

Matteo Magarotto\*<sup>1</sup>

\*University of Cincinnati / Cornell University, United States of America

<sup>1</sup>matteomaga3@gmail.com

## Pure Theory/Impure Analysis

### ABSTRACT

The modern discipline of music theory in the USA has gained quasi-scientific status by pursuing rigorous systematic organization. For example, a complex system such as the Sonata Theory of Hepokoski and Darcy (2006) relies on the foundational principles of ‘rotation’ and ‘essential closures’, organizing musical elements and form in a series of precise relationships to those principles, tending to exclude unrelated elements. Such a high degree of internal coherence, which may be defined as *purity*, is a necessary condition for theory to be theory and to claim scientific prestige. This essay accepts purity as a theoretical requirement, but argues that music analysis obtains the best results through an *impure* mixture of different theories in an attempt to unpack music’s density. For example, analyses of eighteenth-century sonata movements will benefit from the application of Sonata Theory in combination with analysis of voice-leading schemata (Gjerdingen 2007) and musical topics (Mirka 2014). This essay thus highlights the epistemological tension between music theory and analysis. While the former is bound to construct self-contained worlds, the latter should break the confines of these worlds, cross-contaminate them, and respond sensitively to whichever parameters of a composition appear to be salient at any given turn by applying the theoretical concepts most suitable at those junctures. Using two keyboard sonata movements by Mozart as case studies (K. 545, I and K. 576, I), I show how purist analytical results are questioned by the insertion of impurities from other theories.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Premises

Between the 1950s and 70s, American music theory achieved the status of an authoritative scholarly discipline, distinct from both musicology and music theory itself as hitherto understood — i.e., as the pedagogy of music fundamentals and harmony. This new music theory gained power in the academy and produced knowledge, in turn creating more power (McCreless 1996). To maintain this legitimization, theory aspires to quasi-scientific status by pursuing rigorous systematic organization. For example, complex systems such as Schenkerian theory (Schenker 1979) and the Sonata Theory of Hepokoski and Darcy (2006) institute foundational principles — ‘*Ursatz*’ and ‘rotation’ respectively — and build large theoretical edifices whose components are strictly interconnected to those principles and to one another in a series of precise relationships, tending to exclude unrelated elements.<sup>1</sup> Such high degree of internal coherence, which can be defined as *purity*, is a necessary condition for theory to be theory and to claim scientific prestige.

Theory’s purity, however, is at odds with music’s density. A single theoretical system can only partially illuminate the multiplicity of layers and processes active in a given composition. A recognition of such semiotic thickness as an inherent property of music invokes a pluralistic analytical approach; and although there is no final ‘correct’ interpretive account of a given composition, this fact does not exempt analysts to pursue comprehensiveness. Building on these premises, this essay offers an argument for the collapse of analytical purity in favor of mixed approaches. For example, analyses of eighteenth-century sonatas will benefit from the application of Sonata Theory in combination with analysis of musical topics (Ratner 1980; Ratner 1991; Mirka 2014) and study of the pervasive voice-leading schemata unearthed by Robert Gjerdingen (2007), with the attendant issues of cognition. Sonata Theory, as theory, needs to exclude topics and schemata, but a composed sonata does not, nor should its study.

In response to EuroMAC 9’s ‘call to reflect on the epistemological status of music analysis as a discipline’, this essay highlights the unavoidable tension between music theory and music analysis. The two disciplines depend on each other, yet are epistemologically opposite: music theory aspires to the condition of purity whereas music analysis is, at its best, an *impure* empirical process. This premise, if accepted, allows us to address a number of questions posed in the EuroMAC’s call for papers:

Is theory a necessary condition for a scientific approach to musical phenomenon? Or does the confrontation between theory and analysis reveal cultural rather than epistemological differences resulting from a number of national ‘traditions’ or linked to geographic and linguistic areas? Do not such differences reveal a form of immaturity in the discipline and its pre-scientific status? Is the fragmentation of music analysis into increasingly irreconcilable approaches, compounded by linguistic obfuscation and parochial interests not contrary to the very spirit of research?

One difficulty with these issues lies in the definition of ‘scientific’. I doubt that music analysis can be scientific in the same way as disciplines such as physics or chemistry; physics can discover constants and laws, whereas the existence of such things in music is uncertain.<sup>2</sup> Different analytical traditions may not reveal ‘a form of immaturity in the discipline’ but rather the inherent diversity of its object of study. And the preoccupation with scientific status may dissipate if the goal of music analysis is understood not as securing such status but rather as pursuing sophisticated and historically informed

<sup>1</sup> Although Heinrich Schenker (1868–1935) was an Austrian citizen, his principles have been less influential in European scholarship than in US music theory since its onset as a mode of scholarly inquiry.

<sup>2</sup> In the neo-positivist climate of the 1950s, the first issue of the *Journal of Music Theory* opened with an editorial implying the potential of music theory to establish ‘valid laws’ for music and to offer a ‘key for universal understanding’ (Kraehenbuehl 1957).

hermeneutic interpretations.<sup>3</sup> It is also possible that different approaches seem irreconcilable only because scholars have not combined them in their analyses — in other words, that the apparent incompatibility may be a matter of practice rather than substance. If musical works, as already noted, are dense and multifaceted, then they invite a pluralistic analytical approach that can, as such, foster the desired reconciliation.

## 1.2 Metaphors and Method

The purity metaphor refers to a high degree of internal coherence and consistency and suggests an analogy with pure substances such as distilled water. Pure water consists only of hydrogen and oxygen in a stable combination (H<sub>2</sub>O) and no other elements. Similarly, Schenkerian theory establishes the bass arpeggiation and the fundamental line as its essential elements, connected in a stable manner in the *Ursatz* (scale degrees  $\hat{5}$ – $\hat{4}$ – $\hat{3}$  above I,  $\hat{2}$  above V, and  $\hat{1}$  above I); to preserve purity, this theory interprets all musical events as derived from this essential structure and generally excludes other aspects (for instance, gesture or affect).

However, whereas pure water results from artificial distillation, water in the natural environment exists as a solution containing several impurities, such as dissolved minerals and organic compounds or debris. Likewise, whereas musical structure and form as theorized may be described in pure terms, actual compositions are dense objects infused with cultural conventions and influenced by local tastes and other musical genres — accretions on the pure sound matter. In an eighteenth-century instrumental composition, for example, one might note galant schemata and musical topics, such as the hunt, pastoral, or learned style, in addition to ‘pure’ harmonic, melodic, and rhythmic structures (themselves, in fact, influenced by environmental ‘impurities’). Thus, the best analyses do not simply distill these components out of the solution to obtain a supposedly pure musical core, but rather highlight as many of such archeological relics as possible by means of diverse methods, attempting to unpack music’s density.<sup>4</sup>

By advocating for analytical pluralism, I am not proposing a new idea, since it already informs important analytical work. In the field of eighteenth-century studies, already in 1991 James Webster argued for a ‘multivalent analysis’, which he applied to Mozart’s arias (Webster 1991b). More recently, Mary Sue Morrow has called for an armistice in the ‘analysis wars’ (2013), suggesting the combination of different theories in the analysis of Haydn’s instrumental music (LaRue 1992; Hepokoski and Darcy 2006). Yet the matter is worth addressing again, to emphasize the epistemic bases of pluralism by means of the impurity metaphor, which also reminds us that our discipline differs from the hard sciences. Music analysis involves study of artistic objects within a humanistic field, and analysts should therefore pursue not only systematic rigor but also imaginative insights (if supported), even when such insights are unorthodox or fail to align with a single theoretical framework.

<sup>3</sup> I take it as axiomatic that music analysis should aim at interpretation rather than mere description; ‘every analysis tells a story’ (Webster 1991a, 249).

<sup>4</sup> Gjerdingen frames his theory of schemata as ‘an archaeology of musical behaviors’ (2007, 16–19).

Relying on these premises, the following case studies employ an analytical method developed in my dissertation on Mozart’s keyboard sonatas (Magarotto 2016), which integrates Sonata Theory and the analysis of schemata usage according to Gjerdingen. I also use my concept of ‘sonata script’, a cognitive structure guiding the composer in the distribution of schemata within the sonata form. Moreover, I introduce aesthetic and contextual considerations and topic analysis to exemplify analytical impurity and demonstrate its viability. The works selected are the opening movements of Mozart’s Keyboard Sonatas K. 545 (1788) and K. 576 (1789).<sup>5</sup>

## 2. FIRST CASE STUDY: K. 545, I

The first movement of Mozart’s well-known Keyboard Sonata in C major, K. 545, ‘for beginners’, has been subjected to frequent analysis.<sup>6</sup> A distinctive though not unique feature of this Allegro is the restatement of the primary theme (P, bars. 1–4) in the subdominant F major at bars. 42–5, after a span of unmistakable developmental activity (bars. 29–41).<sup>7</sup> The main analytical debate concerns the formal identity of this thematic statement: does it mark the beginning of the recapitulation or does it belong to the development? In what I would call a purist analysis of some time ago, John Snyder assigned the F-major P to the development (1991). He read the unorthodox structure of K. 545, I, as an exception to Schenker’s view of sonata form, according to which the retransition interrupts the *Ursatz* on degree  $\hat{2}$  over V, then the recapitulation begins the *Ursatz* again by recovering the *Kopft*on (degree  $\hat{5}$  or  $\hat{3}$  over I) and continuing with the structural descent to secure 1 over I at the end of the movement. By contrast, for Snyder this Allegro features an *uninterrupted Ursatz* in which the *Kopft*on degree  $\hat{5}$  (G<sub>5</sub> on the fourth beat of bar 1) is prolonged without interruption until the onset of the recapitulatory secondary theme on the first beat of bar 59 (again G<sub>5</sub>; Snyder 1991, 67). Thus, for Snyder the F-major P at bars 42–5 cannot belong to the recapitulation because it lacks a valid *Kopft*on. Working from the different perspective of rotational form, Hepokoski and Darcy interpret the movement as exhibiting an ambiguity between the Type 3 and Type 2 formats (2006, 265–67), a logical reading within the theoretical premises of Sonata Theory.

A final decision between ‘development’ or ‘recapitulation’ or between Type 3 and Type 2 as mutually exclusive options may be beside the point, and one could simply let the ambiguity subsist as an interesting trait of this movement in its own right. Yet, an impure, pluralistic approach provides further insight into the possible origins of the unusual F-major statement of P, suggesting that it presents a twist on the recapitulation’s tonal default, but a recapitulation nonetheless. In the following discussion I complement structural and formal analysis with consideration of other relevant stylistic and contextual aspects,

<sup>5</sup> The scores can be accessed at <dme.mozarteum.at/dme/nma>. For the definition of the Sonata Theory abbreviations used in this article, see Hepokoski and Darcy ‘2006, xxv–xxviii).

<sup>6</sup> Mozart entered the piece as ‘Eine kleine klavier Sonate für Anfänger’ on 26 June 1788 in his *Verzeichniß aller meiner Werke* begun in 1784 (now at the British Library). A couple of weeks later, he entered another work labeled ‘für Anfänger’, the Violin Sonata K. 547.

<sup>7</sup> ‘Recapitulations starting on IV turn up consistently enough in the eighteenth century that we consider it a lower-level default option within the genre, not a deformation’ (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, 264).

including galant style schemata, Mozart's aesthetic values, and the pedagogical purposes of this sonata 'for beginners'.

As an initial observation, although the key of P at bars 42–5 breaks the first-level tonal default, the thematic layout of both P and the following transition (TR, bars 46–57) parallels the expositional model, except that TR now features two statements of the original material, the first in F major (bars 46–9) and the second modulating from F major to C major, while also inverting the parts (bars 50–3). To be sure, recompositions of TR in a recapitulation constitute a normal option in eighteenth-century sonatas and, as such, need no particular explanation. But in this case the extended TR has consequences for the uncommon tonal casting of the preceding P. This observation implies that a composition's segment may influence the make-up of an earlier segment, a dubious notion from a listener's perspective but which makes sense for a composer, who might design a segment in view of structural goals down the road or of specific material he wishes to insert later. Such planned later material can therefore determine aspects of the earlier segment in question. In this case, I propose that the recapitulation of K. 545, I, is best understood by considering first the medial caesura (MC) of bar 57 and then moving backward to examine the make-up of TR — for which the pedagogical nature of the sonata provides a critical cue — to discuss finally the subdominant statement of the primary theme.

My comparative analysis of the first movements of Mozart's keyboard sonatas reveals a strong correspondence between exposition and recapitulation at the point where the last segment of TR leads to the MC (Magarotto 2016, 327–30).<sup>8</sup> Of seventeen sonata-form movements in total, sixteen display a precise thematic parallelism at this juncture.<sup>9</sup> Contextual evidence thus suggests that, in planning the recapitulation of K. 545, I (which features a I:HC MC in the exposition), Mozart was likely to reuse the last module of TR and the MC in identical form (compare bars 9–12 in the exposition, consisting of an Indugio and Ponte, with bars 54–7). We should therefore regard the presence of this material at this point as a formal priority for the composer.

Moving backward, one notes that the previous TR module (bars 50–3) is, in Gjerdingen's terms, a Prinner. As this scholar has remarked, K. 545, I, might be subtitled 'the Art of the Prinner', given the pervasiveness of this schema in the piece (2007, 359).<sup>10</sup> In the exposition, a Prinner provides the riposte (bars 2–4) to the opening gambit, and another constitutes the skeleton of TR's first module (bars 5–8, technically a

P→TR merger). In the extended recapitulation, there are now three Prinner in a row (bars 44–5 in P, bars 46–9 and 50–3 in TR), and only the third Prinner, which interests us here, matches the expositional model tonally if not texturally (compare bars 5–8 and 50–3, allowing for the B-flat in bar 50, neutralized in bar 51). Leaving aside for the moment the textural inversion, the presence of a Prinner in C at this point is justified by the following module (bars 54–7, Indugio–Ponte–MC), identical to the expositional one for the reasons just discussed. Further, a Prinner linked with a subsequent Indugio was a common pattern in galant music and also in Mozart's keyboard style, where it offers one manifestation of his penchant for the stepwise, 'natural' continuity of melodic parts: here the 6–5–4–3 melodic descent of the Prinner (A–G–F–E) continues smoothly to degree 2 of the Indugio (D on the first beat of bar 54).<sup>11</sup> In other words, accepting that Mozart was likely to reuse the Indugio–Ponte–MC of the expositional TR in identical form in the recapitulation, he was also likely to choose the preceding Prinner in C in order to preserve the thread in the passage (compare bars 50–3 to bars 5–8).

This reasoning, however, does not explain the presence of two Prinner in bars 46–53, for Mozart could have preserved the thread by simply repeating the whole original P–TR section identically in the recapitulation, as he does in other sonatas (the first movements of K. 281, K. 284, and K. 330, except for small surface variations in the latter case). Here the contextual evidence offered by Mozart's *Verzeichniß* proves crucial. It is logical to assume that in a sonata intended 'for beginners' the composer aimed to provide practice in a range of essential keyboard skills. Mindful of his sonata's pedagogical purpose, Mozart exploited the most malleable portion of the sonata form, the recapitulatory TR, to give scalar practice to both hands of the pupil by assigning the 16th-notes to the right hand and then to the left, thus offering a more complete coverage of keyboard technique than the movement would otherwise contain.<sup>12</sup> To do so, he used two statements of the transitional Prinner, inverting the parts the second time. Admittedly, Mozart could have created a balanced distribution of scales in many other ways, but the choice of two Prinner in succession offers a particularly effective and elegant solution, provided that the second Prinner is placed a fourth below the first, for this configuration produces a long stepwise line in both voices throughout. In this case, the line is as follows (allowing for octave transposition): D–C–B-flat–A (6–5–4–3 in F major at bars 46–9), continuing with A–G–F–E (6–5–4–3 in C major at bars 50–3), to reach D again in bar 54, as already observed. Thus a long thread runs through the eight measures of the extended recapitulatory TR. Mozart used such two-Prinner schema, with the same tonal relationship of a fourth, at least twice before, in K. 279, I, (1775) at bars 48–51 and in K. 310, I, at bars 67–73.

<sup>8</sup> In movements in which the exposition uses a I:HC MC (nine in total), the last TR module and MC in exposition and recapitulation are identical both thematically and tonally (with the exception of K. 279, I, heavily recomposed), while in movements in which the exposition uses a V:HC MC or III:HC MC (eight in total), the last TR module and MC in exposition and recapitulation are similar or identical thematically though obviously different tonally. This thematic realignment is indeed a central moment — the 'crux' — within the sonata trajectory (Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, 239–40).

<sup>9</sup> The only exception, K. 279, I, belongs to the group of Mozart's earliest mature keyboard sonatas, composed thirteen years before K. 545. K. 279, I, is the most idiosyncratic of his sonata output because of its substantially rearranged recapitulation.

<sup>10</sup> The Prinner typically functioned as a riposte to an opening theme. It features the two main voices in parallel motion by tenths with a 6–5–4–3 descent in the melody (Gjerdingen 2007, 455).

<sup>11</sup> In a letter of 13 August 1778 to his son, Leopold Mozart upheld *il filo* (the thread) as a principle for compositional mastery (Deutsch 1962, 444). One possible interpretation of *il filo* is stepwise linearity, a ubiquitous feature of Wolfgang's instrumental style. An additional, more conceptual connotation of *il filo* may be the connection of schemata in familiar series grounded in the contemporaneous style, as Gjerdingen proposes (2007, 369–85).

<sup>12</sup> Aside from bars 50–3, the left hand plays fragments of fast scales only in the development (bars 31–2 and 35–41). Nowhere else is the left hand equally challenged, in this movement or the entire sonata.

To summarize, if the repetition of the Indugio-Ponte-MC module in the recapitulation is determined by a strong formal preference for Mozart, as previously discussed, and if the application of the two-Prinner schema before that module is justified pedagogically, stylistically, and aesthetically (scalar practice, *il filo*), then the first of those two Pranners (bars 46–9) must be a fourth above the second — that is, in F major.

The final step of this backward analysis consists in noting that the end of P and the beginning of TR (as a P→TR merger) in bar 5 are linked without cadential break and that the Prinner of bars 5–8 repeats the Prinner and tonal structure of bars 4–5 in augmentation.<sup>13</sup> Such voice-leading and conceptual connection, by which P merges into TR activity, represents an important strategy of continuity in this exposition: bars 5–8 appear to provide an expansion and commentary on the primary theme's riposte, an effective way of spinning the compositional thread. Mozart was likely to preserve this important connection and continuity in the recapitulation where, based on my earlier argument, the P→TR merger at bar 46 needed to begin in F major. Thus, for Mozart to connect the primary theme with P→TR in the same manner as the expositional model would have required that P (bars 42–5) be in F major as well. As a lower-level option in eighteenth-century sonata practice, beginning a recapitulation in the subdominant key may not have struck Mozart as far-fetched in any case.<sup>14</sup>

This explanation is hypothetical, but it incorporates more contextual information than analyses based on single theoretical systems. It combines documentary evidence ('für Anfänger'), comparative analysis (Mozart's general approach to the recapitulatory MC and his use of the two-Prinner schema), aspects of style and aesthetics (*il filo* and the composer's proclivity for linear continuity), and patterns of schemata disposition. This case study indicates how an impure analysis that attempts to be comprehensive can put into question purist interpretations, offering stronger results by triangulating evidence from several stylistic, aesthetic, and formal aspects at once.

### 3. SECOND CASE STUDY: K. 576, I

Mozart's last completed keyboard sonata, K. 576 in D major, dates from July 1789, soon after his return on 4 June from his concert tour of Dresden, Leipzig, and Berlin begun on 8 April of that year. Like other works of the time, this sonata likely reveals Mozart's renewed interest in counterpoint and baroque styles stimulated by his visit to Leipzig and new encounters with J. S. Bach's heritage. The opening Allegro features imitative counterpoint and traits of the two-voice invention and gigue, stylistic influences that might also account for the unusual formal characteristics of the movement discussed below. To give a brief description of the exposition, the primary theme zone (P, bars 1–16) consists of a hunt-like fanfare motive presented in a balanced antecedent-consequent period (bars 1–8), subsequently repeated with variation and inversion (bars 8–16); the elided transition (TR, bars 16–27) leads to a I:HC medial caesura in bar 27, followed by the secondary-theme zone (S, bars 28–41) which, however, is initially

P-based (see the sequential treatment of the hunt motive in bars 28–33); after a V:PAC in bar 41 and a new idea marked *dolce*, another V:PAC in bar 53 and a final six-measure phrase end the exposition.<sup>15</sup>

At first, an application of Sonata Theory principles to this exposition suggests hearing the V:PAC in bar 41 as the Essential Expositional Closure (EEC) and the following section including the *dolce* theme as the closing zone (C).<sup>16</sup> Although Hepokoski and Darcy examine only the recapitulation of this movement briefly, their identification of S and C in that context implies that they parse the exposition in the way I have just described (2006, 233–34). As in the previous case study, however, a pure formal reading is complicated by factors impurely gleaned from other domains. Knowledge of Mozart's individual treatment of the sonata form (his 'sonata script') and topic analysis lead to a reevaluation of this formal reading.

On the one hand, what appears to be the secondary theme, starting after the MC with the upbeat to bar 28 (module S<sup>1.1</sup>), displays peculiar features for S, because it is a harmonically unstable and asymmetrical sequence in three statements (bars 28–9, 30–1, and 32–3); in contrast, my comparative analysis shows that the first movements of all other Mozart's keyboard sonatas contain a perfectly stable and symmetrical S<sup>1.1</sup>, indicating that such symmetry is a central property of Mozart's sonata script (Magarotto 2016, 202–5). On the other hand, the *dolce* theme Hepokoski and Darcy deem as C begins with an implication of symmetry as an antecedent four-measure phrase ending on a half cadence in bar 45, followed by a consequent with a varied version of the same melody, although Mozart defers its expected PAC in bar 49 until bar 53, thus denying perfect symmetry. Keeping these elements in mind, the analysis of the recapitulation (which begins with the upbeat to bar 99) provides revealing clues. Here Mozart reorders the materials so that the alleged closing theme appears immediately after the MC (bars 122–37) and is followed by the alleged secondary theme (from bar 138). Importantly, the *dolce* theme now displays precise symmetry, with antecedent at bars 122–5 and consequent at bars 126–9, and is also repeated in varied form (bars 130–7), thus assuming more prominence in this section than it had in the exposition. In view of Mozart's sonata script and its S-symmetry property, this recapitulation thus seems to normalize an idiosyncratic exposition. The modular reordering, in turn, suggests a reinterpretation of the exposition itself: the alleged C was in fact the 'real' S and the alleged S was in fact a second transition that now, with the relocation, functions as an S<sup>2</sup> module (bars 138–55), driving toward the Essential Structural Closure in bar 155.

With this reinterpretation, the exposition is more convincingly understood as a trimodular block (TMB) as follows: MC (bar 27), module TM<sup>1</sup> (bars 28–33), TM<sup>2</sup> (bars 34–41), post-medial caesura (PMC, bar 41), TM<sup>3</sup> or the 'real' S (bars 42–53), EEC in bar 53, and C in bars 53–8 (for TMB,

<sup>13</sup>Moreover, note the voice leading of the left-hand part between the last beat of bar 4 and the first beat of bar 5, where E<sub>4</sub> and G<sub>4</sub> lead to F<sub>4</sub> as its lower and upper neighbors.

<sup>14</sup>See note 7.

<sup>15</sup>The *dolce* theme's melodic ascent (C<sup>#</sup>–D–E–F<sup>#</sup> in bars 41–2) retraces the contrasting idea of the primary theme (upper voice, bars 2–3). I thank Steven J. Cahn for this observation.

<sup>16</sup>The cadence in bar 41 matches Hepokoski and Darcy's definition of the EEC as 'the first satisfactory PAC that occurs within S and that proceeds onward to differing material' (2006, xxvi). Nevertheless, I propose a different interpretation below.

see Hepokoski and Darcy 2006, 170–77). The hermeneutic conclusion is that, in this movement, Mozart plays an engaging game with the norms of the sonata form as well as his own habitual sonata script, creating an imbalanced exposition and then fixing that imbalance in the recapitulation by assigning all the materials to their ‘correct’, that is most normative, formal locations and functions. Further support for this reading comes from topic analysis. The ‘real’ S displays the cantabile quality, clarity, and ‘comprehensibility’ of the singing style (Day-O’Connell 2014) — a characteristic trait of several other secondary themes in Mozart’s sonatas. Conversely, the alleged S elaborates the primary theme’s hunt-fanfare topic in a driving and modulatory fashion better suited to transitional zones (hence the reinterpretation of S as TM<sup>1</sup> in the exposition) or post-S<sup>1</sup> zones, where the music drives toward essential closures (S<sup>2</sup> in the reordered recapitulation, accomplishing the ESC).<sup>17</sup>

The distinctive design of K. 576, I, may be rethought in view of Mozart’s Leipzig experience. The presence of a P-based ‘S’ (TM<sup>1</sup>), unusual in Mozart’s keyboard sonatas, betrays here perhaps the influence of baroque *Fortspinnung* in the tendency to pervade the movement with the hunt motive in gigue-like fashion.<sup>18</sup> At the same time, Mozart was writing a modern sonata movement and thus faced a dialectical tension between the contrasting impulses of sequential repetition and periodicity. The recomposition of the recapitulation, with its emphasis on periodicity in the enhanced symmetry of the *dolce* theme and with the transferring of sequential activity to S<sup>2</sup>, might be heard as the sonata principle gaining the upper hand over the sequential principle in this engaging dialogue between two different stylistic realms.

In the foregoing analysis, Mozart’s sonata script and topic analysis support the interpretation of this movement as a trimodular block in the exposition that the composer rearranges in the recapitulation to realign the music with his preferred script structure. This again demonstrates that the addition of analytical impurities can question or complement the conclusions obtained through a purist application of a single theory.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

As the two case studies demonstrate, a competent melding of diverse theoretical systems and approaches in music analysis bears high hermeneutic potential. The unconventional ring of the metaphor I propose here — analytical impurity — will be helpful in the pragmatics of analysis: music, given its density as a symbol and form of communication, resists yielding to one theory alone, no matter how sophisticated. This essay offers a response to the EuroMAC theme of music analysis’ future and status, arguing that the epistemological status of music analysis, its way of knowing, is empirical inquiry, and proposing pluralism and impurity as promising paths for our discipline in the twenty-first century.

#### KEYWORDS

Sonata Theory, Topic Theory, Schemata, W. A. Mozart, Keyboard Sonata in C major K. 545.

#### REFERENCES

- Caplin, William E., 2014. ‘Topics and Formal Functions: The Case of the Lament’, in Danuta Mirka (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Topic Theory*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 415–52.
- Day-O’Connell, Sarah, 2014. ‘The Singing Style’, in Danuta Mirka (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Topic Theory*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 238–58.
- Deutsch, Otto Erich, and Bauer, Wilhelm A. (eds.), 1962. *Mozart: Briefe und Aufzeichnungen*, vol. 2. Kassel: Bärenreiter.
- Gjerdingen, Robert O., 2007. *Music in the Galant Style*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hepokoski, James, and Darcy, Warren, 2006. *Elements of Sonata Theory: Norms, Types, and Deformations in the Late Eighteenth-Century Sonata*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kraehenbuehl, David, 1957. ‘Foreword’, *Journal of Music Theory* 1/1: 1.
- LaRue, Jan, 1992. *Guidelines for Style Analysis*. Sterling (MI): Harmonie Park Press.
- Magarotto, Matteo, 2016. *The Interaction of Sonata Form and Schemata Derived from Galant Practice in the First Movements of Mozart’s Keyboard Sonatas*. PhD. diss. Cincinnati (OH): University of Cincinnati.
- McCreeless, Patrick, 1996. ‘Contemporary Music Theory and the New Musicology: An Introduction’, *Music Theory Online* 2/2, <<https://www.mtosmt.org/issues/mto.96.2.2/mto.96.2.2.mccreeless.html>>, accessed 26/06/2023.
- Mirka, Danuta, ed., 2014. *The Oxford Handbook of Topic Theory*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Morrow, Mary Sue, 2013. ‘Haydn and the Analysis Wars: A View from the Sidelines’, *Haydn: The Online Journal of the Haydn Society of North America* 3/2.
- Ratner, Leonard, 1980. *Classic Music: Expression, Form, and Style*. New York (NY): Schirmer.
- , 1991. ‘Topical Content in Mozart’s Keyboard Sonatas’, *Early Music* 19: 615–19.
- Schenker, Heinrich, 1979. *Free Composition*, ed. and trans. Ernst Oster. New York (NY): Longman. (1st ed. 1935.)
- Snyder, John, 1991. ‘Schenker and the First Movement of Mozart’s Sonata K. 545: An Uninterrupted Sonata-Form Movement?’, *Theory and Practice* 16: 51–78.
- Webster, James, 1991a. *Haydn’s ‘Farewell’ Symphony and the Idea of Classical Style: Through-Composition and Cyclic Integration in His Instrumental Music*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- , 1991b. ‘The Analysis of Mozart’s Arias’, in Cliff Eisen (ed.) *Mozart Studies*. Oxford: Clarendon, 101–99.

<sup>17</sup>Research in this area is still developing, but the first movement of K. 576 might indicate the existence of a topical syntax in eighteenth-century music, a set of preferred associations of certain topics with specific formal functions (for one study, see Caplin 2014).

<sup>18</sup>Only one other first movement features a clearly P-based S, K. 570, I (February 1789).