

# Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

KARISHMEH FELFELI-CRAWFORD<sup>1</sup>

## Historical contexts

Mozart's Fantasia in C Minor K.475, completed in May 1785, is a quasi-improvisatory, open-ended work that has all the hallmarks of the fantasia as a genre in its resistance of categorical fixity; the apparent spontaneity of the fantasia style is subverted by the inclusion of formal structures more typical of closed forms such as the sonata. More specifically, the dominating C-minor tonal premise that forms the basis for the work's slow introduction and eventual recapitulation bears a close resemblance to Mozart's Sonata K. 457 in the same key, composed only a few months earlier. As a result, the Fantasia is something of an analytical enigma, which might explain the work's exclusion from the already scarce contextual literature on the fantasia.

In her 2001 landmark study of the genre, Annette Richards provides a rich account of eighteenth-century fantasia criticism and relates her findings to conceptualizations of the *Gartenkunst* and the picturesque.<sup>2</sup> The author draws from a vast range of historical treatises to back up her analyses of fantasias and the fantasia procedures of C. P. E. Bach, Haydn and Beethoven, though she remains silent on Mozart. This omission is especially puzzling, given that Richards so eloquently captures the generic properties of Mozart's K.475 when she writes:

... the fantasy has a certain post-modern appeal. Fragmentary, subjective, open-ended, it simultaneously resists interpretation and offers itself promiscuously to multiple readings; ambiguously placed between improvisation and composition, the fantasia pushes away from the

---

<sup>1</sup> The author wishes to thank Stephen Patrick Crawford for his help in the early stages of the writing process. Equally, the author wishes to acknowledge the various comments provided by members of the British-Irish musicological community.

<sup>2</sup> Annette Richards, *The Free Fantasia and the Musical Picturesque* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

constraints of musical notation, evading an obvious conformity to musical form, threatening the fakery and illusion associated with bewitching performance, evanescent and virtuosic display.<sup>3</sup>

The 'rejection of virtuosity' trope is especially crucial to the late eighteenth-century fantasia style and provides one important conceptual framework for my own work on Mozart's Fantasia. Richards fleshes this concept out in a later chapter in which she highlights the centrality of 'private' music-making at the clavichord to fantasia composition and performance.<sup>4</sup> Through an examination of *An das Clavier* [At the Piano] texts, Richards demonstrates the ways in which eighteenth-century conceptualizations of inwardness, melancholy and solitude were musically represented both in domestic songs and keyboard fantasias of the time. The author does not gloss over the more unsettling aspects of fantasia performance such as temporal instability, wild modulations, or heightened poeticism. Rather, she argues that such solitary musical outpourings were closely related to sensibility or *Empfindsamkeit*.<sup>5</sup> Viewed through the lens of sensibility, fantasia performance in the late eighteenth century can be seen as a revolt against the prevailing culture of repression and excessive order on the one hand, and as an intensely private expression of compassion and emotionality on the other. The disturbing characteristics of the fantasia style can also be attributed to an aesthetic viewpoint of the time that considered the awakening of both pleasurable and painful sentiments to be the ultimate goal of music, a point that is explicated in an article by Georgia Cowart.<sup>6</sup> We must be cautious, however, in alluding to the late eighteenth-century keyboard fantasia merely as a musical realization (or, to borrow from ethnomusicology an embodiment) of actual psychological or spiritual catharsis. Music theory and analysis, unlike a purely musicological undertaking, allows us to critique the idea of excessive subjectivity while remaining open-minded about the piano fantasia's ontology.

The recent work of Matthew Head situates the fantasia within existing theories of topical discourse and regards the fantasia procedures of C. P. E. Bach as indicators of sensibility.<sup>7</sup> Even though Head does not venture as far as Mozart, he provides helpful

---

<sup>3</sup> Richards, 15.

<sup>4</sup> Richards, 145–82.

<sup>5</sup> Richards, 149–50.

<sup>6</sup> Georgia J. Cowart, 'Sense and Sensibility in Eighteenth-Century Musical Thought', *Acta Musicologica*, 56/2 (1984), 251–66.

<sup>7</sup> Matthew Head, 'Fantasia and Sensibility' in Danuta Mirka (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Topic Theory* (New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 259–78.

## Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

clarification of the term sensibility, which is 'not a musical topic, a style or a period, but the capacity to experience sensations and feelings and thus a foundational concern of art'.<sup>8</sup> The idea of being moved was a central preoccupation of musicians and theorists who termed this basic aspect of music 'pathetics'. Quite distinct from earlier traditions of sentimentalism and public weeping, a 'pathetic' sensibility in the late eighteenth-century musical context was characterized by 'emotional responsiveness, particularly to the suffering of others'.<sup>9</sup> An awareness of the capacity to be moved and of the moral obligations of such a sensibility can be examined alongside Head's concept of 'untutored simplicity' as it pertains to the late eighteenth-century fantasia and which he elaborates as follows:

Songful melody—enshrined in a region's popular tunes ... was another zone of heightened expression throughout the century. Ideas of untutored simplicity, of the natural beauty of the female singing voice, of flowing movement, and (again) of melody as a natural language of the passions informed the celebration—and sometimes sentimental idealisation—of songfulness.<sup>10</sup>

Such ideas tie in with Annette Richards's earlier theorization of the fantasia as a genre that critiques our capacity to be awed by technical perfection, theatricality, and virtuosity. While the increasingly virtuosic piano fantasias of the nineteenth century may appear to reject this ideal, K.475 retains these properties, even as it remains 'an inherently problematic object of study' compared to the formally closed genres of sonata and rondo such as are found in the Piano Sonata in C minor, K.457.<sup>11</sup> This urges the deployment of a methodological pluralism to enable a full engagement with the more difficult-to-pin-down aspects of this particular piece, and the late eighteenth-century keyboard style more generally.

Particularly useful in this respect is Robert O. Gjerdingen's 2007 book *Music in the Galant Style*.<sup>12</sup> Gjerdingen's theory provides the analyst with a whole 'new' language, archaic *and* user-friendly, which, when absorbed as a set of rules, also presents a way of thinking, breathing, and becoming this music. Acknowledging his debt to the many composers featured in his book, all of whom follow the *partimenti* tradition, the author employs a historically aware mode of analysis to codify his theory of galant schema

---

<sup>8</sup> Head, 265.

<sup>9</sup> Head, 267.

<sup>10</sup> Head, 269.

<sup>11</sup> Richards, *The Free Fantasia and the Musical Picturesque*, 15.

<sup>12</sup> Robert O. Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

(musical prototypes) that are most readily identifiable in a large body of repertoire from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The schema theory provides the analyst with the unique opportunity to reconstruct music in its own historical context. It also allows us to speculate about things we may have already felt intuitively upon listening to or playing the piece, a mode which I call 'presentist'. On a larger level, what I am proposing hopes to validate John Rink's concept of informed intuition, a term that recognizes 'the importance of intuition in the interpretative process but also the considerable knowledge and experience [that] generally lie behind it'.<sup>13</sup> Gjerdingen also remains one of the few music theorists to mention the value of pianistic performativity to analysis, a point that will be developed in the latter half of this article. Gjerdingen's theories help to demonstrate just how brilliantly and effortlessly Mozart composes, by handling the teachings of eighteenth-century music theory in typically user-friendly and practical ways. One can argue, particularly from the point of view of the performer, that Gjerdingen is sometimes too deferential to the forefathers of this theory and from this perspective Joel Lester's work carries greater authority.<sup>14</sup>

### First impressions: reimagining Gjerdingen's schemata in K.475

I don't pretend to be wise, but I am observing, and I see a great deal more than you'd imagine.<sup>15</sup>

I will begin with what may seem a trivial observation about the work's appearance. The first thing that strikes me as odd is not the absence of a key-signature for most of the work, but the fact that Mozart's piece simply goes by the title 'Fantasie'. The first edition paired it with the Sonata in C Minor K.457 and contains a dedication to Mozart's student Thérèse von Trattner, but makes no mention of a C-minor tonality.<sup>16</sup> Despite this omission, the work has assumed a place in our performing canon under the name 'Fantasie in C Minor, K.475', with performers and historians emphasising the

---

<sup>13</sup> John Rink, 'Analysis and/(or?) Performance', in John Rink (ed.), *Musical Performance: A Guide to Understanding* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 35–58.

<sup>14</sup> Joel Lester, *Compositional Theory in the Eighteenth Century*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1994).

<sup>15</sup> Louisa May Alcott, *Little Women*, Project Gutenberg (2008), <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/514/514-h/514-h.htm>. Accessed 7 December 2019.

<sup>16</sup> Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, *Fantasia in C Minor* (Vienna: Artaria, 1785). IMSLP, <https://imslp.org/wiki/Special:ImagefromIndex/294002/vry>. Accessed 7 December 2019.

## Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

centrality of this tonal premise to the music's structural and semantic content. Mozart's refusal to put 'C Minor' in the title of his fantasia may be a deliberate act of cleverness, a move away from tonality and an allegiance to modal thinking, or a sensitive understanding of his public's awareness of key names and characteristics.<sup>17</sup>

This discrepancy notwithstanding (is it in C minor or not?), it is clear that C minor is everywhere in and around the fantasia with the chromaticism of the first two pages eventually resolved only near the close of the piece at bar 167, where a *cadenza lunga* resolves the note A flat in an expressive cadence, the schema for which is 1-6-4-5-1.<sup>18</sup>

Example 1: Recapitulation, bars 167-8.

A glance backwards at the opening page of the work reveals more about this A flat; Mozart starts by providing a descending bass from C, but abandons it once he reaches A flat in bar 5 (see example 2). Instead, the stalled A flat causes us to question the actual directionality of the bass progressions and leads us into Neapolitan territory (N6). Bars 6-7 contain a cadential 6/4 that hints at a dichotomy between A flat and D flat; in this tonally ambiguous landscape, their individual functions are less important

---

<sup>17</sup> For more on this idea see Rita Steblin, *A History of Key Characteristics in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries* (Ann Arbor: University of Rochester Press, 2005).

<sup>18</sup> The examples given follow Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, *Fantasia in C Minor*, Neue Mozart-Ausgabe (Leipzig: C. F. Peters, 1938), a copy of which is available online at IMSLP, <https://imslp.org/wiki/Special:ImagefromIndex/70217/vry>. Accessed 7 December 2019.

than their combined efforts to destabilize the C-minor descent. At this point, the only thing we know for sure is that Mozart's chromatic descent remains fixated on A flat, suggesting various harmonic functions in a range of tonal contexts. Lastly, no mention of this A flat can ignore the note G, that is neighbouring the flattened sixth as a lower complete neighbour note. Without delving into too much detail, there is some mileage in an analysis that proposes an overall Fantasia composed on an Augmented Sixth progression (*on* C minor rather than *in* C minor), which in turn allows for a sonata form to emerge via the G as a lower neighbour note that is composed out in the various sections. This then becomes the G-minor *Più Allegro* at bar 125.

Example 2: Introduction, bars 1–8.

The musical score for Example 2, Introduction, bars 1–8, is presented in common time. The piece is marked *Adagio*. The notation shows a descending chromatic line in the bass, starting from C and moving towards A-flat. The score includes several annotations: "Italian sixth" above the first measure, "high 6 drop" above the second measure, and "quiescenza-like idea around G" above the third measure. The first measure is marked "no key signature". The descending line is labeled "descending lament from C". The score is divided into three systems. The first system (bars 1-3) includes dynamics *f* and *p*. The second system (bars 4-6) includes dynamics *pp*, *f*, and *p*, and is annotated with "stalled Ab" and "(legato) Ab7 (V7)". The third system (bars 7-8) includes dynamics *f* and *p*, and is annotated with "D $\flat$  I6/4" and "fragment 'a'".

Comparing the material of this opening with the recapitulation in bar 161, it is worth pointing out that in the recapitulation the chromatic descent seen in the bass (example 2, above) takes a few short cuts to arrive at the note A flat, which eventually

meets its note of resolution, the neighbouring (G) in the C-minor chord of bar 167. However, this ending, shown in example 3, projects no sense of finality, because the post-cadential bars emphasize both uncertainty and backwardness. Mozart uses a repeated *passo indietro* (bars 171–3) and two deceptive cadences (bars 174–5) to unsettle the standard framework.<sup>19</sup> Translated as ‘a step backwards’, this 4–3 removes the F sharp from the introduction by providing a greater sense of conventional minor-mode sadness via the appearance of E flat (the third of C minor, therefore the most important note). The *passo indietro* also serves a cadential function, because it is located within a C-minor context and occurs within a recapitulation of opening materials. Also, we can see that despite deceiving the ear it displays no ambiguity about what it actually is as a schema or harmonic framework. Three right hand ascending melodic minor scales form a decorative parody of the *Cudworth* flourish found at the end of closed-forms.<sup>20</sup> This can be seen as a type of reverse *Cudworth*, even though it lacks the 5–1 bass motion that usually underpins the schema, as outlined by Gjerdingen. Because schemata are as much about how they are perceived consciously by the performer and received by the listener or analyst, the reverse *Cudworth* allows the music to end in an old-fashioned way, by repetition of passagework that confirms once and for all C minor as the tonal centre (example 3).

Now that we know how the piece ends, it is time to review Mozart's tonal strategies and formal procedures without worrying about their ambiguities and instabilities. In the process we can observe Gjerdingen's theory (and the legacy it consolidates) as being of special significance to Mozart's understanding of the fantasia, both this specific work but also the late eighteenth-century form more generally.

---

<sup>19</sup> See Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style*, 139–76. In his study of galant cadences or clausulae, Gjerdingen explains that the *passo indietro* is a type of close characteristic of an alto voice. It contains the bass descent 4–3 and as its name suggests, it implies a step to the rear. In this respect, it is the opposite of the usual goal directed upward thrust in a conventional cadential bar, which contains a 3–4–5–1 motion. A *deceptive cadence*, now known as the interrupted cadence, contains a bass movement from 5–6 that avoids cadential closure before eventually leading to a complete 5–1 perfect authentic cadence.

<sup>20</sup> The *Cudworth* is a variant of the standard 5–1 cadence. It comprises an octave descent in the treble, against a standard 3–4–5–1 bass.

Example 3: Recapitulation, bars 171–6.

171

4 *passo indietro*

172

*f p f p f*

3 4 *passo indietro* 3

173

*p*

*cresc.*

5  $\flat 6$  *deceptive!*

*f p*

*p* 5  $\flat 6$  *deceptive!*

175

*f p*

*f* *reverse Cudworth*

C minor



### An analysis of K. 475

The opening of the Fantasia spells an Italian sixth in C minor and this is followed by a *Jommelli comma* and a 2–1 tenor close (augmented sixth variant).<sup>21</sup> In addition, bar 2 also resembles a *quiescenza* schema in G, though its function at this early stage in the music is still unclear.<sup>22</sup> The Italian sixth (made up of the flattened sixth and raised fourth) doubles up as a basic idea, a musical idea in the Schoenbergian sense and a formal template for the entire fantasia.

Example 4: Introduction, bars 1–2.

The musical score for the introduction of Mozart's Fantasia K.475, bars 1–2, is presented in common time (C). The piece begins with a descending chromatic line in the bass, labeled "descending lament from C". The treble line starts with a forte (*f*) dynamic, followed by a piano (*p*) dynamic, and then a pianissimo (*pp*) dynamic. The score includes several annotations: "Adagio" at the beginning, "high 6 drop" above the treble line in bar 2, "Jommelli" below the bass line in bar 2, and "aug 6th" below the bass line in bar 2. The score also features various interval markings such as  $\flat 6$ , 1, 7,  $\flat 6$ , 5, 7, 1, 7, 1, and  $\flat 2$ , 1.

A second chromatic descent from B at bar 10 to F sharp in bar 16 can be interpreted as a completed lament that eventually terminates with a Phrygian half cadence in B minor. To bring us safely into the tonal realm of B minor, Mozart employs numerous smaller schema. For example, bar 21 contains another augmented sixth close variant, while the Phrygian cadence that brings the introduction to a close contains the usual  $\sharp 4$ –5 converging pattern (example 5).

<sup>21</sup> The *comma* is a close characteristic of a soprano and features 7–1 in the bass, accompanied by either 5–4–3 or 4–3 in the treble. It is weakly articulated and can occur on its own or as part of a larger schema. The *Jommelli* variant contains 6–5 in the treble against 7–1 in the bass.

<sup>22</sup> The *quiescenza* (translated as 'state of repose' from the original Italian) usually follows a cadence and occurs over a tonic pedal. The chromatic *quiescenza* contains a melody featuring  $\flat 7$ –6–7–1, that is usually (but not always) found in double presentation.

Example 5: End of introduction, bars 19–25.

19

20

21

22

25

*f* *p* *f* *p*

*cresc*

#4 in B minor imitative counterpoint

augmented sixth (2-1 clausula) E#

5 Sarabande cell 2 3

7 *fp* 7 5 5

*f* *p* #4 converging 5 *calando* 5 5

1

repeated F#

D...

HC/B min

## Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

Playing through the first two pages, one might say this fantasia projects a certain haunted quality in that the pianist is confronted by motivic fragments that are neither properly developed nor fully abandoned. At the same time, Mozart presents two rhythmic ideas that dominate over a fluctuating harmonic framework, namely an Alberti bass from bar 6 and a repeated figuration in the right hand from bar 10 that eventually leads us to the terminal note F sharp.

Example 6: Introduction, two rhythmic ideas, bars 7–10.

The musical score for Example 6 consists of two systems of music. The first system (bars 7-8) is in C minor, 16/4 time. The treble clef part has a melodic line with a dotted quarter note, a quarter note, and a half note. The bass clef part has an Alberti bass. The second system (bars 9-10) continues the melodic line and introduces a new rhythmic idea in the right hand. Annotations include 'Db 16/4', 'f', 'p', 'fragment 'a'', and 'descending lament from B'.

The second figure continues into the next tonal region of G major where it is abandoned in favour of a bit of imitative counterpoint (bars 21–2). Echoes of this idea are only heard once again in the repeated F sharp at bar 25, a note first heard in bar 1 where it was a jagged tritone, out-of-place in the C-minor tonality. At bar 25 this note has a dual identity and purpose. First, as dominant of B minor, F sharp is now functionally important in bringing the wandering chromaticism of the introduction to a temporary halt. In the three repetitions that follow, this note undergoes a quick dress and key change, and emerges in all its naturalness within the *pastorella* schema as a musical embodiment of untutored simplicity and sensibility.

This time it is Mozart who sheds light on the idea of ‘songfulness’ when he writes:

The human voice vibrates naturally—but in such a way—to such a degree that it all sounds beautiful—it is the nature of the voice...but as soon as you go beyond the natural limits, it no longer sounds beautiful—because it is contrary to nature.<sup>23</sup>

This brings us to a tonally stable episode in D major (bars 26–35). Mozart reintroduces F sharp, a note that forms the basis of his folk/love song. Inspired by the lower registers of an untrained female voice rather than operatic artificiality, Mozart's songfulness is characterized by quirky accents and a pull towards the sub-dominant. The earthy appeal of this raga-like tune is conveyed through a lightly elaborated *pastorella* schema, containing a melodic pattern 3–2–4–3 that gently oscillates around the tones of the tonic triad.<sup>24</sup> The simplicity of the *pastorella* gives way to the ensuing sensibility of the *ponte* (bridge).<sup>25</sup> Despite its brevity, the *ponte* contains a paired chromatic *sol-fa-mi* (extended to *re*), which conveys musical sensibility that is characterized by 'elegant details rather than through sheer speed, range or loudness'.<sup>26</sup> Even though Mozart's splintered use of this schema actually emphasizes a paired *fa-mi-re* melody in the *ponte* proper (bars 30–35), eighteenth-century contexts relate the chromatic *sol-fa-mi* to music of an affectionate or loving character, and here the fantasia proves to be no exception. The absence of a tempo indication above this section hints at the *pastorella's* freer temporality.

---

<sup>23</sup> Robert Spaethling, *Mozart's Letters, Mozart's Life* (London: Faber, 2000), 157.

<sup>24</sup> The *pastorella's* name implies that the character of the tones evokes scenes of domesticity and rustic simplicity of tune.

<sup>25</sup> The *ponte* functions as a bridge that links two keys—the first before the double bar, and the second during or after the *ponte*. It usually emphasizes the tones of the dominant (5, 2, 7). By either tying or joining two ideas, sections, or functions together, while also presenting new material, the *ponte* should be composed and heard as tonally fixed or unmoving.

<sup>26</sup> See Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style*, 258. The *sol-fa-mi* is a four-stage schema that usually occurs in a paired version (treble: 5–4–4–3). The chromatic *sol-fa-mi* is altered to contain 5–#4–4–3 in the treble, though it can extend beyond to b3–2. This schema was used to portray the heightened expressivity and musical sensibility integral to eighteenth-century thought.

Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

Example 7: D-major song, *pastorella*, *ponte* and chromatic *sol-fa-mi*, bars 26–35.

no tempo Pastorella  
26 3 2 4 3 3

D major simplicity  
1 tonic + subdominant flavour I6/3 ii6 5 V6/4 5/3

28

29 1. Cudworth 2. Ponte  
p 3 3 sensitivity

30 I:PAC 31  
paired chromatic sol-fa-mi extended to re  
V6/5 I V

32 Pastorella  
3 deceptive

34 1.  
5 #5 6  
complete cadence follows

35b

The image shows a musical score for piano, measures 35b and 36. The score is in D major and 4/4 time. Measure 35b is a first ending marked '2.' with a 'cresc.' marking. Measure 36 begins with a 'p' marking. The bass line features descending thirds and double octaves.

The songfulness of the D-major episode is interrupted by the *Allegro* that follows (bar 36 onwards). Underpinning this passage are large and small scale *fontes*, double octaves and *Cudworth* thirds.<sup>27</sup> The *fonte* features two descending events, one minor and one major. In each event, the leading note appears in the bass and moves to the tonic (7–1). The melody matches this bass prototype with a 4–3 descent. The *Hermaphrodite Fonte* features two minor-mode *fontes* (as in this case: B–A followed by A–G). The tonally unstable opening section from bar 37 resembles a sonata exposition and contains a model sequence, which is eventually followed by a subordinate theme in F at bar 56. Cliff Eisen and Christopher Wintle have described this new topic and its *opera seria* turbulence as ‘astonishing’, but I must admit, I find it musically suspect.<sup>28</sup> From a technical point of view, the descending thirds in bars 41 and 50 are expectedly awkward, and the textbook *fontes* appear to serve no real purpose. It takes performer’s intuition, analytical introspection and a comment by the composer to lead me to conclude that this music can be playfully reinterpreted as a brief attack on Muzio Clementi ‘whose best passages are thirds but who doesn’t have a penny’s worth of taste or feeling’.<sup>29</sup>

As quickly as it began, Mozart abandons this violent passagework, a nice example of the ‘Storm and Stress’ being parodied, and instead rescues the subordinate theme from the clutches of his *bête noire*. In bar 56, the tonal region has settled on F, and the music gains a sense of urgency through the use of a modal mixture; an A-flat seventh chord provides a pivot to D flat in a quick flashback to the Neapolitan role-play of bars

<sup>27</sup> The *fonte* translates as ‘down a well’ in Italian. See Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style*, 61–4.

<sup>28</sup> Cliff Eisen and Christopher Wintle, ‘Mozart’s C Minor Fantasy, K.475: An Editorial “Problem” and its Analytical and Critical Consequences’, *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, 124/1 (1999) 26–52.

<sup>29</sup> Spaethling, *Mozart’s Letters, Mozart’s Life*, 301. Mozart does use high speed double thirds very sparingly in the first movement of his Sonata in F Major K.332.

## Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

6 and 7. The music keeps rising until it reaches its highest point F in bar 68, through the use of a *do-re-mi* schema in bars 66–8.<sup>30</sup> Unlike F sharp in the preceding love-song, which combined with its neighbouring notes to portray *Empfindsamkeit*, (a weeping, emotional character or personality), the soprano's arrival on high F in bar 68 triggers a series of events that typify a state of *Schwärmerei*.<sup>31</sup> This bipolarity is very exciting to interpret for the pianist who has to project instability, enthusiasm, and emotional excess in only a few short moments. In an attempt to restore balance, Mozart tries a reverse idea: a descent from B to F sharp but an F sharp landing is ultimately abandoned for F natural, a note that reveals itself to be the dominant seventh for the B-flat-major episode that follows. This semitone switch is crucial to a conceptualization of Mozart's fantasia; F sharp represents the sharp side, F represents the flat side, and by casting both notes in tonally stable episodes (D major and B-flat major), the composer allows for a performative reimagining of these rival narratives.

---

<sup>30</sup> The *do-re-mi* was once a favoured opening gambit in galant music. It features a rising 1–2–3 in the soprano over a 1–7–1 in the bass.

<sup>31</sup> In a chapter of his PhD dissertation, Thomas Irvine translates the term *Schwärmerei* to mean 'socially destabilising feeling' (144) and distinguishes it from the socially acceptable *Empfindsamkeit*. Irvine explores the ways in which Mozart negotiates between these states of being in the Fantasia K.475, before relating his critical observations to historical and literary contexts surrounding the work's reception. See Thomas A. Irvine, 'Utopia Performed: Mozart's Fantasy K.475' in *Echoes of Expression: Text, Performance and History in Mozart's Viennese Instrumental Music* (PhD dissertation, Cornell University, 2005) 143–82. Annette Richards also refers to the term *Schwärmereyen* translated as 'ecstatic visions', though here it is employed in a derogatory sense by Johann Nikolaus Forkel to describe instrumental music that sacrifices conventionality and coherence for the sake of empty fantastical effects. See Richards, *The Free Fantasia and the Musical Picturesque*, 37.

Example 8: *Allegro*, bars 36–82.

sonata exposition/ Clementi-esque parody

36 *Allegro* *f*

40 *fonte* *A minor* *f* *fonte* *p* *N6 (A minor)*

44 *f*

49 *Cudworth and added thirds* *hermaphrodite fonte* *G minor* *N6 (G minor)*

53 *monte-like ascent* *subordinate theme (schwärmerei)* *f* *p* *p* *2 1 clausula vera G minor* *4 3 passo indietro F* *2 1 C [V/F]* *(simile)* *5 6*

59 *high 6 drop* *mode switch* *b6*



# Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

63 high 6 drop

67 re mi 3 (highest point F) Ab7 (pivot) Db

71 descent begins

74 enharmonic alteration arrival on F# - chromatic descent continues

77 F#-B chromatic descent terminates

80 sped-up descent to F# (whole tone) cadenza from F etc...

The score consists of six systems of piano music, each with a treble and bass clef staff. Measure numbers 63, 67, 71, 74, 77, and 80 are placed at the beginning of their respective systems. Annotations are placed above or below the staves to describe musical features. Fingerings (1-3) and accents are indicated. A 'high 6 drop' is noted at measure 63. A 'descent begins' is marked at measure 67. An 'enharmonic alteration' is noted at measure 71. A 'cadenza from F' is indicated at measure 80. The piece concludes with 'etc...'.

Despite their similarities (rounded binary forms, light ornamentation, musical *Empfindsamkeit*), Mozart's slow sections differ on multiple levels. The D-major episode at bar 26 lacks both a tempo marking and notated key signature and its *ponte* is ultimately subservient to the opening *pastorella* idea. The B-flat *Andantino* which commences at bar 85, on the other hand, is the only episode with a notated key signature, and its *ponte* shares equal billing with the opening's Sarabande topic. When it comes to large-scale function, both sections are completely different. The D-major song expresses both *pastorella* and *indugio* properties.<sup>32</sup> In the larger context of the fantasia, this episode therefore combines both tonic and pre-dominant functions through its intermingling schemata. The B-flat *Andantino* meanwhile functions mainly as a large-scale *ponte*, owing to its static internal *ponte* that remains fixed on the dominant F. From a performer's perspective, the Sarabande opening presents some potential for ornamental improvisation due to its reminiscence of the freer, declamatory pianism of C. P. E. Bach. In other words, I read the *Andantino* as a type of concealed artifice that acknowledges the influence of both C. P. E. and J. S. Bach. For example, proving that motives are as important as form and formal syntax, bar 22 contains a fragment from the *Andantino* within the local B-minor context. This motivic trace occurs after a bar of imitative counterpoint beginning on an enharmonically altered E sharp (F). In bar 22, E sharp switches to the alto voice and attaches itself to F sharp, before transferring into the bass voice where it attaches itself to an F sharp once more (example 9).

By providing us with an example of concealed artifice early in the composition, Mozart allows for the eventual enactment of a backward-looking consciousness that begins by acknowledging the influence of J. S. Bach. Within the *Andantino*, however, we find evidence of *Empfindsamkeit* more closely associated with C. P. E. Bach. Therefore, even though Mozart's Sarabande opening recalls J. S. Bach, it is the younger Bach who influences this section's overall *ponte* function; its open-endedness and immobility are typified by the chromatic double thirds and sixths, repeated dominant pedals and two concealed F sharps in bars 91 and 99. By bar 117, Mozart leaves little doubt as to the validity of the *Andantino's* multiple bridging functions. The deceptive cadence reintroduces F sharp in the lowest register, and after a halting chromatic ascent in darkness, the note returns in its natural register where it fuels the final instalment of Mozart's G-minor fantasia.

---

<sup>32</sup> The *indugio* is characterized by rhythmic emphasis on 2, 4 and 6, though without the support of a converging half cadence that is more typical of this schema.

# Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

Example 9: Introduction, imitative counterpoint, sarabande traces, bars 21–3.

19

20

21

22

25

*f* *p* *f* *p*

*cresc*

#4 in B minor imitative counterpoint

augmented sixth (2-1 clausula) E#

5 Sarabande cell 2 3

7 *fp* *f* *p* #4 converging 5 5 5

*calando*

repeated F#

D...

5 HC/B min

Example 10: *Andantino* as *ponte*, from B-flat major to G minor, bars 86–124.

[A] *Andantino*

86 (1) (2) (3) 6 high 6 drop 1 7

notated key-signature *f* passing 1 6/4 V 6/4 5/3

91 #5 6 *f*

96 *p* #5 6

100 Ponte (+ Clementi thirds) 5 #4 4 3 b3 2

104 [A'] *p* 16/4

The musical score is presented in two systems. The first system (bars 86-91) features a treble and bass staff. The treble staff has a key signature of two flats (B-flat major) and a 3/4 time signature. It includes first, second, and third endings, a 'high 6 drop' annotation, and a 'passing' chord sequence (1 6/4 V 6/4 5/3). Dynamics include *f* and 'notated key-signature'. The second system (bars 91-96) continues the treble and bass staves, with a dynamic of *f* and a key signature change to one flat (G minor) indicated by a sharp sign above the fifth line. The third system (bars 96-100) shows the bass staff with a dynamic of *p* and a key signature change to two flats (B-flat major) indicated by a sharp sign above the fifth line. The fourth system (bars 100-104) features a bass staff with a dynamic of *p* and a key signature change to one flat (G minor) indicated by a sharp sign above the fifth line. It includes a 'Ponte (+ Clementi thirds)' annotation and a '16/4' time signature change.

# Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

108

sol 5 fa #4 fa b4

2 1 Ponte

16/4 16/4 V 7 I

111

#4 4 3 b3 2 end of Ponte

fragmented [A] reprise (bridging function)  
an octave lower

114

4 3 see b.91

#5 6 Bb I V7/4/2

119

I6 B dim C min i V7/4/2

122

D min i V 7/4/2 i6 mode switch 17 or V7/G minor

Unlike the *Allegro* with its two-tier *fontes* and clunky double thirds, Mozart's *Più Allegro* (bar 125 onwards) requires both razor-sharp technique and a strong sense of direction. The underlying materials are once again simple: a circle of fifths sequence with alternating major and minor tonalities that first push the music to D-flat major in bar 130.

The passagework rages on through a process of intensification caused by rising *montes* until a semi-climactic arrival at G flat (bar 135) leads to a converging cadence and final release in bar 136.<sup>33</sup> In this heady sub-dominant plane, D flat and A flat reprise their earlier roles as intertwined tonalities in a new cadential 6/4 context. D flat appears to dominate for the first half of bar 136, before finding its ultimate resting place in A flat, where it lingers for a few more bars.

---

<sup>33</sup> The *monte* (It. up a mountain) features a 7-1 bass pattern against a 4-3 soprano, which moves up a step. The version used by Mozart is the *monte principale*, in which the bass rises a fourth and falls a third. See Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style*, 89–98.

Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

Example 11: *Più Allegro*, G minor to D flat, bars 125–32.

*Più Allegro*

125 *f*  
G minor  
circle of fifths begins

127

129

131 *D♭ arrival*  
3 monte principale 3 3

132 monte principale  
3 3

Example 12: *Più Allegro*, climactic segment and A-flat *quiescenza*, bars 131–9.

131

Db arrival

monte principale

132

monte principale

133

monte principale

134

Db dominates

resolves to Ab

Gb release

7

136

IV6/4

5/3 from Ab perspective

Ab as final tonic

138

quiescenza (repose)



## Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

In describing the measured ebb-and-flow of the A-flat arpeggiations (bars 138–139) with the scales of the F7 *cadenza* (bars 82–5), we might conclude that A flat is part of a *quiescenza* schema. From a theoretical point of view, Robert Gjerdingen sheds light on the difference between *cadenza* and *quiescenza* in a way that validates some of my musical responses when he writes:

Just as a *cadenza* exploits a pause within an important cadence to show off the performer's taste, invention, and virtuosity, bringing the forward progress of a movement temporarily to a halt as a result, so a *Quiescenza* exploits a moment of quiescence *following* an important cadence, likewise holding back the further progress of the movement or delaying its ultimate close.<sup>34</sup>

Post-cadential repose aside, there is another older usage for the *quiescenza* schema, which 'frequently called for an opening passage that would, like an expanded cadence, move toward the subdominant ("the fourth of the key") and then toward the dominant before returning to the tonic'.<sup>35</sup> Under this new function, the chromatic *quiescenza* featured an expansion on  $\flat 7-6-7-1$  and is deployed to extemporize a fantasia, as noted by C. P. E. Bach in his keyboard treatise on piano playing.<sup>36</sup> Applying this mode of thinking to Mozart's fantasia forms leads me to speculate that F sharp (later G flat)–F–G–A flat combine to form a large-scale *quiescenza* schema in A flat, with each note generating materials for the inner episodes as demonstrated in Table 1.

There is some historical verifiability in this interpretation; Mozart's sonata K.457/ii contains a secondary episode in A-flat major that closely resembles the two slow sections of the Fantasia. Autographical evidence suggests that Mozart composed the sonata's slow movement first, as a teaching piece for Thérèse von Trattner, which goes some way towards legitimising the double-tonic complex suggested above.<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style*, 183.

<sup>35</sup> Gjerdingen, 182.

<sup>36</sup> Gjerdingen, 183.

<sup>37</sup> Eugene K. Wolf, 'The Rediscovered Autograph of Mozart's Fantasy and Sonata in C Minor, K.475/457', *The Journal of Musicology*, 10/1 (1992), 3-47: 22. For more information on the double-tonic complex, see Robert Bailey, 'An Analytical Study of the Sketches and Drafts', in Robert Bailey (ed.), *Wagner: Prelude and Transfiguration from Tristan and Isolde*, Norton Critical Scores (New York: Norton, 1985), 113–46.

Table 1. Overall fantasia *quiescenza* on A flat (♭ 7–6–7–1).

NOTE	GLOBAL FUNCTION	LOCATION	BARS	SCHEMA	LOCAL FUNCTION	
F sharp (♭7)	Tonic/ Subdominant/ Tritone	Introduction	1	It. Sixth	5 (B minor)	
			2	<i>Quiescenza</i> (G min)		
		Untitled Song	21	Aug. Sixth		3 (D major)
			22	Phrygian H.C.		
			26–29	<i>Pastorella + Indugio</i> <i>Ponte</i>		
30–5	(Chromatic <i>Sol-Fa-Mi</i> )					
F (6)	<i>Ponte</i>	<i>Allegro</i> Exposition	36	Fonte	1 (F major)	
			58–9	High 6 Drop	3 (D flat)	
		Sub. Theme <i>Schwarmerei</i>	66–8	<i>Do-Re-Mi</i>	5 (B flat)	
			83–5	<i>Cadenza</i>		
		Standing on F <i>Andantino</i>	87–9	Paired Upper Thirds ( <i>Do-Re-Mi</i> )		
G flat (♭7)	Pre-Dominant V of v	Fragments	124		3 (D major) 7 (G minor)	
G (7)	Leading Note	<i>Più Allegro</i>	125	Circle of Fifths <i>Monte Principale</i>	1 (G min)	
			135	Converging Cadence	7 (A flat)	
A flat (1)	Tonic	<i>Quiescenza</i>	136–40	<i>Cadenza</i>	1 (A flat)	
			141–60	Retransition 2-1 Clausula Vera		

## Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

Example 13: Mozart, Sonata in C Minor K.457, movement 2, A-flat episode<sup>38</sup>.

The musical score is presented in three systems, each with a piano (right) and bass (left) staff. The key signature is C minor (three flats) and the time signature is 3/4. Measure numbers 22, 24, and 26 are indicated at the beginning of each system. Dynamics include *f* (forte), *p* (piano), and *cresc.* (crescendo). The score features complex rhythmic patterns, including sixteenth-note runs and slurs.

Viewed from an alternate A-flat-major perspective, the outer *Adagios* are merely artificial constructions that impose shackles of structural coherence and tonal unity on the music's fantasia forms and formal procedures. Observing the Fantasia on its own terms therefore leads me to conclude that its posthumous C-minor title can be both misleading and restrictive. There is also a reading that questions C minor's overarching presence, with some eclectic consequences for performance. Observe the

---

<sup>38</sup> The example follows Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, *Sonata in C Minor, K.457*, Neue Mozart-Ausgabe (Kassel: Bärenreiter-Verlag, 1986) a copy of which is available at IMSLP, <https://imslp.org/wiki/Special:ImagefromIndex/456598/vry>. Accessed 12 December 2019.

*quiescenza*-like schema found in bar 2, discussed earlier. This schemata pairing is based on a fleeting G tonal orbit.

Example 14: Introduction, bars 1–2, touching on G, bar 2.

Given the centrality of both F sharp and the stalled A flat (bar 5) to the fantasia’s overall design, a G-minor reconceptualization is possible in theory. The harmonic scaffolding for the F-sharp and A-flat skeleton is provided by D major (sub-dominant simplicity) and D-flat major (tritonal *Schwärmerei*) on either side of G. D flat and D are themselves connected by the Neapolitan A flat (5 of D flat and #4 of D), which comes into its own in Mozart’s *Più Allegro* climax.

In the post-climactic segment (bar 141) which reuses material from the *Schwärmerei* *cadenza*, the arrival leads to G minor in bar 149. The new destination is consolidated by another *quiescenza*-type repose complete with the usual rising arpeggiations. What follows is truly remarkable; the A flat–G pairing begins a steady registral ascent until it is heard as an altered *clausula vera* in the left hand (bar 158). Translated as ‘true close’, this tweaked tenor cadence reverses the augmented sixth paradox of bar 2 and continues its single-voiced, single-handed ascent, undeterred by the repetitive thirds and sixths of the right hand. One could argue this confirms the work as a fantasia and not a sonata, because it consolidates the writing of an open form that emerges victorious over the actual ending a page later.

# Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

Example 15: Fantasia dissolution, bars 140–61.

140 (decresc.) schwärmerei cadenza (p) (f)

143

147 Fenaroli bass 7 1 2 3 G minor 4 3 2 1 repose

151 G7 prinner 'x'

155 'x' b2 'x' 1 b2 'x' 1

160 Tempo I f p

b2 'x' 1

Throughout these concluding bars, Mozart uses diminished sevenths, dominant sevenths, Italian sixths and Neapolitans to depict the awakening of pleasurable and painful sentiments as outlined in Annette Richards's contextual framework. In her own study of the genre, Richards dismisses eighteenth-century ideas of private fantasia performance as a 'disturbing manifestation of a popular cult', and in subsequent pages, I quietly refute this claim through various modes of musical close-reading.<sup>39</sup> However, to dwell a moment on Mozart's sensibility, one can say that, unlike the fantasias and sonatas of C. P. E. Bach or Beethoven, K.475 is not characterized by a C-minor pathos; rather, its 'tearful, trembling fragility' is quietly compensated by a non-conformist, everyday pianism that finds full expression in the composer's G-minor mood, hovering always to usurp the home key.<sup>40</sup>

### Depth and desire: Schenkerian analysis and K.475

Knowledge, like food, must be taken within limits. You must only know as much as you need, and not more. All of the thousands of human beings you have encountered since leaving the shelter suffer from minds overburdened with knowledge, facts and information—fetters and shackles for the rising soul.<sup>41</sup>

I recall Narayan's words at this juncture for two reasons: first, because they evoke the 'rising soul' metaphor that cropped up in earlier contextual frameworks surrounding the late eighteenth-century fantasia style, and second, because they critique the epistemological fallacy that equates knowledge acquisition with understanding, a point that is especially pertinent to any theorization of Mozart's Fantasia. As we have seen thus far, adopting a less-is-more approach to theoretical knowledge (schemata) brings the theory to life and allows for its seamless integration into analytical and performative thought processes. Extending this way of thinking into the domain of Schenkerian analysis is far from straightforward, for the following reasons. The most basic reservation is summed up in a memorable phrase by Robert Gjerdingen, who equates a Schenkerian application to eighteenth-century music, with 'firing heavy artillery at a galant butterfly'.<sup>42</sup> Inhabiting Schenker's world means listening out for end-directedness, privileging a hierarchical way of listening to, analysing, and peeling away the music's surface to reveal long-range structures underneath that may or may not be audible to the analyst. As with any method of analysis, there are advantages

---

<sup>39</sup> Richards, *The Free Fantasia and the Musical Picturesque*, 148.

<sup>40</sup> Head, 'Fantasia and Sensibility', 264.

<sup>41</sup> R. K. Narayan, *A Tiger for Malgudi* (New Delhi: Allied Publishers, 1983), 161.

<sup>42</sup> Gjerdingen, *Music in the Galant Style*, 34.

## Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

and disadvantages to thinking about music in this way, but I am broadly sympathetic to Robert Fink's observation that Schenker's method appears distrustful of the musical surface.<sup>43</sup> There are four possible solutions to combat the more troubling aspects of Schenkerian thought, that involve a rethinking (pace Robert Fink) of the surface/depth metaphor. First, it is necessary to disentangle Schenker's analytical method from his larger-than-life persona and the thorny ideological and philosophical underpinnings of his work. Secondly, we need a freer, more performative usage of the stem-and-slur graphology. Next, Anglicizing Schenker's vocabulary, and replacing it where possible with generic tonal theoretical terminology is an absolute must if our Schenkerian reading of Mozart's Fantasia is to make any sense beyond a purely academic context. Finally, relocating the analysis to the piano allows us to reconcile the opposition between structural depth and surface desire in a way that emphasizes the performative origins of Schenker's analytical method.

It is worth dwelling a moment on this last point: pianists choosing to prepare a Schenkerian reading of Mozart's Fantasia must keep in mind that Schenker's best theories originated in tandem with his ideas of analytical listening, seen in his jobs as a pianist, piano teacher, and composer. As Irene Shreier Scott reminds us:

It is known that his [Schenker's] own students were for the greater part taught at the piano, and anyone who has overheard a Schenker student in the process of analysing a piece of music—probing, playing a segment of a phrase over and over again, emphasizing first one, then another note or group of notes—is aware that the actual sound of the music and its appropriate expression are essential to Schenker's approach to music.<sup>44</sup>

William Rothstein makes the same point when he reminds us that Schenker 'saw his mission as the reuniting of theory and practice' and 'often used the lowly piano lesson as the vehicle for his theoretical teaching'.<sup>45</sup> Equally important is the fact that Schenker considered his method of analysis to be composition in reverse, a *generative* rather than reductive way of conceptualising tonal music. Schenkerian graphology that is rooted in a systematic stripping away of surface diminutions sometimes obscures this basic fact. A Schenkerian graph may help pictorialize an analysis, it may

---

<sup>43</sup> Robert Fink, 'Going Flat: Post-Hierarchical Music Theory and the Musical Surface' in Nicholas Cook and Mark Everist (eds), *Rethinking Music* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press), 102–37.

<sup>44</sup> Irene Shreier Scott, 'Translator's Introduction' in Heribert Esser (ed.), Irene Schreier Scott (trans.) Heinrich Schenker, *The Art of Performance* (New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), vii–xi.

<sup>45</sup> William Rothstein, 'Heinrich Schenker as an Interpreter of Beethoven's Piano Sonatas', *Nineteenth-Century Music*, 8/1 (1984), 3–28: 21.

uncover a long-range motivic connection that might not be immediately visible or audible and it might even reveal startling similarities across entire movements and bodies of music. However, when it comes to analytical representation, a Schenkerian graph does not necessarily speak a thousand words. This might explain why Schenker's writings occupy such prominence alongside his graphic analyses. Constructing a Schenkerian reading at the piano means preserving the best and most basic aspects of Schenker's thought, without any of the theoretical excess that typifies a graph-only approach. As an added bonus, a voice-leading analysis conceived of at the piano automatically retains a sensitivity to music's acoustical, physical, and temporal qualities, all of which are especially important to this study of the Fantasia. Interestingly, for Schenker, the physicality of piano-playing and the intellectuality of graphic analysis must cooperate, since he is quoted as saying that 'fingering also must be honest; the hand—like the mouth—must speak the truth; it must correspond to the voice-leading'.<sup>46</sup> But there is no reason why such mutual cooperation between body and mind cannot be reversed, by considering the ways in which a voice-leading graph might occasionally take into account or even reflect on paper a particular fingering or articulation.

Assessing Mozart's fantasia for potential motivic connections that exist both within and below the music's surface, we were able to map a tension trajectory for the fantasia that begins a climb from C minor, to D major, E minor, F major before arriving on G minor via a leisurely detour through B-flat major. Mozart's final destination is A-flat major, where the music lingers in a repose of sorts. It is possible to construct an analysis with just this kind of tension roadmap, crucial to which is the arrival on G, the ascent to A flat, and a return to G. This is a classic 'motive' in a Schenkerian sense. The piece begins with a chromatic descent from C down to A flat. The music stalls on the A flat, which can be identified as an upper neighbour note on the largest scale (background level) that needs to eventually resolve down to G. In this case, Mozart's Fantasia offers a beautiful example of a background motive working in tandem with developmental tension. The entire piece culminates with an ascent from G (minor) to its Neapolitan neighbour A flat (major), which is reached in the climactic bars of the *Più Allegro*. As already observed, Mozart's ending allows the A-flat neighbour note to resolve down to G, via a modified *cadenza lunga* (long cadence) in bars 167–8.

Thinking about this long-range motivic connection (and its harmonic implications) allows for the embodiment of a particular performative identity that acknowledges

---

<sup>46</sup> Schenker, *The Art of Performance*, 34.



## Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

this unique tension trajectory at work in the fantasia. Schenker elaborates on this very point when he states:

One thing is essential: in a given piece, the tension must be maintained throughout. This must not result in using meter mechanically to ensure the flow of the music; the means that keep the piece in motion are of an inner nature, nor of a superficially metric one. The impulse must renew itself continually from within.<sup>47</sup>

At a basic level, this background motive (in a Schenkerian sense) is also at work in the music's middle ground and foreground. Such motivic parallelism is fascinating on multiple levels. Rather than highlight differences between various levels of musical structure, Mozart's motivic parallelism effectively erases the boundaries between background and surface. The G–A flat neighbour note pairing is found in virtually every section of the fantasia, where it is seen to emphasize, embellish, and elaborate the other musical ideas that accompany it. Proving that surface impressions *do* count, Mozart's two-note motive occurs in the work's foreground first, in the left hand in bar 2. This fleeting idea provides a riposte for the descending lament of the first bar, and is impossible to ignore. The following examples provide a pictorial representation of the A flat–G motive as it occurs within different structural levels in Mozart's Fantasia.

---

<sup>47</sup> Heinrich Schenker, *The Art of Performance*, 53.

Example 16.1: Opening bars, K.475. A flat-G motive in foreground and background

*Adagio*

The musical score is presented in three systems, each with a grand staff (treble and bass clefs). The first system (measures 1-3) features a foreground motif in the bass clef and a background motif in the treble clef. The foreground motif is marked with *f* and *p*, while the background motif is marked with *(pp)*. The second system (measures 4-6) continues the foreground motif in the bass clef and the background motif in the treble clef. The foreground motif is marked with *f* and *p*, and the background motif is marked with *(pp)*. The third system (measures 7-9) continues the foreground motif in the bass clef and the background motif in the treble clef. The foreground motif is marked with *f* and *p*, and the background motif is marked with *p*. The score includes various musical notations such as dynamics (*f*, *p*, *(pp)*), articulation marks (accents, slurs), and fingerings (e.g., *b6*, *5*). The key signature is one flat (B-flat major/D minor), and the time signature is common time (C).

*f* *p* *(pp)* *f* *p*

*(pp)* *f* *p*

*(pp)* *f* *p*

*b6* *5*  
foreground  
A $\flat$  - G motive

*b6*

*(pp)* *f* *p*

background stalled A $\flat$

*f* *p*

D $\flat$   
I6/4

fragment 'a' *p*

Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

Example 16.2: Motivic parallelism in *Più Allegro*, bars 122–5.

122 middleground A

125 Piu Allegro middleground A - G in RH inner voice  
f background arrival on G

126 Ab in top voice

foreground Ab - G in minor

Example 16.3: Further foreground elaboration in *Più Allegro*, bar 127.

127 Ab in top voice

foreground Ab - G in minor

Example 16.4: Climactic Realization of Background Motive in *Più Allegro*, bars 135–9.

135

background G

136

background Ab

Ab repose

138

Ab

These relationships can be represented in a looser middleground sketch, drawn at the piano (in keeping with the pianistic/artistic origins of Schenker's method).

Example 17: Performer's middleground sketch of K.475.

Cmin. i6. II (iii) IV V bVI V7 i i6 bVII ii6 V

## Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

In his critique of Schenker's system of reductive analysis, Nicholas Cook points out that 'we only have to glance at the emerging literature on analysis and performance to see how it is conceived in terms of a one-sided process that goes from structure to realisation'.<sup>48</sup> Presumably, Cook is referring especially to analyses that are derived from a Schenkerian base, since 'Schenker's graphs...decompose the musical surface, thrusting the reader into the middleground and in effect leading her to recompose it for herself'.<sup>49</sup> While Cook is right in observing that 'working through a Schenkerian graph creates a sense of possession of the music in question', there is some scope for a creative implementation of this methodology that rejects the usual privileging of analysis over performance.<sup>50</sup> Indeed, a voice-leading analysis generated *through* performance (as in the above example) reverses the usual trend, bringing both activities in contact with one another, on a more equal footing. In doing so, it serves three functions: 1) it captures on paper the underlying essence of an improvisation or recomposition, 2) it makes sense of existing interpretative decisions and acts as a roadmap for future performances and 3) it facilitates a more controlled type of free fantasizing at the piano. This last point is worth dwelling on, since Mozart's K.475 typifies a type of late eighteenth-century fantasia that combines improvisation with through-composition. Lest we forget, experimenting with both activities, at least in private performance, was once considered an important aspect of keyboard fantasizing. Matthew Brown sums up Schenker's own views on this neglected practice when he states:

Few issues bothered Heinrich Schenker more than the state of music education...he was especially dismayed that contemporary curricula no longer provided students with a firm grounding in the art of improvising fantasies, preludes and cadenzas.<sup>51</sup>

According to Brown, Schenker placed a high premium on practical musicianship, especially improvisation, a fact that is sometimes overlooked in favour of his graphic analyses and polemical writings. Acknowledging that 'written-out fantasies...are not necessarily the same as de facto improvisations', Schenker is quoted as saying that

---

<sup>48</sup> Nicholas Cook, 'Heinrich Schenker, Anti-Historicist', *Revista de Musicologia*, 16/1 (1993), 420–32: 423.

<sup>49</sup> Cook, 'Heinrich Schenker, Anti-Historicist', 432.

<sup>50</sup> Cook, 'Heinrich Schenker, Anti-Historicist', 432.

<sup>51</sup> Matthew Brown, 'C. P. E. Bach, Schenker, Improvisation and Composition', *Intégral*, 24 (2010), 1–27: 3.

'composers acquire their sense of long-range coherence by improvising'.<sup>52</sup> An earlier article by John Rink clarifies Schenker's changing definition of improvisation:

...his earlier position acknowledges the existence of an 'improvisatory imagination' that is unencumbered by formal constraints, while his later view states that the improvisatory façade of an open form like the fantasia usually conceals an underlying scheme or plot.<sup>53</sup>

Of course, the idea that beneath a seemingly irrational musical structure lies something more deliberate and ordered is hardly a new one; eighteenth-century composers like C. P. E. Bach routinely employed this technique of compositional deception for their fantasies, and Mozart is no exception. Yet what is interesting about Schenker's U-turn (as identified by Rink) is his later assertion that *all* keyboard fantasizing—in other words all improvisation—is a composing out of some underlying formal plan. However, as we all know, there are countless instances where composers generate musical materials through properly spontaneous improvisations that emerge only as a result of pianistic experimentation. If Rink is correct, Schenker's altered viewpoint argues that even when improvising, the performer-composer must fulfil the following preconceived formal obligations:

First, like composition itself, the act of improvisation involves the prolongation of a remote structure—a "basic plan" or model—which is linked directly to the middleground or background; second, the prolongation of that structure in improvisation takes place through diminution, specifically, diminution of the fundamental line.<sup>54</sup>

So, while it is true that this line of thinking does not entertain the idea of improvisation (post schemata) as a freer, more performative alternative to strict composition, Schenker's principles, like the rules of Fuxian counterpoint, can sometimes be seen to operate even in music that is less consciously conceived. The recording technology of our time makes capturing free improvisations a relatively easy task. Any musical experiments that take place at the piano can be recorded and scrutinized for Schenker's two-fold notion of improvisation. William Drabkin points out that the genuine spur-of-the-moment improvisation, with an authentic irrational streak, does not bypass Schenker entirely, since he uses the term '*irrationalitat*' or 'irrationality' to describe 'the way in which the masters created large-scale forms without following a pre-determined plan'.<sup>55</sup> Viewed from such a vantage point,

---

<sup>52</sup> Brown, 'C. P. E. Bach, Schenker, Improvisation, and Composition', 21–2.

<sup>53</sup> John Rink, 'Schenker and Improvisation', *Journal of Music Theory*, 37/1 (1993), 1–54: 3–4.

<sup>54</sup> Rink, 'Schenker and Improvisation', 8.

<sup>55</sup> William Drabkin, 'Schenker's "Decline": An Introduction', *Music Analysis*, 24/1-2 (2005), 3–31: 17.

## Analysing Mozart's Fantasia K.475 through Intersections of Schematic and Schenkerian Thought

Schenker's idea of motive takes on greater analytical significance and becomes an indispensable aid to fantasia performance, which is concerned with retaining a sense of presentness (and therefore an awareness of surface details) alongside a pianistic construction of long-range musical desire.

Unpicking this idea of musical desire is equally vital to the present theorization of the late eighteenth-century fantasia, of which Mozart's K.475 is a landmark work. A performer encountering this piece for the first time will be expected to embody this basic principle: the projection of musical tension in the *Più Allegro*, which climbs from G minor to A-flat major. But desire is equally evident in the surface structures of the two slow sections, where both A and A flat act as rival upper neighbour notes to G, in a teasing out of musical detail. Example 18 provides a reproduction of such superficial motivic interplay in the slow movements of the Fantasia.

Example 18.1: Ornamental A as an upper neighbour note to G in the D-major song, bar 26.

Example 18.2: A and A Flat appearing alongside G in *Sarabande* foreground, bar 99.

Already we have seen how a Schenkerian preoccupation with superficial and hidden neighbour-note motives is compatible with a mapping of musical desire. I am not suggesting that this music be automatically read as a metaphor for sexual experience (*pace* McClary), only that it be performed as an embodiment of *musical*

desire and desirability. So, for example, the introduction of an upper neighbour-note A to embellish G in the folk song section is so much more than a surface ornament: it inserts scale degree 5 into the typical 3-2-4-3 *pastorella* schema and gives the entire section its unique musical identity. Similarly, the slow-burning *Sarabande* gives way to a vertiginous *Più Allegro* that demands both physical daring and an uninhabited musical imagination on the part of the performer.

This kind of reading naturally reminds us that performance must always remain central to any analysis of eighteenth-century piano music. Crucial to the discourse generated thus far is an analysis conceived of at the piano itself, which remains sensitive to the physical and sensorial aspects of music that are at the very heart of Mozart's late eighteenth-century Fantasia. K.475 may not be an anomaly, but appears, post-analysis, to become a textbook example of the time and place it inhabits. K.475 also shatters sometimes hasty and misguided analytical viewpoints of the fantasia style, by appearing as a closed form in C minor, with a fixed identity that remains stubbornly aligned to sonata. In moving between two established theoretical frameworks, I have rejected a one-sided theorization of the late eighteenth-century fantasia, which privileges history and theory, in favour of an immersive approach that is truer to the living, breathing spirit of the genre. Theorizing and performing this type of fantasia are no longer ends in themselves, rather, they require the pianist to approach the piece from multiple vantage points—those of analyst, composer and performer. Ultimately, through a synthesis of formalism and performativity, we might be able to make more sense of Mozart's inscrutable fantasia procedures, which will no doubt illuminate our understanding of this enigmatic genre.

Karishmeh Felfeli-Crawford

Independent Scholar