The various traditions of music analysis do not entirely agree about the fixity or fluidity of a musical text. There are, of course, mainstream approaches to analysis where, although it seems almost comic to express it so baldly, the text of a sonata is assumed to have a single correct version determined by some combination of a composer’s true intentions and the natural and eternal laws of music. A logical outgrowth of this ‘work-concept’, in Lydia Goehr’s sense of the term (1992, p. 9), has been a series of idealised, Urtext editions of esteemed compositions. Such texts stand pure and complete, like marble statues in Goehr’s ‘imaginary museum of musical works’.1 In other approaches to analysis, a musical text may be treated as more contingent, subject to differences in performance, perception and, for lack of a better term, cultural context. Among these other traditions, where the text can be a moving target, one finds the Penn School.

The Penn School had its roots at the University of Chicago in the person of Leonard B. Meyer (1918–2007). From the youthful brilliance of his 1956 Emotion and Meaning in Music to the autumnal reflections of his 1989 Style and Music,2 Meyer traversed the disciplinary territories first of philosophy, aesthetics and psychology, then of music analysis and criticism and finally of history. He came closest to proposing a technical method of analysis in his 1973 Explaining Music,3 which grew out of the Bloch Lectures delivered at the University of California, Berkeley, and which reflected his supervision of a dissertation on melodic analysis by Eugene Narmour.4 The University of Pennsylvania hired Narmour in 1971 and then Meyer in 1975. Their many studies emanating from the 1970s–90s, along with subsequent publications by their students from that period, largely delimit the material record of the Penn School. Its methodological influence on music analysis, however, has extended beyond Chicago and Philadelphia, encouraging and validating a renewed focus on listeners.

The Penn School was, for instance, an inspiration to the emerging discipline of music cognition. The behavioural experiments and data analysis which constitute much of the work of music cognition provide little evidence of complete agreement among listeners. In a classic experiment conducted by Diana Deutsch,5 about half of her listeners heard an artificially produced melodic interval as ascending while the other half heard the same interval as descending. That surprising result depended in large part on specially prepared pitches. For ordinary melodic intervals in a musical context, one might expect that all listeners would agree on something as simple and foundational as ‘up or down’. Yet in my long experience as a teacher of music theory, I have had at least two
very musical students who simply could not map changes in pitch onto that particular spatial metaphor. When experiments are directed towards more complex musical phenomena such as key or harmony, the level of disagreement among even highly trained musicians remains surprisingly high. Music psychologists may be satisfied by a set of results which is statistically unlikely to have been derived by chance. Yet it may be disquieting for music analysts to imagine that some crucial feature of a work could be heard in three different ways by, say, 40 per cent, 36 per cent and 24 per cent of listeners.

In the humanities, as opposed to the empirical sciences, the rise of postmodern criticism and the generally anti-authoritarian attitudes of scholars coming of age in the late 1960s and 1970s helped foster the view that texts were as much a product of their readers as of their writers. What was called ‘reader-response’ criticism reached a large audience through the 1980 publication of Stanley Fish’s *Is There a Text in This Class?* Its subtitle, *The Authority of Interpretive Communities*, spoke to the political question of which group gets to promote its interpretation of a text as the preferred one. Jenefer Robinson, in her recent study of emotion in the arts, quite rightly likens Meyer’s listener-response orientation towards music analysis to the reader-response literary criticism of Stanley Fish or Wolfgang Iser, a connection noted by the Penn School itself in the 1980s. All of these scholars realised that the prior knowledge and unique frames of reference possessed by individual readers and listeners must substantially affect their experience of a text.

Perhaps because literature connects with the world around us in direct ways, it has always been obvious that, for example, while a young boy and an old man may both read *King Lear*, they will not have the same experience of the text. In reader-response theory this presumption of personal difference is easily extended to social difference, as when white and black Americans read *Gone with the Wind* or *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn*. Difference is also presumed when comparing a reader of today with a reader in the past. The more than 2,000 helpful asides which augment *The Annotated ‘Pride and Prejudice’* highlight just how much may be lost in reading a text crafted for those who lived centuries before us.

Listener-response music analysis must, by its own premises, allow for the losses and mutations that build up between a present and a past. If, following Meyer and Narmour, we assume that musical implications depend on a combination of, on the one hand, innate factors such as gestalt laws of perception and, on the other hand, learned frames of reference such as cognitive schemata, then people living in different eras will likely develop slightly different schemata owing to their differing experiences. For Meyer, there were always more implications than realisations. Experience and learning served to guide a process of selection from that thick tangle of possibilities. Similarly, Narmour described ‘shadowgraphs’, which marked a profusion of implied melodic paths. Learned, ‘top-down’ frames of reference – schemata – often tipped the perceptual scales in favour of one pattern or another. Differences in experience and learning could thus affect how the same set of pitches would be interpreted by listeners in the past and in the present, and could lead to somewhat different meanings in different eras. Leonard
Meyer made a small foray into this area of inquiry in Explaining Music,12 where he attempted to contrast what he took to be Mozart’s phrasing of K. 331’s first-movement theme with the phrasing of many late nineteenth- and early twentieth-century editions. Yet phrasing is a type of second-order difference applied to what was still assumed to be the same underlying text. The sonata retained the purity of its text, even when dressed in Victorian garb.

As suggested, literature affords access to fundamental truths of the material world and human custom. Were a young woman of today to read Edith Wharton’s 1905 House of Mirth, she might wonder about the frequent references to ‘phaetons’ passing through New York City in the 1890s. A moment’s research, however, would reveal them to be a type of stylish carriage. A similar moment’s research would not, unfortunately, reveal the precise meaning of a musical phrase by Corelli or Handel, much less whether its meaning had changed over the centuries. Because we assume that others hear music much as we do ourselves, it can be difficult to imagine a radically different hearing, a radically different sense of the musically normal.

In 1907, two years after the appearance of The House of Mirth, Wharton penned a short letter to The New York Times.13 In it she requested donations to save an Italian landmark from expropriation for an agricultural college. Her letter began, ‘Miss Violet Paget (“Vernon Lee”) has written me from Italy asking me to appeal for aid in rescuing the Villa Borghese in Rome from the grave disfigurement which threatens it’. Who was this Miss Paget who was at the same time Mr. Lee? Like Currer Bell (Charlotte Brontë), George Eliot (Mary Ann Evans) or George Sand (Aurore Dupin), Vernon Lee was the literary pseudonym of a significant author who happened to be female. Her life story reads like an improbable script for a BBC costume drama, where all the famous names make cameo appearances. But Paget really did actively engage with many of the great artists (John Singer Sargent, Mary Cassatt), aestheticians (Walter Pater), playwrights (Oscar Wilde) and authors (Henry James, Edith Wharton) of her era. Living comfortably in her villa overlooking Florence, Violet Paget (1856–1935) had time to study art, literature and music in depth, access to original documents, the personal freedom to dress as a man and the social courage to become known as one of the most prominent lesbian women of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Not the least among the many extraordinary aspects of this woman’s active career was her precocity and immersion in eighteenth-century Italian music, to the practical exclusion of music from her own time. Between the ages of fifteen and twenty she studied eighteenth-century music and literature so thoroughly, so passionately and so insightfully, ransacking libraries across Italy to become a recognised authority on the subject, that excerpts from her 1881 book Studies of the Eighteenth Century in Italy,14 completed when she was but twenty-four, were still being assigned to graduate musicology students in the seminars of Daniel Heartz at the University of California, Berkeley, more than a century later.15 In the very month of Edith Wharton’s appeal to the Times Paget was
finishing a preface to the second edition of her *Studies*. There she provided some autobiographical context for her youthful passion, although still writing nominally as Vernon Lee. The story she tells is self-deprecating, but some details are significant. Apparently, in the 1870s she knew ‘practically nothing of modern music, of music, indeed, later than Mozart’ (Lee 1908, p. xxi). Even though she laughed at her study of *partimenti* – ‘I struggled for two whole years, all in vain, with Fenaroli’s figured basses’ (*ibid.*, p. xxii) – she nonetheless obtained the same type of training undertaken by eighteenth-century apprentice composers. And the music she knew best was exactly the type of instructional *solfeggi* used in the eighteenth century to teach the art of melody: ‘[b]ut most of my knowledge was drawn from the various collections of old songs, *Echos d’Italie, Gemme d’Antichità [Jewels of the Past], Lira Partenopea [The Neapolitan Lyre]*, and so forth, which had in that day been edited, doubtless a little garbled, for the use of singing-masters aspiring to tradition and their more ambitious pupils’ (*ibid.*, p. xxii). Through private lessons with ‘her earliest and most patient teacher of singing and thorough bass [Gaetano Capocci], the then Chapel-Master of St. John Lateran [in Rome]’ (*ibid.*, p. xxii), she forged a direct link to the Neapolitan conservatories of the eighteenth century. Nicola Sala, great maestro of the Conservatorio di Santa Maria della Pietà dei Turchini, arrived there in 1732 to study with Leonardo Leo; Sala later taught Valentino Fioravanti, a late eighteenth-century master of comic opera, who in turn taught Capocci, young Paget’s own maestro.

It is Paget’s remarkable location as a practising eighteenth-century amateur musician living in the later nineteenth century, along with her great sensitivity to differences of all kinds (eras, genders, languages, cultures), that helps to make her such an interesting and revealing informant. Again, from her retrospective 1907 preface:

> While poring over my childlike little library of eighteenth-century music I became aware that *style* – *style* which is *character* and results in resemblance – is independent of such large classes as *sonata, symphony, aria;* that the same *style* may be manifest in different things of this sort; and a different *style* in pieces of music belonging, outwardly, so to speak, to the same category .... It was, I think, Gluck’s *Orpheus* which led me to the recognition of this something more important, something more essential in musical history, than what most writers still mean when they speak of *musical forms*. For it was well known ... that Gluck constructed an opera entirely different from any Italian opera of this time .... These differences Gluck boldly introduced .... And when all was done the music which he thus arranged and rearranged was of the same *style* as the music which his contemporaries Jommelli and Traetta were doling out patiently into the usual subdivisions .... My point is that the musical *style*, in its *musical essentials*, was unaltered by Gluck’s reforms. The *style* was in something far minuter and more subtle than all these divisions of sonatas and sonatas’ parts, of airs and airs’ parts. It was in what I have called musical *form*, what I believe other writers mean by *figure*; what I think it might be most intelligible to call musical *phrase*, implying thereby that as verbs, nouns, adjectives, and other parts of speech combine to
form the literary phrase, so intervals, rhythm, and harmonies unite also into the smallest musical whole which our intelligence and memory can recognize as *a whole*. (Lee 1908, pp. xxvi–xxvii)

Here this daughter of the nineteenth century articulates her mature realisation, achieved in the early twentieth century, that as an inheritor of eighteenth-century values, techniques and training, she had sensed the proper scope of stylistic judgement in the age of Gluck differently than had her contemporaries. She heard a different Gluck.

I was introduced to Paget’s writings only recently. The reader might well imagine how, given my junior membership in the Penn School and authorship of books with titles like *A Classic Turn of Phrase* and *Music in the Galant Style*, the words of Paget, with their pragmatic approach to musical style and their focus on the gestalts of musical phrases, resonated with my own experience of eighteenth-century music. Years earlier, when I began graduate school at the University of Pennsylvania, I had quickly realised that my imagined broad knowledge of European music was little more than a ‘greatest hits’ compilation of concert favourites. Even in my chosen area, eighteenth-century musical phraseology, I had to confront a repertoire of staggering depth and richness. So, like Paget before me, with the energy of youth I dove passionately into this sea of music, what the eighteenth-century chapel master at Regensburg, Joseph Riepel, termed an ‘inexhaustible sea’. I sought out compositions in every genre from all corners of Europe, avoiding contact only with the conservatory and concert-hall warhorses which I had known before (pieces like Handel’s *Messiah*). I catalogued the standard phrases of *galant* music, practiced the *partimenti* of Sala, Leo, Fenaroli and other maestros and edited the Neapolitan *solfeggi* written to impart sensitivity to the beauties of the eighteenth-century phrase. These journeys of apprenticeship bear a strong resemblance to the paths taken by Paget a century earlier. Through shared experiences she and I seem to have arrived independently at a similar set of cognitive schemata tuned to the regularities which we experienced in this repertoire.

Neither Paget nor I claim any special gifts of musical insight or talent. On the contrary, she claimed that in the eighteenth century, the ordinary experience of daily church music,

repeated constantly, could do more to form people’s musical taste than the most strained attention at an opera. The shopkeepers, artisans, and peasants, while dawdling carelessly about, imbibed music unconsciously; they became critics, and occasionally one of their sons or nephews, instead of turning shopman or farmer, would turn composer or performer; and indeed nearly all the great Italian musicians belonged to the humbler, often to the humblest, classes of society. (Lee 1908, p. 128)

Constantly repeated exposure to a coherent musical repertoire, whether through the compulsion of attending mass or the curiosity of scholarly inquiry, can lead
to a listener’s cognitive adaptation to regularities in that repertoire. The mind adapts to the music.

This brings me to one of the warhorses which I had avoided all those years: Mozart’s Keyboard Sonata K. 331. This work, so woven into the fabric of bourgeois amateur pianism in Paget’s Victorian era as to resist strongly any attempt at historical contextualisation in our own time,18 was nonetheless written for the tastes and purposes of galant society. Its second movement presents that society’s courtly dance par excellence, the minuet or menuetto.

Riepel took the standard minuet as a model for pieces of all kinds,19 or, as Paget might put it, as a core phraseology ‘independent of such large classes as sonata, symphony, aria’. Riepel paid great attention to the proper concatenation of stock phrases. For him, the moment just after the double bar at mid-minuet was a point of maximum predictability, requiring maximum propriety. It was the place to employ one of only three possible phrase types: the monte, fonte or ponte (mountain, well or bridge).20 In general terms, we might describe his model phrases as patterns of rising, falling or steady pitch, respectively. But in Riepel’s world proper behaviour was not defined in general terms. Proper behaviour required the punctilious presentation of a number of carefully coordinated musical features. Ex. 1 shows one of Riepel’s own examples of a model fonte.21 Making a proper fonte required knowing how to coordinate a pair of specific moves in both melody (local scale degrees 4–3) and bass (7–4) which result in changing sonorities or chords. The fonte’s first half should be in the minor mode, and its second half should be in the major mode, which in most cases will be the key of the minuet as a whole.

Surviving eighteenth-century uses of the term fonte appear limited to Riepel’s own writings, although it may be significant that no contemporary review of them objects to the term. The name itself is of little consequence, being merely a verbal label for a cognitive schema, one derived from repeated exposure to a set of similar musical phrases occurring in the same musical and often social context. But the act of naming does signal a conscious awareness of this phrase type during the eighteenth century, at least among some professionals. To paraphrase Paget, the fonte, in the experience of an eighteenth-century musician, was
‘repeated constantly’ at the beginnings of second halves of minuets. Even a galant amateur musician ‘dawdling carelessly about’ a harpsichord could be expected to have ‘imbibed’ this phrase pattern ‘unconsciously’. Of course, Mozart, as a prodigy, picked up the fonte schema from almost the beginning of his musical life.

As adults we often infer a conceptual generality to the sayings of children, when in truth a child may have learned only a literal response to a particular stimulus or context. Take, for example, the colloquial English word ‘wanna’, meaning, alternatively, ‘want to’ or ‘want a’. As adults we might explain the word as a contraction in rapid speech of commonly collocated words. To a child, however, ‘wanna’ might be understood more literally as a unitary and useful word, a word that can take as its object either a verb (‘I wanna go’) or a noun (‘I wanna toy’). The child has learned a specific exemplar, where the adult infers a general concept or underlying principle. Mozart’s early productions of the monte, fonte and ponte in minuets are not Riepel’s conceptually clean models (although the Mozart family did own his treatise). Instead, Mozart’s early productions showcase his ‘imbibing’ of various adult exemplars that often combine more than one schema.

Ex. 2 details the four bars following the double bar of Mozart’s first minuet, the ‘menuetto’ of K. 1d (written in December 1761). Riepel would likely call this a ponte leading into a type of imperfect cadence, given the dominant pedal point on the C octave in the left hand. In Mozart’s next known composition, the minuet of K. 2 (composed in January 1762), the texture and pacing of the ponte from K. 1d have been recast into an eight-bar fonte (Ex. 3). All the features of what I term the Fonte schema are present in this exemplar, but so are a few features of the Fenaroli schema (named by me in honour of the partimento master whose studies plagued young Paget). Riepel’s own explicit version of the Fenaroli schema is shown in Ex. 4. Riepel himself gave this pattern no name, but he clearly points it out as something for a student to memorize as the practice ‘of some famous masters’ (1996, Ch. 3, p. 40). Notice the alternation of V and I chords (Riepel’s exemplar begins with I, but most Fenaroli exemplars begin with V), the dominant pedal point on G4 and the canon created as the outer voices follow each other on scale degrees D→C→B→A→G→F (or, as we will see in other versions of this schema, D→C→B→A→G→F).
What was implicit in K. 2 becomes explicit in K. 3 (from March 1762). Ex. 5 shows how, within the larger context of a Fonte schema, Mozart manages to incorporate two iterations of the Fenaroli schema. Riepel’s bass becomes Mozart’s treble. In practice, the two parts were interchangeable. Was he creating this mixture out of experimentation, as a child might explore new sounds through babbling, or had he absorbed a new exemplar from a specific adult model? The question is not easily answered, although the existence of obvious adult models like the then famous aria from Piccini’s *La buona figliuola* (first produced in Rome in 1760) might argue for mere imitation at this early stage in Mozart’s life (Ex. 6).

What was implicit in K. 2 becomes explicit in K. 3 (from March 1762). Ex. 5 shows how, within the larger context of a Fonte schema, Mozart manages to incorporate two iterations of the Fenaroli schema. Riepel’s bass becomes Mozart’s treble. In practice, the two parts were interchangeable. Was he creating this mixture out of experimentation, as a child might explore new sounds through babbling, or had he absorbed a new exemplar from a specific adult model? The question is not easily answered, although the existence of obvious adult models like the then famous aria from Piccini’s *La buona figliuola* (first produced in Rome in 1760) might argue for mere imitation at this early stage in Mozart’s life (Ex. 6).

On the other hand, combinations like the Monte-plus-Fenaroli schema of K. 5 (Ex. 7; written in June 1762) suggest, to the contrary, that Mozart was productively mixing and matching schemata which he recognised as separable phrase types. Notice how, for instance, he precedes and follows the Monte-plus-Fenaroli combination with presentations of the Fenaroli alone.
These schemata, often in habitual combinations ‘repeated constantly’, clearly formed important compositional building blocks which Mozart acquired at an early age. Just as an English-speaking child never outgrows simple combinations such as ‘good night’ or ‘thank you’, so Mozart never outgrew the schemata that he learned as a young boy. In Paget’s words, ‘as verbs, nouns, adjectives and other parts of speech combine to form the literary phrase, so intervals, rhythm and harmonies unite also into the smallest musical whole which our intelligence and memory can recognize as a whole’ (emphasis in original). I term her memorized wholes ‘schemata’, although like ‘mental representations’, ‘ideas’, ‘prototypes’, ‘archetypes’ or ‘gestalts’ could serve equally well.

An ordinary listener might not pick up such regularly recurring patterns as quickly as a Mozart. But over an extended period of listening it is possible to recognise the regularities of a style and to form expectations about the normal order of its musical events. In fact, the more familiar one becomes with a schema,
Ex. 6 A Fonte with embedded Fenarolis from Piccini’s aria ‘Una povera ragazzà’, from La buona figliuola (Rome, 1760); this phrase may have been a model for Mozart’s Fonte in K. 3 (see Ex. 5)

the earlier in its course of events one will recognise it and begin to form more focussed expectations about its continuation. At the double bar of the minuet of K. 331, Mozart begins what for all the world seems like an easily recognisable combination of the Fonte and Fenaroli schemata (Ex. 8). Fontes typically begin by melodically negating the third of the key of the dominant, which here is G♯.

By cancelling a characteristic pitch of the previous key (E major), the Fonte thus initiates a digression to a minor key (G♮ is the lowered sixth degree of B minor) and a subsequent return to the tonic key (A major) through a type of circle-of-fifths harmonic sequence. The opening bar of treble octaves performs that cancellation of the G♯ quite dramatically, and it is then followed by the expected Fonte in a standard combination with the Fenaroli. Note how the important pitches of the Fenaroli are decorated by appoggiaturas on every downbeat.

To understand the way Mozart wrote the second half of this Fonte, we first need to learn what Riepel, speaking in the voice of an imaginary maestro with prudish tastes, termed the ‘hermaphrodite fonte’ (Riepel 1996, Ch. 2, p. 124; one can only imagine what Paget would have made of this term, she who routinely dressed à la garçonne). Riepel’s maestro averred that the major mode was male and the minor mode female. Beginning the second half of a Fonte with the feminine lowered sixth degree of the intended masculine major mode was thus an unwelcome violation and corruption of accepted gender differences, even though the maestro admitted that the practice had ‘a hundred admirers’. An early work by Gluck is representative of the practice (Ex. 9). The hermaphro-dite pitch, the starred C♮, occurs as the first bass note in the second half of
Gluck’s Fonte. It is worth emphasising that the hermaphrodite C♭ does not alter the mode of the Fonte’s second half, which remains major.

The Fonte in general seems to have been a phrase type that ranked high in Mozart’s adult repertoire. It appears hundreds of times in his works in every genre, often in functionally the exact spot dictated by Riepel. A large number of these Fontes are of the hermaphroditic persuasion, although there is no evidence for or against Mozart’s sharing Riepel’s fanciful interpretation of them. Among Mozart’s keyboard sonatas, one of the first clear examples of the hermaphrodite Fonte can be found in the Sonata No. 2, K. 280, of the early set probably written to impress the music director Christian Cannabich in Munich and Mannheim (Ex. 10). Cannabich, who had studied with Jommelli in Rome and Stuttgart, knew the Italian style very well. Immediately following the double bar (bar 78) of the finale of this sonata, Mozart introduces a quiet voice in the soprano range that calls out the cue for a Fonte: the E♭-to-E♭ lowering of pitch that cancels the third of the previous key (the first half of the sonata ended in C major). In the
The loud and active four-bar passage which follows (bars 82–85), the E♭ emerges as the lowered sixth degree of the key of G minor. The second half of the Fonte repeats the first half, this time transposed down a step to the key of F major. The D♭s in bars 87 and 89 are the hermaphrodite notes that belong more closely to the key of F minor than F major. Note that in the loud passages Mozart includes many features of the Fenaroli schema. Most evident in the canonic presentation of bars 91–93, those features include the V–I–V–I harmonic alternation, the canon in the outer parts and the prominent scale-degree series of 7–1–4–3 in both outer parts. Were this an orchestral work and not one limited to the resources of two hands, a pedal point on the local scale degree 5 would probably have been added (D in bars 82–85, C in bars 90–93), as is typical for this schema.

Ex. 8 The first half of the eight-bar Fonte with embedded Fenarolis from the minuet of Mozart’s Keyboard Sonata K. 331 (1781–83)

Ex. 9 A Fonte from an early minuet by Gluck; the ‘hermaphrodite’ pitch is the starred C.
Ex. 10 The sixteen-bar Fonte with embedded Fenarolis from Mozart’s Keyboard Sonata No. 2, K. 280 (1775); the hermaphrodite pitches are the D♭s in its second, major-mode half.

Ex. 11 A Fonte from the aria ‘Nel cor più non mi sento’ (Paisiello, 1788)

It should perhaps be emphasised that both the Fonte schema and the Fonte-plus-Fenaroli combination were common currency among all eighteenth-century composers and were not peculiarities of Mozart’s own style. In 1788, for example, Paisiello brought out a new opera in the simple, sentimental style pioneered by Piccinni. It was known variously as L’amor contrastato or La molinara, and its duet ‘Nel cor più non mi sento’ became enormously popular. In 1795 the young Beethoven wrote a set of six keyboard variations on it. Ex. 11 presents the four-bar Fonte, as Beethoven transcribed it, which begins at the midpoint of this small theme. The leading notes which begin each half of Paisiello’s Fonte, the pedal-point that underlies its Alberti bass and the general association of Fonte and Fenaroli schemata may have suggested to Beethoven the
Fenaroli ascents through scale degrees 7-1-2-3 found in his second variation (Ex. 12). Variation 2 is thus less an original take on the theme and more, in eighteenth-century terms, a presentation of Paisiello’s Fonte in a different although related attitude or pose, one with affinities to Piccinni (see again Ex. 6). It is an exercise in the *ars combinatoria*, the artful although not necessarily original combination of known possibilities. Originality lay in the particular presentation, not in transforming the language itself.

With some context now in mind, we can return to the minuet of K. 331 to examine the second half of its Fonte. As shown in Ex. 13, Mozart’s second half gives us the expected one-step-lower restatement of the first half (see again Ex. 8). The initial bar is a variation on the dramatic octaves that open the first half, with the octaves replaced by quaver appoggiaturas which include the ‘hermaphrodite’ F♮. The next four bars replicate all the Fenaroli patterning heard before, with the exception of a harmonic turn, beginning in bar 27, towards the augmented sixth chord at the end of bar 28. The only real problem with this thoroughly expected and normative passage is that editors, since the late nineteenth century, have been divided over whether bars 24–26 are in the key of A minor or A major, with the majority now favouring A minor.

In Mozart’s time, a listener would hear an untold number of Fontes with a minor-to-major key sequence – practically every composition contained at least one. By contrast, the minor-to-minor key sequence is exceedingly rare in this context. One might pore over a hundred C major works from the 1780s and still not find one containing a Fonte-like sequence with its first half, for instance, in
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E minor and its second half in D minor. Hence the following statement, from the editors of the authoritative *Neue Mozart Ausgabe* (NMA), seems to emanate from a different reality:

The transmission of bars 24–26 of the minuet is obviously corrupt. Although there can be no doubt that the passage is intended to be in A minor, the corresponding accidentals are missing in the first printing (and strangely enough even in the *Oeuvres complètes*). In bar 26 (right hand, first crotchet) both these editions expressly indicate C♯, which contradicts the further harmonic progress (bars 27ff). The editors have therefore decided to reinterpret this passage.24

In the opening paragraph of this article I opined that, in mainstream analysis, a musical text – in this case a minuet – ‘is assumed to have a single correct version determined by reference to some combination of a composer’s true intentions and the natural and eternal laws of music’. Mozart’s autograph of the minuet has not survived, or at least has not come to light. Bereft, then, of access to Mozart’s ‘true intentions’, the editors needed a justification for their reinterpretation. Against the evidence of the (cautionary?) C♯ of bar 26 in early prints (a typographical perplexity if A major had once been obvious), they probably interpreted the hermaphrodite F♮ of bar 23 and the turn towards minor in bar 27 (leading to an augmented sixth chord with a prominent F♮ in bar 28) as overt markers bracketing a unified minor mode. The editors thus appealed to the laws of harmony and ‘harmonic progress’.

Paget had a low opinion of the laws of harmony espoused in textbooks, a view that emerges in her discussion of music education in the eighteenth century:
A hundred years ago musical amateurs were rarer than now, and to be one involved much more responsibility .... [Music] was an art, a profession, rather than an amusement or an accomplishment .... People had not yet conceived the modern notion of culture, which most often consists merely in giving slovenly cultivation to endowments which deserve no cultivation at all. But where real musical talent existed it was usually made the most of; and it must be remembered that the study of music was at that time far more arduous than in these happy days of classes, piano arrangements, manuals of harmony, and other royal roads to mediocrity. The musical education of professionals, the seven or eight years spent in learning to sing by men who were to be mere composers; the two or three years spent in learning composition by those who were to be mere performers; the inexorably complete system according to which one branch of the art could not be mastered without a knowledge of the others, all this reacted on the education of the non-professional musician; the music which people heard was too good to permit them to endure music that was bad; the masters were too thoroughly trained to submit to slovenly pupils. (Lee 1908, pp. 141–2)

Even if the laws of harmony were little more than pabulum offered to a Europe hungry for Bildung, they seem insufficiently pointed to speak to the problem of Mozart’s Fonte. Almost any phrase of this minuet could be minor or major without violating a law of harmony, and the works of many composers, Schubert in particular, would be the poorer if major and minor could not occur in close proximity. Furthermore, the hermaphrodite $F_\natural$ that begin the second half of Mozart’s Fonte do not, at least in the eighteenth century, change the expected mode from major to minor. Perhaps, then, by ‘harmonic progress’ the editors of the NMA meant something closer to ‘sonata form’.

Aubyn Raymar, writing an introduction to the once widely used 1931 edition of Mozart sonatas published by the Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music, noted that ‘[o]wing to the loss of the autograph, uncertainty of the reading in bars 24–27 cannot be quite dismissed’ (Raymar 1931). But the less likely reading to which he refers was A minor, not A major. The editor, York Bowen, set the passage in A major, with smaller ossia staves (marked ‘variant’) placed above the treble and below the bass to indicate the alternative minor-mode text. In a paragraph directly preceding his remarks about this uncertainty, Raymar points out that ‘the Menuetto is a compact example of the first movement form having a definite secondary idea in the dominant key at bar 11 which, after the Development section (bars 19–30), recurs in regular manner with the first subject in the tonic key’ (ibid.). A. B. Marx, who as much as anyone wrote the recipe for the nineteenth-century vision of sonata form, taught ‘musically untrained university students’ (Balthazar 1983, p. 40 n. 4), which may have accounted for some of the rigidity and idealisation in his precepts. Could it be that another factor which caused Mozart’s passage to seem (in the twentieth century) ‘obviously corrupt’ was the imagined error of returning to the home key and mode before the ‘official’ recapitulation?

I once heard, on a public radio station in Hawaii, a substitute announcer attempt to read the hourly news. There was a brief story about the Sioux, a
famous tribe of the Great Plains whose name (among European settlers) rhymed with ‘blue’. This announcer, sensing that ‘Sioux’ was not pronounced as written, but not knowing exactly how it was pronounced, in the press of the moment said ‘Suez’. He pulled something out of his general knowledge from the past to paper over his embarrassment in the present. Perhaps that is similar to what the editors of the NMA felt compelled to do. Not knowing about uncorrupted Fontes and Fenarolis, and confronted with conflicting evidence for either mode, they had to invoke general principles of a supposed higher order to justify rewriting Mozart.

Most performers today play this Fonte with its second half all in A minor. Such is the authority of an Urtext edition such as the NMA. The further one goes back in time, however, the more likely the performer is to begin the phrase in A major. Lili Kraus, for instance, who studied with Bartók and Schnabel, played bars 24–25 in major and bars 26–27 in minor. A crossover point, where minor began to overtake major, may have been the 1893 edition of G. Schirmer. As seen in Ex. 14, it introduces a C♮ where the original editions had an explicit C♯ in bar 26, and it reflects that C♮ back onto bars 24–25. As a mark perhaps of general confusion and perplexity, note the natural sign before the low E in bar 25. Although it was probably intended for the C on the second quaver in the left hand, it may stand as a small typographical rupture, an aftershock caused by the slow collision of different conceptual continents.

In Explaining Music, as mentioned, Meyer took the nascent Penn School on a brief foray into textual scholarship. His narrative genre was that of the detective story, with a villain (Hugo Riemann) appearing late in the plot just in time for Meyer to wrap up the case. The satisfactions of that type of denouement may be found most reliably in light fiction. Editors need to make choices, and those choices need to make sense to the players who use their editions. Today some listeners (and many scholars) can be persuaded that different forms of decoration in a highly decorative style like that of Chopin might all be equally valid, but it is quite a different matter to suggest multiple Mozarts, whose music stands for the perfect, the natural, the timeless. Perhaps it takes the rare case of someone like Violet Paget, a nineteenth-century woman raised on eighteenth-century

Ex. 14 From the G. Schirmer edition of 1893, an early minor-mode revision of Mozart’s Fonte
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music, to drive home the idea that musical texts— even ones in the statuary museum— are in flux to the extent that our experiences are in flux. The editors of the NMA were careful to alter a text only when it no longer seemed to make sense— when it was ‘obviously corrupt’. Yet ideas of what made sense had changed considerably in the century since the first complete edition of Mozart’s works. Two authenticities thus compete, and performers need to choose one or the other. Which should they choose?

In Paget’s narrative of eighteenth-century music, she begins by going to the church in Bologna that once housed the Philharmonic Academy. She sits down and opens the eighteenth-century musical travelogue of Charles Burney. For three long chapters she follows him on his voyages around Italy, commenting on his opinions and the musicians he met along the way. At the end of that journey, tracing out a unique text created jointly by Paget, Burney and ourselves as readers,

[w]e shut the old, brown, calf-bound volume of Dr. Burney’s musical tour, and lay it down on the oaken table. The evening sunlight, rosy and golden, is gilding the red brick belfry of San Giacomo Maggiore, the grass of the quiet little cloister court, the brown fittings of the cozy library of the Bolognese music school. We tie up the bursting portfolios of old prints, we replace the ill-sewn, musty-smelling music books on their accustomed shelves; we close the cardboard box of yellow, shrunken letters, and we take our leave. In going away we pause a moment in the vast, vaulted, desolate refectory, where our steps re-echo as in a church; the grey twilight is slowly filling the place, and from out of it faintly appear the rows and rows of portraits: Marcello, stately and sad in his patrician robes; Jommelli, heavy and bowed; Farinelli, strange and weird in his knightly mantle of Calatrava; Pergolesi, sweet and mournful; and the many others, more forgotten than they, dignified composers at their harpsichords, dapper and sentimental singers holding their scores, men and women in plush, and satin, and powder, and buckle wigs, once famous, now forgotten. Dimmer and dimmer do they grow in the twilight, till they melt into the colourless uniformity of the walls. (Lee 1880, p. 139)

Here was a woman who knew these musicians like members of her own family. She knew their life histories, their goals and the world in which they strove to succeed. In terms of musical style, she grouped Mozart with Cimarosa and Paisiello, both products of the conservatories in Naples. Although the music of the two Italians is not well-known today, the comparison is apt and would have been self-evident to their contemporaries. For all three, she would recommend focussing on their phrases. In the case of the minuet of K. 331, knowing eighteenth-century phraseology means knowing about the Fonte schema, and that calls for the major mode in bars 24–26. The first printings got it right, the first complete edition got it right and only later in the nineteenth century did a different musical reality, one not focussed on phrases, trump the older, eighteenth-century knowledge. Paget’s beloved world of eighteenth-century music may have grown ‘dimmer and dimmer’, but we can still choose to turn on a light. We can recognise that the NMA, like a museum catalogue, represents the
best understanding at a given time for a given audience. But we can also
recognise that the statuary may occasionally reanimate and walk out the door,
returning to a different time and to the audience for which they were fashioned.

NOTES
1. Lydia Goehr, The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: an Essay in the Philosophy of
2. See Meyer (1956) and (1989).
4. See Narmour (1974). Parts of Narmour’s dissertation were reworked and published
in 1977 as Beyond Schenkerism: the Need for Alternatives in Music Analysis. The title
was a play on Arthur Koestler and J. R. Smythies’s 1969 Beyond Reductionism: New
Perspectives in the Life Sciences.
6. For a discussion of other metaphors for pitch, see Eitan and Granot (2006). Eitan
was a student of Meyer’s and Narmour’s at Penn.
7. See Fish (1980).
8. See Robinson (2005), pp. 460–1 n. 54.
11. See, for example, Narmour (1977), p. 184, ex. 56.
13. See Wharton (1907).
15. Heartz’s assigning of Lee/Paget was confirmed to me by two of his former students,
Thomas Bauman and John Rice.
16. It was John Rice who first brought Vernon Lee’s study of partimenti to my attention,
knowing of my interest in that eighteenth-century practice. My e-mail response,
blissfully ignorant of Violet Paget, reads: ‘I was amazed by how his knowledge of the
Who’s Who of eighteenth-century music was so rich, and he seems to hear the music
with eighteenth-century ears’.
17. See Riepel (1996), Ch. 1, p. 79: ‘Musik ist ein unerschöpfliches Meer’.
18. For a witty review of this much-discussed movement, see Allanbrook (2008).
20. Ibid., Ch. 2, p. 44.
21. Ibid., Ch. 4, p. 2.
22. Ibid., Ch. 2, p. 103.
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25. For instance, Rink (2005–) presents thirteen exemplars of various versions of Chopin’s Prelude, Op. 28 No. 4.

26. For a parallel case of how Beethoven reception has been subject to similar mutations, see Byros (2009).
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ABSTRACT

The Romantic and Modern reception and reinterpretation of eighteenth-century music stretches over a period much longer than that of the eighteenth century itself, in the process forming its own authenticity and norms. Modern editors of
eighteenth-century music must occasionally grapple with musical texts which appear to violate either the earlier or later standards. A minuet whose text seemed ‘obviously corrupt’ to the official editors of Mozart’s keyboard sonatas would probably have seemed highly artful yet utterly normative to Mozart or his audiences. A focus on the norms of musical phrases was proposed by the Victorian author Violet Paget, writing under the pseudonym Vernon Lee. Her immersion in eighteenth-century music at an early age, along with her training in the Italian tradition, gave her a unique position from which to comment on the differences between the musical culture of her own time and that of Mozart and his Italian models.