A European expert on the music of the Beatles, Tuomas Eerola, made a careful study of their experimental style. He compared the distribution over time of Beatles recordings that feature Indian instruments, tape manipulations, psychedelic or nostalgic lyrics, modal scales, changing meters, and so forth with the distribution over time of the Meyer, as reported in my A Classic Turn ofPhrase.¹ A graph of his comparison is shown below, with the much longer time scale of the Meyer contracted to match the relatively short period of Beatles recordings:
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**Figure 30.1** Eerola, the Beatles' experimental style and the Meyer (1997)
There is little direct connection between the Beatles and galant music. But the very high
correlation of these graphs suggests that the hypotheses put forth in A Classic Turn of
Phrase about the nature of theoretical categories in a music history may have broad appli-
cability, which was the point of Eerola’s comparison.

This graph allows a number of inferences to be made about the nature of stylistic
categories or schemata. First and foremost, typicality is tied to prevalence. That is, we tend
to recognize the most typical exemplars as stemming from the period of a schema’s great-
est use. Usage of the Meyer peaked in the early 1770s, at the same time that we find espe-
cially numerous clear and direct examples of it. Likewise, the Beatles’ experimental style
peaked in early 1967 at the time of the Sgt. Pepper album, which in turn is widely consid-
ered the prototype of that style. Second, as a corollary of the first point, there is a marked
decline in typicality at the margins of a schema’s history. A concept like “the world’s first
Prinner” would be just as questionable as “the world’s last Prinner,” because at the margins
there may be only a tenuous connection to the schema. Prior knowledge of the schema
can make the marginal exemplars subjectively seem to belong, but a different schema
might objectively be more appropriate. Third, the resemblance of the graphs to bell-
curve–like charts of probabilities is more than accidental. The graph does in fact represent
rough probabilistic estimates of the chance of encountering a particular schema in a par-
ticular repertory at a particular time in history. A graph of the Monte would peak some-
what earlier than the graph of the Meyer. A graph of the Quiescenza would peak some-
what later. A graph of the Do-Re-Mi or Fonte would stretch across a broader time period.
A graph of the Indugio would be focused more tightly on the 1770s and 1780s. All these
microhistories, when combined, would form a composite graph of the galant style. Isolated
aspects of galant practice appear already in the late seventeenth century, and remnants of
it persist well into the nineteenth century, especially where aristocratic society and patron-
age is involved (Chopin and Tchaikovsky come to mind). Yet this imagined graph of the
galan style would show a high probability of the style only within the period of perhaps
1725 to 1785, peaking in the vicinity of 1765.

The central thesis of A Classic Turn of Phrase—that one’s theory of a musical style or
pattern defines or delimits how one views its history, and vice versa—seems to have been
borne out in a long history of various misreadings of the galant style. Overly strong music
histories, constructed more by analogy with German art-historical fashions than by intrin-
sically musical resemblances, created an imaginary eighteenth-century moiety in which
each composer had to belong to either the Baroque or the Classical clan. The galant world
hardly fits into that stark dichotomy, and one sees the resulting discomfort in the endless
remarks in surveys and encyclopedias about musicians whose compositions “show charac-
teristics of both Baroque and Classical styles.” One might conclude that all but the most
one-dimensional eighteenth-century composers were stylistically uncertain of their true
identities. These dichotomous histories went hand in hand with overly strong, dichoto-
mous music theories. An early manifestation was the “second theme” and “second key
area” becoming the fetish markers of the Classical sonata form as opposed to the reified
Baroque practice of “spinning out” works without form. The later American embrace of the chauvinistically German doctrines of Arnold Schoenberg and Heinrich Schenker resulted in what can be described as theory-driven historiography. That is, some of the publications from professional music theorists seem to reinforce the curious notions (1) that all music before 1750 is not quite “tonal” and thus the sole property of music antiquarians, (2) that all music from Corelli to Mahler should be understood through Schenker’s totalizing ideology of a transcendent tonality, and (3) that music after Mahler is the province of set-theory as the patrimony of Schoenberg. Again, the galant style can find no place in this essentialist fantasy of “pretonal, tonal, and post-tonal” music.

What I would like to suggest further is that the galant style is not alone in its discomfort. The grand dichotomies of histories past and the totalizing theoretical ideologies of the early twentieth century have been revelatory for no style at all. The appeal of a Manfred Bukofzer or a Heinrich Schenker can, of course, be quite strong. In a discussion of the generation of architects who followed early twentieth-century giants like Frank Lloyd Wright or Le Corbusier, Rupert Spade wrote in 1971 about the American architect Paul Rudolf, who had been stung by one of Wright’s pointed remarks.

To such a denunciation, uttered as it were over the space of half a century, a man in Rudolph’s position could make no adequate riposte. The rigid utterances of the nineteenth-century men—“Form follows Function,” “Less is more,” “Ornament is crime,” “A house is a machine to live in”—cannot be refuted, any more than are the remnants of the giant statue of Ozymandias ridiculed by Shelley’s famous poem. The writings and works of the great pioneers do stand like “vast and trunkless legs of stone”; but to their bombastic utterances men of Rudolph’s generation can only reply with complexities, qualifications, amendments, explanations.

In proposing a focus on schemata—microhistories with corresponding microtheories—I hope to make a detour around those “great pioneers,” to engage galant music more through its own concepts and less through the discourse of “nineteenth-century men” who were often hostile not only to its artistic premises but also, certainly in Schenker’s case, to the ethnicity of the artists who developed it. Had those nineteenth-century men known more about galant music, I suspect that their substantial musical understanding coupled with their aptitude for the craft of composition would eventually have disabused them of some of their more farfetched claims. As Spade might put it, when a Schenker says “Origin is destiny,” I can make no adequate riposte.

The world of galant courts was not a realization of some trenchant aphorism or the unfolding of some overarching principle. And the music that both supported and was supported by those courts is similarly not the result of the spirits of tonality or the sonata. The deep roots of the styles of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries were plainly in view in the eighteenth century. The Romanesca, for example, spanned this whole period. The Clausula Vera had been a meaningful cadence when the Renaissance was still young. Various past traditions were thus part of the galant present. Balancing the force of the past
was the strong desire for fashionable novelty. In the course of this book we have seen a full range of works extending from the simplicity of a Somis minuet to the enormous intricacy of a Jommelli duet or a Haydn quartet movement. Schemata like the Indugio or the Quiescenza seem to have risen in tandem with those larger works. The Indugio, for instance, served to hold back an expected big cadence, thereby heightening anticipation. The Quiescenza, by contrast, served to quiet things down after a big cadence. Neither function was needed in a small minuet. So in considering the world of those musical courtiers, we should bear in mind that genre mattered, tradition mattered, fashion mattered, their training mattered, and all the elements that Pierre Bourdieu might have described as their musical habitus mattered in how they constituted their musical world.

The habitus, a product of history, produces individual and collective practices—more history—in accordance with the schemes generated by history. It ensures the active presence of past experiences, which, deposited in each organism in the form of schemes of perception, thought and action, tend to guarantee the “correctness” of practices and their constancy over time, more reliably than all formal rules and explicit norms. This system of dispositions . . . [is] a present past that tends to perpetuate itself into the future by reactivation in similarly structured practices.3

Like each of the galant schemata, the Prinner was saturated in the associations and practices of a living tradition. It was neither essentially a chord progression nor fundamentally a parallel descent of outer voices, though it was correlated with such patterns. As Romantic music theory moved to make harmony the essential element of music, the Prinner, in its two harmonically incompatible forms (the modulating and nonmodulating variants), became more and more invisible, more and more unhearable. This potsherd has lain in the musical rubble of the ancien régime for almost two centuries. Yet any assiduous reader of this book will now begin to recognize Prinners when listening to eighteenth-century music. Prinners were ubiquitous in the galant style because they formed useful ripostes, and the details of their construction operated within modes of harmonic-contrapuntal thought that had been conditioned by ritualized training in figured bass, partimenti, and solfeggi. For someone within this courtly music culture, the Prinner required presentation, not explanation. The child Mozart, for example, learned to present the basic Prinner when he was only five years old (KV1c; see ex. 25.3), and he no doubt wrote hundreds of versions of it over the next thirty years. Each of them was localized in a web of styles, references, compositional techniques, and rhetorical practices.

Mozart is a special case because he often located his utterances at the margins of what was acceptable musical behavior. Thus his work could delight or repel depending on the listener or performer. Dittersdorf, a reliable, centrist composer with great success at court, recalled an imperial minister likening Dittersdorf’s music to “a well-furnished, daintily arranged table. The dishes are well served up. One can take a good helping from each, without risk to the digestion.”4 Mozart’s late style, by contrast, seems to have been an
acquired taste. Dittersdorf and Mozart knew each other well. They even played together, along with Haydn and Wanhal, in a friendly string quartet. By the later 1780s, however, Dittersdorf had begun voicing reservations about Mozart’s esoteric, mannered style. In a letter to the publisher Artaria from August of 1788, he offered his recent string quartets for sale and claimed, “I am sure that you will do better with mine than Mozart’s (which according to my, as well as the great theorists’, judgment are worthy of the highest praise, but which, however, because of their unrelenting extreme artfulness are not everyone’s purchase).” Dittersdorf returned to this complaint when, in his autobiography, he recounts a conversation with the Austrian emperor. The emperor had asked him what he thought about Mozart’s music, and Dittersdorf replied:

He is unquestionably one of the greatest original geniuses, and I have never yet met with any composer who had such an amazing wealth of ideas; I could almost wish he were not so lavish in using them. He leaves his hearer out of breath; for hardly has he grasped one beautiful thought, when another of greater fascination dispels the first, and this goes on throughout, so that in the end it is impossible to retain any one of these beautiful melodies.5

What Baron von Grimm praised in the seven-year-old Mozart as a “wealth of ravishing ideas, ideas which he nevertheless knows how to place one after the other with taste and without confusion” became, for Dittersdorf, the “amazing wealth of ideas” that the adult Mozart seems to place one on top of the other with resulting confusion and frustration for the listener.

In the summer of 1788, shortly before Dittersdorf wrote to Artaria about the relative merits of his and Mozart’s quartets, Mozart was hard at work finishing his famous G-minor symphony. In the Trio of its third movement, he set what could have been a very simple sequence of schemata: (1) Do-Re-Mi, (2) cadence, (3) Prinner, and (4) cadence. The actual movement, though lovely, is anything but simple. Indeed, Leonard Meyer devoted sixty-nine pages of closely argued, heavily footnoted text to the discussion of Mozart’s mere forty-two measures of Trio.8 As shown in example 30.1, its opening gambit (mm. 1–4) is a blend of Do-Re-Mi and Pastorella (note the parallel thirds), which seems appropriate to the movement’s general character. A small cadence (mm. 4–6) closes off the first section. Then the oboes begin a modulating Prinner (mm. 7–12). Before they have completed even two measures, a flute begins to play their motive and quickly rises above them. A bassoon then enters below the oboes with the same motive and helps lead the passage to a deceptive cadence (m. 12), followed immediately by the requisite complete cadence (mm. 13–14) and coda-like echoes of that cadence (mm. 14–18). Were we, as listeners, focused intently on hearing the oboes complete their Prinner, we might concur with Dittersdorf that “hardly [have we] grasped one beautiful thought, when another of greater fascination dispels the first.”
But would we go as far as Dittersdorf and conclude that “in the end it [was] impossible to retain any one of these beautiful melodies”? Some might object that Dittersdorf’s comments were small-minded sneers motivated by professional jealousy. Yet two years earlier (1786), when Mozart’s Don Giovanni vied with Dittersdorf’s The Doctor and the Apothecary for the public’s attention, Dittersdorf’s work was easily the more popular, even if aimed somewhat below a courtly audience. If we do accept Dittersdorf’s reactions, and accept them as characteristic of courtly society, then we should conclude that modes of listening have since changed. If the courtiers were listening for the details of familiar schemata, then Mozart’s complications could indeed cause confusion. As a patron, the emperor would have been prudent to inquire about Mozart. Being confused by a musical servant could put at risk one of the central functions of galant art—the public display of discernment and good taste. When we hear a reviewer of Beethoven’s Opus 10 piano sonatas complain in 1799 that “his abundance of ideas . . . leads Beethoven too often to pile one
thought wildly upon another,” it may be further evidence of the increasing failure of traditional galant strategies of listening.

Almost any eighteenth-century source that discusses the genres of music will note the three main divisions of church, chamber, and theater. Courts categorized their music by venue because each required different musical forces with different talents. Older and pensioned musicians could play in the very large ensembles used for religious festivals and feasts. Elite instrumentalists in their prime vied for favor in aristocratic chambers. Famous singers commanded huge sums to grace the court theater and sing the allegorical praise of its patrons. All three sides of this musical triangle were part of musical life at a wealthy court, and almost every composer was well versed in the requirements of each. Today we may find it difficult to place these parts into a coherent whole. Pianists learn the sonatas of Mozart and Haydn but usually not their masses. Singers learn Mozart operas but often not Haydn quartets and certainly not the quartets of Galuppi. Violinists learn Bach solo sonatas, but not Jommelli arias and never the sacred motets of Durante. When the practices of the one sphere spill over into another, we may interpret the effect not as a reference to the other sphere but as some special artistic initiative. Frequently invoked terms like Sturm und Drang (“storm and stress”) or “the learned style,” for instance, may partly reflect the modern tendency to attribute acts of personal artistic expression to what in many cases were merely musical behaviors typical of the church or theater making an appearance in music for the chamber.

Mozart was especially prone to mix styles. In March of 1784 he wrote a masterful quintet for keyboard, oboe, clarinet, horn, and bassoon (KV452) — a mixture of wind instruments usually associated with outdoor entertainment or other light fare. For its slow movement he crafted an intricate Prinner more commonly found in high church music (see ex. 30.2). The Prinner plays out over a dominant pedal point (③). While the upper two voices descend in a chain of 2–3 suspensions, the keyboard player performs arpeggios and repeated notes. The bassoon, in the tenor range, provides the normal bass tones first of a Fonte and then of a Long Comma.

That particular combination of 2–3 suspensions, Prinner melody, the equivalent of the bassoon part, and alternating 6/5 and 5/3 sonorities was previously introduced in chapter 17. An example from the solfeggio of Porpora (ex. 17.1) was suggested as a prototype. Giuseppe Bonno, the imperial chapel master in Vienna, had been sent to Naples for study when Porpora still taught there. Because Bonno was a teacher of Dittersdorf, a possible connection was suggested between Porpora’s Neapolitan type of contrapuntal Prinner and a very similar phrase from one of Dittersdorf’s string quintets (ex. 17.2). While both these examples share much with the elaborate Prinner in Mozart’s quintet (ex. 30.2), Porpora’s was completely diatonic, and Dittersdorf’s was similarly diatonic save for some fleeting chromatic appoggiaturas in the tracery of the first violin. Neither had the Fonte-like chromatic inflection of Mozart’s example. More importantly, neither played out over a dominant pedal point. It is that ③ held by the French horn and reinforced each measure by the keyboard player that helps to give Mozart’s example its harmonic pungency.
In an earlier keyboard work (KV205b, 1775) Mozart had already equated this type of contrapuntal Prinner with a normal if nonetheless ornate version featuring the *la-to-sol* flourish. The contrapuntal version, with all four voices compressed into little more than an octave, comes first. The more florid version, with the double use of the *la-to-sol* flourish in the style of Aprile (ex. 9.15) or Eckard (ex. 26.1), comes second:
Haydn likewise paired a standard Prinner in A major with a contrapuntal, minor-mode version. Here is just the contrapuntal version from his keyboard concerto in D major, written near the time of Mozart’s quintet:

**Ex. 30.4** Haydn, Concerto in D (Hob. XVIII/11), mvt. 2, Larghetto, m. 53 (ca. 1784)
While any number of explanations can be imagined for the similarity of Haydn’s and Mozart’s contrapuntal Prinners, one of the most probable is that these phrases reflect a tradition within the sphere of church music, a subtype of Prinner made deeply memorable by the closing Amen from the *Stabat Mater* of Giovanni Battista Pergolesi (1710–1736):

ex. 30.5  Pergolesi, *Stabat Mater*, Presto assai, m. 45 (ca. 1736)

This work, of which the passage shown here is only a small fragment, was enormously popular and influential. Isabelle de Charrière was so fond of it that she had the dying heroine of her novel *Caliste* request it during her last moments. The musicians finished the *Stabat Mater* as Caliste drew her final breath.  

“Cadenza Doppia” (It., “double cadence”) of course refers to the Neapolitan term for the sacred-style cadence that graced the final measures of a huge number of partimenti (see chap. 11). Pergolesi was a product of the Neapolitan conservatories, and in turn later Neapolitan partimenti replicated patterns found in his *Stabat Mater*. Here is the final passage from a partimento by Paisiello showing a major-mode version of the “Stabat Mater” Prinner (bass and figures, Paisiello; upper voices, mine):

ex. 30.6  Paisiello, *Regole*, p. 34, m. 58 (1782)
Note that Paisiello’s thoroughbass figures do not specify a tenor voice (the bassoon part in Mozart’s quintet). Alfred Einstein, in his Urtext edition of the Pergolesi Stabat Mater, also failed to provide a tenor part for Pergolesi’s Prinner because one was not explicit in an early manuscript. Many modern recordings thus have no tenor part. But that tenor part was explicit in Neapolitan performance traditions and in eighteenth-century traditions generally. The tenor part shown in the Pergolesi excerpt above is taken from a Schirmer publication, circa 1900. Though not intended as a scholarly edition, it does convey an authentic nineteenth-century performance tradition based on real galant norms.

The fame of the Stabat Mater extended even into Lutheran domains. Late in his life J. S. Bach made an arrangement of it for use in Leipzig:

ex. 30.7  J. S. Bach, arrangement of the Stabat Mater, m. 45 (Leipzig, 1745–47)

The surviving copy, in the hand of Bach’s student and copyist Johann Christoph Altnickel, includes a tenor part played by the viola. For the above Prinner, its core tones fall on the first and third quarter-notes of each bar.

Even Mozart’s idol J. C. Bach knew this specialized schema. In an otherwise cheerful Allegro movement in B♭ major, the London Bach inserted a doleful passage in D minor:

ex. 30.8  J. C. Bach, Opus 12, no. 6, mvt. 1, Allegro, m. 71 (Paris, 1773–74)
It is the Stabat Mater Prinner shorn of its pedal point, thus making the passage more like the Bonno-Dittersdorf type. Yet, alternatively, one might think of it as having a pedal in the style *brisé*, the manner in which lute players and harpsichordists often gave the illusion of more voices than were actually concurrent. The low A₂ in measure 71 could form a memory that only connects to another low tone in that register (D₂) at the conclusion of the passage.

As the examples by Mozart, Haydn, and J. S. Bach show, an overt tenor part was clearly incorporated in the received Stabat Mater Prinner, and it was absolutely required in the Bonno-Dittersdorf type. Even Italian models likely predating Pergolesi’s work confirm the presence of a separate tenor part, as in an elegant passage from a flute concerto by Leo (note how the deceptive cadence and augmented sixth delay by one measure the Prinner’s expected ⁶–⁵ ending):

**Ex. 30.9** Leo, Concerto in G Major, mvt. 2, Adagio, m. 58 (ca. 1730s)

The deeply sedimented tradition of courtly schemata was too complex and multifaceted to be taught directly. Young composers absorbed it indirectly through the rituals of copying scores, imitating famous works or passages, singing and accompanying solfaggi, and realizing partimenti. As one might imagine, important schemata like the Stabat Mater Prinner were included in advanced partimenti. The *lezione* (It., “lesson”) by Tritto in example 30.10 is such a work. The realization presented here (bass by Tritto, figures [not shown] probably by a Neapolitan student or copyist, and upper voices by this author) demonstrates how a student would learn to place a Stabat Mater Prinner in both major- and minor-mode contexts (mm. 24–27, 69–72). Saturated in the schemata of the galant style, didactic works by maestros like Tritto faithfully replicated the formulas found in the
earlier partimenti by Durante, Leo, and Tritto’s own maestro Cafaro. Students could not just read this music—they had to rediscover it in the act of performance:

EX. 30.10 Tritto, *Partimenti regole generali* (Naples, ca. 1816)
ex. 30.10 (continued)
At eighty-four measures long, Tritto’s lezione is of a moderate size for an advanced partimento. Some extend to over two hundred measures. They constitute the clearest examples of eighteenth-century instruction in large musical forms. Any student who studied and internalized a hundred or more partimenti of this scope would have little difficulty in fashioning an original work of similar size.\textsuperscript{15}

Whether one looks at the influence of important exemplars like the Stabat Mater, the training of future chapel masters through the realization of partimenti, the practicing of solfeggi, the memorization of ornamental figures according to intervallic patterns as outlined by Quantz, or the guarding of correct behaviors by maintaining the traditions of individual schemata like those detailed in the preceding chapters, one sees converging evidence that the schematization of courtly musical utterances was so pervasive as to constitute a dominant mode of thought. If musicians learned, wrote, and taught this way, did they not listen this way as well? I believe the answer is a qualified “Yes.” Moreover, I believe that in listening this way many of them actually heard more. This music was a richer experience for them because the music and its mode of listening had co-evolved and co-adapted during the long reign of the ancien régime.

Were this book a concerto, we would now be ready for the cadenza. In the Bolognese tradition of partimenti, which reflected the teaching of Padre Martini through his disciple
Padre Stanislaw Mattei, who in turn taught Rossini and Donizetti, partimenti were often called *cadenze*. Like cadenzas, partimenti were loose frameworks made of schemata suitable for improvisation and musical fantasy. When, as Quantz describes, more than one soloist participated in a cadenza, it needed to be more firmly formulaic, with each new formula introduced by a reliable cue. In the aforementioned quintet for winds and keyboard, Mozart gives the final movement a *cadenza in tempo* for all five performers. That is, the cadenza maintains a beat and meter throughout, and everyone participates. This tour de force (ex. 30.11) begins with one of Quantz’s recommended interval progressions, but continues to rise with more voices and more complexity (mm. 109–14) until one can imagine Dittersdorf thinking “hardly [have we] grasped one beautiful thought, when another of greater fascination dispels the first, and this goes on throughout.” The peak of complexity (mm. 114–15) is followed by a series of completely regular schemata—two Stabat Mater Prinners with J. S. Bach’s active tenor voice in the bassoon part, a large Monte with chromatic bass, and a glorious leaping version of the Romanesca with brilliant figuration in the keyboard part. A circle-of-fifths harmonic progression then connects three bravura statements of the High Drop and Comma led by oboe, clarinet, and then oboe again. The third such statement is followed by a huge passing-6/4 Indugio, which initiates several delays of the final cadence. That cadence is an elongated, decorated form of the Cadenza Doppia.

Mozart’s players would have found all these schemata immediately recognizable. Had more than one of them intended to further ornament their parts, the strongly schematized plan of the *cadenza in tempo* would have allowed them to do so without creating inadvertent clashes with the other players. There was freedom to improvise, but it was constrained by the mutually recognized strictures of these galant schemata.

*Ex. 30.11*  Mozart, Quintet (KV452), mvt. 5, Andante, m. 108 (1784)
EX. 30.11  (continued)
EX. 30.11  (continued)
There is a long list of true statements that one might make about Mozart’s cadenza. In terms of an overall harmonic plan, it is clear that the cadenza serves as a gigantic embellishment of the “compound” form of the complete cadence. In terms of a large-scale melodic plan, the general trend is a rapid rise to a peak in measures 113–14 and then a gradual descent to the final trill on 2, interrupted of course by several intermediate rises and falls. Yet those statements could as easily describe cadenzas by Brahms or Prokofiev. Mozart’s cadenza was a very specific presentation of galant schemata—the “compulsory figures”—by a supremely accomplished artist. He knew all the basics, but his invention and flair far surpassed the merely correct. One is reminded of a pronouncement by the haughty Miss Bingley in Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*. Expounding on the subject of being “accomplished,” she declares, “A woman must have a thorough knowledge of music,
singing, drawing, dancing, and the modern languages, to deserve the word; and besides all this, she must possess a certain something in her air and manner of walking, the tone of her voice, her address and expressions, or the word will be but half deserved.” Every detail of courtly behavior mattered, and musical behavior was no less constrained. Long and assiduous training in partimenti and solfeggi could make many musicians accomplished, but Galuppi, Jommelli, Piccinni, Mozart, Haydn, and other real masters of the galant style possessed “a certain something” that transcended mere propriety. They attained the Earl of Chesterfield’s ideal of “a superior gracefulness.”

In digging down through the many layers of reinterpretation that have built up since the nineteenth century, I hope to have uncovered authentic potsherds of galant music. When we see and hear all the shards pieced together, whether in a masterwork like Mozart’s cadenza in tempo or in a humble lezione by Tritto, I believe we have reconstructed something of that musical world. The schemata in Mozart’s cadenza, and indeed in his whole quintet, were the common currency of galant music. These “stock speeches” of the courtly musical language can all be found in the partimenti and solfeggi taught to generations of galant musicians, and the ubiquity of these ritualized presentations helped to mold the responses of the aristocratic audiences. There was potential rigidity in all this schematization, but there could also be art of real depth and significance. Speaking of his own quintet, Mozart wrote to his father that the work “was applauded extraordinarily; I myself consider it the best work I have composed in my life . . . . I only wish you could have heard it.” To hear this music more as a Mozart might have heard it, to imagine musical behaviors more consonant with the premises and goals of those who lived at galant courts, and to seek a more realistic account of how galant musical craftsmen fashioned raw tones into finished art has been the aim of this book. The art of eighteenth-century court music extended beyond knowing all the schemata, to be sure. One needed experience in writing fugues, setting liturgical or operatic texts, and constructing an appropriate sequence of schemata for any occasion and musical genre. Yet these were added skills. To “speak” at court, it was first necessary to learn the courtly vocabulary and phraseology, for which the galant musical schemata were central.