeat pattern, obviously signalled by the a¹ shifting up to a² on the third beat. The tonal profile of the piece likewise makes a minor second stage improbable, for we never properly leave A major. Although the next four bars – what Byros has termed the Le-Sol-Fi-Sol schema, ₁—₁—₁—₇ over ii₆—₃—₅—₅ ending in a half cadence and shown here with solfège names¹⁶ – is in the tonic minor, the half-cadence in bar 16 is followed by a return to A major. In addition, a minor-to-minor sequence was a rarity in eighteenth-century music, from which this largely traditional dance-type is derived, whereas the Fonte’s minor-to-major was widespread.¹⁷ It follows that this pattern can easily be accounted for by the Fonte, all the more so given the composer’s already demonstrated knowledge of the schema and its native habitat.

In compact forms such as these dances or his (binary) études, typical structural placement encourages one to hear a Fonte where some of its other features are not standard. Fontes are common in rondos too, a form used for the finale of Hummel’s Sonata for Flute or Violin and Piano, Op. 50, and this fact helps us to identify the Fonte in Ex. 5.8. Again, the first stage is major but “corrected” to minor in the second half of bar 46. Although the registral difference between g♯₁ and g♮₂ makes it less clear than in the previous example, the g♮₂ also refers back to the g♯₂ in bar 45. Writing E major first rather than E

---

¹⁶ Byros, ‘Towards an “Archaeology” of Hearing’.
minor permits Hummel to make as if proceeding in the dominant of A major, in which key we have quite clearly arrived at the start of this extract:

Ex. 5.8. Hummel, Sonata for Flute or Violin and Piano, Op. 50 (1811–1814), iii: Rondo – Pastorale, bars 45–47\(^{18}\)

![Musical notation]

When the passage returns a few bars later (Ex. 5.9), the “correction” is made more immediate by the drop from g\(^{\#}\)\(^{1}\) to g\(^{\natural}\)\(^{1}\) in bar 50, but new complications are added. The last quaver of bar 49 is a ii\(^{6}\) chord, which belongs to the key of E minor. This is certainly appropriate for the first stage of a Fonte, but this diminished chord is transposed down a step at the end of bar 50, suggesting now D minor for the second stage. Because the Fonte finishes, as usual, in D major, this produces once again a curious modal mixture such as would resurface later in Op. 125 \textit{études} (Exx. 5.5–5.6).

In the last three examples, the necessary minor third really comes technically in the second stage, because the phrase structure includes upbeat figures in which that minor third is situated. Nevertheless, as it remains on the same harmony as the preceding major third, it is easy to comprehend as a “correction”. In the next extract, however, a harmonic change on the upbeat to the next stage makes “correction” less simple. Again, the first stage culminates in a major chord (G major, bar 66), the third of which slides down to B♭ in the next chord, but here this takes place over the unusual colour of a minor subdominant to the next stage:

---

19 Ibid.
Harmony alone may not be sufficient to call this passage a Fonte with much confidence, but that the schema is the basis for the phrase is beyond doubt. It comes from the third variation on a theme from Gluck’s opera Armide, the corresponding bars of which unequivocally contain a Fonte in Hummel’s setting (Ex. 5.11, bars 9–12); all other variations in the set are very clearly Fontes as well:

Ex. 5.11. Hummel, Variations on a Theme from Gluck’s Armide, Op. 57, Thema: Un poco allegretto, bars 9–16

In these last few examples, the note of “correction” has occurred in metrically weak lead-ins, yet Hummel did not always include lead-ins in his Fontes. In Ex. 5.12, another Fonte with a major first stage, the metrically strong 4 of the second stage must serve retrospectively as the proper 3 of the first stage. As Gjerdingen points out, ‘there is no


\[21\] Ibid.
reason why [schema theory] should exclude the role of retrospection’, especially in this case where the placement of the notes in question is virtually adjacent and therefore presents no strain on short-term memory.\textsuperscript{22}

Ex. 5.12. Hummel, Etude in F\# Major, Op. 125, No. 13 (1833), bars 9–12\textsuperscript{23}

In standard Fontes, the two middle melody notes are the same (as 3 in one stage and 4 in the next) and the sub-phrases are thereby punctuated in a manner that is characteristic of the style galant. It is common in this style to hear paired phrase units where each unit presents two melodic notes connected by step. When the second phrase unit starts, usually after some point of rest, it is typical for it to reiterate the second note of the previous melodic dyad. This can be seen in the paired “Do–Re, Re–Mi” variant of the Do–Re–Mi schema and in the 4–3, 4–3 of the Fonte. (If expressed in terms of the Fonte’s overall key, this would be 5–4, 4–3.) In Ex. 5.12, Hummel has neither composed any point of rest at the end of each stage (although note how each is divided like in Ex. 5.7), nor included the pitch repetition between stages. Instead, he has opted for a continuous melodic line of 4–3–4–3 (c\textsuperscript{2}–b\textsubscript{a}\textsuperscript{1}–b\textsubscript{a}\textsuperscript{1}–a\textsuperscript{1}). Rhythm and phrase construction in études are frequently kept very regular in order to produce an effect of perpetuum mobile driven by a single instrumental technique. The way Hummel has realised this Fonte goes some way to concealing not only the schema’s internal structure, but also its role as a signpost in this relatively straightforward form.

If, as in the previous excerpts, we can invoke the role of retrospection, does it mean we can convincingly argue that the next example, from one of Hummel’s Op. 30 string

\textsuperscript{22} Gjerdingen, A Classic Turn of Phrase, p. 127.

quartets, is also a Fonte (Ex. 5.13)? As schemata are a matter of perception and mental association, some listeners may indeed think of a Fonte while others may not. There is, strictly speaking, never a passage that definitely is or is not a Fonte. In forming a schema, we build for ourselves, from exposure to a large amount of material, a mental abstract to group together passages of music that have a number of similarities. To make a ‘doctrinaire assertion that a phrase is or is not [a Fonte]’ is not only erroneously to reify the abstract schema, but is also something that would ‘slight the important interplay of positive and negative evidence’.  

Those who do perceive a Fonte in Ex. 5.13 might hear the second violin’s es♭₁ in bar 67 (marked ❹) as a correction of the es♮₁ in bar 64, whereas others might not on account of the intervening material. The former may hear the es♭₂ in bars 59 and 61 (marked by asterisks) as implying a minor tonality for the first stage, while the latter may rather hear the first stage as major because of the raised ❻ in bars 61–63 (A♮). Although in bar 61, the a♮₁ is part of a descending line, in bars 62 and 63, it actually rises according to the melodic minor scale. Indeed, if the second violin and viola parts were removed, the Fonte would appear more normal, with bars 61 (minor) and 65 (major) in the first violin supplying the harmonic identity of each stage.

In *A Classic Turn of Phrase*, Gjerdingen’s proposed the concept of a ‘deformed style structure’ as an ‘alternative to the contention that a musical structure must either be, or not be, a member of a particular structural category.’ While the distinction it makes is important, it is often difficult to demonstrate convincingly that the ‘deformed’ structure in question is originally based on the schematic prototype which it purportedly ‘deforms’. Gjerdingen does acknowledge that individual instances might more readily be associated with an altogether different structure that is also recognisable in the context. In the case of our string quartet example, this might simply mean a major-to-major descending sequence.

---

25 Ibid. The term ‘style structure’ is taken from Eugene Narmour, *Beyond Schenkerism: The Need for Alternatives in Music Analysis*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1977 and explained in *A Classic Turn of Phrase*, as well as in Meyer, *Style and Music*. A ‘style structure’ can be understood as a group of notes or musical concepts given a specific meaning through a particular rhythmic context. All the schemata in Gjerdingen’s *Music in the Galant Style* could be called style structures.
However, central to the role of schemata in listening to music is the ‘interplay of positive and negative evidence’, so let us marshal one last bit of positive evidence for Ex. 5.13 by turning to its immediate context. Just a few bars earlier, Hummel had presented another descending sequential passage that likewise terminates on B♭ major, this time very much what we expect of a typical Fonte. Having this in one’s recent memory might lead us to hear Ex. 5.13 along the same lines:

---

The modal mixture of the preceding examples is an important development in which Hummel was a key participant. The interplay between the major and minor modes is a change which renews the Fonte when it might otherwise have begun to appear outdated or to go unnoticed. It is revivified by being adapted, and, though in a new guise, the old convention is reinforced, its validity prolonged. The Verfremdungseffekt in action here stimulates people to notice afresh the musical patterns to which they may gradually have been becoming oblivious. Even if one had no prior knowledge of the schema, this change arguably still focuses attention on the pattern, for the two stages appear no longer to be related diatonically. In fact, its identity as an idiomatic turn of phrase is brought into relief as it is not only the schematic convention being confronted, but the elementary authority of diatonic harmony as well. I argued in Chapter 3 that one could in some cases predict the occurrence of the second stage on the grounds of harmony alone, but when the first stage is major, this no longer becomes possible and schematic knowledge becomes necessary for making predictions. When Hummel extends major and minor elements into both stages, he not only shows how the pattern still has plenty of potential for subtle and complex manipulation, but again distances the schema from intuitive harmonic progressions.

Another manipulation of the Fonte that can be found in Hummel’s works is the evading of the schema’s endpoint. The examples that follow include arrangements of music by other composers, showing that this technique was not Hummel’s work alone and probably not even his idea in the first place. Yet by appropriating this music, he took in this particular manner of realisation and applied and extended it in his own work as well. In Ex.

---

27 Ibid.
5.15, from a *pot-pourri* of themes by Paganini which included the movement shown in Ex. 5.3, the first stage of the Fonte is played out broadly from bars 9–12; the second stage begins with the same *élan*, but is hurried on from its end-point so as to end the phrase with a tonicised half cadence. Although the first stage has its point of resolution at the start of bar 11, the remainder of that stage plays out a confirmation of G minor, including a reiteration of (V⁷)-ii (in the grey square). The fact that this established pattern is not given a chance to repeat itself in the next stage is what makes the move to V such a surprise.

Ex. 5.15. Hummel, *Recollections of Paganini*, S. 190 (1831), ii: Paganini’s Quartetto – Allegretto, bars 9–16

In developing this part of the theme later in the piece (Ex. 5.15), Hummel introduces other voices in imitation which delay the point of resolution until the fourth bar of the stage (bar 85) by which time all the voices have come together and made a crescendo towards an emphatic cadence in outward contrary motion (note the reversal in dynamic and gestural contrast from Ex. 5.3). In the second stage, it is perhaps because he associates this imitation with the gravitas of the learned style that Hummel now ends in F minor. The momentum of the additive texture again culminates in a strong half cadence, now via an augmented sixth chord – and with strokes, not dots!

---

Using a half cadence at the end of a Fonte was a technique also used by Maltese-born composer Nicolas Isouard in his opera *Cendrillon*, first performed in Paris in 1810. Hummel wrote variations on a march from the opera, the theme of which is partially shown in Ex. 5.17. I have identified the point of resolution in the first stage as bar 12, because it has the local tonic harmony in root position unlike in bar 11, where it is only in first inversion (hence the $7\rightarrow 1$ in brackets). Likewise, bar 15, though it does have a tonic chord on the downbeat, is not a persuasive point of resolution for the second stage. Because of the impulse to parallelism, we expect it to take place in bar 16, but there we have moved to a most unparallel half cadence. Unlike in the previous two examples, this half cadence is not highlighted through tonicisation or an augmented sixth:

---

Ibid.
Ex. 5.17. Hummel, Variations on a March from Isouard’s Cendrillon, Op.40a (1811), Tema: Allegro maestoso, bars 5–21

Just as Beethoven’s half cadence in Ex. 4.12 led him straight back into the opening minuet theme, so this example does the same at bar 17. Though there is no proper point of resolution in the second stage, the tonic harmony in bar 15 comes closest. From here, we are hastened, as in the previous two examples, on towards the half cadence – the Fonte only really reaches its goal in bar 17.

My final two examples for this chapter have, on the face of it, very little resemblance to the Fonte, but on closer inspection, they do seem to come from the same family. Both come after a double bar (in a trio) in the same collection of functional Deutsche Tänze; both follow a cadence in the dominant (not shown in Ex. 5.19) and move straight into tonicising the supertonic; both also begin with a classic melodic leap and then a gradual descent. After the first two bars of these near-Fontes, both abandon the pattern altogether but return to

the tonic after another two bars (the fifth bar from the double bar). In both cases, this return to the tonic coincides with the return of the trio’s theme:

Ex. 5.18. Hummel, *Deutscher Tanz*, Op. 25, No. 5 (1807), Trio, bars 8–13

![Ex. 5.18. Hummel, *Deutscher Tanz*, Op. 25, No. 5 (1807), Trio, bars 8–13](image)

Ex. 5.19. Hummel, *Deutscher Tanz*, Op. 25, No. 7 (1807), Trio, bars 9–16

![Ex. 5.19. Hummel, *Deutscher Tanz*, Op. 25, No. 7 (1807), Trio, bars 9–16](image)

In other contexts, these patterns would not have led me to make the connection with the Fonte, but because they are found in one of the most tried and true structural positions in one of the most common movement types, I cannot help but see the Fonte as at least a subconscious point of departure. It is the strength of structural placement that makes so many of the other examples in this chapter convincing Fontes, though they may have “wrong” harmonies, such as a major chord for the first stage.

In the previous chapter, Beethoven modified the Fonte in ways whose sophistication would have appealed primarily to connoisseurs, or *Kenner*, through the often private medium of a piano sonata or Bagatelle. By contrast, Hummel makes bold and therefore easily noticeable changes to the schema’s realisation often in music destined for the core of

---


32 Ibid.
popular musical life – those who attend the society dances in Vienna. Even if we might say that dancers and revellers would not have paid enough attention to the music to register that these changes, the dances were later enjoyed very widely in piano arrangements. Though many of the examples here give the Fonte a substantial harmonic overhaul, the finer details of schema realisation are also given careful attention by Hummel, such as in the smooth chromatic lines he places in the melodies, the “topical dissonance” that subverts the reciprocal gestures in Fontes of the style galant, or in the adventurous harmonic combinations which must have appealed to his more musically trained admirers, one of whom was Frederic Chopin.33

Chapter Six

Schubert

In his Lieder, Schubert demonstrates how the Fonte may be adapted to carry with equal effectiveness the greatly contrasting emotions and moods conveyed in the poems he sets. The tritone inherent in each stage of the typical Fonte structure is something that Schubert at times emphasises and at other times abandons altogether. In drawing out its dissonance, he may express pathos; in skipping over it, he may communicate a blithe joyfulness. His great familiarity with the schema is manifest in the dozens of short society dances which, as was the case with Hummel, sometimes furnished a context for experimenting with the schema. The occasional example from these dances will support this discussion, which takes as its primary concern the use of the Fonte in Schubert’s songs.

When the Ethiopian king Memnon was slain by Achilles at Troy, the plaintive tears shed by his mother Eos, goddess of the dawn, so affected Zeus that he felt moved to make Memnon immortal. His immortality, however, was tantalisingly incomplete – he could only come back to life each day for the brief moments when the sun was rising in order to call piteously to his mother. The story of this imprisoned soul inspired Johann Mayrhofer’s poem “Memnon”, which Schubert set to music. In his setting, he uses a Fonte that contributes to the portrayal of anguish in the text (Ex. 6.1), a passage which, in pianist Graham Johnson’s view, is ‘among Schubert’s loveliest (sequences)’. Reflecting Memnon’s gradual awakening before dawn is the narrow compass of the opening bars: a repeated f at first, then small intervals increasing only in slight increments. Come bar 13, the singer’s range has opened up considerably, with a climb to f. This paves the way for Memnon to lament his auroral half-life with no vocal constraints, and it is with a Fonte that Schubert sets these words of self-pity (bars 16–20). An unaccompanied upbeat makes the downbeat at bars 17 and 19 more expressively powerful, an effect intensified not only by the fp marking on the piano’s fully voiced

---


dominant-minor-ninth chords but also by the longer note value in the vocal part – the longest it has in these bars:


The dissonance contained in the Fonte schema (the tritone of 4 against 7) is made linear at the beginning of each stage, a particularly apt setting for Memnon’s “Klage” in bar 19. It is softened in bars 16–17 by being broken into thirds (e♭₂–c₂–a₁), thereby reserving for “Klage” the unmitigated dissonance of the descending tritone, d♭₂–g♮₁. The fact that the latter has 4 directly on the downbeat also makes it stronger in expressive power than bar 17. The melody and harmony provide end rhyme where the text does not (bars 18 and 20), a rhyme which features 4 as an appoggiatura in the voice over a triple suspension in the piano, protracting the dissonance of the bar before.

One final point of interest in this excerpt is its structural function. It does come at a transitional moment, but its exact nature is quite unexpected. As this Fonte is in A♭, the global dominant, we would anticipate the music would proceed in that key before returning

---

to D♭. However, the song turns immediately to a section in F major, the major mediant, a key whose sudden arrival is a surprise—harmonically, but also because the usual context for a Fonte specifies a different continuation. As Memnon must go back to the shadows soon enough, we do eventually return to D♭ but he must first have his moment in the sun.

Memnon’s is not the only “Klage” that Schubert set to a Fonte. In his setting of Goethe’s “Lied der Mignon” from his cycle Gesänge aus Wilhelm Meister, Schubert emphasises the bittersweet sorrow one feels in being able to bemoan one’s fate to a consoling friend when he repeats half a line of the poem. The words “in Klagen sich ergiessen” are sung twice in bars 29–30 (Ex. 6.2); the first time (in minor) conveys the sadness, the second time (in major), the consolation. The repetition takes the form of a Fonte, and the ♪–♫ that occurs in the schema involves, like in Ex. 6.1, a dissonance over the local tonic—in this case, an accented passing note. This is accompanied by a suspension in the piano (marked S on the score). Neither ♪ is harmonised by the dominant (except briefly in the piano in bar 30—though that chord does not have the leading note in it, so the tritone is not literally present). So unlike in the example from “Memnon”, the ♪ in the vocal line does not produce a tritone dissonance, but rather that of a fourth over the bass. Conceptually speaking, we may still understand ♪ and ⑦ as happening at the same time, as when we might, in reductive analysis, simplify the music to the two chords of the point of resolution. In any case, the emotional weight of discordant fourth above the bass aptly portrays the outpouring of self-pity the singer is contemplating. Resolution has the semblance of being even more delayed in the second stage as the left hand’s quaver and two semiquavers from beat two in bar 29 are shifted back to beat three in bar 30:

Though this Fonte appears to end a phrase, it is far from conclusive, so the music must seek closure further on. Its potential for tonal continuation is again curtailed in this example, as bar 31 launches us into a quasi-recitative with meandering harmonies and return to the Fonte’s E major harmony is only granted later: the schema’s “middle” function is then retained.

A similar treatment of similar text can be heard in the setting of Schiller’s “An Emma” (Ex. 6.3), with an accented passing note on Verlangen, an appropriate word to hold on a yearning dissonance (“lang-en” should be sung as two pitches only – the e♭² and d♭²). As in “Memnon” and in bar 28 of “Lied der Mignon”, the tritone is traced through a descending triad in bar 43 (e♭²–c²–a½), though here the resolution from ⑦ to ① only occurs in the piano:


The second stage of this Fonte differs significantly from the first. In the previous two examples, the pre-resolution material was not identical in each stage but the end rhyme made those differences superficial. Here there is no strong end rhyme and the rise to e♭² (bar 46) has a marked effect of concealing the arrival point of the schema. Nevertheless, the singer’s falling third in bars 43–44 (f²–e♭²–d♭²) is answered by a rising third in bar 46 (c²–e♭²). Of course, this rising third musically intones the universal linguistic practice of raising the pitch of one’s voice when asking a question. The ❸ on the downbeat of bar 46 fulfils the imperatives of the Fonte’s voice leading and the subsequent rise activates the e♭² (= ❹) as something of a delayed cover tone – at once pushing aside the ❸ as the object of our attention and also perhaps suggesting this use of ❹ a variant of the way the schema is usually realised.

---

However, without a similar use of ✳️ in the first stage, the lack of parallelism makes perception of the Fonte less intuitive than normal. Notably, the absence of a resting point immediately after the ✳️ slightly impairs the listener’s ability to mark that moment as the end of the schema. Resting points between the stages in a schema obviously make the comprehension of musical material easier for the listener. Robert Gjerdingen explains that because the mental processing of a constant stream of melodic and harmonic information is ‘of necessity largely retrospective’, resting points give the listener ‘opportunities to “catch up” with the flow of stimuli’ and it is only then that ‘the prospective and implicative force of musical schemata [can] be fully developed’.⁷ This refers chiefly to the break after the first stage, which furnishes listeners with the information needed to make predictions about what they will hear next, but it is logical to assume the same process facilitates the comprehension of completed schemata – predictions about a schema need a brief moment of time if they are to be verified.

It is therefore particularly interesting that the ascent from b♭¹ to e♭² in bars 45–46, which conflicts with our expectations for the second stage of the Fonte, should terminate on a fermata, one of the only points when the ‘lyrical impetus’ of this song is interrupted.⁸ Here is a deliberate and lengthy cessation of the musical motion, so it is indeed possible to hear the Fonte, especially as the second event features ✳️ in the vocal line, which is helpful for perceiving the unity of the schema. We can even say the change of musical idea from one stage end to the next shows that the Fonte, like “Love’s sweet desire”, is but vergänglich – fitting for this transitional structure. (To complete the picture, this Fonte comes directly after a modulation to a new key, A♭ major, and prolongs that key in the same way that it does in the many examples from two-reprise forms that modulate at the end of the first reprise.)

The end of the Fonte is similarly disguised in Ex. 6.4. Although the vocal line still ends on ✳️, it is an octave higher than expected and the singer rises to it rather than descends. It is the piano which provides the complete and unaltered Fonte, but in raising the vocal line into the upper register, the end is concealed and a new melodic idea initiated without a pause – a fitting way to convey the anger in the text at this point:

⁷ Gjerdingen, A Classic Turn of Phrase, p. 149.
In both Exx. 6. 3 and 6.4, the end of the Fonte is altered, but this need not present a significant challenge to the perception of the schema in these passages. A highly typical first stage may initiate schematic recognition in the listener, and both of these examples have very typical opening stages, followed, furthermore, by a rest in each case. Gjerdingen suggests that in a schema with two clear halves, deviation from the schematic norm is more likely to occur in the second stage than in the first, so that the schema is not obscured.\footnote{Gjerdingen, \textit{A Classic Turn of Phrase}. p. 78.}

Without a clear initial event, no prediction about its continuation can be made, whether based on schematic or other stylistic knowledge. However, following a strong initial prompt, the listener’s expectations help to make sense of the remainder of the schema. In such a situation, notes that seem ‘wrong’ can be understood as variations or deviations from the pattern, rather than as belonging to an altogether different musical idea.

Schubert recognised the emotive quality of the dissonance contained in the Fonte and extrapolated that tension into appoggiaturas, accented passing notes and suspensions in the first four examples. In “Erlafsee” (Ex. 6.5), the \(4\rightarrow3\) is given a different harmonic

treatment: the 4 is harmonised instead by a pre-dominant chord (hence the brackets on the score), giving each Fonte stage more of a cadential shape (iv–V7–I and ii–V7–I) than that outlined simply by the Comma (see Ex. 2.41). The expressive effect this produces is mixed. On the one hand, Schubert’s easing of the tension normally created by the 4 contributes to the serenity of the lakeside scene. On the other hand, the 4–3 is still the principal voice leading and therefore still conveys some of its affective weight; this infuses the song with the sense of melancholy expressed in the opening line of the poem, “Mir ist so wohl, so weh’”.

As the 4 in bars 50 and 52 is not held over into the next bar, this leaves only 2 to be coupled with the piano’s 7. While the voice’s 4 does not form a vertical tritone with 7 as it normally does, it is still heard as leaning towards the 3 because of its longer duration and its placement on a hypermetric downbeat. The voice’s 2 is best regarded as a consonant skip from the 4, implying that the latter is prolonged for the duration of that beat. This interpretation is supported by the piano’s 4 in bars 51 and 53. Although all the Fonte’s structural requirements are in fact all present in the piano part, it is scored decrescendo to pianissimo, putting the vocalist very much in the foreground:
The manner in which this excerpt reduces the prominence of the 4–7 tritone raises the question of whether the motion from 4 to 3 found in the typical Fonte is at all necessary. In the following example, an excerpt of “Das Wandern” from Schubert’s song cycle, Die schöne Müllerin, a Fonte structure occupies bars 13–16. Although the voice has a 4 in bars 13 and 15, it appears merely as a harmonised passing note. This makes it less likely that listeners will hear 4–3 as the principal melodic motion, favouring instead 5–3 as the downbeat-to-downbeat melodic structure. Perhaps the decision not to use a prominent 4–3 melody in the voice was in order to create a contrast with the following section, where bars 17 and 19 each begin with a prominent 4–3 appoggiatura:


\[ \text{Franz Peter Schuberts Werke, Serie XX, Sämtliche einstimmige Lieder und Gesänge, No. 331, ed. Eusebius Mandyczewski, Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1894–1895.} \]

Yet despite the weakness of its 4–3, it is still easy to perceive the schema. It features a simple melody that is exactly transposed (thereby producing perfect end rhyme), the semitone in the bass provides the necessary tonicisation, and its phrase rhythm is regular. Crucially, its beginning point is easily demarcated, as the Fonte (which effects a brief shift to the dominant) constitutes all the third section of this short quatrain. Note also the

---

local dominant pedal in each Fonte stage, marked by the 5 on the score: when d moves to c in bar 13, it further creates a separation between the stages, assisting in the perception of the schema.

Ex. 6.6 suggests that we can still recognise a Fonte even when the 4–7 tritone is reasonably inconspicuous. Indeed, as the following examples will show, the usual 4–3 voice leading is an aspect of the Fonte that Schubert appears at times to have ignored, either because he leads the 4 elsewhere or because he leaves it out altogether. In the trio from the minuet of his eighth string quartet, the cello establishes a clear pattern in which the 4 gives a strong sense of moving to 5. In purely voice-leading terms, 4 may go to 3 (on the downbeat of bars 20 and 24), with 5 reaching over, but the patterning surely makes 4–5 the more salient progression:

Ex. 6.7. Schubert, String Quartet No. 8 in B♭ major, Op. posth. 168, D. 112 (1814), iii: Minuetto – Allegro (Trio), bars 13–24

Each stage in this Fonte appears to have two points of resolution, but as I argued in Chapter 2 (see for instance Ex. 2.35) it is more intuitive to hear one “true” point of resolution and to explain the other on different terms. Here, a voice-exchange – a common post-resolution event, often arising from combining the Fonte with the Fenaroli schema – suggests the actual point of resolution falls on the downbeats of bars 18 and 22. In Fig. 6.1, I have proposed that the second scale degree in bars 19 and 23 in the violins be understood as implied in order to complete the voice-exchange. From a compound-melodic point of

---

view, furthermore, the e♭₃ suggests a d³ in its descent to c³, a note not suggested by the g². (In the violins, the second scale degree is implied in bars 19 and 23.) This means that the Fonte proper in fact has no 4 whatsoever, but, as seen in “Das Wandern” (Ex. 6.6), has a 5 – 3 melodic line instead:

Fig. 6.1. Foreground voice-leading reduction of Ex. 6.7

A 5 – 3 melodic line is reminiscent of a descending arpeggio, where the continuation from 3 to 1 would take place after the point of resolution. This procedure is one that Schubert made use of frequently, and in the following Ecossaise it can be seen virtually unembellished:


The preceding examples show that Schubert made use of an alternative melodic line for the Fonte, one that substituted 5 – 3 for the usual 4 – 3 and added a descent to 1

beyond the point of resolution, thereby outlining the root-position local tonic arpeggio in each stage. This alternative melody can also describe the Fonte in “Das Wandern” (shown in Ex. 6.6; see Fig. 6.2). Of course, that example has an obvious stepwise descent from ❶ to ❺, but ❶ and ❹ coincide with metrically important points. Because ❶ is harmonised arguably by ii₆ (the local tonic minus the root), the first bar of this Fonte brings the local tonic harmony to the fore more than its dominant, which is only properly pronounced on the last quaver of bars 13 and 15. The dominant would have made a stronger impression if it had been placed on the downbeat, and if the bass had run in contrary motion to the voice rather than in parallel thirds, the sense of resolving its urge to the tonic would likewise have been more palpable. Instead, the first bar of each stage comes across primarily as a prolongation of the local tonic harmony:

Fig. 6.2. Foreground voice-leading reduction of Ex. 6.6

rather than:
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This melodic structure is particularly apt in a piece that employs arpeggios so gleefully, such as at the end of the opening melody (see Ex. 6.6, bars 10–11). It is surely no mere coincidence that this kind of figuration, here evoking the bucolic setting, should resemble the undulating yodel of Ländler and Deutsche Tänze, or more specifically, of those dances as they are adapted for the more “elevated” setting of the salon or concert hall. As Leo Black has explained, German Volksmusik still relies even today on ‘a four-square [melody] that goes up and down the tonic triad ... whereas [Das Wandern] immediately uses wide intervals including the difficult diminished fifth, and a relatively sophisticated musical technique, sequence’.

That sequence is the Fonte of Ex. 6.6, in this case a nexus of art music and folk music. It was a combination which Schubert used often. The familiar registral see-sawing of the Ländler could naturally be coupled with the Fonte’s alternative 5–3–1 melodic complex:

Ex. 6.9. Schubert, Drei Deutsche Tänze, D. 972, No. 1 (n. d.; before 1817?), bars 9-12

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Ab: } & (V) \\
& \text{ii} \\
& V \\
& I \\
\end{align*}\]

Continuing with Die schöne Müllerin, we find the same arpeggio melodic complex carried on in the next song. Its descent from 3 to 1, as was clear in the preceding examples, follows the point of resolution. As anything after the resolution is, strictly speaking, inessential for the schema’s completeness, it is no surprise to find it left out of the vocal melody in bar 26. However, it is in fact present in the piano’s left hand, and the voice’s continuation to d\textsuperscript{2} at the end of that bar and d\textsuperscript{1} in the next joins the end of the Fonte very smoothly to the next phrase:

---

Schubert begins to repeat the figure later on in bar 42, but rather than “correcting” the Fonte by providing the missing 4, he in fact deviates away from the established and expected continuation of the schema (Ex. 6.11). A four-bar Fonte is drawn out into an eight-bar phrase, with what was the first stage of the Fonte now repeated to flesh out four bars instead of two. Whereas in Ex. 6.10, the Fonte initiates a modulation to the dominant (D major), here Schubert opts to be in the relative minor (E minor). He takes advantage of a convenient property of a Fonte that modulates to the dominant: in tonicising its supertonic in the first stage, it tonicises the relative minor of the home key. That is, E minor is both the supertonic of D major and the relative minor of G major. This means that Schubert need take the harmony no further after bar 43. He uses only E minor at the middle and end points of this eight-bar phrase, just as he had only used G major at the same points in the first phrase of the song (bars 2–10, not shown). That gave a harmonic quiescence that mirrored the evenness of the brook’s flow – an effect perhaps less well achieved by the greater harmonic polarity contained within, say, an antecedent-consequent phrase. Yet Ex. 6.11 is

not just a parallel to the opening phrase: because bars 42–43 are the same as those that initiated the Fonte in Ex. 6.10, heard just a moment earlier, the deception we feel when we hear that they are not continued as before may prompt us to notice a greater subtlety of interplay between components of the musical structure in this passage than its apparently uncomplicated character may lead us to expect:

Ex. 6.11. Schubert, “Wohin?” from Die schöne Müllerin, bars 41–52

Reviewing the examples presented in this chapter, we see that Schubert could apply the Fonte to text that conveyed virtually opposite ideas: carefree optimism on the one hand and pining lament on the other. For the latter, he would draw out the dissonance between the ❹ and ❺; for the former, leave it out entirely or merely glance over it. In doing so, Schubert developed an alternative melodic complex that dispenses with the usual ❹ – ❸

18 Ibid.
voice leading. In its place, a descending arpeggio outlines the local tonic of each stage. With less emphasis on dominant-tonic polarity (see Fig. 6.2), one may hear in these Fontes what is obvious of Fontes in general: namely, that the first stage is a tonicised neighbour chord to the second. Thus, hearing beyond the leaps in the arpeggio melody, especially in a case like Ex. 6.8, a stepwise connection between the stages is evident:

Fig. 6.3. Middleground voice-leading reduction of Ex. 6.8

![Image of musical notation]

In the songs that make use of this melodic complex (Exx. 6.6, 6.10), it could be said that the Fonte enables a brief and slight divergence from the larger tonal context in a way that does not draw as much attention to the harmonic deviation as the typical Fonte does. After all, its function was normally one of ‘digression from, and then return to, a previous state’, underscored when a composer emphasised the tritone in each dominant-seventh or diminished-seventh chord. Conversely, by intensifying precisely that emphasis on the tritone, Schubert married dissonance with pathos, as he did in the songs that communicate heavier emotions (Exx. 6.1–6.5).

The fact that Schubert was able to employ the Fonte for contrasting dramatic purposes points to another aspect of its versatility. We have seen how the schema does not specify any hard-and-fast configuration of its melody and bass components, nor any very strict requirements about its length, giving composers wide scope not only for melodic and rhythmic individuality, but also for manipulation of what one might regard as some of its more essential elements. This chapter shows that the Fonte does not, as an unrealised schema, signify any one particular affect or emotional character. By way of a contrasting

---

example, Peter Williams has undertaken a comprehensive historical study over four centuries of a pattern he calls the “chromatic fourth”, which does express a more or less predetermined affect. As a descending chromatic tetrachord, this pattern is usually associated with a character of plaintive melancholy or mourning, a famous example being “Dido’s Lament”, from Purcell’s *Dido and Aeneas*. Unlike the chromatic fourth, however, the Fonte is a “neutral” musical structure that can be flexibly applied to settings of a range of dramatic or poetic texts.
Chapter Seven

Chopin

Throughout this study, I have emphasised the connection between the Fonte and two-reprise form. When Riepel prescribed the schema as one of three options for after the double bar in a minuet, he was not offering new ideas but describing common practice at the time. In Chapter 1, I referred to Riepel’s later comment that the Fonte and Monte, at least as he presented them, were regarded by many people as outdated. Yet we see the Fonte continuing to be used for a long time after this, a sure sign that the schema was not old-fashioned. Koch suggested that direct melodic transposition, which he considered undesirable, could be avoided by varying the pattern set in the first stage (see Ex. 1.8). As we have seen, not everybody agreed with Koch, for direct transposition continues long after his pronouncements. Yet many composers did realise the Fonte in new and different ways, and Koch’s technique was one among many that were applied in the examples I have shown. In order to be able to recognise differences in realisation, we rely on constants, and one of those is two-reprise form (such as the minuet). Fontes are by no means only used in two-reprise form, but where they are, we can trace a link between earlier and later realisations. It is this formal connection that makes Ex. 7.1 so evidently a manifestation of this long-lived compositional practice:


[Ex. 7.1 image]

One of the defining features of the Fonte must surely be that ii is tonicised, but that does not happen here. Instead of a C major chord in bar 17 (as V of ii), Chopin writes C minor, the submediant. The 2–3 melody is perhaps uncommon, but this can be attributed to the absence of seventh chords, which the previous chapter showed to be dispensable. (The a♭ in the upbeat to bar 19 could perhaps be read as a seventh, admittedly.) Its structural position is, however, the age-old classic, and the tonal relationship completely standard. It follows a regular phrase structure, which despite the imitative writing is clearly conveyed by the prominent upper register, and the melodic transposition features no variation – perhaps because the harmonic profile makes this Fonte unusual enough. So, although there is no tonicisation in the first stage, how can this passage not be regarded, at the very least, as related to the Fonte? This seems undeniable, but one of the questions that will be explored in this chapter is how closely a passage should be related to the Fonte to warrant describing the passage by means of the schema.

In Chapter 2, I tried to show that there is no single, definitive Fonte prototype. Some presentations appear to be much more typical than others, but those that are less typical may equally activate the Fonte schema in a listener’s mind. Gjerdingen advocates what he calls “fuzzy” categorisations, through which, as remarked in Chapter 5, we can avoid the problem of having to make a ‘doctrinaire assertion that a phrase is or is not’ an instantiation of a schema.² As a schema is a ‘recognition device’, anything that reminds a listener of a Fonte, however incompletely, could be regarded as an instantiation, and some “fuzzy” examples will be considered towards the end of this chapter. However, as subjectivity is virtually limitless, claims of what is possible will often leave the reader nonplussed. I will therefore begin by focussing on the composer rather than the listener. That is to say, many of the Fontes in this chapter are not immediately recognisable, but I will attempt to demonstrate that the schema was in many cases a basis for the phrase Chopin composed. By the time I come to discuss “fuzzier” examples, the reader will have been presented with a background of Chopin’s Fontes against which to make his or her own assessment from a listener’s perspective.

One of Chopin’s most straightforward Fontes comes from his Op. 10 Etudes (Ex.7.2). It is positioned directly after the close of a 16-bar period, and the pattern is exactly

---

² Gjerdingen, A Classic Turn of Phrase, p. 83.
repeated. It has a clear 2 + 2 phrase structure and the hypermetric placement is typical. There is a slight smudging of the end point of the schema brought on by the continuation of the figures in both melody and bass (bar 21), but that does not involve sequence:

Ex. 7.2. Chopin, Etude in C major, Op. 10, No. 7 (1832), bars 16–21

![Ex. 7.2](image)

In the context of an etude, repetitiveness is normal, and this makes the parallelism between the stages very clear. There is also an underlying parallelism in his Polonaise Op. 71, No. 3 (Ex. 7.3), with both stages featuring 5 – 4 – 3 at the end and 4 at the beginning, but it is well disguised. The opening 4 is harmonised differently in each stage, and in the second stage it is transferred up an octave where the rhythm is different. Nevertheless, the importance of the 4 is underscored in its being a part of both note-to-note resolutions and what are essentially downbeat-to-downbeat resolutions as well. (The 4 on the downbeat of bar 83 really delays the 3, which in a simplified reduction of this phrase would fall on beat 1.) It is also emphasised in the second stage by the leap the bar before and by the acciaccaturas. Although the ends do not seem parallel, the 4 – 3 end-rhyme is in fact accentuated by the longer 4 in the second stage as well as by the noticeable grace notes before 3. Like Schubert in Exx. 6.1 and 6.2, Chopin has used the melodic 4 as a dissonance over local tonic harmony (it also appears in the tenor register in bars 82 and 84, “correctly” harmonised). The affective weight of the accented passing note

---
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is stretched out in the second stage, however, with the 4 being held for the duration of the whole bar, and the resolution to 3 overlapping with the beginning of the next phrase.

Ex. 7.3. Chopin, Polonaise No. 10 in F minor, Op. 71, No. 3 (prob. 1828), bars 82–88

From a structural point of view, this passage is typical of a Fonte, being placed immediately after the double bar in what is like a trio in this polonaise. What disguises it is the elaborate variation on the pattern set in the first stage. Had Chopin transposed the pattern more or less directly, it might have sounded like Ex. 7.4 (bars 80–81 are original). In Chopin’s version, however, he creates a smooth motion over the underlying structure, replaces sameness with variety, and propels the music forwards at phrase ends.

---

Phrase overlap is again a feature of the next example (Ex. 7.5). Without the overlap, we might imagine a four-bar Fonte, with bars 72–73 as the first stage and 74–75 as the second. The second stage, however, is significantly delayed by a rapidly moving circle-of-fifths pattern (5–8–5–8). This progression prolongs V\(^7\) (B\(^♭7\)), with the expected D\(^♭7\) chromatically altered to D\(^o7\) at the end of bar 74, thereby preserving the line f\(1^\text{st}\)–e\(1^\text{st}\)–d\(1^\text{st}\)–c\(1^\text{st}\)–b\(♭\). The resolution that “should” have occurred in bar 74 and again in bar 75 (following the model in bars 72–73) now falls on the downbeat of bar 76. There is also a very subtle overlap of the two stages themselves: the first stage features two points of resolution, but the second of these moves to the major third (a\(\text{♮2}\)). This note coincides with the beginning of the linear intervallic pattern, and it is “corrected” to a\(\text{♭2}\) on the downbeat of the next bar, similar to Exx. 2.7 and 2.8.

Because of these factors there is even less parallelism here than in Ex. 7.3, but points of similarity can still be found. First, the register and voicing of the V\(^7\) are similar in both stages, and second, the 3–2–1 melodic descent in the upper voice (in brackets above the staves) follows the same pattern, only the expected 3 at the end of the second stage is elided with the return to the rondo theme. Such treatments give the Fonte’s transitional
function a new lease of life, with the traditionally static end-point of the second stage animated through elision:

Ex. 7.5. Chopin, Rondo in E♭ Major, Op. 16 (1832), bars 71–80

Phrase overlap is again a feature in Ex. 7.6, from Chopin’s Rondo à la Krakowiak, Op. 14, though of the kind used by Hummel in Exx. 5.15–5.17, where the second stage ends on a half cadence. These eight bars come after the first sixteen bars of the rondo theme and are followed by a return of those sixteen bars in varied form. The first stage begins with the local tonic, from which the bass retains the G for the duration of the stage. In bars 82–83, however, an otherwise standard point of resolution takes place (the “(V\(^{4/2}\))” takes its bass note from the second violins). This pattern is not repeated, as the second stage instead moves towards a half-cadence in F, the key of the Fonte. F major is also the key of the rondo itself, which permits the end of the second stage to overlap with the return of the theme’s opening strain. Although I would say this thematic return constitutes the proper point of resolution for the second stage, there is an earlier one in bar 86.

There is again little evidence of parallelism between the stages, although the descending figure in the right hand in the first stage is reciprocated by an ascending one in

---

the second stage, and the syncopated leap in the last bar of each stage is a gesture which in fact ends each four-bar phrase unit in the whole thematic group. Note also the $d^\#$ in bar 84 – the lowered sixth that characterises the hermaphrodite variant of the Fonte.

Ex. 7.6. Chopin, Rondo à la Krakowiak, Op. 14 (1828), (bars 80–96)\(^6\)

As noted, this Fonte features local tonic harmony in the first stage. The same can be seen in Ex. 2.30 as well as further examples in this chapter, including the next one, drawn

---

again from Chopin’s Rondo in E♭ Major, Op. 16. The parallelism between stages, though still slight, is more noticeable than in the previous two examples. These points are indicated by the labels in bars 87 and 89:

Ex. 7.7. Chopin, Rondo in E♭ Major, Op. 16 (1832), bars 81–90⁷

![Ex. 7.7 Chopin, Rondo in E♭ Major, Op. 16 (1832), bars 81–90](imageURL)

The F minor harmony from the first stage is altered to become a Neapolitan sixth at the start of the next stage, normally a chord built from a minor scale but here part of a phrase unit that has a major end-point. This modal mixture is reminiscent of that in Exx. 5.5 and 5.6 by Hummel, whom Jim Samson names as ‘the obvious model for Op. 16’.⁸ Here, Chopin has harmonised the F (C♭) of the hermaphrodite variant with the Neapolitan chord. A similar shift to a different harmony can be seen in Ex. 7.8, from yet another of Chopin’s rondos, which uses a diminished ii at the beginning of the second stage (bar 140). In bar 139, the Fonte’s first stage arrives on a C minor chord. By adding the seventh (B♭) and dropping the G to G♭, Chopin moves seamlessly to a chord which is in fact a direct transposition of the ii⁶/₃ chord that began the first stage in bar 136. The result is another harmonised hermaphrodite Fonte:

---

When the Fonte returns later in the piece (Ex. 7.9), the interplay of modes is taken a step further, as Chopin unexpectedly ends the Fonte on C minor instead of C major:

---

Ex. 7.9. Chopin, Rondo à la Mazur, Op. 5, bars 336–346 (starts 339)

The reader may be struck by what appears to be an arbitrary delineation of the stages in the above two examples. The brackets I have placed above the systems cut right through the slurs in the right hand. Although neither the autograph nor any manuscript copies remain of Op. 5 in order to authenticate these slurs, and although the first edition\(^\text{10}\) is inconsistent with its slurring over these two extracts, bars 135–136 (Ex. 7.8) and the others like it clearly constitute a single gesture that rises and falls dramatically. Interpolated between these figures are two-bar quasi-scalar ascents in the bass, which would seem to indicate that my stage-bracketing is one bar out. However, my brackets follow the harmonic and voice-leading structure of the Fonte. What is in effect here is what W. Dean Sutcliffe has called ‘a counterpoint of parameters’, a concept which describes simultaneous continuity and discontinuity afforded by different parameters in the music.\(^\text{11}\) In this case, these parameters are, on the one hand, harmony, and on the other, “melodic” gesture. The triplet figures are grouped into two bar units that in turn form four-bar phrases (in Ex. 7.8, these four-bar phrases run from bars 135 to 138 and 139 to 142), while the harmonic syntax is grouped in four-bar phrases that start one bar later. Notice that the triplets in bars 135 and 136 express different harmonies from each other (B\(^{\flat}\) and d\(^{4/3}\)), just as may be seen in bars 139–140 and the analogous points in Ex. 7.9. In Exx. 7.3 and 7.5, the end of the Fonte was

\(^{10}\) Chopin, *Rondeau à la Mazur pour le pianoforte*, Leipzig: Hofmeister, 1836.

somewhat concealed by the phrase overlap; in this example, both beginning and end are blurred by the fact that all parameters are not in alignment. A further instance of this will be discussed with reference to Ex. 7.13.

In the above two examples, the Fonte’s “middle” function is to separate sections of similar material, a usage which returns in Ex. 7.14. In the next extract (Ex. 7.10), however, the “middle” function is once more the traditional one of beginning the new section after the double bar in what is roughly a two-reprise dance form. The dance in question here is a mazurka, but its connection to the other dance forms encountered in this study such as minuets and Deutsche Tänze can be seen not only through its formal layout and its 3/4 time signature, but also through its use of a Fonte after the double bar. In fact, this genre-based structural feature is one of the constants, or controls, that counterbalance the unusual harmonic profile of this Fonte.

The previous few examples began with atypical harmonies before moving to a normal point of resolution. Ex. 7.10 presents a harmonic scenario which is even further removed from a typical Fonte. Both its stages are major, the first in C♭ major and the second in B♭. Thus, the characteristic minor-to-major transposition is lost and the usual whole tone shift is replaced by a semitone descent:

The section that precedes Ex. 7.10 switches between D♭ major and D♭ minor. The harmonies Chopin has used for the Fonte are in keeping with this rather mysterious interplay of mode, perhaps the imprint of folkloristic materials, with its use of intervals like the augmented second. If Chopin could employ different pre-resolution harmonies in his Fontes, why not also a complete alteration of the tonality of the first stage? By doing so, the schema is still able to be used in a context where the usual minor-to-major progression would scarcely fit. Any attempt to make Ex. 7.10 more "normal" only produces a horribly lumpy transition into the Fonte.

Chopin’s passage may be very effective, and indeed it is a sequential descent, but is there enough justification to call it a Fonte? I believe there is, for a number of reasons. The first I have already mentioned: its position within the form. Second, it strongly emphasises the melodic voice leading from 4 to 3, with the common tone, e♭1, as 3 in the first

stage and 4 in the second, clearly conveyed. Third, it has a regular phrase structure, which naturally is applicable to just about anything, but here the structure of the Fonte coincides with the phrase structure. That is to say, each stage presents the dominant to tonic relationship in conventional syntax, starting with $V^7$ and finishing with the point of resolution on the downbeat of the fourth bar, meaning, furthermore, that each end-harmony is tonicised as normal. Fourth, it begins with a leap (the previous note, not shown, was d♭2) to a 4 of long note value. Fifth, Chopin apparently improvised mazurkas regularly from an early age,13 and having schemata like the Fonte at hand not only made improvisation simpler, but made those patterns obvious and attractive objects to manipulate in all sorts of different ways.

Another factor that links it to the schema is that the whole sequence is immediately repeated. (Although it is deceptively aborted at the end, this does not affect the integrity of the Fonte: the implication for how that stage was meant to end is clear.) This repetition is not a traditional feature, but is nevertheless one which composers had by this time been using for at least thirty years. It can be seen, for instance, in Beethoven’s piano sonata, Op. 14, No. 1 (Ex. 4.14), as well as in the following excerpt from Hummel’s piano sonata, no. 9:

---

Chopin had also done likewise a few years before Op. 30, in another mazurka, his Op. 7, No. 3, where the Fonte again occupies a typical position within the dance form (Ex. 7.12). Repetition is in fact the order of the day in this example, for not only is the whole schema repeated, but each stage contains two point of resolution, making an internal repeat as well. The harmony, unlike Ex. 7.10, is quite standard, although the melody (in the left hand) descends and then ascends, rather than vice versa. Furthermore, the 3 at the end of the first stage does not offer any point of rest but instead seems to drive forwards, propelled by its ascending dotted rhythm (bar 60). This rise to 3 is answered at the end of the second stage by a descent to 1 (d♭, bar 64), in what constitutes a reciprocation of melodic material between stages:

14 Johann Nepomuk Hummel: Piano Sonata No. 9, Braunschweig: Lilholff, n. d. [ca. 1870].
Fontes tend to be brief and transient, but what is significant about this repetition is that it augments the length of the passage considerably. The effect is that the Fonte seems to become more of an independent unit than the transitional one it has mostly been for the hundred years or so until this point. That Beethoven should cast a Fonte as an entire subject in a sonata-form movement (Ex. 4.14, referred to above) shows he saw in it precisely this potential for independence. Repetition helps the Fonte to stand on its own structurally, rather than be subordinate to the surrounding material.

Chopin enhances this sense of the Fonte’s standalone unity in his *Grande Valse Brillante* in A-Flat major (Ex. 7.13), where again a Fonte is immediately repeated. This passage stands as one section in a string of modular structures: some bars before this we find a Monte, and after it a chromatic ascent to the dominant. It therefore still serves a “middle” role, but not the same transitional one as when it initiates the second section of a

---

minuet. Here, in the first of the two Fontes, Chopin deviates slightly from the melodic pattern at the end of the first stage (bars 249–250) by transferring the 4–3 up an octave at the end of the second stage (bars 253–254). At the end of the second Fonte (bars 261–262), this ascent is counterbalanced by octave displacement in the other direction. In Ex. 7.12, one stage complemented the other; here, a complementarity emerges between the two Fontes that unites them as a single section. Thus, the repetition and its associated variation very clearly have the effect of giving the whole Fonte passage an independent status:

7.13. Chopin, Grande Valse Brillante, Op. 34, No. 1 (1835), bars 246–266

---

Once again, as in Op. 5 (Exx. 7.8 and 7.9), Chopin plays with a counterpoint of parameters. Bars 247–248, the first two full bars of the Fonte, are transposed down for the second stage, as expected (partially by step and partially by a third). However, this transposition comes a bar “early” and as a result straddles the last bar of the first stage and the first complete bar of the second (bars 250–251). The same happens when the Fonte is repeated from bar 254 (first full bar in 255). Unlike in Op. 5, however, the result is not two sets of four-bar phrase units out of line with each other; rather, the early transposition of bars 247–248 creates the effect of an eight-bar phrase made of a lopsided 3 + 5. What is particularly clever about this is that Chopin now has an extra bar in which to climb (to bar 254) or descend (to bar 262) in register without having to accelerate the note values or to make very large jumps.

In his book *Phrase Rhythm in Tonal Music* William Rothstein describes what he has dubbed the Great Nineteenth-Century Rhythm Problem, in which composers faced (but did not always meet) the challenge of maintaining ‘aesthetically appropriate simplicity’ while avoiding the mechanistic drudgery of an unrelenting four-bar phrase structure. This was particularly problematic in the dance forms and character pieces that were so popular at the time, as they tended towards organisation of phrases in multiples of two. Their symmetries, ‘the slight artificial “naturalness” of the folk aesthetic, and the metric regularity of lyric poetry – all conspired to intensify the Rhythm Problem’. While Rothstein berates some composers such as Field for their ‘tedious’ regularity of phrase rhythm, he shows how other composers, including Chopin, devised innovative solutions. He shows how Chopin would employ melodic or rhythmic continuity to ‘melt away the seams’ of his phrase structure, an effect which he also achieves in Ex. 7.13.

Other factors also work to conceal the four-bar phrase units. The long upbeats (bars 246 and 254) give little opportunity for marking off the preceding phrase-ends, and the section which follows the second Fonte is brought forward one bar to start in bar 262, resulting in a phrase overlap with the end of the schema. (Note that in Ex. 7.3, phrase overlap was achieved by the reverse process, as Chopin stretched the end of the Fonte one

---

18 Ibid.
20 Ibid.
The choice of harmony also makes the similarity of phrase structure less marked. None of the stages begin with (local) dominant harmony, no two stages have the same pattern of bass voicing and the final stage (bars 258–262) introduces an entirely new bass pattern altogether. And if these ingenious means were not enough to blur the phrase structure, the whole passage is played very fast, sometimes with an added accelerando.

In the remaining examples, the phrase rhythm is a lot clearer, with strong end-rhyme in both cases. This makes up for their more problematic position within the piece, both in terms of formal location and harmonic relationship to the surrounding material. I would call these “fuzzy” examples, not because of their internal structure, which is in fact reasonably normal and readily grasped, but because where they are used in the piece makes it difficult to argue they are specifically Fontes rather than simply descending sequences. I do not, in fact, argue either way. Rather, I describe the passages from the perspective of the Fonte and consider what might lead a listener to associate them with the schema or not. (Even in these contentious cases, I will still refer to “the Fonte” for ease of discussion.)

Repeating the Fonte in Ex. 7.13 made the passage longer and therefore gave it more integrity as an independent unit; as such, it was not dwarfed by the surrounding context. In Ex. 7.14, from Chopin’s Polonaise in F♯ Minor, Op. 44, the Fonte is again a standalone entity, and although it is by no means short, there is no repetition. Instead, it is isolated from the surrounding context because it is harmonically far removed. If Fontes traditionally had a close harmonic connection to a neighbouring key area, it might make more sense to say this is not a Fonte but just a descending sequence. However, sequences in general also traditionally had a close relationship to an adjacent key, so to say that this example is “just a descending sequence” would ignore the fact that they have by this point also undergone some of the same changes as the Fonte.

The Fonte is normally used to return to an earlier key, or to usher in a new key area, but here we have come from F♯ minor, we move to B♭ minor for the first stage, A♭ major for the second, and then return to F♯ minor. For Samson, such a harmonic disconnect ‘creates a strong surface contrast but effects no real tonal shift’, and indeed Chopin coaxes the music with ease into and out of F♯ minor. In bar 26, F♯ is dropped a semitone to become the fifth of B♭ minor; in bar 34, the last three quavers effect a seamless move from A♭ major through A♭

---

minor to D♭7, which is the enharmonic equivalent of C♯7, the dominant of F♯. The few harmonies that I have labelled on the score have been done from the point of view of the Fonte, therefore in A♭ major. This shows that the usual relationship between the two stages obtains, yet the key signature shows B♭ minor. A Fonte’s first stage normally takes its tonal bearings from the second, but the reverse may be the case here. However, it is difficult to gauge how Chopin may have perceived the tonal identity of this section – whether firmly in B♭ minor first before shifting down, or altogether unified by the key of A♭ major – as the section returns at a later stage in the piece, where although it is in a different key, the relationship between it and the surrounding material is the same as here and no new key signature is introduced. In any case, Chopin’s own ideas of the section’s tonality are a different matter from how a listener might perceive it.

On its own, the passage is very like a Fonte, but it has no functional harmonic relationship to the surrounding context, irrespective of which stage provides the tonal anchor. This distinguishes it from standard Fontes. Its structural role, however, is not altogether different, for while its tonal disjunction consolidates its structural independence, its positioning between repeats of a theme still assumes for it a role of structural “middle”. Instead of initiating a new part of the piece, it functions here as a kind of “spacer” between repeats of sections:
The structural role of the next example is somewhat more ambiguous. It is of course commonplace to find a Fonte in a trio, but after the double bar that separates the two reprises. Here it comes at the very start, so we should rather attribute a “beginning” function to it than a “middle” one. On the other hand, the trio is itself a “middle” in the larger context of the whole polonaise, just like the middle section of Beethoven’s Bagatelle, Op. 33, No. 1 (Ex. 4.9), which began with a Fonte. Furthermore, a sequence that moves from ii to I is never suitable opening material, unless one wishes precisely to avoid the effect of a stable or declamatory opening, such as Chopin did in his Nocturne, Op. 9, No. 2 (Ex. 2.43).

This Fonte’s harmonic connection to the previous section is in fact straightforward. Following a close in G♯ minor, the B major trio manifests the minor-to-relative-major

---

transition that is fairly common in the history of the Fonte (such as in Ex. 2.3). Were Chopin to have followed a typical route for this transition, he would have moved from G♯ minor straight into G♯ major, as V of ii in B major. This he might have done if the Fonte were in the “correct” location. By plunging straight into B major, however, he can establish the sense of a new beginning that separates the trio from the rest of the piece, and by then moving on to tonicise ii, he can at the same time weaken it.

Because Chopin lingers on B major for three full bars before the point of resolution in bar 31 and then continues on ii (C♯ minor) for the first three bars of the second stage, the passage may give an impression of moving up rather than down. Furthermore, the semiquavers before the point of resolution are also transposed up in the second stage (compare beats 2 and 3 of bar 34 with the same in bar 30). However, there is a very clear end rhyme, which, thanks to its longer note values, has far greater salience than the melodic shimmer that precedes it. These points also articulate the end of each phrase unit:


Again we are faced with the problem of why this should be a Fonte and not just a passage that employs sequential descent. However, the Fonte is a particular kind of descending sequence, with its own distinct qualities, so any listener familiar with the schema could easily be reminded of it by anything that exhibits the same structural and functional properties. If we acknowledge the connection between these examples and the schema, it also means we recognise that it has had a significant role to play in many compositions up to and including this period in time. Furthermore, if we can allow for techniques such as phrase overlap, register transfer, alteration of harmonies, modal mixture, ‘counterpoint of parameters’ or melodic continuation – all of which can disguise the Fonte – why should we not also consider changes to its structural identity?

If the last two examples occupied a “normal” position in the form, we would have no difficulty in calling them Fontes, for they are otherwise reasonably clear. Many of the examples in this chapter are in the “right” place but have other “irregularities” in the way they are presented. In those cases, their formal position is often the schematic constant. By extension, could we say that in Exx. 7.14 and 7.15, the formal position is the “irregularity” and the clear end-rhyme, points of resolution, obvious patterning and phrase structure are the constants?

With this chapter we have come as far as the 1840s, so we should now turn back to regard the full sweep of time surveyed in this study. If one were to define the Fonte based solely on music from, say, the 1740s, how relevant would that be as a guide to identifying Fontes in Chopin a whole century later? Insofar as the Fonte appears to have blossomed in galant music, one might say it makes good sense to identify later Fontes according to a strict galant definition, thereby excluding those examples that do not closely follow that model. From such a perspective, minor “deviations” simply reinforce the existing schematic norm by drawing attention to what those deviations “should” have been, and anything that is too far removed from the prototype is simply disregarded. As an alternative to this view, could we not instead consider that the schema itself might become modified with time, reflecting the ways the schema has adapted to changes in style? In my final chapter, I will reflect on the implications that these changes have on the identity of the schema, and what they might mean for applying a larger theory of musical schemata to early nineteenth-century composition.
Chapter Eight

Conclusion

This study has focused on Fontes written chiefly in the first few decades after 1800, but I have also given a brief glimpse of them in the preceding century, allowing the reader to see something of a picture of the schema’s use over more than a hundred years.\(^1\) If one were to undertake a survey of the Fonte at other points during this time in a manner as detailed as in the current study, one would find fascinating nuances in its realisations, all of which in their own way kept the schema alive and stimulating; but the variety, both subtle and bold, in the way the Fonte was presented in the early nineteenth century underscores how important novelty is to the survival of a common pattern such as this.

As we have seen, the Fonte is a malleable schema, offering room for much invention within its framework, so it can easily be adapted to fit a range of musical circumstances. If, in the nineteenth century, some composers used harmonies in different ways from the composers before them, additional harmonies could be used in conjunction with the Fonte’s schematic ones that kept the schema compatible with these changes; ambiguities of mode in a piece could be enhanced through modal mixture in the Fonte; and the use of more distant tonal relations between adjacent sections could be extended to the way the schema related to its immediate context as well. Where composers wrote longer pieces, they could repeat the Fonte to bolster its presence in the musical fabric rather than let it be swamped by the proportions of its larger surroundings (especially in rapid tempi), and where they faced what Rothstein called the Great Rhythm Problem of nineteenth-century music, they could apply numerous techniques to soften or disguise the Fonte’s symmetrical phrase structure. This great flexibility, to say nothing of its vast melodic capacities, made it a schema that could suit the new and more personal musical idioms of nineteenth-century composers.

In fact, a few of the examples that I presented in the last four chapters were in some ways significantly different from typical Fontes, such that one might have asked whether

\(^1\) For instance, I have shown the Fonte in the 1720s (Exx. 1.2, 2.17), the 1750s (Exx. 1.1, 1.3) and later in the eighteenth century (such as Exx. 1.4, 3.1).
they should even be considered as such. If, after all, we are able to define the schema and identify its realisations, is it not because it has a set of particular features that are fixed in a specific configuration? One could certainly argue such a case, but if composers preserved a single version with total fidelity, they would, however, run the risk of leading the Fonte into ‘stylistic exhaustion’, to return to Jairo Moreno’s term. Furthermore, if we consider the Fonte’s history as a compositional tradition, then we could argue that it is inevitable that the schema will change. According to Taruskin, traditions are not ‘time capsules’ that preserve the past unaltered, but they in fact ‘modify what they transmit virtually by definition’.² Traditions like that of ‘the Western fine art of music [...] are multiple, always contaminated, and highly suggestible’,³ so it makes little sense to subscribe to a rigid definition of what constitutes a Fonte. This does not mean all Fontes needed to change drastically – while some realisations involved very noticeable deviations, others could continue to be straightforward. When composers realised the Fonte in new ways, however, they drew renewed attention to the schema. As mentioned in Chapter 4, this effect is one of Brechtian Verfremdung, where the varied manipulation of a musical schema could make listeners – and, for that matter, composers – sensitive to the fact of its being used. Rather than falling into disuse as a result of people becoming inured to it, the schema continues to feature in the composer’s inventory, not just in different permutations, but in “normal” realisations, too.

From the preceding paragraphs, I may seem to be casting composers as very deliberate in their treatment of the Fonte, but the nature or extent of compositional intentionality is, as discussed in Chapter 3, problematic and ultimately unknowable, even to the composer himself. Rather than suggesting that composers consciously realised it in different ways, then, an alternative is to ask if the schema could perhaps have mutated in the same way that a meme does. Coined by evolutionary biologist Richard Dawkins in his 1976 book The Selfish Gene, the term describes a cultural phenomenon or idea that can become replicated in the same way that a gene can.⁴ The vehicle for a gene is a biological organism and its expression is in one of the traits of that organism. A meme, on the other hand, is carried in the human mind and expressed in human actions and creations. ‘Just as

² Taruskin, Text and Act, p. 182.
³ Ibid.
genes propagate themselves in the gene pool by leaping from body to body via sperms and eggs, so memes propagate themselves in the meme pool by leaping from brain to brain via a process which, in the broad sense, can be called imitation.\textsuperscript{5} And just as genes compete with other genes, so the propagation of a certain meme is a sign of its success over rival memes. The success of a meme’s survival, as for a gene, depends on how suited it is to its environment. When that ceases to be suitable for its continued replication, the meme (or gene) either mutates in order to adapt to it or it dies out. Furthermore, as Dawkins sees it, ‘[w]henever conditions arise in which a new kind of replicator \emph{can} make copies of itself, the new replicators \emph{will} tend to take over, and start a new kind of evolution of their own.’\textsuperscript{6}

In describing the Fonte as a meme, we are building on the work of Steven Jan, who has applied the idea of memes to the study of music.\textsuperscript{7} One might think that the notion of competition among musical memes – of one meme surviving at the expense of others – might not square with the fact that variety, on some level, is of tremendous importance to music. However, although we could think of, for example, the Fonte and Monte as competing memes, our purposes are better served if we take a more detailed approach and rather see rivalry between different ways of realising a single schema. Indeed, for Jan, a realisation of the Fonte (or a similar musical meme) would have as ‘its most significant competitors … its mutational antecedents or consequents’.\textsuperscript{8} This would explain why it is that alongside some of the more radical permutations of the schema, completely typical Fontes continue to appear in compositions in the nineteenth century: they all continually compete with one another.

However, this is not to say that typical realisations have always been the same. The many ways Fontes have been presented generally reflect the larger trends of musical style at the time. Thus two supposedly “normal” Fontes written in, say, 1750 and 1820, will convey stylistic differences manifested on the musical surface, such as through rhythmic profile, melodic construction or instrumental figuration, while both still preserve the most typical ingredients of the schema. The later one has mutated to fit with the changing style; the earlier one is no longer suitable. Their relation to their own stylistic contexts means

\textsuperscript{5} Ibid., p. 192.
\textsuperscript{6} Ibid. p. 193 (original emphasis).
\textsuperscript{8} Ibid., p. 50.
these two Fontes, even if they were of equal length and in the same key, could not be interchanged.

As musical style evolved over the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, there were changes in the way the Fonte was realised. A composer may have consciously decided to write a Fonte, but the manner of its realisation may have been guided in part by the success of a newer meme over an older one. It is less likely that a composer deliberately entertained then rejected outdated ways to realise the schema than that he or she semi-consciously opted for realisations that better situated the Fonte in the prevailing musical style. Likewise, some of the very complicated means of disguise demonstrated in Chapter 7 could also be put down to memetic adaptation. It is doubtful that Chopin deliberately obfuscated all of the elements of a typical Fonte in those cases, especially when he may have had other (or fewer) compositional problems at the forefront of his mind, such as instrumental virtuosity or melodic line.

To speak of memes adapting to the environment may appear to shift the issue of intention from the composer onto the meme itself. Indeed, Dawkins’ description of genes as ‘selfish’ applies equally to memes, and this term implies that genes or memes act purposefully. They do not in fact act at all, being without consciousness, but those that are frequently replicated will engender effects that give the impression of goal-directed intent; selfishness or purpose is meant by Dawkins as purely metaphorical.9 As Jan explains, a meme or gene ‘can be said to be selfish if it has the effect (again, not the purpose) of promoting its own welfare.’10 What is attractive in meme theory is that it offers an a way to understand the provenance of features in a piece of music that it would be nonsensical to attribute to calculated decision-making on the part of a composer operating against a blank background. The concept of schema-based music may likewise explain the origin of many musical ideas composed in a musical score, but, while we should not forget that putting pen to manuscript is still an intentional act, the idea of memetic replication takes away the need for that composer to have deliberately invented every last detail. Like schema theory, it ‘fatally corrodes the notion of the “great composer”, whose conscious intentionality – so

10 Jan, ‘The Evolution of a “Memeplex” in Late Mozart’, p. 50.
the work-concept [...] induces us to believe – gives rise to the monistic, organic work of art’. 11

For a meme to thrive, we are told that the conditions must be conducive, so what might they have been for the Fonte? Galant musical style certainly provided a context that was very propitious to its healthy and successful existence. It did so in several ways, not least of which was in its by-and-large periodic construction. As I mentioned in Chapter 2, this made it easy and desirable for the Fonte and other schemata (many of which also had regular phrase structure) to fit in, and be perceived, as components of the compositional framework. Yet this is not restricted to the galant: regular phrase rhythm still underpins music in the nineteenth century – and Rothstein, as we have seen, has shown how this is sometimes even more so than in the eighteenth – so structurally, the Fonte still “fits in” to the music of this time. The flexibility of the schema’s framework also permits it to be adapted to changes in the way composers manipulated the musical surface, as mentioned above. More innovative presentations also show how the Fonte meme could be adapted to suit, for instance, the greater length of pieces or their different harmonic and tonal palettes.

Another condition that was ideal for the Fonte was of course the use of two-reprise (and similar) forms. Though the two are entities of a different sort and on a different scale, there is no reason why two-reprise form and the Fonte cannot be thought of as memes that thrive together. The notion of ‘co-adapted’ memes describes those which each benefit from the existence of the other meme(s) with which it has evolved into a stable set. Again, the term is derived from biology, where, for example, the genes for the teeth, guts, claws and sense organs of a carnivore evolved in conjunction because they each gave the animal attributes that worked together. 12 Two-reprise form and the Fonte are certainly often found together, but, admittedly, the concept of co-adapted memes is perhaps more fruitfully applied to other musical pairings or sets than to this combination. The implication would be that the two depend on each other, but this is patently not true, and even if one might point to some level of dependency, the schema probably relies on the two-reprise form more than the other way around. Two-reprise form can just as easily begin its second reprise with a Monte, Ponte or other musical idea as with a Fonte.

11 Ibid., p. 51.
That said, the Fonte does offer two-reprise form a working method of how to begin its second half, and the smallness of the form benefits from the Fonte’s ability to effect an easy return to the tonic while still digressing momentarily (in its first stage), or to make a rapid transition to a related key area like the dominant or relative major. In galant music, this coupling of form and schema was seen most commonly in the minuet, and while minuets were occasionally written in the nineteenth century, composers then generally favoured other small forms, as we have seen. Different though these forms may be in character, they can each count the minuet in their ancestry. This is of course widely accepted, but just as we saw in Beethoven’s bagatelles, the occurrence of the Fonte within such genres as the scherzo, eclogue, mazurka, impromptu or polonaise provides further evidence that they may indeed trace a part of their lineage to the by then antiquated minuet. When we consider this relationship further, we may appreciate that so many of the techniques used to manipulate the Fonte in the previous chapters are more likely to appear in these newer forms than in the minuet, where such complex means of disguise would conflict with its functional and aesthetic basis of, generally speaking, simplicity and structural clarity.

Again, though, the Fonte does not only appear in two-reprise forms, so evidently other factors also ensure its success. In Chapter 1, I referred to the element of repetition contained within the Fonte, repetition of course being a near-universal factor of music that augments its capacity to communicate ideas effectively, whether melodic, rhythmic, harmonic or otherwise. Despite the numerous examples in this study that are atypical, I must reiterate that most Fontes in this period tend to be relatively “normal”. The straightforward repetition of the pattern one step lower makes the Fonte a readily-grasped schema, which in turn points to an overall aesthetic of relative listener-friendliness. Whether listeners recognised the Fonte as a particular schema, or whether they were simply familiar with sequences of this type, the music remained accessible to them: by its uncomplicated transposition of a short pattern, it communicated its melodic and harmonic content lucidly and in a way that revealed the characteristic elements of its own construction. That such an aesthetic was appreciated by composers, and therefore by listeners as well, is indicated by the fact that straightforward realisations of the schema were far more prevalent than complicated ones.
One implication of such accessibility is that it contradicts the flimsy but popular notions of the “misunderstood artist” or of the composer out to turn convention on its head, especially with regards to a figure such as Beethoven, but it also challenges Gjerdingen’s belief that galant schemata constituted an esoteric vocabulary that privileged courtiers above other listeners. In Chapter 3, I argued that the language of schemata could be much more widely accessible, and the subsequent chapters have shown that early nineteenth-century composers – operating largely outside the patronage system of the court – were very familiar with the schema and well-disposed to using it. If schemata like the Fonte retained a healthy existence in the early 1800s, I do not believe it is merely as “residue” from the 1700s. Rather, it suggests that schematic listening and schematic composition need not have been the sole domain of courtiers and of the musicians trained to please their noble employers. The degree of variety in realisations of the Fonte in later years indicates that nuanced play with known schemata could be appreciated as much by the nineteenth-century amateur salon performer or concertgoer as by the galant courtier.

If galant schemata altogether could be so accessible to later generations, as the Fonte was, then what about the other schemata that Gjerdingen describes in *Music in the Galant Style*? More research is of course needed (and should be done) to be able to answer this question, but one might also ask whether the Fonte was successful because it was a galant schema – which would suppose that galant music as a whole formed the syntactical basis for early nineteenth-century composition – or because it was one particular schema whose construction, character and usage simply made it desirable both for later composers and for galant ones. Examples of various other schemata used in the early nineteenth century are peppered throughout Gjerdingen’s book, but they do not tell us how widespread they were. That is still to be investigated, but in my encounters with this repertoire, I believe one could expect with some confidence to find, for instance, examples of the Monte, Quiescenza, Do-Re-Mi or Fenaroli being used reasonably frequently; and the Meyer is already known to have remained in the composer’s inventory at this time.¹³ (A schema like the Romanesca, however, has a rather more antique character that might mean it is not used so frequently.) Gjerdingen’s schemata also need not constitute the entire

---

catalogue of galant patterns. Byros, for one, has added to it with the Le-Sol-Fi-Sol schema, which, as we saw in Ex. 5.7, also circulated in later repertories.

Furthermore, what Gjerdingen provides is only his interpretation of patterns he has identified. I pointed out in Chapter 3 that the schemata in his book are each different in type and that this can affect their relative salience to the listener, thus affecting their chances of being replicated. The Fonte is amongst the most recognisable of them all, but the open-endedness of the Ponte (Ex 1.1) and the Romanesca (Exx. 2.39, 2.40) make them by contrast more vague, and the fact that one could consider the Meyer, Jupiter, Pastorella and Aprile (referred to in Chapters 1 and 3) all as forms of a “changing-note schema” can be put down to the differences between them seeming less significant than Gjerdingen makes them out to be. There may also be large amounts of music, galant or later, that cannot be accounted for by Gjerdingen’s schemata, but as already observed, he does not propose that every note of every piece be assigned to one schema or another. This concession leaves the theory open to additions and refinement by other modern contributors and, by extension, also in effect leaves room for the schemata themselves to change over time. Many of the examples in this study may well not have passed as Fontes in the eighteenth century, but if we draw again on meme theory, we should not consider a schema’s essential elements to be immutable as history progresses. Many nineteenth-century musicians were evidently very familiar with the Fonte in its older and more recent versions, pointing to its ability to mutate in ways that extended its appeal as a compositional option.

I believe the present study lends support to the idea that more stylistic continuity existed between the music of the early nineteenth century and that of (mainly the second half of) the eighteenth century than traditional historical narratives convey. The persistence of the Fonte – and probably other schemata – throughout these years offers evidence of a very specific stylistic constant. (Indeed, in a new article that has just come to hand as I finalise this text for submission, Byros argues that a repertory of shared schemata underpins the ‘long eighteenth century’, which he regards as 1720 to 1840.) One might object that I allow this “constant” to mutate and still consider it “healthy” rather than view such changes as the dying-out of a schema that really belonged to earlier decades. It is essentially the latter stance that underlies the way Gjerdingen describes the Meyer’s frequency over the
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14 Byros, ‘Meyer’s Anvil’, p. 278.
course of nearly two hundred years, where a bell-shaped curve peaks sharply around the 1770s, when Meyers were most commonly used and were at their most typical, and dwindles into obscurity at each end.\textsuperscript{15} However, the organic narrative of growth, maturity and decay on which this description is premised is no less value-laden than, say, a teleological view where an end-point is understood as the goal which earlier efforts strive to reach.\textsuperscript{16} Although my proposal of stylistic continuity also ultimately betrays an organicist view by thinking of ‘a style period in terms of any discoverable unity within it’,\textsuperscript{17} I am suggesting that the growth-maturity-decay, or “life-cycle”, view can get in the way of discovering some of those unities. By considering differences in a schema’s presentation as memetic adaptations to a changing stylistic environment (changes can be detected within any style period), we might consider that the schema retains its significance rather than loses it.

The focus of \textit{Music in the Galant Style} is an undeservedly neglected repertoire from the middle of the eighteenth century, which its insights will hopefully help to redress. The music of the early nineteenth century suffers from a similar lack of recognition and, as a result, is often awkwardly perceived as something of a transition between the “Classical” and “Romantic” periods. The “great masters” narrative has done nothing but perpetuate this perspective, banishing into insignificance such accomplished composers as Hummel or Ries. In fact, such has been its influence that, as James Webster points out, Beethoven alone has sometimes come to stand for the years that bridge the “Classical” in the eighteenth century and “Romantic” in the nineteenth.\textsuperscript{18} However, not only is labelling a time as a “transition” a teleological description, in terms of what it is transitioning to, but it also reveals a view that history is a single story with one narrative thread that ultimately leads to present-day reality.

Understanding history as a single chronological chain is perhaps a fallback for many because it is easier than a pluralistic approach, in which so many more problems are raised which each call for explication. It is for this reason, Byros suggests, that traditional approaches to music theory, which work in support of such narrative histories, have had so much influence. By contrast, he says that Gjerdingen’s theory of musical schemata presents

\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., p. 229.
\textsuperscript{16} James Webster, ‘Between Enlightenment and Romanticism in Music History’, p. 112.
\textsuperscript{17} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{18} Ibid., p. 116.
a fairly large number of patterns that must be remembered and which connect, not to subsequent musical developments, but to other contemporary patterns in stereotyped configurations. ‘Inevitably,’ he explains,

... this results in a theory of music which is very expensive. And it is true that the efficacy and power of ‘conventional’ music theory lies in its profound economy. Perhaps macrotheories and macrohistories are the status quo precisely because of this economy – their widespread applicability and their capacity for storytelling and constructing grand narratives, such as the ‘pretonal, tonal, post-tonal’ paradigm which underlies most theorising and historiography, a ‘fantasy’ that Gjerdingen wants to dispel.\textsuperscript{19}

It is in the service of these ‘grand narratives’ that the early nineteenth century is labelled a transition, for as Dahlhaus points out, historians interested in making connections over time will ‘gravitate toward the emergence and crystallization of the new rather than the demise and disintegration of the old’.\textsuperscript{20} But rather than consider one concurrent historical strain as in ‘demise and disintegration’ while another grows healthy, one should also be open, as Dahlhaus is, to the possibility of different styles operating alongside each other. This permits one to have the view that music which held schemata and other principles of galant composition in high regard need not have represented a dying aesthetic while other styles flourished alongside it. Gjerdingen has, for instance, attempted to show an engagement with musical schemata, similar to that in the galant period, taking place in late nineteenth-century Russia, especially with regard to musical education.\textsuperscript{21} He identifies galant schemata (some more persuasively than others) in the music of such composers such as Rachmaninov, Glazunov and Kalafati, and presents tables of “schemata” devised by Arensky. He shows how Tschaikovsky, in the first movement of his sixth symphony, wrote a Fonte couched in a framework reminiscent of two-reprise form, while in western Europe the Fonte was by this time virtually out of circulation:

\textsuperscript{19} Byros, ‘Unearthing the Past’, p. 122.
\textsuperscript{20} Dahlhaus, \textit{Nineteenth-Century Music}, p. 2.
Ex. 8.1. Tchaikovsky, Symphony No. 6, Op. 74 (1893), i: Adagio²² (Gjerdingen has adapted the theme to show its correlation to two-reprise form)

The Fonte of course wanes in popularity in the music of western Europe, with instances becoming fewer in the 1830s and rare from the 1840s onwards. This can be attributed not so much to the deliberate rejection of this schema – indeed, so vociferous a figure as Schumann, for all his anti-conventional rhetoric, gave pride of place to two very similar realisations of the Fonte in the scherzos of his second and fourth symphonies (the latter shown at Ex. 3.7) – but rather to composers opting to write in forms and styles which no longer provided a propitious environment for the schema to survive in. A number of different changes in this stylistic environment will each have the affected the viability of the Fonte in one way or another: its two points of resolution would not have found favour with the tendency away from strong cadential articulation; with composers inclining towards long melodic arcs, the succinct utterances of each Fonte stage would give way to longer melodic sequences; as minor keys came to be increasingly favoured, the Fonte’s major

²² Reproduced from ibid., p. 197.
tonality would have had less applicability; when the size of pieces grew, the small Fonte (despite techniques like repetition) would have drowned in its surroundings; or, as composers tended towards forms that were unlike the old two-reprise – such as “fragments” or programmatic structures – the Fonte would have found itself out of its usual habitat, with other compositional options being more relevant and immediate.

Yet this does not mean composers were now unaware of the Fonte. In the guise of an epilogue, I present an example from Stravinsky’s neo-classical output. In adapting the music of Pergolesi, Stravinsky engaged closely with the musical conventions employed in this suite. The obvious Fonte in Ex. 8.2 suggests that Stravinsky, and doubtless many of his contemporaries, would have been well attuned to the role it played in galant music and, one would like to believe, in the music of the early nineteenth century too.
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