The earliest compositions of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart (1756–1791) reflect both the private and the public faces of the Mozart family. Some of them resemble individual leaves in a childhood album—an internal family record of the boy’s musical growth, complete with music-grammatical errors and awkward expressions. Others suggest the transcription of a studied musical performance—a written documentation of the boy’s precocity and professionalism intended to impress potential patrons or sponsors. All of them were produced under the careful eye and ear of his father, an esteemed court musician in his own right. These early manuscripts are in the father’s hand because Wolfgang, like a child in any language, learned to “speak” before he learned to write. That is, he learned to recognize and replicate phrases of adult music before he learned musical notation. The possibility of a kind of dual authorship of father and son cannot therefore be fully excluded. Moreover, Mozart’s first published works—Opera 1 and 2 (Paris)—could have been variously redacted by a gauntlet of adults: his father, the copyist, the publisher, and the engraver. A little boy, fully dependent on adults, cannot be considered an autonomous artist, and we should expect adult influences to color these compositions at every step. Indeed, that is why these small works are so interesting and important. They document the rapid assimilation of adult patterns of musical “speech” by a precocious child. If, as I maintain, a galant musician needed to learn a repertory of phrase schemata in order to “speak” music at court, then the preserved corpus of Mozart’s juvenilia should document his acquisition of that knowledge. Because these pieces are preserved from the “kindergarten” period of Mozart’s life, we should be able to chronicle the entrance of new schemata into his working musical vocabulary and to describe how he first used them in simple contexts. The presence or absence of sanctioned modes of variation and recombination should help us to distinguish whether the boy was merely parroting adult behavior.
or whether he was actually acquiring a working knowledge of the schemata and their appropriate usage.

During the 1956 bicentennial celebration of Mozart’s birth, scholars were able to examine some long-lost pages from what was presumably the music notebook of Mozart’s sister. These pages contain four small compositions in Leopold Mozart’s hand, attributed to “Little Wolfgang” (Wolfgangerl) and date from the spring to the early winter of 1761, when Mozart was five years old. The strong provenance of these compositions, together with the explicit dating, puts them first in the Köchel numbering of Mozart’s works: KV1a–d. The earliest, KV1a, is demonstrably the most childish (ex. 25.1). It begins in one meter, 3/4 time, and then switches to a different meter, 2/4 time, just four measures later. Such a shift might seem tame in the world of Bartók or Stravinsky. But in the world of the Mozarts it would, at best, have been viewed as endearing childhood gibberish.

ex. 25.1  Mozart, KV1a (1761; age 5)

This metrical switch, which looks so definite and planned on paper, was likely a result of Leopold’s best effort at transcribing Wolfgang’s idiosyncratic performance. The boy may not yet have acquired what a specialist in child development might describe as “metrical constancy,” the knowledge that a stable metrical framework should persist throughout a movement. It is also possible that this piece represents quite literal imitations of different exemplars. One, in 3/4 time, is recalled by babbling short fragments based on the Sol-Fa-Mi schema. From a technical perspective, the first two iterations (mm. 1–2) show the melodic 5 as a stable consonance that becomes unstable and descends to 6 after the bass
ascends from ① to ②. In the second two iterations (mm. 3–4) the melodic ❶ is reached from below, which would create bad counterpoint if the bass once again ascended from ① to ②. So Mozart changes his bass and descends from ① to ⑦, indicating possibly a sensitivity to variants of this schema or early training in the basics of counterpoint. Other exemplars, in 2/4 time, are recalled through two standard cadences, a Long cadence (mm. 5–6) and a Cudworth (mm. 8–10). The small passage between these cadences is ungrammatical, fitting easily into no single galant schema and including a combination of contrapuntal infelicities (m. 7) typical of the rank beginner. It would appear that the boy knew each cadence well but was unable to link them effectively. His use of the older, “Mixolydian” form of the Cudworth cadence (m. 8; note the flatted ❼) may reflect the very conservative style of pieces that, on the evidence of his sister’s musical notebook, were being taught in the Mozart household.

In his second composition, KV1b, the metrical constancy is no longer a problem. The curious babbling iterations of an opening schema seen in KV1a are now replaced by a broader, somewhat more coherent discourse, and the incorporation of a deceptive cadence followed by a full cadence shows a recognition of the proper linkage of schemata:

**Ex. 25.2** Mozart, KV1b (1761; age 5)

The opening gambit grafts aspects of a Quiescenza onto the traits of a Fenaroli. Given the unadorned two-voice texture, which initially sounds only one note at a time (mm. 1–3), both schemata are underdetermined. That is, they lack the unambiguous cues and ancillary features that would solidify their reference. The diatonic Quiescenza without a tonic pedal point, for example, can only be called such by conjecture, and a Fenaroli without a
dominant pedal point would be unusual. Later in his life Mozart would embed a Fenaroli within a Quiescenza (see ex. 13.24), but the dovetailing of a Quiescenza into a following Fenaroli violates the normal functions of both schemata. If the boy’s musical discourse is nevertheless now much clearer than in KV1a, the proportions of this tiny work are little improved. Fully three-fourths of the movement is involved with a single extended act of cadencing. Measures 4–6 present the initial cadence, which ends deceptively. Measures 7–9 repeat the cadence an octave lower with the expected full close. Measures 9–12 constitute a small coda with Final Falls and closing iterations of the tonic chord. In a normal galant movement, these nine measures of cadencing would end a work of perhaps eighty to a hundred measures. So although young Mozart cannot yet construct a movement of that scope, he would appear to be listening to full-sized works and learning to replicate important parts of them.

Being able to control various schemes of repetition was a necessary skill for crafting galant music. In KV1a Mozart repeated the Sol-Fa-Mi, but not in any approved manner. In KV1b he nicely handled the repetition of the cadence, yet the ubiquity of deceptive-to-authentic pairing of cadences was such that the boy might merely have been replicating a passage that he learned as a single entity. Only in KV1c, whose date of December 11, 1761, may place it as much as eight months later than the previous two works, do we see the repetition scheme of the double-reprise form that defined the adult norm for small instrumental movements:

ex. 25.3  Mozart, KV1c (1761; age 5)
This work signals a marked advance in Mozart’s ability to present a well-crafted movement. The previous two works began with awkward or ambiguous opening gambits. KV1c begins with an obvious Do-Re-Mi. The previous two works had cadences out of all proportion to their movements as a whole. KV1c matches a two-bar cadence to the two-bar Do-Re-Mi. The previous two works had no Prinner ripostes as foils to their opening gambits. KV1c includes a Prinner, though on the “wrong” side of the double bar and functioning instead as a type of Ponte. The previous two works did not modulate. KV1c modulates implicitly through its Prinner, although the Prinner lacks the inner-voice B♭ that would make patent the modulation to C major. And whereas the previous two works never returned to their opening material, KV1c closes with a restatement of the opening schema and its matching cadence.

The “Menuetto” of KV1d was notated as scant five days after KV1c:

EX. 25.4 Mozart, KV1d (1761; age 5)
This Menuetto (KV1d) was Mozart’s first work to be attributed to a genre. Genre had great significance in galant music because of its close connection with social function. Whereas the previous small pieces were for an unknown, presumably internal purpose, the Menuetto makes an explicit reference to an external purpose. This is not to say that anyone would have ever danced to it. But at least it was an imitation of music with adult functions and associations. Its two-measure, six-beat unit of the dance step is clearly evident in the composition’s unbroken series of two-bar phrases.

The Mozarts owned a copy of Riepel’s treatise, the first three volumes of which appeared during the 1750s. Riepel would no doubt have approved of Wolfgang’s early focus on the minuet because Riepel considered it fundamental to the larger genres. Indeed, once initiated in this genre, Wolfgang continued with a series of minuets that explored Riepel’s “three master examples” of Monte, Fonte, and Ponte. KV1d, above, introduced Mozart’s first Ponte, his first Converging cadence, his first Passo Indietro, his first Comma, and overt modulations not only to C major with the melodic B in measures 6–7, but also to a fleeting G major with an F in measure 5. We can thus see in this Menuetto a significant expansion of his schematic vocabulary (with each new schema used appropriately), the first real three-voice texture (mm. 1–2), the first octave played by one of Wolfgang’s small hands (m. 1), and perhaps the first sign of Wolfgang’s interest in the recherché manipulation of thematic material.

The strangely hectic, oddly accelerating third measure of the Menuetto has no counterpart later in the movement. If follows the far more serene quarter-note descent of measures 1–2 and leads into a similarly calm measure 4. Could that peculiar melody have been a byproduct of the boy’s fascination with an unusual type of *ars combinatoria*? That is, did he desire to fashion the bass of measures 3–4 from the melody of measures 1–2 played backwards? I have added gray beams to measures 1–4 of example 25.4 in order to highlight this possible relationship. Listeners are generally unable to recognize the retrograde version of a melody, so this type of esoterica, if intentional, would be done for personal satisfaction or to impress a professional like Leopold. Ordinarily one does not look to galant minuets for technical manipulations more typical of fugues. But such manipulations do reoccur in Mozart’s early works, and throughout his adulthood they seem to remain a private pleasure or possibly a gift to the cognoscenti. Haydn’s *Minuetto al rovescio* (Hob. XVI:26), where the minuet is played forwards and backwards, would be another case.

Mozart’s second minuet, also in F major, appeared in January of 1762, the month of his sixth birthday (ex. 25.5). If KV1c was based on two-measure units, and the minuet of KV1d on two-measure units occasionally pairing to span four measures, then KV2 shows a complete reliance on four-measure units. The obvious Fonte after the double bar even combines two four-measure halves into an eight-measure whole, the boy’s longest utterance to date. This Fonte is also constructed from the motives of the opening cadential phrase, a degree of integration not seen before in these early works. The prominence of ❹–❼–❺–❹ in the Fonte melody, as well as the hint of a canon (❼–❶ in mm. 8–9 answered by ❼–❶ in mm. 10–11) are suggestive of the Fenaroli schema.
On March 4, 1762, the six-year-old played, and the father transcribed, the thirty measures of KV3 (see ex. 25.6). The small, initial Do-Re-Mi is unremarkable, though following it with a double presentation of the diatonic Quiescenza (minus the pedal point) is unusual. This work properly positions its Prinner ahead of the double bar and makes explicit the Prinner’s modulation (note the melodic E♭ in m. 7). It also makes explicit the close connection between the Fenaroli, the Do-Re-Mi, and each half of a Fonte. There were, as mentioned, hints of this relationship in the Fonte of KV2, but in KV3 one can hear the melodic ascent of the Fenaroli “bass” 7–6–5–4 (mm. 14–16), the Do-Re-Mi 1–2–3 (mm. 15–16), and a close copy of the Durante countermelody 3–2–3–1 (mm. 14–16). The eighth-note rest that separates the Fenaroli’s 7 from the 1–2–3 is likely due to Mozart’s again matching the motives of the Fonte to those of the opening theme. Because the theme presents a descending pattern of thirds, an eighth-note rest, and then an ascending stepwise pattern (mm. 1–4), Mozart gives each half of his Fonte the same general profile (mm. 13–16, 19–20).
Mozart continues in this same vein with his next two minuets, KV4 and KV5, from May and July of 1762 (KV5 in Wolfgang's own hand). The two works are so similar in their sequence of schemata as to be almost the same piece written twice, each featuring Mozart's first Montes. KV4, Mozart's third attempt at a minuet, is given as example 25.7. At twenty-four measures long, it is the first of these early works to be shorter than its predecessor. Furthermore, with the exception of the new Monte, it represents something of a step back
from the high rate of novelty in the preceding pieces. It seems almost a resumé of his previously learned schemata, a chance to revisit the old material so as to use it more artfully. The minuet begins with a Do-Re-Mi (mm. 1–2), first heard in KV1c in the same key, and cadences with a variant of the Cudworth cadence (mm. 3–4) first heard in KV1a. In measure 5, the very notes that began the Fonte of KV3 now introduce a Passo Indietro with its attendant modulation to the dominant key of C major, the same combination used in the
same key and in the same measure in KV1d. A repetition of the Passo Indietro leads into the final cadence of the first half of the movement, which features descending triads whose upper tones outline the first three stages of a Prinner.

The second half of the movement (m. 11) begins with the opening motive of this minuet and continues, in measure 12, with the exact notes of the Do-Re-Mi that began KV3. The hint of a Fenaroli within the Monte, that is, the weak connection between the bass ⑦ of measure 11 and the ①-②-③ of measure 12, will be reworked into a clear Fenaroli in KV5, described below. This first Monte ends in measure 14 of KV4 and is followed by the two-bar Do-Re-Mi of the opening. Mozart repeats this passage an octave lower, a procedure that he tried originally in KV1b, and then varies the repetition of the Passo Indietro (mm. 21–22), also transposing it an octave (though an octave higher). From there Mozart replays the same cadence that ended the first half of the movement, transposed of course to the home key of F major. The extent to which he reused literal quotes of his earlier works is, to my mind, indicative of a fascination with the combinatorial possibilities of these galant schemata and their constituent parts. His love of combining his “toys” in every possible way has been shared by many little boys, though in the twentieth century the focus of that attention was more likely to be directed toward Tinker Toys, Erector Sets, and Legos than toward Montes, Fontes, and Pontes.

In Mozart’s fourth minuet, KV5 (ex. 25.8), he assembled almost the same schemata that he used in KV4, but he varied their melodic motives and figurations in such a way that the two movements’ underlying similarity is not immediately apparent. A simple correlation of schemata with measure numbers nevertheless reveals that these works are nearly identical: Do-Re-Mi (mm. 1–2); Cudworth cadence (mm. 3–4); Passo Indietro or Fenaroli, repeated (mm. 5–6, 7–8); cadence of triplet descending thirds (mm. 9–10). The Passo Indietro of KV4 and the Fenaroli of KV5 (mm. 5–6) share the same descending bass G3–F3–E3 and the same B§4–C5 melody, so Mozart could substitute the one for the other. Perhaps it was the prominence of the Fenaroli in measures 5–8 that suggested emphasizing, in KV5’s Monte, the embedded Fenaroli that was only implied in KV4. It is in KV5 that the Fenaroli emerges as an independent entity in Mozart’s vocabulary. His double presentation of this schema as the first pattern in the key of the dominant is further evidence of a careful emulation of adult galant norms.

All in all, these two minuets are perhaps best understood as transcriptions that, in different months, froze in time two slightly different images of the same evolving performance. Mozart’s choice, for example, to restate the opening gambit in the second half of the minuet was a performance option (KV4, yes; KV5, no), not a fundamental difference of “form.” The same can be said of the option of using the deceptive-authentic pairing of cadences (KV4, no; KV5, yes). It cannot, of course, be easily determined if the six-year-old Mozart made these decisions alone, or if these transcriptions represent final states suggested and approved by his father. What is indisputable is that later the same year the boy was to embark with his father and sister on the first of a series of European tours that would have him improvising keyboard music at the greatest courts of the age. Through his music
he “spoke” publicly and by all accounts impressed both the casual listeners and the connoisseurs. In the words of Friedrich Melchior, Baron von Grimm, a German diplomat who heard him in Paris in 1764 and became one of the family’s sponsors:
What is incredible is to see him play off the top of his head for a full hour. He abandons himself to the inspiration of his spirit and to a wealth of ravishing ideas, ideas which he nevertheless knows how to place one after the other with taste and without confusion. The most consummate music director could not be more profound than him in the science of harmony and of modulations which he knows how to lead down paths lesser known but always precise.¹

In the early 1760s one of the “most consummate” music directors was Niccolò Piccinni (1728–1800). His La buona figliuola, a comic opera based on Goldoni’s adaptation of the English novel Pamela, went from a hugely successful Roman premiere (1760) to stagings all over Europe. Its charming, heartfelt arias became among the best known of the decade and, like Jean-Jacques Rousseau’s novel Julie, ou la nouvelle Heloïse (1761), helped fuel the vogue for things “sentimental.” Mozart’s two Fenarolis in KV5, for instance, share many traits with the Fenaroli in Piccinni’s aria “Una povera ragazza” (“A Poor Girl”). That is, they both dwell at length on ♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭♭.Flat

Ex. 25.9 Piccinni, La buona figliuola, act 1, scene 12, Andantino, m. 28 (Rome, 1760)
Baron von Grimm’s observations, even allowing for hyperbole, suggest that the boy was fluent in the galant style by age seven or eight. His first publication, known then as his Opus 1 (= KV6 and KV7), contains two multimovement sonatas for keyboard with optional violin accompaniment. These works, while not equal to the art of a Piccinni, Galuppi, or J. C. Bach, are nonetheless on a par with compositions by, for instance, an assistant chapel master at a small court. Mozart continued to show musical growth and to refine his technique. In the slow movement of KV6, for instance, he wrote his first attempt at a Quiescenza in its normal position following a main cadence, basing it on the Prinner:

Ex. 25.10 Mozart, Opus 1 (KV6), mvt. 2, m. 42 (1762–64; age 7)

While this was an adequate, even charming effort, it had technical shortcomings. The thirty-second-note high E6 of measure 44 (at the asterisk) and the corresponding E5 of measure 46, for example, are left hanging at the top of the register without really connecting to a tonic F. But just a month later, in the opening movement of KV8, Mozart produced (or reproduced) a proper Quiescenza with all the standard features (see chap. 13, ex. 13.17).

His overreliance on the Prinner was apparent as early as KV1c, when he used it in place of a Ponte. Almost two years after KV1c, in the first of the two minuets from KV7, he showed that he could write a Ponte that bears comparison with Riepel’s prototype. To aid that comparison, I notate Riepel’s prototype in the same key as Mozart’s Ponte, that is, in the local A-major dominant of a global D-major context (ex. 25.11). Mozart matches not only the technical features of Riepel’s Ponte, but even its heavy accentuation of each successive downbeat.

As Mozart learned where not to put a Prinner, he also learned how, in its proper position, a Prinner should be expanded and ornamented. You may remember that his very first Prinners, in KV1c and KV3, were only four beats long (discounting repetitions). That was fine for such little pieces but would not serve the larger movements found in KV6 and beyond. In the opening movement of KV6, Mozart tried his hand at a full-sized Prinner (ex. 25.12). He incorporated a simplified version of the la-to-sol flourish in the melody.
(the rise from 6 up to the tonic and then back down to 5) and employed an Alberti bass as accompaniment. Inasmuch as the movement’s opening theme was four measures long with a two-measure extension, this two-measure Prinner was still not quite large enough. Mozart thus repeated it (mm. 7–8, not shown) to achieve a rough parity between opening gambit and riposte.

ex. 25.12  Mozart, KV6, mvt. 1, m. 7 (1762–63? age 7)

In the opening movement of KV9, Mozart refined his presentation of the four-bar Prinner. His opening theme had been only two bars in length, with a busy Alberti bass. He matched that with the first two bars of his Prinner, also with an Alberti bass and a mature
form of the la-to-sol flourish, and then concluded the Prinner by shifting the sixteenth-note activity to the melody:

**Ex. 25.13** Mozart, KV9a, mvt. 1, m. 3 (1763–64? age 8)

Ex. 25.13 Mozart, KV9a, mvt. 1, m. 3 (1763–64? age 8)

The first half of his Prinner, which puts the 4–3 bass in an inner, tenor voice, may have been in imitation of the Parisian keyboard virtuoso Johann Gottfried Eckard (1735–1809; see chap. 26, ex. 26.1). The second half of his Prinner bears comparison with a slightly more compact passage from one of Cimarosa’s keyboard works (ex. 25.14). I am not suggesting any direct influence or copying between Mozart and Cimarosa—in 1764 they were both just boys far removed from each other, with Mozart eight and Cimarosa fifteen. Moreover, Cimarosa likely wrote his sonata much later. But the passages do show how two musicians from the same generation could come up with similar solutions to similar problems if they both began with the same repertory of stock schemata.

**Ex. 25.14** Cimarosa, Sonata C48, Allegro, m. 2 (ca. 1780s)

Ex. 25.14 Cimarosa, Sonata C48, Allegro, m. 2 (ca. 1780s)
The maestros in Naples had been imparting such Prinners to their students for quite some time, demonstrating how the various parts could be combined in different ways. Giacomo Insanguine (1728–1795), a student of Durante, taught the following two variants in his solfeggio for bass voice—the first a modulating Prinner with a simplified la-to-sol flourish and a root-position bass, the second a Prinner riposte with a triadic flourish and the tonic in the bass:

**ex. 25.15** Insanguine, Solfeggi nos. 24 and 25 (Naples, ca. 1770s?)

Similar constructions of the four-bar Prinner can be found in the solfeggio of Sala, a student of Nicola Fago (1677–1745) and Leo, and the solfeggio of Aprile (cf. ex. 9.15), who was a student of Gregorio Sciroli (1722–ca. 1781), himself a student of Fago and Leo. These Leisti taught nearly the same variants as a Durantisto like Insanguine, suggesting a common currency. Aprile in turn taught Cimarosa, so the lineage of Cimarosa’s Prinner can be determined with some specificity. The same cannot be said for Mozart. It remains unclear whether he learned the galant schemata solely from hearing other compositions or whether, at some point, he encountered the widely disseminated didactic works emanating from Naples and other centers of musical training.
Mozart’s musical world expanded tremendously as the family toured Europe. He heard a broader and more fashionable repertory than was played in Salzburg, and he met with musicians of greater talent and experience than he had encountered at home. It was during this period, especially 1764–65, that his schematic vocabulary came more fully into alignment with the practices of galant musicians as a whole. The Romanesca, for example, was a staple of the Italian masters but absent from Mozart’s earliest pieces. Mozart’s first try at what appears to be a Romanesca occurred in the small minuet of KV8:

**ex. 25.16**  Mozart, KV8, Menuet I, m. 1 (1763–64? age 8)

The fourth stage of a Romanesca in C major (m. 4) would normally have an E3 bass with a C-major harmony, or a G3 bass with E-minor harmony. Mozart’s phrase has the G3 bass but with G-major harmony, not quite comme il faut. Indeed, the G-major harmony of measure 4, coupled with the F# grace note of measure 2, suggests that measure 3 would have been harmonized with the tones A, F#, and C, a chord more appropriate to the modulating Prinner or the Clausula Vera than the Romanesca. That is, this phrase has a Romanesca-like melody but an accompaniment better suited to schemata that shift their tonal focus toward G major.

While harmonizations like that in KV8 do occur in works by other galant composers, and while they conform to the “Rule of the Octave” (see appendix B), they were not the norm as an opening gambit, especially when given a Romanesca-like melody as in KV8. Nearly identical melodies by Pasquale Cafaro and Fulgentius Peroti (shown in the following chapter as exx. 26.2, 26.3), for instance, both employ the standard Romanesca bass. In his next work, KV9, Mozart demonstrated that he had learned the standard Romanesca (ex. 25.17). He now makes a clear distinction between its harmonization and that of a modulating Prinner. He followed his Romanesca with a pair of cadences, the first deceptive, the second complete. In the deceptive cadence he presents an embedded Prinner in the main key of C major. After the complete cadence, he then offers a pair of modulating Prinners in the key of G major, complete with High ▼3 Drops.
Leopold, of course, may still have had a hand in Wolfgang's works destined for public presentation, such as Opus 1 and Opus 2 (= KV6–7 and KV8–9). Wolfgang's London sketchbook of 1765, however, shows few if any traces of Leopold's editorial influence. The sketchbook was created in part during a period when Leopold was ill in London and Wolfgang was more or less confined to their hotel room for weeks on end. These personal, unexpurgated musical "doodlings" reveal that the young Mozart had fully internalized the normal Romanesca opening (see ex. 25.18). Mozart's placement of the deceptive cadence second instead of first in a pair of cadences is typical of the idiosyncracies that abound in this private sketchbook. A comparison of examples 25.17 and 25.18 with example 3.17 by L'Abbé le Fils will show the extent to which Parisian models helped shape Mozart's evolving compositional practice.

Whether through the conservative influence of his father, frequent exposure to the simple pieces played by his sister, knowledge of the repertory played in Salzburg, or the effects of early training in the "strict" style of counterpoint, Mozart did not decorate his earliest works with elaborate "graces." That is, the Salzburg pieces lack indications of the conventionalized and highly ornamental melodic tracery that was considered fashionable and indicative of a "heightened sensibility." That all changed when the Mozarts came to Paris in 1764. Melodic graces were something of a French specialty, and it would have been impossible to impress the Parisians without demonstrating considerable skill at ornamentation.
For the study of French ornamentation, the music of Johann Gottfried Eckard would have seemed an obvious choice. Though of German birth, Eckard spent his professional life in Paris, where he was renowned as a brilliant keyboard performer whose playing and compositions were singled out for praise by Baron von Grimm, by the Englishman Charles Burney, and most importantly by Leopold Mozart. In Eckard the young Mozart encountered someone who could spin out highly ornamented versions of the basic schemata of galant music such that twenty or thirty notes might separate their individual stages. So ornate is Eckard’s manner that an example from 1763 takes an entire page of notation to present only its Jupiter opening gambit and a Prinner riposte with embedded Meyer (ex. 25.19). Notice that the ❹–❸ dyads of these schemata are played twice, the first time closing more weakly and the second time more strongly.

The effect on young Mozart must have been significant, for his subsequent works quickly began to show a variety of Parisian traits. After leaving Paris, the Mozart tour continued on to London, where as mentioned Mozart worked on his sketchbook. He also composed six more sonatas for violin and keyboard that were eventually published as Opus 3. They were dedicated to the young Queen Charlotte, who had met the Mozarts and heard both children play. She was the same Charlotte Sophia whose “accomplishment” in music had helped advance her marriage to George III in 1761 (see chap. 1). The queen’s Master of Music was, of course, J. C. Bach.
ex. 25.19  Eckard, Opus 1, no. 6, mvt. 1, Con discretione, m. 1 (Paris, 1763)
One of these sonatas, KV12, documents an early stage in Mozart's assimilation of Eckard's style. In its first movement (ex. 25.20), we can compare an opening Jupiter and a Prinner riposte to the same schemata in the preceding example by Eckard. The boy has adopted chromatic appoggiaturas in the melody and a thirty-second-note run, but the overall effect is still somewhat mechanical and four-square. The Prinner that begins in measure 5 contains the standard la-to-sol ornament between stages one and two of the schema. In retrospect, its first half, with the $\text{④–③}$ bass, functions like a gentle form of the Passo Indietro (cf. mm. 5–6 of the theme for Haydn's variations in chap. 10). The second half of the Prinner was thus replaced by a cadence, here a Converging cadence. Characteristic of Mozart's precocious understanding of how these schemata can be interchanged and recombined, the Converging cadence has the same melody as a modulating Prinner. That is, the tones $E_5–D_5–C_5–B_4$ (mm. 6–8) can be heard as either $\text{③–②–①–⑦}$ in C major (as shown) or as $\text{⑥–⑤–④–③}$ in G major. Neither representation alone does justice to the merged meaning that I believe they had in Mozart's time.

EX. 25.20  Mozart, KV12, mvt. 1, m. 1 (1764; age 8)

After spending over a year in London, the Mozarts began their return journey by way of the Hague, the most illustrious court in the Netherlands. Six additional sonatas, Wolfgang's Opus 4, were published there in 1766, and in the opening movement of KV27 (ex. 25.21) he showed that he had mastered and perhaps exceeded the art of Eckard. A Meyer serves as opening gambit, with a smaller Meyer as echo leading to a Prinner riposte. At six measures in length, the Prinner matches the extended opening gambit.
ex. 25.21  Mozart, KV27, mvt. 1, Andante poco adagio, m. 1 (1766; age 10)
In a movement like this, the ten-year-old Mozart achieves an adult level of sophistication. He has, to be sure, copied much from Eckard’s style. In addition to all the borrowed tracery like the thirty-second-note ascending scale of measure 4, Mozart has learned to emulate the pacing of Eckard’s “delivery.” For example, Eckard presented his Jupiter in two measures, but echoed its last half in order to add an additional measure, three in all. He then began a broad Prinner, giving one measure to each of the first two stages before quickening the pace with an embedded Meyer. Those same proportions hold for Mozart’s movement, though the count of measures is doubled. Mozart begins with a four-measure Meyer (mm. 1–4), which is echoed by a two-measure Meyer (mm. 5–6), six measures in all. He then begins a broad Prinner, giving two measures to each of the first two stages (mm. 7–10). The end of Mozart’s Prinner is likewise accelerated so that the last two stages take only one measure each (mm. 11–12).

While this movement shows ornamentation and form well in hand, it also shows a mature understanding of combinations and subtle contingencies between and among schemata. A simple example would be the embedding of a Prinner within the second half of a Meyer (mm. 2–4), something that we have seen done by adult composers like Graun and Haydn (see chap. 9). More subtle would be the relationship between the termination of a Meyer, Jupiter, or similar schema and the beginning of a following modulating Prinner. A common practice was to end the opening gambit on in a middle register and then to begin the modulating Prinner an octave higher on what becomes in the key of the dominant. In Eckard’s movement, the falls on E₄ in measure 3, and the ensuing in the key of the dominant is the E₅ in measure 4. In Mozart’s movement the same E₄ is in measure 6; then, in measure 7, E₅ an octave higher becomes in the key of the dominant. This was a very traditional move, one already practiced by Leo in the 1730s (see chap. 22), yet it might not be evident to someone who had only learned each pattern by rote.

As a last mark of his rapidly maturing craft, I might cite the way in which Mozart draws out, through the extension of the first two stages of his modulating Prinner, an association with the Fonte. By using the less-common A-minor harmony for the Prinner’s first stage, and a G-major harmony for the second stage, he provides a minor-then-major, one-step-down analogue of the Fonte, which serves here as a Fonte-like digression from, and then return to, the more goal-directed activity. As Baron von Grimm said, “The most consummate music director could not be more profound than him in the science of harmony and of modulations which he knows how to lead down paths lesser known but always precise.” A ten-year-old boy might seem an unlikely candidate for the “consummate music director,” but only well-trained adults could match the level of skill shown in KV27.

One can, of course, imitate subtlety without understanding it. The Parisian Leduc wrote similar passages, and the boy might have been mimicking Leduc’s procedures (cf. his Opus 4, no. 2, mvt. 1, mm. 17–20, not shown). He might also have been mimicking the opening aria of La buona figliuola (see ex. 25.22), with its two Meyers and broad Prinner-as-Fonte.
Piccinni, who was indeed a “most consummate music director,” devoted ten measures to the minor-then-major contrast of his modulating Prinner (mm. 33–44; he aided his listeners by marking *forte* the widely separated core events). When examined closely,
however, Mozart’s Andante poco adagio of KV27 appears more like a synthesis of certain aspects of Eckard, Leduc, Piccinni, J. C. Bach, and others. The weight of evidence from all of his juvenilia suggests that imitation progressed quickly to assimilation. As he absorbed a variety of prototypes and exemplars, Mozart internalized their various traits, structures, meanings, and contingencies, becoming a fluent speaker of galant musical “prose” by perhaps age eight and a minor artist of galant musical “poetry” by perhaps age ten.