like Galuppi’s famous hallmarks of musical excellence, “beauty, clarity, and fine modulation” (“vaghezza, chiarezza, e buona modulazione”),¹ Leopold Mozart’s hallmarks of a master composer, “good technical composition and the arrangement of material: il filo” (“der gute Satz, und die Ordnung, il filo”),² can be difficult to translate into the language of our time. I, for instance, read Leopold as describing two concepts, with the second named in both German and Italian, while Emily Anderson, the enormously talented translator of Mozart’s letters, took Leopold’s laconic remark to have three parts—“good composition, sound construction, il filo.”¹ The English words “composition” and “construction” seem insufficiently distinct. In my view, Leopold’s use of Satz refers to the craft of musical composition, with all its rules and preferred procedures, while Ordnung refers to the choices made in the serial disposition of musical material. Placing things in a suitable order creates the cognitive thread (il filo) that, like Ariadne’s thread which led Theseus through the labyrinth, guides the listener through a musical work. One might have wished for Leopold to expand on il filo, since it appears to have had an accepted meaning among the Mozarts and perhaps among musicians of that time generally. Like so many musical terms of the eighteenth century, whether adagio, concerto, crescendo, or fonte, it was Italian in provenance and probably disseminated through both Italian musicians working in the north and northern musicians studying in Italy.⁴ As a metaphor the term is, of course, open to many interpretations. In this chapter, I will approach it from four perspectives—schemata, paths, partimenti, and sketches—in the hope of establishing a more prosaic definition, one that nonetheless is important for understanding how the Mozarts and other galant musicians conceived of the art of composition.
In the conservatories of Naples there was a pragmatic orientation to the training of young composers. A maestro needed to impart the specifics of a living praxis. When asked a difficult “why” question of the type that beginners love to pose, the great maestro Durante is said to have replied,

My dears, do it this way because this is the way it is done. It must be this way because the true and the beautiful are one, and in this I am not mistaken. I cannot tell you the reasons that you ask of me, but you may be sure that the maestros who come after me will find them, and of the precepts that I give you now, they will make many axioms that will develop into infallible rules.¹

Durante (1684–1755) was succeeded at the conservatory of Sant’Onofrio da Capuana by Carlo Cotumacci (ca. 1709–1785), who was in turn succeeded by his student Giovanni Furno (1748–1837). When Furno’s student Francesco Florimo (1800–1888) recalled Furno, in the same situation, saying “Do it this way, and as I tell you, for this is how my teacher Cotumacci taught me to do it,” we hear the continuity, even the obstinacy of Neapolitan tradition. The situation appears to have been much the same in Bologna. Of his teacher Stanislao Mattei, Gioachino Rossini recalled that “when I asked Mattei for explanations, he always replied: ‘This is the way it has been done.’”² Durante, Cotumacci, Furno, and Mattei were not, however, Old Testament prophets awaiting a New Testament revelation of harmonic principles from a Fétis, Riemann, or Schenker. The Italian emphasis on the emulation of models, the internalization of frequently occurring schemata, and the training of the musical imagination through partimenti and solfeggi was, in fact, the very sort of regimen that experts in the learning sciences might recommend today.

A generation of Neo-Romantic idealists active in the later nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was at pains to ground its deeply felt engagement with classical music in the quasi-magical properties of harmonically tonal forces and the Hegelian mysteries of sonata form. Given that none of the world’s other musics appeared governed by those forces or privy to those mysteries, they held classical music as a thing apart, as a zenith of musical development attained by only one people. The early study of ethnomusicology, for instance, was directed toward all musics except the classical heritage of Europe. Yet if one adopts the perspective of twenty-first-century ethnomusicology, eighteenth-century galant musicians in Naples, Dresden, Versailles, or London do not look so very different from eighteenth-century court musicians in Tehran, Dehli, Yogyakarta, or Seoul. All these artisans worked in preindustrial cultures where highly trained, often hereditary musicians catered to the refined tastes of noble patrons. Training in any of these traditions took years and required the memorization of huge amounts of musical vocabulary and repertory. Apprentices learned how traditional melodic figures and motifs could be fit within frameworks of scales and meters, and which music should be chosen for various moods, occasions, and ceremonies. In styles that favored improvisation, young musicians practiced how to select strings of patterns that helped to fashion larger formal or narrative designs:
They develop flexibility in the use of initially limited stores of vocabulary, devise a systematic way of relating vocabulary patterns one to another, and absorb the aesthetic principles that guide vocabulary usage. . . . Once thoroughly absorbed into a storehouse, new patterns take their place beside the multitude of other set patterns—the precise shapes from which musical thoughts are fashioned. There, within the artist’s imagination, they lead a rich existence, continuously transformed in relation to other vocabulary patterns. . . . As soloists call the figures repeatedly into action and redefine their relationships, however, they sometimes find that the figures occur to them more frequently in some settings than others, interact more comfortably with certain other individual patterns, and even evolve increasingly consistent forms of usage with specialized syntactic functions.9

The above quotation might equally well describe how to select from the musical storehouse of radif for a performance of classical Persian music, or how to string together galant schemata to create a fantasia. The actual source is the ethnomusicologist Paul Berliner describing the employment of learned “licks” by jazz improvisers.

Oral traditions have much in common no matter what the culture, century, or medium involved. Berliner’s concepts of frequency of occurrence and evolving syntactic function through co-occurrence are amplified and formalized in Domenico Pietropaulo’s description of commedia dell’arte banter as a Markov chain of serial probabilities:

Improvisation is a text-building process . . . , a collaboration among the cast for the purpose of conjoining signs drawn from the repertoires of the individual actors and harmonised into a plot-creating strategy. It is, in other words, a process of composition—aiming, that is, at the formation of composite units by the addition of discrete parts. . . . Given the stimulus produced by one character, the process of improvisation must determine the textually appropriate response of his interlocutor, which is then regarded as another stimulus, itself awaiting a response in the evolving script. . . . A perfectly co-ordinated company . . . may be described as a system of interrelated parts which, from an initial state of rest at the beginning of a scene, goes through a series of transformations that take it from a state, in which it is dominated by an actor performing a segment of his repertoire, to another, in which a second actor claims the spotlight, and so on, until one of them engenders a verbal or gestural expression which cannot be further elaborated. . . . Because at any given time the possible states that the system can enter are all items in actual repertoires, they must have all occurred in various combinations in the theatrical tradition prior to the performance in question, and this means that their formal history as second elements in composite units of communication can be expressed as relative frequencies of occurrence in the verbal and gestural language of the commedia dell’arte. Relative frequency, however, is just another name for probability.10

We understand today that auditory learning depends very much on the probability distributions of the sounds we hear. Whether a child learns, say, Dutch or German vowel sounds depends on the probabilities of the exact vowels heard, not on some universal principle. In the same way, the probabilities of one schema following another account for much of what Durante described as “the way it is done” in the galant style. If one takes the
complete movements presented in this volume as a small but representative sample of galant music, one can then compute the probability of any schema leading to any other schema. There are over three hundred such pairings in this small sample. All of them are represented in the graph below (fig. 27.1), with the darkness of each square representing the probability of the schema named on the left leading into the schema named along the top. In this small repertory, for example, the Jupiter has a 100 percent chance of leading into a Prinner, as shown by the black box in the extreme lower left of the chart. Likewise the deceptive cadence is certain to lead to a complete cadence. The dotted line on the diagonal indicates a schema followed by itself. For the Fenaroli and the Quiescenza, immediate repetition is the most likely outcome. Though a graph like this is not easy to assimilate visually, it contains a wealth of information. One can find important asymmetries that help to reveal a schema’s function. The vertical column “Prinner,” for instance, shows that this schema is most likely to follow themes like the Romanesca, Do-Re-Mi, or Jupiter, while the horizontal row “Prinner” shows that it can lead to more than a dozen

![Figure 27.1](image_url)  The probability of progressing from schema A to schema B.
other schemata, with only a slight edge given to a following cadence. Thus a Prinner is often strongly implied, but itself has weak implications for a following schema. Similarly the Indugio is most likely to lead to a Converging cadence, and the Cudworth cadence to a Quiescenza, but not the reverse.

For the strong probabilities, one can legitimately speak of expectations or implications. For the many weak probabilities it may be better to speak of permitted successions. If one were to examine the numerical data, the Prinner, for instance, would have a 30 percent chance of leading into a cadence, a 12 percent chance of repeating itself, and low-single-digit chances of leading to a dozen other schemata. A pairing of two schemata that occurred just once in forty or fifty opportunities could hardly be described as “expected,” though one might want to distinguish such occasional combinations from pairings that never occur at all.

The above matrix of “transitional probabilities” is based on too small a repertory to be fully representative of galant music as a whole. The graph is nevertheless sufficiently detailed to suggest some preferred paths through a composition. If one were to choose “Romanesca” as a starting point, the following series would be highly probable: Romanesca ⊗ Prinner ⊗ Cadence ⊗ Fonte ⊗ Prinner ⊗ Cadence. Allowing for some minor adjustments, that series would come close to the basic thread of the minuet by Somis in chapter 5. In other words, a highly probable path may outline a prototypical composition. These probabilities—what a linguist might term a “finite state grammar”—capture only some of the knowledge of galant musicians. Successful musicians also possessed technical knowledge of contrapuntal and harmonic patterns internal to a given schema, and strategic knowledge of how to arrange the schemata to achieve certain aesthetic effects and to fulfill the requirements of particular moments in the course of specific musical genres. That said, an understanding of the normal dispostio of schemata formed an important background to the judging of compositions. In our own time, the failure to understand this basic type of musical phrase grammar may explain why many computer-composed works “in the style of Mozart” seem to have tangled or broken threads that rarely sound like Mozart to experienced listeners.

Applications of schema theory to music, as developed by Leonard B. Meyer, Eugene Narmour, and myself, focus on a listener’s evolving interactions with a stream of musical events. As suggested above, the actual complexity of those real-time interactions, in which a listener attempts to relate each new sensation to learned regularities and remembered exemplars, may go far beyond verbal description. But if one focuses only on highly probable, idealized successions of events, then it may be possible to present at least an outline of a modern schema theory as it relates to musical patterns.

Central to the experience of a listener familiar with galant music would be the recognition of musical events that imply subsequent events, and of later events that suitably realize those earlier implications. Let me review basic schema theory by first imagining a simple, abstract schema of two parts: an implication I and a realization R. A listener may learn to associate I with R to form a recognizable whole that we may call schema A:
This schema is not a preordained whole or unity. There need be nothing about I that intrinsically or essentially points to R other than the statistics of their frequent co-occurrence. A single implication could become associated with different realizations to form different, though related, schemata. In figure 27.3, implication I could associate with at least three different realizations to form three different schemata: A, B, and C.

In galant music, a number of musical events or configurations are strongly implicative. Thoroughbass norms, for example, hold a 6/5 chord to be implicative of a subsequent
realization. The characteristic passages shown below in example 27.1 take the identical 6/5-chord implication (shown in a rectangle) and realize it in three different, though related, keys—F minor, Bb major, and G minor. Note that the designations of scale degrees only become stable in retrospect as each combination of implication and realization (or further implication) clarifies the context. The F-minor passage, for instance, achieves a measure of perceived closure and stability as a two-event schema. The Bb-major and G-minor passages, by contrast, remain implicative as notated and would require at least one more event to stabilize as a memorable whole.

ex. 27.1  A musical implication with three different realizations

A series of schemata could be imagined as beads on a mental string or cognitive thread—*il filo* (see fig. 27.4). This thread represents an impression of continuity, which can arise from simple succession, from various kinds of higher-level schemata, or from the
quite low-level but nevertheless significant effects of musical meter and the stepwise movement of parts. Simplistic ways of thinking that might be fallacies in formal logic—for example, believing that because two events occur in sequence, the prior one caused the later one—can have a strong influence on the human interpretation of musical logic and continuity. As Carl Dahlhaus observed, it can be very difficult to make two passages played in succession seem unrelated.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure27.4}
\caption{A string of schemata—\textit{il filo}}
\end{figure}

If higher-level schemata can give a sense of continuity to a succession of lower-level schemata, then clearly it must be possible to superimpose schemata of different dimensions:

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure27.5}
\caption{A string of nested and overlapping schemata}
\end{figure}

In figure 27.5, schema A is not only nested within schema C but also contains schema B. These are abstract examples of complete nesting where one schema is wholly contained, or wholly contains, another schema. Simple overlaps are also possible, as where schema D begins near the end of schema C.
Highly contrapuntal works like fugues often feature overlapping schemata. A new entry of the fugue subject, for example, may begin before a previous context has fully concluded, and a *stretto* is defined as a series of such overlaps. Works in the galant style, by contrast, are the *loci classici* of nested schemata. For instance, the previous musical example featured an implicative 6/5 chord followed by three possible continuations. The first of these, as a two-event schema interpreted in the key of F minor, could itself form the implicative event in larger schemata, which in turn might have different realizations leading to still different keys:

**Ex. 27.2** The first schema of example 27.1 embedded within a Fonte and a Monte

That F-minor, 6/5-to-5/3 schema (shown in the rectangle above)—what I termed a Comma in the chapter on clausulae (chap. 11)—can nest comfortably within either a Fonte or a Monte. The context of the larger schema alters the retrospective significance of the scale degrees and harmonies of the embedded 6/5-to-5/3 schema, just as the 6/5-to-5/3 schema itself helped determine an interpretation of the 6/5 chord. So the overall key of the Fonte is likely perceived in E♭ major, and that of the Monte in C minor, even though both are initiated by a smaller schema that, heard alone, would be perceived in F minor.

Because it is based on the statistics of music heard, and on human learning, memory, and other cognitive abilities, schema theory does not insist on either a canonical set of schemata (certain patterns and no others) or a canonical set of relationships. It is descriptive rather than prescriptive. It accepts that connoisseurs may be able to recognize a large
number of highly differentiated schemata with quite specific implications, while neophytes may apply a coarser, all-purpose set with very general implications. Both types of listeners may thus enjoy hearing the same composition, and neither may fully understand the experience of the other.

In addition to the cases of (1) a thread of separate schemata and (2) a thread of nested and/or overlapped schemata (two constructions often associated with oral and literary traditions, respectively),

there is the case of (3) clusters of associated schemata. For instance, a florid melody may simultaneously match the features of a number of schemata associated with slightly different types of galant themes. The paired Do-Re-Mi, for instance, shares features with other thematic schemata like the Jupiter and the Pastorella. All three schemata may be activated simultaneously by a particular passage, as shown in abstract form in figure 27.6. The three schemata, A, B, and C, are depicted next to each other like consecutive documents in a file, but they represent either simultaneous alternatives or superpositions for that location on the cognitive thread. Although schema B might seem the most salient, schemata A and C could also be cognitively activated. In particular, a different performance could change the relative salience of these schemata and result in schema C, for instance, being the dominant frame of reference. Performers and listeners hence play major roles in determining how a composition will be interpreted. For advocates of exemplar models of categorization, figure 27.6 would still be relevant, though the clusters of associated schemata would be replaced by associated exemplars.

As mentioned, any study of implications and realizations will need to refer, even if only generally, to the probabilities of implication I being followed by realization R. Some combinations are highly probable, some are highly improbable, and others are somewhere in between. Within a given schema, there are also certain combinations of features that are more or less probable to be its constituents. Likewise there are more and less probable successions of schemata. In common parlance, musicians use different terms to describe unexpected events in these different contexts. They often describe improbable
realizations in terms of surprise ("a deceptive cadence"), improbable features in terms of oddity or transgression ("an altered chord"), and improbable sequences of schemata in terms of a metaphorical path ("a sudden turn toward . . .").

Baron von Grimm is worth quoting again for his use of the path metaphor in describing his first experience of hearing the child Mozart improvise at the keyboard.

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.¹⁵

The image of "ideas. . . . place[d] one after the other" corresponds well with the image of *il filo* as a cognitive thread connecting a series of schemata. But the metaphor of "paths lesser known" suggests the existence of more than one thread. There is not only the thread spun out along the path actually taken, but also other threads that might have existed had the music proceeded down different paths. Thus there are forks in the road:

![Alternative paths M, N, O, P](image)

*Figure 27.7 Alternative paths M, N, O, P*

*The path, or the thread, is the result of choices made at various forks. In figure 27.7, paths M, N, O, and P represent choices not made.*¹⁶ The musical import of those choices can vary considerably from listener to listener. Someone new to the galant style will hardly be aware of any of the paths not taken. A galant composer, by contrast, would have known several alternatives at each fork and understood their implications. Taking a roundabout
path early in a movement, for example, could be a clue that the dimensions of all the subsequent sections will be enlarged. Taking a shortcut in the second half of a movement could be understood as a reasonable defense against listener boredom.

Composers were the musicians skilled enough at pathfinding and thread-spinning to warrant writing down their creative excursions. In speaking disparagingly of an inexperienced instrumentalist who would try his hand at writing a solo sonata (soloist plus thoroughbass), Quantz commented, “If he lacks knowledge of the rules of composition, he has someone else write the bass.” The sense that a bass contained the essential trace of the musical path was widespread and explains to some extent why partimenti were so common in the training of future composers.

Learning and performing partimenti involved recognizing at each moment a suitable path. Elementary partimenti contained abundant road signs in the form of thoroughbass figures. More advanced partimenti rarely gave the student overt figures but did provide other clues to the intended path. In a fugal partimento by Durante (ex. 27.3), I have marked the entries of the *proposta* (P) and *riposta* (R), or subject and answer. Note that, beginning in measure 4, each new entry is preceded by a change of clef:

**ex. 27.3** Durante, a fugal partimento in A major

The first entry of the riposta in measure 2 did not cause a change of clef because it was common to demonstrate how the continuation of the *proposta* and entry of the *riposta* should fit together. One might argue that the changes of clef were motivated by a desire to avoid ledger lines. Yet Durante could have notated this passage with only two clefs—treble and tenor—and still avoided ledger lines.

If clef changes signaled the thematically significant entries of distinct voices in the contrapuntal texture, the presence of a second voice often signaled a contrapuntal combination worthy of the student’s special attention. Durante presented the opening combination in two voices and then reverted to the partimento norm of a single voice until measure 7. There a second voice and a new clef indicate a new contrapuntal combination (Long Comma and Cadenza Doppia; see chap. 11) that would recur several times later in
this work. Once that new material was presented, Durante again returned in measure 9 to
the norm of a single voice. In terms of information theory, more bandwidth seems required
at the beginning of the work and at passages where new, less predictable combinations are
intended. Less bandwidth is required where the partimento merely cues material already
known or readily inferred. As a continuous, mostly one-voice blueprint for realizing a
polyphonic composition, an advanced partimento shares many features in common with
what scholars of composers’ sketches often term a “continuity draft.” Indeed, someone
unacquainted with partimenti could easily mistake a manuscript copy of an advanced
partimento for a composer’s sketch.

Most galant composers left behind no sketches. For many of these musicians, rough
drafts of new compositions were likely worked out only at the keyboard or in their imagina-
tions. The case is different for Mozart and Haydn, whose fame encouraged the preserva-
tion of ephemera, and who both at times cultivated a more complex musical style that
warranted sketching. Mozart’s early study of the sacred music of Johann Ernst Eberlin
(1702–1762), a respected composer in Salzburg, would have exposed him to basses that at
times look very much like Durante’s fugal partimenti. A copy in Leopold Mozart’s hand
(1769) of an Eberlin *Hosanna* presents a bass replete with clues from which almost the
complete four-voice fugue can be unpacked. The first excerpt (ex. 27.4) begins in the man-
ner of a fugal partimento, with the opening proposta (P) presented solo without figures.
The riposta (R) in measure 6 is implied by the figures. Note the “8” in measure 6, which
draws attention to itself for being redundant with regard to any chord, but which specifies
the opening tone of the riposta. I have drawn circles around all the tones similarly speci-
fied, and one can thus see how the core tones of the riposta emerge.

**ex. 27.4** Leopold Mozart, copy of Eberlin’s *Hosanna*, m. 1 (1769)

After all four voices have sung either the proposta or the riposta, the bass returns with
the proposta to end the first section of the work. Rapid modulations to G major, C major,
and A minor ensue. During this modulatory passage the clef changes frequently in con-
nection with the entries of voices. A large Cadenza Doppia then prepares the entry of the
Young Mozart became quite comfortable with the partimento method of encapsulating a multivoice work in a single bass part. As an adult, he often sketched works on a single staff, using frequent clef changes either to signal the entries of new voices or to accommodate different instrumental or vocal ranges. Mozart did not restrict this technique to contrapuntal or sacred works, nor did Durante, who frequently used rapid changes of clef to indicate the call-and-response of treble and bass in an imaginary concerto-like dialogue. Example 27.6, for instance, comes from Mozart’s incomplete comic opera L’oca del Cairo (The Goose of Cairo). The excerpt begins in soprano clef (m. 22) with the second part of an evaded-then-complete pair of cadences. The bass clef signals a modulation to F major (m. 23), following which Mozart presents a large Do-Re-Mi (mm. 24–28):
Treble clefs cue the core events of the schema (the “calls”) while the interleaved comedic patter is cued by the bass clef (the “responses”). Because Mozart was sketching for himself, he notated only some of the clef changes, which made these sketches a challenge to read before their decipherment in a modern edition.\textsuperscript{19}

The remainder of this chapter is devoted to the sketches for a slow movement by Haydn from the third of his Opus 20 string quartets of 1772. As you will see, in producing these sketches Haydn likewise seems to have retained many of the notational practices taught in advanced partimenti, learned perhaps from his Neapolitan maestro Porpora.

A diplomatic transcription of the sketches can be found in the modern edition of Haydn’s complete works.\textsuperscript{20} Haydn sketched the first half of the movement on one large sheet of paper ruled with staff lines, and did the second half on a second, similar sheet. These sketches exhibit a more or less consistent correspondence with the left-to-right and top-to-bottom progression of notation typical of a finished score, though some variants of passages are written near their models instead of where they will occur in the completed quartet. Reading these sketches can be difficult. Not only does one need to flip back and forth constantly between quartet and sketch, but one is also confronted with a number of musical paths, not all of which were chosen for the finished quartet. While there is no substitute for a careful comparison of every detail of the sketches with the corresponding part or parts of the quartet, I believe it is possible to gain a broader view of Haydn’s working method by integrating the sketches and the quartet into a single score.

If \textit{il filo} could be likened to a necklace of pearls, then Haydn’s sketches would resemble that necklace laid in a small jewel box. To better view the necklace one would first need to remove it from the box and stretch it out. That is what I have done with his sketches. I have taken Haydn’s four staves of fragmentary parts and aligned them, on a single staff where possible, in Haydn’s ordering. For much of the sketched movement Haydn notated only a single staff, and he did not bother to sketch fully some repetitions and returns of earlier material. For the opening measures he notated all four parts, for more complicated combinations of voices he notated two parts, and for the movement’s apex of complexity—a tour-de-force Monte in the minor mode—he again notated all four parts. The shifting of attention between the voices naturally involved changes in clefs, and so the end result of my adaptation looks very much like an advanced partimento. A young composer who had studied advanced partimenti would have learned all the essentials of how to create a continuity draft or sketch, and it is likely that these two domains of activity influenced each other. Someone taught to hear multiple voices from the cue of a single voice would only need to write a single voice as a cue for himself.

After adapting the notational form of the sketches, I adapted the notational form of the quartet. I reduced its four original staves to two. Not every note of every part could be preserved without creating a notational tangle, but I hope the loss of a few insignificant doublings and filler parts is compensated by the increased legibility of the result. I then placed the adapted sketches directly above each measure of the quartet. Blank measures in the sketches generally indicate repetitive material that Haydn did not deign to sketch,
and blank measures in the quartet indicate sketched material that he omitted from the final version.

The sketches, as shown in example 27.7, present almost all the material found in the finished movement. Only a few passages indicate major divergences from the movement’s final form. The first of these begins in measure 19, where Haydn had sketched a Monte (I have added in parentheses a minimal second voice to make the Monte Principale more audible). It was mentioned in earlier chapters that as the century progressed the Monte became less and less fashionable in the first half of a movement. For whatever reason, Haydn chose to leave this Monte out of the final version and drew a large X across it in the sketches. What seems significant for this chapter is the inference that Haydn’s compositional choice involved deciding whether to add the entire schema to il filo—in other words, whether to add a whole pearl to his musical necklace. These four measures (mm. 19–22) were clearly treated as a conceptual unit.

The second major divergence involves the four alternate paths sketched for the approach to the final cadence of each half of the movement. Because it was not possible to show all four sketched paths above the quartet score, and because an understanding of Haydn’s strategies will be facilitated by having just heard the final version of his movement, I defer presenting his network of alternate cadential paths until the end of this chapter.

A number of passages, here listed by beginning measure number, warrant special notice.21

m. 1 Haydn begins by sketching all four voices. There is considerable overlapping of schemata (a plain texture but complex relationships). All repeated material is sketched in only one voice.

m. 3 Leonard Meyer’s phrase “grammatical simplicity and relational richness” comes to mind in viewing Haydn’s Prinner riposte. For its later reappearances I mark it simply as “Prinner.” Yet his phrase is a nexus of references to other important schemata as well. The four notes of the bass, ④–③–⑦–①, match the reduced countermelody of a Fenaroli. The phrase’s first half, with its ④–③ bass and ④/2 sonority on beat 2 matches the Passo Indietro, and its second half (m. 4) matches the Comma.

m. 13 A modulating Prinner begins a broad, ornate section (a complex texture but simple relationships) sketched in two voices.

m. 19 As mentioned, this is a Monte Principale not used in the final version.

m. 27 Haydn writes divergent paths toward the cadence (see below).

m. 74 Great complexity required sketching all four voices.

m. 81 The sketched bass shows the Falling Thirds / Romanesca pattern more clearly than the final version.
m. 85 I have circled Haydn’s “et.” (= etc.), which referred to the self-evident but unsketched second half of the Fonte. It makes sense that a pattern so common as the Fonte would not need to be sketched in full. A curved line leads to a sketch for measure 88.

m. 88 Haydn sketches only the lower voice of a Fenaroli, and he gives only one statement of it. The normal pair of statements appears in the final version. As the graph showed (fig. 27.1), double presentation of the Fenaroli was the most probable sequence. For Haydn, it seems to have been a matter of course.

m. 89 This is the last measure notated on the second page of sketches. Everything else was deemed self-evident.

m. 97 This variant of a cadence appears on the first page of sketches (see p. 396).

The following pages present the condensed score (bottom two staves) and reformatted sketches (upper staff or staves) of the slow movement from Haydn’s string quartet, Opus 20, no. 3.
ex. 27.7  Haydn, Opus 20 (Hob. III/33), no. 3, mvt. 3, Poco adagio (1772)
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For Haydn, the alternate paths of *il filo* seem to have branched most luxuriantly in extended cadences. Example 27.8 shows Haydn’s sketches for the paths of four related cadences. The first path, which was the most straightforward in simply launching into the cadence, was rejected and crossed out. Immediately below it was sketched the second path, which first detours through a Passo Indietro and then veers away from complete closure with both deception and evasion. This was the path chosen to end the first half of the quartet movement. For his third path, destined for the second half of the movement, Haydn expands the design of the second path by doubling the length of the *fioritura* over ♭ in the bass. The fourth and final path, which was not incorporated into the finished quartet, adds the further detour of the Indugio. Note that in the second measure of this

**Ex. 27.8** Haydn, four sketches for a cadence; dotted lines highlight expansions

[Diagram of cadences and related passages]
fourth path, Haydn overshot his mark with the rising fioritura. He crossed out his mistake and then resumed his course. In rejecting this fourth path, with its chromatic and rather hectic Indugio, he may have felt that he had also overshot his mark in terms of the character of the whole movement.

It should not be surprising that Haydn, who studied with a famous Neapolitan maestro, would create a partimento-like sketch. Nor should it be surprising that having mastered the Italian galant style as a young man he would use almost the full set of schemata introduced in this volume. Yet I do find it surprising that across two centuries of time and cultural distance one can nevertheless find the preserved traces of a particular type of schematic music-compositional thought. It seems clear that Haydn had the equivalent of a mental jewel box filled with musical pearls, the galant schemata. He could choose to add a pearl to il filo, or he could change his mind and take one off. One can almost hear him thinking, “A Monte would work nicely here, but . . . I’ll just leave it out” or “The Fonte starts here” or “The Fenaroli works here. . . . I only need to notate the first one.” When he envisioned paths branching off in several directions, his sketch branched as well, as if he were evaluating each alternative: “Standard bass . . . too simple. Passo Indietro followed by standard bass . . . good before the double bar. Passo Indietro with a florid extension leading into a Cudworth . . . good toward the end. Passo Indietro, florid extension, Indugio, Converging Cadence . . . too much!” There is no evidence, of course, that Haydn used any particular labels, or thought musically in terms of words at all. But his behaviors would be difficult to explain had he not learned the equivalent galant concepts and categories. His compositional craft, of which he was justly proud and for which he gave credit to Porpora, seems clearly grounded in knowing the proper features of each galant schema, and it demonstrates what Leopold Mozart would have called der gute Satz (“good technical composition”). Knowing how to string the schemata together, and how to judge their effects, required a companion skill at die Ordnung, il filo (“the arrangement of material: the thread”), and that depended on Haydn’s highly developed musical taste.