Court musicians in central Europe wrote several major treatises during the 1750s and early 1760s. Those of Riepel (1752, 1755, 1757, 1765) are still significant for their descriptions of compositional practice.\(^1\) The flute treatise of Quantz (1752), the keyboard treatises of C. P. E. Bach (1753, 1762), and the violin treatise of Leopold Mozart (1756) are important for detailing performance practice.\(^2\) And the thoroughbass treatise of Johann Friedrich Daube (1756) is valuable as a sign that galant simplifications of musical syntax had begun to influence conceptions of the tonal system.\(^3\) Daube’s *General-Bass in drey Accorden [Thoroughbass in Three Chords]* drew attention, as Rameau had earlier in France (1722), to the central roles of three distinct sonorities: a 6/5 chord above ④ in the bass, a seventh chord above ⑤, and a simple triad above ①. Though Daube oversimplified galant practice for his readership of amateur musicians, as we saw in chapter 11, it is nevertheless true that one can produce a typical galant cadence using only these three sonorities:

**Ex. 20.1** Daube’s “three chords” (1756) set as a cadence
Among the schemata introduced in previous chapters, the Ponte could be characterized as an extension of, and a focus on, the second type of sonority (a seventh chord on ⑤), and the Quiescenza could be described as an extension of, and a focus on, the third type (a simple triad on ③). What I call “the Indugio”—so named because it signals a playful tarrying or lingering (It., indugiare) that delays the arrival of a cadence—was a schema for extending and focusing on the first type of sonority, a 6/3 or 6/5/3 chord on ④.

To show the Indugio in a typical setting, I have selected a passage from one of the many undated keyboard works by Cimarosa (ex. 20.2). The movement in question began in B♭ major but at this point has already modulated to the dominant key, F major:

ex. 20.2  Cimarosa, Sonata C78, Allegro brioso, m. 21 (ca. 1780s)

Cimarosa first presents a four-measure Fenaroli in F major. In the Fenaroli’s last measure (m. 24), its bass moves from ③ to ⑥, which often indicates the beginning of a cadence. Measure 25 would thus likely have begun a one- or two-measure cadence had not an Indugio delayed the cadence for several extra measures (mm. 25–28). Moreover, the Indugio leads into a Converging cadence on C, which can be heard either as the new tonic key or as the dominant of F major. Cimarosa’s example presents many of the hallmarks of the Indugio. There is the initial and prominent melodic ② (m. 25), the rapid, ultimately rising sixteenth-note figures that touch on ②, ④, and ⑥ (mm. 25–28), the sound of the minor mode (G minor), chromatic lower neighbor-notes (the A₃ in the bass and F♯₅ in the soprano of mm. 25–28), and the chromatic rising bass of the Converging...
cadence (mm. 28–29). Just as important is the perception that the strong forward progress of the Fenaroli gets sidetracked by the Indugio. Measure 26 repeats measure 25 exactly, the first half of measure 27 repeats the first half of measure 26, and the second half of measure 27 repeats the first half of the same measure. In short, the listener is forced to linger in a busy stasis until the Converging cadence reestablishes a sense of goal-directed motion.

Gaviniés, though twenty years senior to Cimarosa, nonetheless shared with him many of the same strategies for employing the Indugio. Example 20.3 is taken from the slow movement of his violin sonata in G major. Like the movement of Cimarosa, this movement modulates to the dominant key of D major and then begins a Fenaroli. Cimarosa went from a Fenaroli directly to an Indugio. Gaviniés takes a more leisurely route. A full cadence follows the Fenaroli (mm. 15–16) and closes the first half of the movement. The second half begins with a chromatic Fonte (mm. 17–20). The Fonte’s melodic descent of D₅-C♯₅-C₅-B₄ leads down to A₄ as ❷ in measure 21, where Gaviniés lingers on the Indugio.

ex. 20.3 Gaviniés, Opus 3, no. 3, mvt. 2, Adagio cantabile, m. 11 (1764)
An important variant of the Indugio features a bass with stepwise ascents and descents between ④ and ⑥, while the melody parallels that movement by going up and down between ❷ and ❹. The combination of an inner-voice pedal point on the tonic ① with the passing tones in the outer voices produces a passing 6/4 chord over ⑤. Each of the two examples by Cimarosa shown below demonstrates this practice. The first one, in B♭ major, notates all three voices and may thus be easier to recognize as the passing-6/4 variant. It features the common agitato syncopations in the melody:

ex. 20.4  Cimarosa, Sonata C70, Andantino, m. 8 (ca. 1780s)

The second one, in B♭ major (ex. 20.5), presents only the two outer voices, with the inner-voice pedal point implied. This Indugio is likewise slightly syncopated and includes a chromatic leading tone (B♭) to ❷. As in the previous example, I have added the figures “6/4” to highlight the placement of that sonority—the figures are not present in the early manuscripts or prints. This second example of the passing-6/4 variant also shows the less common option of the Indugio not proceeding to a Converging cadence. Instead the phrase comes to a complete cadence in the key of B♭.
In the partimento tradition, the passing-6/4 variant of the Indugio was sometimes figured without an overt “6/4,” but in a way that better conveyed the movement of voices. In an example by Tritto one can see the tonic inner-pedal figured as “5 —” (meaning “sound the fifth above and hold it”) and the melody-bass parallelism figured as “6 6 6 6.” The partimento shows an Indugio occupying the third stage of the Long cadence, as defined by Sala (see chap. 11).

ex. 20.6 Tritto, partimento in G major, m. 46 (ca. 1810–15)
Unlike the Indugios of the last two examples, a typical Indugio will generally conclude with a Converging cadence. These cadences strike a balance between the keys of the tonic and dominant, allowing for either to be heard. Only a slight push is needed to upset that balance and force a single interpretation. In another Indugio by Gaviniés, the early arrival of C♯ in both bass and melody (m. 21) puts D major squarely in the foreground:

ex. 20.7 Gaviniés, Opus 3, no. 5, mvt. 1, Allegro, m. 19 (1764)

As is true of most galant schemata, the Indugio had a number of incidental variants, due perhaps to local traditions and personal preferences. In Vienna, for example, Wanhal frequently put the Converging cadence’s bass of ④–④–⑤ in the tenor voice. Two such examples from his string quartets feature a modulating Prinner that precedes the Indugio. The first, example 20.8, adds a Ponte and fermata after the Indugio to further the delay of E major, the new tonic harmony.

The second, example 20.9, is also preceded by a large modulating Prinner, which in this case has a common type of Meyer embedded in its second half. As in Wanhal’s previous example, the ⑥–⑤–④–③ descent of the Prinner leads smoothly down to the ② of the Indugio, making a long general descent that continues through ① and ⑦ at the close of the Converging cadence.

The contractual arrangements that tied court musicians to their noble patrons were sometimes onerous, sometimes generous. Though Mozart, Haydn, and many others frequently chafed under these agreements, they did so as free men. Wanhal, by contrast, began life actually owned by a nobleman. Legally he was a serf, someone’s chattel. He reached an important milestone when he became successful enough to buy his own freedom. He never subsequently became lackey to any court, and made a good living as a writer of keyboard and chamber music to be printed and sold to the middle class. This bourgeois music still draws heavily on the repertory of galant schemata, but subtle changes arise in how the schemata are presented. At times, the musical discourse seems to become more obvious, almost didactic.
ex. 20.8  Wanhal, Quartet in A Major (A4), mvt. 1, Allegro mod., m. 16 (ca. 1784)

ex. 20.9  Wanhal, Quartet in C Major (C1), mvt. 1, Allegro, m. 18 (1773)
Three examples provide a glimpse into the development of this repertory, the larger story of which falls outside the scope of this book. The first is taken from Wanhal’s early C-minor quartet (1768–69). Galant practices are still very much in evidence. A flowing cadential four-bar phrase in E♭ major ends with a deceptive cadence in measure 24 as the first violin plays an appoggiatura and the second violin completes a melodic Prinner. As the phrase is repeated, an ornate Indugio leads to the standard Converging cadence:

\[
\text{ex. 20.10} \quad \text{Wanhal, Quartet in C Minor (c2), mvt. 1, Allegro mod., m. 21 (1768–69)}
\]

In the second example, from his G-major quartet of around 1780 (see ex. 20.11), the first phrase hints at an Indugio in measure 143; the second phrase then realizes that potential by adding two extra measures, some of which is silence (m. 143 becomes mm. 147–49).

The third and final passage (ex. 20.12) comes from Wanhal’s E♭ string quartet of the mid 1780s (1785–86). As in the previous two examples, Wanhal presents a model phrase followed by an altered copy. The model phrase is very “four-square”—no appoggiaturas, no Prinner, no deceptive cadence. Only the hint of an Indugio at the melodic  in measure 7 (note the associated syncopations) helps to delay the full cadence until the middle of measure 8. The second phrase is an extended copy of the first. The extension begins at the melodic  in measure 11 and turns into a large Indugio complete with an embedded, canonic Fenaroli in F minor. When the complete cadence arrives in measure 14, it falls squarely back on the downbeat.
EX. 20.11  Wanhal, Quartet in G Major (G8), mvt. 1, Allegro molto moderato, m. 142
(ca. 1780)

EX. 20.12  Wanhal, Quartet in Eb Major (E♭11), mvt. 1, Allegro con fuoco, m. 4
(1785–86)
In the previous three excerpts one can see a stylistic progression in which musical meaning becomes more internal to the single work. That is, whereas a courtly audience could be expected to understand an Indugio whenever and wherever it occurred, one senses that Wanhal was giving his more bourgeois audience internal clues to the schema's meaning. He was, in part, teaching them. In each excerpt he presents a model (the first phrase), then inserts an Indugio to lengthen the copy (the second phrase). The meaning of each extension can be inferred from the internal evidence of its corresponding model, and thus someone without extensive musical experience of the courtly style could still get the point of the Indugio. I recognize that the transition toward a musical art that was more self-referential and less formulaic is generally ascribed to the “heroic” acts of composers like Beethoven. But perhaps changes in the audience and the economics of being an independent composer were equally important. If we accept Norbert Elias’s contention that some of Mozart’s problems stemmed from his being a nascent “bourgeois artist in court society,” then perhaps Wanhal’s success was in recognizing how to function as a bourgeois artist in bourgeois society.5

Beethoven, as one might expect, took matters somewhat further. The opening of his E♭ piano sonata from 1802 (ex. 20.13) presents the Indugio as an opening schema. This unusual tack can still elicit comment long after the Indugio ceased to resonate as a courtly schema. The program notes for a 2003 London recital by Artur Pizarro broadcast on the BBC mention that “the Sonata opens with a striking harmonic idea that begins on an ambiguous added-sixth chord and does not reach the tonic until the sixth bar.”6 The courtly schema thus fades into a harmonic curiosity.

ex. 20.13 Beethoven, Opus 31, no. 3, mvt. 1, Allegro, m. 1 (Vienna, 1802)

The gradual transition from a galant to a more bourgeois music culture accelerated during the final decades of the eighteenth century. Obviously the revolution of 1789, which led to a crisis for French aristocrats and the bishops of the Church, created a concomitant crisis for the many musicians whom they supported. The unfortunate Anton Stamitz, one
of Louis XV’s resident musicians (“ordinaire de la musique du roi”), is believed to have gone mad—he was never seen again in public. The ensuing Napoleonic Wars made matters worse across the continent, since a court musician, who had little choice but to work for whoever was in power, could suddenly become persona non grata following a change of regime. In Naples, for example, the regime changed five times in the decade from 1798 to 1808. As early as 1794, Piccinni had been placed under house arrest for unfounded Jacobin leanings, being released only in 1798. The following year saw Paisiello investigated for sedition and Cimarosa imprisoned under sentence of death, though later pardoned. Cimarosa and Piccinni never really recovered from these shocks. The far more agile Paisiello managed to become chapel master to Napoleon himself.

If famous, well-connected composers had difficulties, imagine what it was like for an ordinary musician. In her memoir of the revolution, Grace Elliot, one of the most exalted courtesans of the time, mentions that on Sunday, July 12, 1789,

I went, with the Duke of Orléans, Prince Louis D’Aremberg, and others whose names I do not recollect, to fish and dine at the Duke’s château of Raincy, in the Forest of Bondy, near Paris. We returned to Paris in the evening, meaning to go to the Comédie Italienne. We had left Paris at eleven o’clock in perfect tranquillity; but on our return at eight o’clock at the Porte St. Martin (where the Duke’s town-carriage was waiting for him, and my carriage for me), my servant told me that I could not go to the play, as the theaters were all shut by orders from the police; that Paris was all confusion and tumult.7

In the course of her fête galante everything had changed. History records that the great duke would later be executed, and that the beautiful courtisan was arrested and would only narrowly escape the guillotine. Yet we ought not to forget the thirty or so musicians who worked at the Comédie Italienne. They all lost their jobs.