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Francesco Galeazzi (1758–1819) was born in Turin. There the tradition of violin playing at the court of Savoy was perhaps the finest in Europe. Its great maestro G. B. Somis had studied with Corelli. Somis in turn trained first Leclair and later Pugnani, who in turn trained Viotti. Galeazzi grew up in that tradition, studying violin in the 1770s surrounded by many of these great musicians. He would, however, be almost completely unknown today had not Bathia Churgin, in an often-cited article from 1968,1 drawn attention to a small section of a large treatise that Galeazzi published in 1796.2

The section in question seems to discuss “sonata form,” though Galeazzi never actually uses the term. Someone unacquainted with the traditions of late nineteenth- and twentieth-century conservatories and collegiate music departments would likely be astonished at the way “form,” and “sonata form” in particular, developed into fetish objects. Parallels would be difficult to find. Collegiate students of literature appear to worry very little about identifying “novel form” in each novel that they read. Collegiate art majors seem unconcerned about the presence or absence of “still-life form” in every still life that they view. But collegiate music students seem to consider identifying the presence or absence of the delineaments of sonata form their first order of business when asked to “analyze” an instrumental work from the eighteenth century. Inasmuch as most such works are sonatas, with the exceptions openly announced on the printed score (“rondo,” “theme and variations,” “fantasia”), one might justly wonder what all the fuss is about.

As I suggested in the introduction, many inherited approaches to eighteenth-century music are perhaps best understood as descendants of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century attempts to reinterpret the galant tradition—a tradition that, although in many ways antithetical to the bourgeois art of Romanticism, was nevertheless claimed by the Romantics as a crucial part of their patrimony. Galant music became the childhood of
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Romantic music, meaning that the galant was thought to be both childlike and suitable for children. An adult galant musician like Clementi, capable of great range and profundity, became known almost exclusively for tiny pieces used to teach beginning piano students in Victorian middle-class households. Galant musicians, thus viewed as genial children, were judged to lack an understanding of “higher” form. At best, they seemed to stumble toward sonata form, with only Haydn and Mozart finally getting it right.

The French Revolution (1789) had begun a long series of dislocations and upheavals that weakened the galant social order. Napoleonic armies overturned, bankrupted, or threatened almost every court in Europe, including the Church. When nearly thirty years of instability ended with the Treaty of Vienna (1818), prerevolutionary life was but a distant memory. Perhaps the Romantic reinterpretation of galant music was thus unavoidable. 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.”

Other authors have attempted to narrate the complex history of “form” as a central preoccupation of early musicological discourse. Carl Dahlhaus, for instance, noted the homologies between the Romantic passion for taxonomies of flowers, butterflies, or birds, and their taxonomies of musical forms: “first rondo form,” “second rondo form,” and so forth. That history is largely a history of nineteenth-century authors, and much of the attention given to Galeazzi’s description of a double-reprise melodia has been due to its being one of the first accounts to conform with what became the paradigmatic Romantic prescription of a sonata’s “themes and keys.” Since many modern readers come to Galeazzi with that paradigm in mind, the fact that Galeazzi’s description resonates with the Romantic paradigm is often taken as a partial validation of the paradigm’s applicability to Classical music, as a confirmation of its cognitive force some thirty or forty years before the German and French treatises that finalized the nineteenth-century codification of sonata form. As the title of Churgin’s article proclaims, a reader inculcated in the Romantic paradigm will encounter “Francesco Galeazzi’s description of sonata form.”

By 1796, Galeazzi had long since left the Savoy court to seek his fortune in Rome, where the treatise was published. In April of that same year, Napoleon, seeking a fortune with which to pay his destitute legions, invaded Savoy to begin the conquest of the peninsula. His forces entered Rome less than two years later, deposed the pope, and sent some five hundred wagonloads of plundered art back to France. The publication of Galeazzi’s treatise thus coincided neatly with the end of one era of Italian history and the beginning of another. If Galeazzi could be seen as a transitional figure, as someone more Janus-faced and less merely a harbinger of the future, then his treatise should still resonate with galant traditions. The melodia with which he illustrated his ideas should, presumably, contain strong echoes of the phrase schemata that were so central to the tradition in which he was
nurtured at Turin. It might showcase a newer notion of form, to be sure, but perhaps not without honoring a remembered content as well.

The first two columns in the list below show the correspondences between Galeazzi’s melodia as parsed by him according to the terms used in his treatise (col. 1) and by this author according to the galant schemata discussed here in previous chapters (col. 2). Measure numbers refer to example 29.12, where the full melodia can be seen along with a bass that I have added to clarify the schemata.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Galeazzi’s Term</th>
<th>Schema</th>
<th>Key</th>
<th>Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Motive</td>
<td>Do-Mi-Sol . .</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Motive / Depart. from the Key</td>
<td>Prinner, modulating</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Characteristic Passage</td>
<td>Fenaroli, bis</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cadential Period</td>
<td>Falling Thirds</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coda</td>
<td>Quiescenza, bis</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leaving aside for a moment the opening gambit (“Do-Mi-Sol . . .”), Galeazzi’s series of schemata—Modulating Prinner, Fenaroli (repeated), Falling Thirds, Cudworth cadence, Quiescenza—hardly seems revolutionary. If anything it seems old-fashioned, more like movements from the 1760s or 1770s. The typical schemata of the galant style occur in the typical order. A Fonte following the double bar could hardly be more traditional. As the discussion in chapter 14 demonstrated, a Fonte in that position was the first choice for an earlier composer like Wodiczka and for a later one like Pugnani. The minuet
in chapter 5 by Pugnani’s teacher Somis, written in Turin sixty years before Galeazzi’s treatise, used the Fonte in exactly the same way.

Galeazzi would likely have approved of Leopold Mozart’s term *il filo*. According to Galeazzi, the best composers concerned themselves more with the flow and sequence of things than with the character of a single motive or phrase. As he put it, “The art, then, of the perfect composer does not consist in the invention (*trovare*) of galant motives (*galanti motivi*), [or] of agreeable passages, but consists in the precise behavior (*esatta condotta*) of an entire piece of music.”¹ The emphasis on the *esatta condotta*, which could also be translated as “exact conduct” or “correct behavior,” is not a reference to a reified global form or design. The perception of musical “behavior” is dynamic, and depends on moment-to-moment evaluations. Thus while being able to invent “galant motives” based on recognized schemata was a necessary prerequisite for composition, merely stringing them together without care was not sufficient for perfection in composition. Galeazzi’s subsequent focus on “laying out the melodies”⁵ highlights the same skills that, in Leopold’s words, distinguished “the master from the bungler.”⁶ A treatise nearly contemporaneous with Galeazzi’s, the third volume of *Versuch einer Anleitung zur Composition* [An Introductory Essay on Composition; 1793] by Heinrich Christoph Koch (1749–1816), shows this very same focus in its subtitle: “On the Connecting of Melodic Parts.”⁷ If many of the “parts” (*Theile*) in question are the “compulsory figures” of the galant style (with *galanti motivi*), then one should expect to find Koch’s descriptions of musical functions or manipulations likewise exemplified by well-known schemata.

In a discussion of musical “parenthesis,” he described how one could insert a “complete part” between repetitions of a passage. The passage in question was a four-bar, paired Sol-Fa-Mi with strong elements of the Do-Re-Mi as well. His first choice for a “complete part” to insert between the Sol-Fa-Mi and its repetition was the venerable Fonte (ex. 29.1):⁵

![Ex. 29.1](image)
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¹ Ex. 29.1 Koch, *Versuch*, “parenthesis,” vol. 3, p. 221 (1793)
A Fonte was almost always a good choice for a parenthetical insertion, since it can digress from, and then return to, the same key. But Koch's choice also exhibits a sensitivity to larger-scale melodic coherence. The ❶–❷ . . . ❸–❹ descent of the Sol-Fa-Mi's core melodic tones would, if projected forward, reach a ❸ in measure 6. That would be D₅, the ① of the minor half of the Fonte, which, continuing the progression, leads to a global ① “one step lower” in the major half (m. 8). So here “precise behavior” is a combination of a likely sequence of schemata with a sensitivity toward how emerging melodic implications might be smoothly realized.

Koch’s second choice, a further “expansion” of the previous parenthetical insertion, involved placing complete Fenarolisi within each half of the Fonte. This eight-measure “part” was then extended even further by a Converging cadence (ex. 29.2). Again the global ❶, D₅, is reached in measure 6. But since the Fenarolisi serve to double the length of each half of this Fonte, the global ①, C₅, is not reached until measure 10. Continuing this broader progression, a global ❶, B₄, is reached right on schedule in measure 14. As the leading tone, ❶ then makes a good connection back to the return of the Sol-Fa-Mi. Koch’s “thread,” while hardly the mythical Urlinie, completes a simple but satisfying course that still meets Galeazzi’s demand for “precise behavior.”

**Ex. 29.2** Koch, *Versuch,* “parenthesis,” vol. 3, p. 222 (1793)

Though Koch wrote obvious Fontes and acknowledged the influence of Riepel, he did not use the terms *fonte*, *monte*, or *ponte*. Curiously, aside from tempo indications, Koch used almost no Italian terms, avoiding even the solfège syllables. Perhaps as chapel master of the small Protestant court at Rudolstadt in Thuringia, he wanted to avoid the
impression of describing a Catholic practice. But Koch’s musical examples are nonetheless always in general accord with the Italian practices described by Riepel’s “three-fold example.”

Koch’s clear understanding of the normative details of the standard schemata can be observed in his discussion of “progressions.” He began by describing progressive repetitions of a small motive on successively descending scale degrees and gave the following phrase for illustration:

**Ex. 29.3** Koch, Versuch, a “progression,” vol. 2, p. 431 (1787)

In the key of G major, the tones that fall on the downbeats (E5, D5, C5, B4) sound out the Prinner melody. Koch seems to have made the same association. He remarked that because of the “underlying harmony,” it might be necessary to adjust some of the intervals. To illustrate his point he offered a more galant example, on which he marked two “modified” intervals with Maltese crosses. As shown below, the phrase that he provided, now in D major, presents a prototypical instance of the galant four-bar Prinner, complete with High Drop and a concluding half cadence:

**Ex. 29.4** Koch, Versuch, a modified “progression,” Allegretto, vol. 2, p. 432 (1787)

“Harmony” alone does not fully explain the choices of Koch’s modified tones, inasmuch as several alternatives were equally “harmonic.” Only the tones actually chosen were exact matches to the Prinner schema replicated countless times in the galant repertory. From the viewpoint of schema theory, it is revealing to witness Koch implicitly equating the older, “mechanical” pattern of the circle-of-fifths Prinner (ex. 29.3), which was Riepel’s “seventh-progression,” with the newer, galant type (ex. 29.4).
Koch’s sense for the proper concatenation of schemata—the “connecting of melodic parts”—is at times grounded on the stepwise progression of core tones, at times based on harmonic expectation, and at other times motivated by simple patterns of repetition. Example 29.5 shows his basic version of the modulating Prinner, introduced by the phrase “modulation through the transposition of a part to a new key.” The example begins with a Comma followed by a half cadence (both treble and bass are by Koch). The stepwise melodic descent links these two schemata, as does a traditional association based on older, more elaborate clausulae like the Cadenza Doppia. The appearance of the modulating Prinner begins a new descent in the new key, D major. The Prinner and ensuing Converging cadence lead the melody down through the complete D-hexachord, one step per measure—to close with an accelerated descent from to and beyond in measure 8.

Ex. 29.5 Koch, Versuch, “modulation through the transposition of a part to a new key,” vol. 3, p. 209 (1793)

The location at the beginning of measure 7 (ex. 29.5), where the melody reaches and the bass sounds , is one shared by a number of schemata. It is a place where a galant musician would recognize il filo as potentially leading off in a number of different directions. One could choose to take one of those divergent paths, or just allude to one with a characteristic figuration. In example 29.5, for instance, Koch already hinted at the Indugio. In example 29.6, he went further in that direction by allotting to his Converging cadence the sixteenth-note figurations strongly associated with the Indugio.
In example 29.7, he stepped fully onto the path of the Indugio, inserting a complete two-measure extension of the basic Converging cadence.\(^{13}\)

His two versions of characteristic Indugio figurations (exx. 29.6–7) are very similar to those that Mozart employed for the first movement of his C-major keyboard sonata of 1788 (see ex. 26.6, mm. 9–10, 22–23).

As Koch discusses various musical genres, it becomes clear that each involves different selections and arrangements of the same set of “parts” and procedures—an *ars combinatoria*. The difference between the first and second ritornellos of a concerto or aria, for instance, rests on the need to modulate to the key of the dominant in the second rito-
In his example of a second ritornello (ex. 29.8), he matches the requirement (a modulation to the dominant) with the generic, formulaic “part” of the modulating Prinner, indeed one almost identical to those shown in examples 29.5–7. In all these cases he respects the old precedent of ending the preceding part in a low register before leaping up an octave to begin the modulating Prinner (cf. ex. 22.1, m. 23, by Leo; ex. 25.19, m. 4, by Eckard; or ex. 25.21, m. 7, by Mozart). His modulating Prinner, unimpeded by an Indugio (the path not taken), moves directly to the Converging cadence, which then leads into two statements of a busy Fenaroli, complete with a rapidly repeating pedal-point ⑤, in the new key of D major:14

**EX. 29.8** Koch, *Versuch*, the modulation in a second ritornello, vol. 3, p. 426 (1793)

Galeazzi faced a similar situation after the close of the first “period” of his *melodia*, and he responded by choosing the same basic parts with nearly the same procedures (see ex. 29.9).15 After a complete cadence in the tonic key of C major, a modulating Prinner extends to a complete cadence on the dominant of the new key of G major (“V of V”), to be followed by two statements of a Fenaroli (the normal ⑦–①–②–③ voice would be in the bass).

While Koch’s choices were made in “concerto form” or “aria form,” Galeazzi’s were made in “sonata form.” Since the same general choices were made in both instances, the reasonable inference arises that “form” had relatively little influence on the “connecting
Rather than failing to understand form, and being unable to articulate its “deeper” secrets, galant composers and writers about music understood it very well. They understood the practical abilities of listeners to follow schemes of repetition, digression, or return, to attend to the rise or fall of melodic or bass progressions, and they understood that the real art of composition lay in guiding their patron’s and audience’s moment-to-moment experiences. Galant composers could succintly describe the overall form of movements in different genres because the craft of managing *il filo* depended very little on the different formal schemes. One only needed to be aware of a few important forks in the road. To be sure, Galeazzi transforms the *character* of the Fenaroli, and his treatise describes this “characteristic passage” as “dolce, espressivo, e tenero” (“sweet, expressive, and tender”) in a way that strongly resonates with Romantic definitions of a lyrical second theme. But navigation by the perceived contrast of character, which became an important listener strategy as nineteenth-century compositions grew in both length and complexity, would lie outside a galant concept of “form.”

As mentioned, for many students the formal analysis of an eighteenth-century movement still involves finding the development, the second theme, and other nineteenth-century markers of sonata form. The twentieth century has added a professional level of analysis in which the goal is to assign every tone to its place in a vast “tonal hierarchy.”
One might ask “Why?” The typical answer is that the tonal hierarchy demonstrates the organic unity of the musical artworks produced by a small set of master musicians. Surely this is a metaphysical solution to a self-inflicted problem. Since music, in the full sense of the word, takes place in the human brain rather than in a metaphysical world of tonal “spirits” and “wills,” we should be interested in a cognitive hierarchy, which is typically a mental structure that outlines levels of abstraction or “chunking.” Take, for example, Jane Austen’s novel *Pride and Prejudice*. A reader or listener (early novels were often read aloud) hears sounds (phonemes) that make up parts of words; the words make up clauses, which make up sentences, which in written texts make up paragraphs, then chapters, and finally the book as a whole. At each level of this cognitive hierarchy the elements are somewhat different in kind. The gist of a chapter, for instance, is not the text of any individual paragraph, nor is the gist of the novel as a whole the text of any one of its chapters. In a tonal hierarchy, by contrast, it would seem that the elements of each level are exactly the same as the elements above or below. To take an absurd but actual example, the claim would be that the gist of the finale of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony would be the tone D that sounds at its conclusion. The analogous claim might hold the gist of *Pride and Prejudice* to be its final word: “them.”

The more closely one studies the craft of eighteenth-century court music, the less the “organic unity” of the musical artwork seems “a truth universally acknowledged,” to echo the opening line of Austen’s novel. There was a galant musical hierarchy, to be sure. Tones made up parts of figures, which made up parts of phrases, which in instrumental music combined into sections, movements, works, and finally a published opus. But within each quite distinct level of the hierarchy there was considerable freedom and latitude. Replacing a D with a C♯ in a small melodic figure would not cause the whole musical house to collapse, nor would replacing a Sol-Fa-Mi with a Romanesca. As the cognitive scientist Herbert Simon pointed out more than thirty years ago, the hierarchies of complex systems are usually “partially decomposable,” meaning that each level in the hierarchy has a measure of independence. What he labeled “loose coupling” refers to the relative weakness of interactions between levels and the relative strength of interactions within a given level. The “precise behavior” of *il filo* was crucial at the level of phrases and cadences, but of minor significance at the level of overall form.

The master musicians were the ones most able to recognize the contingent nature of any particular musical thread. They were the ones who chose to follow a particular path in the schematic road, and in doing so had to forgo the alternate paths. Jane Austen, it appears, looked at *Pride and Prejudice* in much the same way. Upon its publication she wrote teasingly to her sister:

> Upon the whole . . . I am well satisfied enough. The work is rather too light, and bright, and sparkling; it wants shade; it wants to be stretched out here and there with a long chapter of sense, if it could be had; if not, of solemn specious nonsense, about something unconnected with the story: an essay on writing, a critique on Walter Scott, or the history
Austen, a master writer if ever there was one, described a need for “stretching out” the work “here and there,” and focused on the need for “anything that would form a contrast.” She may have exemplified her points facetiously, but it was a writer’s discourse on writing. Galeazzi’s concerns were similar. He described “the most interesting part of modern music” as involving “drawing out the melodies” (“tirare le Melodie”). And he advocated beginning the second half of a double reprise with the contrast of “an idea that is quite new and foreign,” preferably in a different key to achieve a “greater surprise.”

Austen’s and Galeazzi’s discourse reflects artists’ careful evaluations of the effects that various compositional options may have on a listener or reader. In 1845, A. B. Marx (1795–1866) described Mozart’s style as a succession of many “small structures that lack any stonger connection than that derived from the general mood. This gives his compositions the charm of the ever changing, the ever new, nimbly seeking further.” Marx, from the generation of Franz Schubert, had sought to contrast Mozart’s style, somewhat negatively, with the dynamism and “inner necessity” of Beethoven’s. Marx did not advocate a Mozartean style for his contemporaries, and in the 1920s Heinrich Schenker excoriated Marx (“mistakes thrive like rats in the canals of ignorance”) for failing to understand Mozart’s organic “sonata-synthesis.” Thus, concerning the galant sprezzatura (nonchalance) in the linking of “small structures,” one can mark a gradual progression from approving description (Koch, Galeazzi, Austen) to accepting remembrance (Marx) to disbelief and condemnation (Schenker).

In the list shown earlier, in which Galeazzi’s melodia is parsed by different taxonomies, an obvious difference between the first two columns is the greater detail in the “schema” column. Galeazzi was aware of omissions and mentioned that his “small, extremely simple” example did not contain every possible detail. But there is another reason for the difference: his intended readership. His title page makes explicit the orientation toward “beginners, dilettantes, and violin teachers.” In other words, rather than being a technical specification of melodia for the training of aspiring composers, Galeazzi’s terms are more a list of impressions or characteristics that might be recognizable to someone without professional training (I believe he intended “violin teachers” to serve as proxies for their untrained students). Like Riepel and Koch, he used mostly melodic examples described in generic, functional terms. As mentioned earlier, the vast nonverbal knowledge that professional musicians gained through years of studying partimenti, solfeggi, and famous scores under the guidance of a maestro contrasts markedly with what could be imparted through words to amateur musicians. It might not be too strong an interpretation to describe these widely read eighteenth-century music treatises as “translations” from a ritualized, preindustrial, nonverbal culture to a commercial, modern, verbal one.

Perhaps the most modern aspect of Galeazzi’s melodia was, as mentioned, his treatment of the opening theme:
This opening section is discursive in the way it “draws out” the melody, eschewing any single organizing schema. Galeazzi begins with a small Do-Mi-Sol melodic triad. His “thread” wanders through an evaded cadence (cf. the Passo Indietro), a Long Comma, and a Falling Thirds sequence before reaching the complete cadence of measures 7–9. This was never a common succession of schemata, and one senses a lack of direction in what he termed his “principal motive” (mm. 1–9). Inasmuch as he admired Haydn, Boccherini, Wanhal, and other major composers active in the 1790s, he may have been trying to emulate the ways in which they created large opening “periods,” to use his term. Perhaps Galeazzi meant the second system of this example to present a large form of Sala’s Long cadence. In my added bass, the downbeats of measures 5–9 do present the ①–⑤–④–⑤–① pattern characteristic of the Long cadence. But somehow the upper voices do not assist the effort. Galeazzi does not seem quite up to the task of creating the broad slancio (“dash” or “swoop”) of his famous contemporaries. Only when, following his principal motive, he reverts to the schemata of his galant training does il filo seem to have been spun out with real fluency.

In the 1790s, Italian maestros from the “old school” still had considerable prestige. As late as 1806, Haydn wrote a letter of recommendation for Mozart’s son Karl to study with Bonifazio Asioli (1769–1832), a maestro in Milan who, like Galeazzi, would eventually commit his copious musical knowledge to print in a comprehensive textbook. The movement of Italian maestros to Paris, and their prominence in the teaching of music, extended...
the influence of the galant style for several more generations, though in a propaedeutic role. The full story of that particular nineteenth-century reverberation of galant practice would warrant a separate study. But perhaps one example will suffice. Gustavo Carulli (1801–1876), son of an Italian musician, was born in Paris and there became a well-known teacher of singing. Teaching pieces from his 1838 *Méthode de chant* figured prominently in the famous compendium *Solfège des Solfèges*, a nineteenth-century series of graded studies still in print today.\(^{25}\) As shown in example 29.11, Carulli, though living in the Paris of Berlioz, Liszt, and Chopin, was fluent in the galant phraseology of the 1780s. Even without their implied basses, the galant schemata should be clearly evident in what Galeazzi would call Carulli’s “principal motive” (mm. 1–19) and the start of his “second motive” (mm. 21–24). This “second motive” uses the same choice of modulating Prinner that Galeazzi made for the analogous moment in his *melodia* and that Koch made for his second ritornello. Though relegated to the practice room, galant syntax thus continued to be inculcated in conservatories and private studios.

**Ex. 29.11** Carulli, *solfège* (1838), reprinted in Dannhauser, vol. 3, no. 1, Andantino
In example 29.12 I have reproduced Galeazzi’s entire *melodia* and added a bass to help clarify the various schemata. As mentioned, Galeazzi was, in the 1790s, a conservative composer. The scope of the movement, his “laying out” of schemata, and his melodic style are all more reminiscent of Leduc in the early 1770s than, say, Viotti in the 1790s. Yet I do not mean to diminish the importance of his treatise. Churgin’s insightful remarks of 1968 still accurately describe a treatise of great historical significance. By viewing Galeazzi’s musical examples in a more detailed, historicized light, I find his treatise more, not less, interesting.
Galeazzi’s model sonata with a bass added to clarify the schemata
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PASSO INDIETRO
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