The recapitulation of the finale of Mozart's Symphony No. 38 (the *Prague*, 1786) begins quite innocuously with the return of the playful tune that serves as protagonist for this movement. At this point, we might well become complacent: our experience with other such pieces may lead us to expect little more from what remains of the movement than the reiteration of themes and a grand conclusion. But after a mere thirteen bars, the proceedings are rudely derailed by a blast from the brass and timpani.

Principles of formal propriety for this period dictate that new materials not intrude into a composition so late in the game. And, as it turns out, the outburst is not entirely extraneous: we can trace it back to the development section, where it repeatedly obstructed the progress of the principal theme. Thus we might explain the event in the recapitulation by arguing that the business of developing had not quite been completed within the segment of the piece devoted to development, so that it necessarily spills over into the section usually concerned with consolidation.

But the blast also recalls a more distant referent: the symphony's introduction is repeatedly disrupted by a similar configuration,
which is not so much resolved as sidestepped by the comedic affairs of the opening movement. Its reappearance here at the eleventh hour, after all the turmoil ought to have subsided, represents quite literally a return of the repressed. Indeed, the eighteenth-century topos here invoked is the *ombra*, a stock image long associated in opera with the shadowy supernatural.

Moreover, this moment resembles the one near the end of *Don Giovanni* where the foreboding *ombra* that opened the overture suddenly breaks in on Giovanni's revelry to announce the arrival of the statue. That Mozart was writing the *Prague* Symphony and *Don Giovanni* at the same time encourages the comparison, even though there are crucial differences—most obviously, the sinister music in the opera announces Giovanni's impending doom, whereas the symphony's finale recovers its playful character for an affirmative conclusion. But as in *Don Giovanni*, the symphony's finale suffers the intrusion of the militant materials from the introduction into what appears to be an extremely secure context. In neither instance can purely structural accounts suffice. Like the parallel occurrence in *Don Giovanni*, this disruption in the *Prague* may tempt us to appeal to narrative for explanations.

While an earlier generation of critics were happy to write in narrative terms about such tensions in Mozart's instrumental music, musicologists of the last thirty years have focused almost exclusively on its formal dimensions. Many critics today prefer to hear his music as the manifestation of perfect order, and their analyses consequently strive to account for that order, which is presumed to stand outside or beyond the realm of mere signification. Disruptions are demonstrated not truly to have been disruptions at all, but instead sophisticated strategies in voice-leading, discernible by those who have studied advanced music theory. Moments of apparent conflict, such as the one that occurs in the last movement of the *Prague*, are not so much explained as explained away.

In the last few years, however, the issue of narrative in instrumental music has reemerged in musicology and has sparked a
lively theoretical debate. On the one hand, scholars such as Anthony Newcomb, Lawrence Kramer, and Fred Maus—all of whom focus on questions of musical signification—have begun to demonstrate how narrative procedures often informed nineteenth-century instrumental music.⁵

The other side of the debate has been most forcefully articulated recently by Carolyn Abbate.⁶ Abbate objects to narrative accounts of most instrumental music in part because they usually fall short with respect to both musical and historical specificity: that is, as the plotline proposed by the critic takes on its own momentum, details of musical construction (especially those that do not advance the cause of the plot) are often ignored; and insofar as the narrative scenarios suggested by critics tend to fall into a few stereotypical patterns, crucial differences between moments in musical style are obliterated. In short, narrative accounts, while perhaps attractive as crutches, lead us away from the piece of music and its cultural particularities.

These objections need to be taken very seriously, even if—especially if—the Prague tempts us to appeal to narrative. I propose that narrative impulses began to influence compositional procedures in the late eighteenth century—that narrative is not simply imposed from the outside by critics who lack analytic sophistication, but that it is often integral to the rationale of the music itself—and that these impulses correspond to extremely important concerns emerging in other areas of European culture at that same moment in history.

By suggesting that Mozart's instrumental compositions may have narrative dimensions, I do not mean to imply that he engages in what later became known as programmatic music (in which a title or accompanying scenario indicates explicitly the framework to be employed in listening), but rather that he often introduces significant narrative inflections into his formal procedures. In other words, the structural order and balance celebrated by so many analysts are indisputably present in his music, but so are other elements—such as the event described at the beginning of this paper—that raise the kinds of questions typical of plot-oriented media.⁷
As Terry Eagleton has demonstrated, this tension between formal and narrative impulses is among the most fundamental characteristics of bourgeois culture. In *The Ideology of the Aesthetic* (1990), Eagleton explains how the theories of art that emerged in the 1700s served as one of the sites where the emerging bourgeois class worked through many of the dilemmas it confronted as it attempted to carve out a new *modus operandi*. Significantly, many of the principal aestheticians of the day were also leading political theorists, and these two domains—art and the public sphere—were understood quite self-consciously in the same terms.

In both realms, attention was focused especially on questions of the self. Previous eras had seemed to bestow markers of identity such as class at birth; but with increasing opportunities for upward mobility, intellectuals and artists began to concentrate on the process of self-generation, with its attendant rewards, but also its responsibilities and anxieties. Thus eighteenth-century aestheticians, like political theorists, typically deplored the rigid conventions of the *ancien régime* and advocated free individual expression. But at the same time they recognized that private feelings without objective form fail to be intelligible, just as groups of individuals acting according to their own separate whims produce chaos. Structure, therefore, was deemed indispensable to the new art and to the new society; yet the structures that made identity viable had to seem now as though they were the result of internal necessity, motivated by ongoing trajectories of becoming, rather than of the surrender to outside authority. Eagleton writes: “If the aesthetic comes in the eighteenth century to assume the significance it does, it is because the word is shorthand for a whole project of hegemony, the massive introjection of abstract reason by the life of the senses. What matters is not in the first place art, but this process of refashioning the human subject from the inside, informing its subtlest affections and bodily responses with this law which is not a law” (42).

Much of what Eagleton writes concerning aesthetics and bourgeois ideals would sound quite plausible if we were dealing with Beethoven. But Mozart? Even though Beethoven too worked un-
under aristocratic patronage for much of his career, we tend to associate Mozart far more closely with that institution. Our accounts of Mozart often assume that he faithfully reflected in his music the sensibilities and interests of his patrons, that he accepted unconditionally the constraints of his employment as he composed. Thus our critical readings of Mozart's music typically emphasize its courtly dimensions: its noble grace and formal balance.

We have no evidence that Mozart had any interest in class politics per se. Yet even if he did not identify his plight with those of other nonaristocrats, he frequently bridled at having to submit to those who had economic authority over him. Moreover, he had a healthy regard for his imagination, which permitted him to inflect in such unexpected ways the galant style that surrounded him. And if we delve beneath the polished surfaces and assuring reconciliations that characterize the public veneer of Mozart's music, we often find him wrestling with precisely the tensions Eagleton analyzes as characteristics of late eighteenth-century bourgeois culture.

Mozart's music could scarcely have avoided the tensions that preoccupied his particular historical moment, for they were already implicated in the formal procedures he had inherited before he even touched them. In other words, the narrative impulses of his music are not truly "extramusical": they emerge from the premises of the most fundamental of his musical materials—tonality and sonata.

The brand of tonality that developed in Italy over the course of the seventeenth century traces something like the familiar quest narrative, whereby identity (the tonic key area) is established, destabilized through excursions into other keys, and eventually regained (fig. 1a). In most music of the 1600s, this pattern of beginning, middle, and end is best explained by rhetorical models—which is, in fact, how theorists of the day accounted for effective musical organization. So long as the expected series of events proceeds relatively unimpeded, narrative seems not be at issue.
As the eighteenth century approached, the onrushing flamboyance of early tonality became domesticated, in part through standardization, in part through the rise of various formal schemata that served to contain and channel its extraordinary vitality. The da Capo aria that dominated aristocratic opera seria during the 1700s, for instance, operates according to a principle of nested symmetries: the opening section presents the tonic, moves to a closely related key, and returns to reestablish the tonic for closure; a middle section moves through contrasting areas; then the opening section returns intact to insulate the unstable middle section, to restore both tonic and the initial affect (fig. 1b). The linear thrust of earlier procedures was thus radically reconstrued: eighteenth-century formal designs continued to draw on tonal energy, but they kept tight control over its potentially unruly qualities through hierarchically arranged patterns of structural repetition.

Sonata procedure—a new formal means of articulating the tonal background—began to appear in the mid-eighteenth century, and it became the principal organizing schema in most instrumental genres for over a hundred years. Like most other structural procedures of the 1700s, sonata depends heavily on formal conventions. But the exuberant rhythms of opera buffa animate this procedure, infusing it with dynamic energies reminiscent of tonality.
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before its formal containment. Thus sonata resulted from a fusion
between the symmetrical structures of the eighteenth century and
a newly invigorated, somewhat rebellious tonal impulse. The his­
tory of this genre has been played out along the fault lines between
these virtually incompatible elements.

On the one hand, sonata procedure developed not from the
kinds of baroque movements that unfold through principles of
linear progress, but rather from the staid binary form of the courtly
dance (fig. 1c). Thus, while its opening section moves dramatically
to the point of the first modulation (on the dominant or relative
major), this section must then be repeated. Likewise, the second
half—which contains the series of contrasting keys as well as the
return to tonic—is reiterated. The dynamic impulse contributed by
the tonal dimension of sonata is effectively held in check by such
formal imperatives (fig. 1d).

Sonata procedure itself adds yet another structural device that
weighs against progressive narrative: the section articulating the
return to tonic (recapitulation) grows to mirror in both length and
sequence of events the opening half (exposition). And as bipartite
dance forms become rather more tripartite in their distribution of
functions, issues of architectonic balance begin to inform the
process, as they do in da Capo arias. Textbook diagrams of sonata
sometimes resemble a static classical building, with symmetrical
wings buttressing a middle section.

But on the other hand, certain other aspects of sonata intensify
the dynamic forces that fuel it. Composers began to mark the
openings of sonata movements with idiosyncratic themes which
are deployed as though they were protagonists. Moreover, the
second key area in the exposition started to rival the tonic in
duration, and it often brought with it its own themes and affects.
The relationship between first and second key areas varies from
piece to piece: the sense of uniform agency typical of Baroque
music may be maintained if both keys are articulated with the same
theme; or the two may establish a crucial dramatic dichotomy,
either complementary or antagonistic. The tensions between
these two aspects of the exposition are not immediately resolved;
rather they spill over into the middle section, which destabilizes and develops thematic materials as it proceeds through its series of distant keys.

Thus far (if we count the repetition of the exposition as something like an instant replay that allows us to witness once more the move from tonic to secondary key), the process could be regarded as linear. Moreover, the development leads back eventually to the dramatic return of tonic and opening theme for recapitulation and closure. But at the point of recapitulation, principles of formal balance suddenly come to the fore, since the central business of this section is to reiterate the events from the exposition. Unlike the return in the da Capo aria, however, the recapitulation is not a mechanical reiteration of a previous self-contained section. The tensions raised by the dynamic contrast of the exposition are resolved only in this concluding section, in which all materials typically confirm the tonic. Thus the recapitulation serves as a literal “capitulation” to formal convention, but also as narrative telos—as the site of reconciliation for all the dramatic conflicts that made the movement seem idiosyncratic.

As it attempts to satisfy both the demand for formal symmetry and also the desire for unimpeded progress and free expression, sonata manifests in its musical premises the tensions Eagleton describes. In some movements, structural exigencies appear to prevail over the particularities of the process. Others privilege the more dynamic aspects of sonata, so that something like a narrative trajectory rather than a predetermined set of conventions seems to motivate the movement's central events. Neither of these solutions, of course, can be entirely consistent: the energies whipped up by the process always threaten to overflow the bounds of the form, making containment seem a bit arbitrary; and narrative inflections—while they may encourage us to hear some of the important junctures of movements in terms of linear causality—do not influence the many passages where conventional musical processes dominate.

But in any case, sonata is never merely a form imposed from the outside. Because it captures so well the dilemmas surrounding
identity and dynamic change in the bourgeois era, sonata becomes the central arena in music where such issues are explored, fought through, and negotiated. Whatever the solution in any given movement, the tensions between energy and stasis inherent in the procedure remain—just as they remained unreconciled in the social sphere. Yet music's malleability always suggests that a possible answer to the great puzzle is just around the corner. This is why generations of musicians continued to hack away at sonata rather than inventing thoroughly new procedures, once the frustrations of sonata became apparent. We can tell a good deal about what was most important to each artist, each moment in history, by observing where the compromises occur, what gets sacrificed, and what is preserved at whatever cost in sonata-based constructions.17

Mozart's narrative inflections in his instrumental music operate simultaneously on two fronts. First, he sometimes enacts resistance against the musical signs of aristocratic absolutism and against the social constraints that manifest themselves in music as formal conventions. In other words, the revolutionary impulse that becomes far more explicit in Beethoven is detectable not only in Mozart's operas such as The Marriage of Figaro or Don Giovanni, but also in some of the instrumental music.18 The emancipatory narrative recounting the emergence of a new variety of self-sufficient (bourgeois) individual here begins to make its appearance.

At the same time, Mozart can be heard exploring a set of issues that seem at first glance to be more private: the construction of an integrated self in the face of both the desire to remain in an infantile state of blissful coextension with the mother, and the threats and demands posed by patriarchal law. In "The Image in Form," Maynard Solomon proposes a psychoanalytic model for addressing such issues in Mozart's music, manifested in Mozart's proclivity for dark undercurrents that often threaten to break through his affirmative surfaces. While accepting much of Solomon's Freudian schema, I would like to qualify it a bit.

First, rather than regarding Freud's account as the universal experience of early development, many theorists now contend that
important aspects of this model are particular to males and to the bourgeois era. This explains in part why Mozart and Freud could both arrive at similar constructions, why we latter-day bourgeois still are hailed by it, and why musics of other places and times seem not to work according to such precepts.

Second, even if such an experience of subjectivity were commonplace, European composers did not see it as a suitable topic for musical representation until about Mozart's time. We might relate this set of issues to Mozart's own struggles with his father for adult identity. But Mozart certainly was not the first composer to be burdened with a domineering father. He does happen, however, to have been composing at a time when the ordeals of the inner self as it aspires to maturity had become paramount in European culture—not only in literary genres such as the Bildungsroman, but also in music. These "private" issues turn out, in other words, to be at the center of public discourse in the late 1700s: we need not read Mozart's pieces as revealing personal secrets.

To some extent, these two narrative strands—emancipation from aristocratic/patriarchal authority and the self-generation of a seemingly autonomous identity—are similar stories. And many of the cultural artifacts of the late eighteenth and nineteenth centuries merge the two. The kind of self celebrated by the psychologically preoccupied novels of this time is a specifically bourgeois subject—a subject who must learn how to negotiate successfully in a world in which class status and masculinity must constantly be won anew, how to prize yet compartmentalize sentiment, how to overcome and repress the contradictions required in achieving selfhood.

For on the one hand, the liberation and Bildung agendas of this historical moment need to show the generation of the new breed of subject step by step—a feat that requires that we first meet him as a vulnerable, relatively unformed being and that we witness him become something other than what he was, even though such a process often involves severe crises. But on the other hand, this same subject needs desperately to believe in his immutable integrity; consequently, the traumatic narrative of emergence is disavowed at the very moment it succeeds. The increasingly "organic"
aspects of such narratives are designed to imply that the seeds of success were present in the subject from the start, that identity owes nothing to contingency but is (regardless of conflicts in the manifest content of the story) always already guaranteed.\textsuperscript{23}

Mozart's music also resides uneasily between these positions, as he takes up and works through the same thorny issues.\textsuperscript{24} If he increasingly inflects his musical procedures with narrative drama, he also puts increasing effort into the "purely musical" relationships within his compositions. Many of his constructs try to sustain the fiction that we can have it both ways—narratives of becoming and structures of immutable being at the same time. It is, I believe, for this reason that we who still cling to many of these same fictions gain such solace from his music.\textsuperscript{25} Yet the contradictions are quite apparent, even in Mozart.\textsuperscript{26}

The adagio that opens the \textit{Prague} Symphony fulfills the functions typical of slow introductions in this repertory, in that it arouses our expectations for what follows.\textsuperscript{27} To use Edward T. Cone's terminology,\textsuperscript{28} an introduction serves as an extended rhythmic upbeat that releases its accumulated tension only with the arrival of the allegro and the securing of the tonic key area. It exists prior to the beginning of the movement's sonata procedure; and although its relative instability may seem to propel us causally forward into the movement's exposition, it need not share actual materials with the remainder of the symphony.

Mozart's adagio turns out to be more integral to the unfolding of the symphony than usual, for—as we realize in retrospect—it introduces in the course of its fantasia-like meanderings many of the topoi, motives, and dilemmas that pervade the remainder of the piece.\textsuperscript{29} It begins conventionally enough, with grand, sweeping gestures invoking the French overtures of Louis XIV, the absolutist monarch \textit{par excellence}. Both the presence of trumpets and timpani and their favored key of D major underscore the opening's aristocratic (and potentially military) associations.

Somewhat incongruously, this majestic pronouncement is followed by quiet, staccato pitches creeping up through the tonic
triad, as though to some other place. The F-sharp at the peak of the ascent is met by the full orchestra blaring out an unexpected, deceptive harmony that diverts us away from D major to B minor. Apparently unfazed, the strings echo the diversionary tactic and arrive on G major; the winds do likewise and take us even further afield, to E minor.

Instead of unfolding rationally to establish the tonic D major, the continuation from the bold opening triad simply spirals off into what is marked—for the moment at least—as unintelligibility. Recall that Eagleton speaks of aesthetics as "this process of re-fashioning the human subject from the inside, informing its subtlest affections and bodily responses with this law which is not a law." This musical passage seems to have escaped the old law, only to indulge in feelings that do not yet have any "objective" form to regulate them.

After a pause, the strings take us back to D, but into the very different affective realm of Empfindsamkeit—the highly stylized tenderness of mid-eighteenth-century bourgeois sensibility. In contrast to the absolute certainty of the opening, this section (mm. 7–13) proliferates sighs, languid melodies, exquisite harmonic inflections (once again to E minor), and chromatic meltdowns, all over a hesitant accompanying figure.

One could associate these gestures with "femininity" as it was construed in musical codes of the time. Certainly this section represents a more intimate, gentle mode of discourse than the public spectacle heralded by the opening. But an important feature of the middle-class male subject was his sensitivity, even his willingness to display tears. Thus we could read this moment both as feminine and also as a function of masculine interiority. Moreover, given the appropriation of sentiment by bourgeois males as evidence of their moral superiority to the noblemen they aspired to displace, we might read it as pertaining to class as well.

At last, in measure 12, we are prepared for a clear diatonic cadence. True to its melancholic predisposition, however, the phrase ends instead on a sigh and a deceptive cadence, which is echoed in the winds. But this is exactly the same move that diverted the
movement from D and its aristocratic bearing in the first place. The full orchestra suddenly bursts in, as though picking up where it left off before the tender bourgeois episode we have just enjoyed. Indeed, Mozart banks on our having enjoyed this episode so much that it returns, gently wresting the controls back from G major, which the trumpets and drums had asserted, for a second attempt at a cadence on D.

The sentimental dalliance of this material, however, is not allowed to subvert the composition—at least not without a proper battle. At this point, the trumpets and drums return with a vengeance, in the guise of the ombra topos. The benign D major of the beginning is disfigured into a grim D minor, made all the grimmer by a military tattoo in the timpani. As in measure 3, the strings sneak up through the triad presented, now intensified with pleading turn figures. Each would-be arrival is met by a new orchestral chord, to which the cowering strings conform—yet from which they apparently seek escape.

The series of chords at first seems almost arbitrary—the exercise of absolutist authority. But the chords are not truly random: after leading us through a number of flat-laden keys related to D minor, they lead back inexorably to a dominant pedal anticipating a cadential arrival in that key. The chords also turn out to be the ones dictated by the constraints of those signs of aristocratic might, the natural trumpet and timpani: in order to sound with their full acoustical force, these instruments can play only the pitches D and A. Yet these restrictions become the most terrifying evidence of their power over the discourse, as they legislate that all motion be confined to accommodate their own severe limitations.31

In the final bars of the introduction, motivic fragments from the Empfindsam section return, their former mobility now imprisoned by martial alternations between D and A, their sweetness rendered pathetic by the minor-mode context. Once again, both class and psychoanalytic readings seem plausible, as absolutist or patriarchal order thwarts the emergence of another kind of agent: one that exhibits such characteristics as flexibility, curiosity, tenderness, and dynamic motion—namely, a bourgeois subject. Yet its
very sentimentality seems to have hampered it from successfully avoiding the static law of the aristocratic Father.\(^{32}\)

I have chosen thus far to highlight those elements in the score that would enhance a narrative approach. But most of my musicological colleagues would select rather different details—those that demonstrate that an iron-clad sense of musical order underlies all the discontinuities and violent ruptures I have privileged. And they would, of course, be perfectly justified in doing so. For instance, those digressions to B, G, and E near the beginning are soon folded back into normalcy. Every musical detail can be understood as operating within an autonomous musical domain of harmonic, melodic, contrapuntal, and rhythmic relationships.

Yet I would view an entirely formalist account as reductive. Mozart presents within this introduction a bewildering array of culturally significant affects and topoi that seem virtually to demand a story, a justification for materials that are not yet rationally deployed. The economy that we expect of aesthetic objects of this period—especially Mozart's—requires something more by way of explanation. Why have we been subjected to this jumble?\(^{33}\) If we have faith that these fits and starts were purposeful, the continuation of the symphony will reward our expectations. Rather than choosing between strictly formal and strictly narrative accounts, it seems critical to acknowledge that Mozart is operating continually in both registers, and to see this tension as perhaps the most important aspect of content in this work.

The first movement of the \textit{Prague} enacts marvelously the construction of the subject, from timid beginnings to a degree of confidence comparable to—if vastly different from—the autocratic gestures of the introduction. If we examine the clues we already have been given, we might know in advance something of what will constitute an appropriate answer to the opening section, for the orchestral forces deployed at the outset will probably be used again—in part for the sake of balance, but also (on a much more pragmatic level) to have made the hiring of all those musicians worthwhile. In other words, despite its exceedingly modest debut,
the subject of the first movement must eventually grow to fill the very large shoes of its predecessor.

The inauguration of the allegro’s subject is singularly inauspicious: while the solo D in the first violin delivers the tonic pitch foretold by the introduction, it does so hesitantly, in quaking syncopations. The other strings enter with tentative, inverted harmonies that hover between consolidating D as tonic and inflecting it as a function prepared to resolve to G major, the passive, subdominant side of the key. So insubstantial is the first violin that the lower parts may be heard as the melodic line, a line that strives twice to rise before it descends to the first genuine cadence we have had thus far. At the moment the lower strings begin their descent, the first violin emerges from its paralysis with a small motive of its own and joins in the arrival.

The first theme of the exposition contrasts sharply with what has preceded it, yet it draws heavily upon figures that Mozart already has set forth. The syncopations of the opening, for instance, had been established in the final measure of the adagio; the turn in measure 43 had already marked the tormented ascents between oppressive blasts from measures 17-27; and the tendency to deflect inward to G major or B minor—rather than pushing dynamically toward the self-confirmation of tonic and dominant—had occurred repeatedly in the introduction.

But even if its genetic materials can be traced to the adagio, the identity of this thematic unit is woefully insecure, given its ambivalence with respect to pulse, phrasing, direction, key, and even which line counts as the tune. Nevertheless, it does succeed in pulling together enough rhythmic and harmonic momentum to achieve the tiny triumph of a cadence, an occasion hailed with a fanfare by the whole ensemble—brass, drums, and all. This burst of approbation encourages the theme to repeat itself, leading to a second cadence and the beginning of the theme’s progress toward self-realization.

Skipping ahead to the end of the movement, we find that the process concludes with a victorious apotheosis of this first theme. It has been duly transformed to occupy its role as confident adult: its
parts are inverted so that the yearning gesture originally in the lower strings now serves unequivocally as melody, while the stammering syncopations have developed into constant eighth notes that press dynamically forward to the final cadence. This, then, is the telos, the goal toward which the movement strives: the confident coming-to-power/coming-of-age of a subject whose advent can be detected in retrospect in the introduction, who begins his journey unaware of his own resources, and who eventually works through his own potentialities to become fully actualized.

More than most Mozart movements, this one seems determined always to generate new ideas out of materials already presented: consequently, the development of the self-sufficient subject seems constantly at stake. For instance, the harmonic motion of measures 51–54 is accomplished by the motive of measure 42 laid end to end; the turn figure inverts and the syncopations become aggressive to produce the vigorous sequence beginning in measure 55; and even the halting redundancies of measures 9 and 39–40 are embraced and mobilized in the jubilant arrival on the dominant in measures 63–71.

But if the movement as a whole pursues a trajectory of linear development, it does not do so simplistically. The emancipation from aristocratic/patriarchal control is only one feature of the story here enacted; even more crucial is the question of what kind of subject the emergent self will be. As though addressing precisely these concerns, Mozart problematizes various critical moments in the unfolding of the movement—the moments where the narrative and structural components of the composition are most likely to pull in opposite directions. These include most obviously the second key area and the requisite return to opening materials for recapitulation.

Although formal procedures had not yet become frozen into the schemata theorized later, the second key area was even in Mozart's time a moment when contrasting thematic materials most often appeared, in order to heighten the tonal dichotomy fundamental to the dynamic process. In this movement, however, Mozart installs his contrasting key with yet another enactment of the emergence of
the first theme. Its identity thus is stamped on this site where integrity might have been threatened, and although a contrasting theme occurs presently in this new key, the terrain of this key is already defined as belonging to the protagonist—especially as the increasingly empowered opening subject returns to serve also as closing material.

The second key area offers a new set of challenges to our subject. First, it turns out that to cadence on the dominant is not the same as to be in the dominant, nor does self-proliferation of imitative patterning guarantee security. The enterprising sequential passage beginning in measure 82 seems to intensify identity, yet it rushes headlong into a tonal crisis—the first suggestion of violence in this otherwise rather playful context. It is as though the dominant had been won too easily, without the struggle such a step necessarily entails. The brass and timpani return to set out an unyielding pedal on D; and it is only with tremendous effort (the bass shoving up through a chromatic scale) that A major is regained—earned this time rather than simply assumed as the next step in the convention.

This process—the sustained D in the brass, the chromatic bass leading eventually to an arrival on A—resonates with the crisis of the introduction (mm. 16–28). In the introduction, the arrival served as containment; here in the exposition, it represents hard work, success, and the opening of new terrains. Instead of smacking into the dominant as though conquering it, the escape from D deflects deceptively onto F-sharp, from which position the harmony floats down graciously into A major. Only now, in this carefully circumscribed realm, does another thematic unit appear.

This unit is not, of course, altogether new: it is related affectively—even through melodic profile and accompaniment pattern—to the lyrical materials that first appeared in measures 7–12 of the introduction. Unlike the principal theme, which constantly overflows expected phrase boundaries, this second theme unfolds placidly in symmetrical four-bar groupings. It luxuriates in sensitive chromatic inflections, then repeats itself in the melancholic coloring of A minor. But at the moment of cadence where the minor mode might have established itself, the major intercedes and
brings us back—at first tenderly, and then by the energetic sequential motives that first brought us to the dominant—to the triumphant opening theme.

We might regard these contrasting materials as representing another force, perhaps—as in the introduction—aligned with femininity. Yet it seems that Mozart has taken great pains to situate them within a domain bracketed firmly at both ends by the principal theme. Moreover, they too display the legacy of the introduction: they resemble the motives that worked in opposition to the tyranny of the brass but were too weak to prevail. Here in this context—after the principal theme has laid the public foundation for its unimpeded continuation—it becomes possible to indulge in tenderness, in depth of feeling without the fear of destruction from the outside. Form has begun to structure feeling.

To be sure, sentiment soon devolves into melancholy and threatens to undo the confident facade achieved during the first section of the exposition. Thus the sudden turn to major in measure 112 sounds like a conscious decision not to continue in that vein. But this detour into sensitivity makes the eventual triumph of the principal theme seem all the more palatable, for we have witnessed not only the battle of self-development waged in the public sphere of motivic construction, but also the realm of subjective interiority: the spiritual depth demanded of the new bourgeois male.

The recapitulation is a bit different. Adorno has made us aware of the problematic nature of formal recapitulations: the conventional demand that a movement return to its original key and thematic materials two-thirds of the way through the piece would seem to destroy the illusion of ongoing narrative development that became such a central concern of nineteenth-century culture. Beethoven tended to display his rebellion against the external requirements of formal conventions quite dramatically, and the entry into recapitulation is often the site for his most resistant maneuvers. In contrast with Beethoven, Mozart sometimes seems to accept the constraints of formal convention without a struggle. But in the *Prague*, the moment of recapitulation is inflected narratively rather more than one would expect.
The development section itself is one of the most intensively combinatorial passages in Mozart, as he works through a series of motives, each put into canon-like imitation with itself and in superimposition with the others. The one moment that had seemed to stand outside the subject—the huzzah that greets its first presentation in measure 43—unexpectedly provides the motive (originally a simple countermelody to the brass fanfare) that pervades its development section. Once all these ideas have been explored sufficiently, Mozart channels the tension through a linear buildup into what sounds initially like the recapitulation. We have heard precisely this buildup and resolution before, however: it is a repetition of the passage that first arrived on the dominant. And this is exactly what happens here—we begin not on tonic but on A major.

Notwithstanding its problematic key, the principal theme begins confidently; but within a couple of measures it becomes hesitant and lists toward D minor. The melancholy shadings of the second theme are recalled, as well as the sense of entrapment over the A pedal at the conclusion of the introduction. The motive that had dominated the development so aggressively now fades into mourning and reveals its affinity with the lyrical motives of the second theme. But it gradually builds momentum and drives into the actual recapitulation in measure 208.

Once again, this presentation on A of the principal motive serves as a foil, to demonstrate the follies of premature assumptions. Just as the easy arrival on the dominant had to be discarded and properly achieved in the exposition, its reappearance in the movement's most critical juncture makes the return to tonic seem earned rather than mechanical. To be sure, the recapitulation satisfies formal expectations; yet Mozart designs his strategies to suggest that it is motivated not by convention, but by the demands of this narrative of becoming.

Mozart also problematizes the security of D major itself after it returns. In measure 217 (after the celebratory fanfare), the theme indulges in chromatic inflections and moves unexpectedly into B-flat major. It is as though the first theme is sufficiently confident
that it can incorporate some of the flexibility of its more private side into its public presentation. This move requires a renewed struggle if the identity of D major is to be regained: thus the crisis that built toward the second theme in the exposition can be repeated as though of internal necessity, and the lyrical themes themselves serve as welcome dramatic contrast rather than blind repetition.

The movement ends with the consolidation of identity: the principal theme occurs twice in its triumphal form, inflected with the chromaticism of the second theme, permitting the two to reach a kind of synthesis at the end. Unlike the rigid, aristocratic gestures of the introduction, the subject that has fully emerged by the conclusion of the movement is dynamic, its motives carefully balanced among its central figure's yearning, sensitivity, and confident ability to enact closure. And like the bourgeois individual whose characteristics the movement so closely resembles, it appears to be autonomous—self-reliant and self-generated.

To some extent, the narrative closure enacted by this opening movement seems to render subsequent movements superfluous. This is, of course, a central formal preoccupation of the nineteenth century: when narrative components appear to motivate structural unfolding, the usual four-movement series becomes an embarrassment. Beginning most clearly with Beethoven, composers attempt to refashion their narratives so that the finale serves as closure for an entire cycle of interrelated movements.

While Mozart often creates affinities among his movements, one rarely finds evidence of cyclicism per se. Yet he rarely pushes his narrative inflections as far as he does in the opening movement of the *Prague*; and in this piece, some of the dilemmas confronted more vehemently by Beethoven begin to emerge. The most obvious instance of cyclical interdependence in the *Prague* occurs in the passages of the closing movement mentioned at the very beginning of this paper, where the patriarchal authority left behind in the introduction suddenly returns in full force.

The exposition of the presto drops few clues that anything troublesome might be forthcoming. Its principal theme is sprightly
and confident from the outset; it does not seem to demand a narrative of becoming, for its identity is already secure. To be sure, the exposition goes through the paces expected of it, and it recalls superficially some of the tensions of the first movement—the modal shifts and chromatic inflections similar to those in the allegro recur, as does a triumphal transformation of the sprightly opening theme. But the doubts that confronted the subject of the earlier movement appear to have been transcended: the crises that appear in the exposition of the finale sound like tempests in teapots.

The development section alters that state of affairs, however, as it opens with the notorious blast from the brass and timpani. As in the introduction, the protagonist here follows the harmonic dictates of the blasts—yet its impish energy tends to mock the seriousness of those autocratic pronouncements. And after four brass interjections (none of them, incidentally, particularly disruptive harmonically), the subject just dances off. The remainder of the development is devoted to working out the implications of the principal theme itself. After some clever feints and dodges, it enters into the recapitulation in measure 216. The business at hand would seem to be the reiteration of the sequence of events in the exposition and final closure on the tonic.

Scarcely has the D major recapitulation begun, however, when the aristocratic blast reenters, now in earnest—in G minor. The theme itself might be said to have provoked this harsh intervention, for it had just pivoted off teasingly (and apparently irresponsibly) toward G major. As in the introduction and development, the theme follows dutifully the dictates of the blasts, even as it appears to be attempting to sneak away. Suddenly in measure 244, the protagonist seizes the powerful voice of the brass and timpani, but compels it now to conform to the finale’s principal tune. It marshals those forces through to the arrival on the dominant in measure 260, at which point the puckish second theme group emerges unscathed.

Something like this particular crisis with the brass and timpani had already occurred in the exposition. But it was not at that time
explicitly affiliated with the symphony's introduction. What Mozart
accomplishes in the finale's recapitulation is the confrontation that
had been postponed since the first movement's exposition began.
For while that movement successfully demonstrated the generation
of the self, it did so without referring to the traumas that had
preceded it. The theme in measure 37 of the opening movement
simply turns its back on the introduction's painful struggle over
authority. But if we have been paying close attention to the implica­
tions of that opening movement, we may feel as though we have
been waiting for the other shoe to drop—as we are throughout the
apparent frivolity of *Don Giovanni*.

As in the opera, the symphony's nightmares are realized when
the repressed refuses to remain buried and returns to interrupt the
proceedings. However, this composition is far more comedic than
*Don Giovanni*, and the return offers the opportunity for the emer­
gent subject to demonstrate that he has in fact achieved the aristo­
cratic father's strength and stature without also taking on his more
autocratic tendencies. Power has been transformed from prohibi­
tion to dynamism. Yet one more crisis occurs (mm. 307–317) before
the end—again brought on by an ill-advised approach to G; but, as
was the case in the parallel moment in the exposition, it is quickly
laid to rest and is superceded by playful triplets, trills, and a final
statement of the theme, which has appropriated the brass-and-
drum fanfares to its own glory.

If only the outer movements were at stake, I would be inclined to
follow primarily the political implications of this narrative traject­
ory: the emergence of a bourgeois sensibility out of aristocratic
oppression. But it was a slow movement that inspired Maynard
Solomon's psychoanalytic inquiries, and the middle movement of
the *Prague* too invites a reading that draws us into the private
sphere (which is no less publicly articulated).

The andante is in G major. This follows convention, for the
subdominant had long been a common choice for slow movements.
But this key also ties in with some details of the framing move­
ments. Recall, for instance, that the principal theme of the allegro
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has a tendency to lean passively toward G—a tendency that has to be overcome repeatedly in favor of forward motion. And the central crisis in the finale is precipitated by an attempted move to G—a move that brings down all the prohibitive weight of the Law. In other words, the key of G seems to be desired yet forbidden—by external forces and also by the subject's own imperatives for dynamic progress and self-sustained identity.

As the second movement begins, this realm becomes topically more specific. The movement presents a kind of pastoral, in that its rhythms are those of the siciliano and its melody (doubled in "sweet" sixths) occurs over a tonic pedal, in the style of a musette. It displays a tendency toward its own subdominant, stressing the nostalgic atmosphere already suggested by the references to antiquated and rustic types.37

The altered inflections that had already appeared in the introduction and first movement proliferate here, producing an affect of heightened sensitivity. A chromatic scale seems to lead toward the first implied cadence in measure 4, only to overflow with excess bounty through the measure to the beginning of the next phrase. This next phrase turns out to be a repetition of the first, but intensified by still more inflections and yearning suspensions. Measure 8 brings in a contrasting idea—a tiny staccato motive moving timidly in sequence. Gradually its baby steps acquire greater confidence and lead back into the embrace of lush suspension chains related to the opening material, rounding off the first section.

This nostalgic landscape of plenitude corresponds to images not simply of "the feminine," but, more specifically, of "the maternal." This is so not only because of the semiotic associations with which Mozart engages in constructing this tableau, but also because of the conflicted way this material operates within the movement's structure. A successful representation of infantile coextension with the mother would require that the static quality of this opening be maintained indefinitely; in fact, the movement's sequence of events implies that this dreamy stasis is precisely what is desired.
Alas, the movement is indelibly stamped with its own historical moment—the late 1700s—and the procedures of that time necessarily bring dynamism along with them. The andante can be intelligible only if it participates (however reluctantly) in the teleological processes of tonality and sonata. In contrast to Movements I and III, which seem to rely on narrative inflection to overcome the nay-saying oppression of the brass, this interlude resists change and must be forced into narrative (the by-product of separation) by harsh interventions. It seems to cling to the fixed image of preoedipal bliss; yet reality keeps breaking in, disrupting the peace and pressuring the movement to participate both in the progressive dimensions of late eighteenth-century ideology and in the traumas of maturation.

The first disruption happens in measure 18, where the cocoon of G major is suddenly shattered by loud B octaves, introducing an imperious E-minor passage. As in the introduction to the symphony, a struggle ensues as the more gracious elements emerge and move through a chain of sighs toward D major, then D minor. The louder forces break in again on B-flat, and when the sighs return, it is over an A pedal—again as at the end of the symphony’s introduction. The sixteenth-note runs that had spelled plenitude at the beginning of the movement circle within this minor-mode context as though lost, until they are marshalled toward a cadential arrival on the dominant, D major. The second key area restores the musette, suspensions, and baby steps from the opening passage. At measure 45, they participate briefly in a minuet, as though they have moved to a more external, social terrain. A crisis in measure 51 threatens to destroy the illusion, but it is defeated and maternal peace seems to reign at the end of the exposition.

If in the other movements the Law of the Father seems to prohibit growth, here it is generative, as it destabilizes the domestic inertia and nostalgia into which the subject seems all too happy to regress. The kinds of identity forged in the outer movements could not emerge if the pastoral were permitted to survive. Thus we hear this landscape through a glass darkly—we get glimmers and half-forgotten memories, but access back to the experience itself is
heavily mediated by noise and interference. As Solomon has written so eloquently:

Such music is expressive of a preverbal, preoedipal state of symbiotic fusion of infant and mother, a dual-unity matrix that constitutes, under favorable circumstances, an infancy Eden of unsurpassable beauty, inexpressible love, and ecstatic merging, but also a state completely vulnerable to terrors of separation, loss, psychosis, and even fears of potential annihilation; moreover, a state that inevitably terminates in separation, which even under the most favorable circumstances leaves a residue of mourning and engenders a desire to rediscover anew the blissful sensation of undifferentiated fusion with the mother. (10)

In the development section, Mozart inscribes the opening tableau on three successive pitch levels (mm. 64-83), as though he were trying to find a way to reconstitute and inhabit this Edenic memory. Each time it disintegrates after a few measures. At last the baby step motive is forced to undergo a stormy development; and although it eventually finds its way back for the recapitulation, the pastoral is henceforth indelibly marked by a history of violent struggle. Again, Eagleton locates this structure within its historical context:

The subject of the sublime is accordingly decentred, plunged into loss and pain, undergoes a crisis and fading of identity; yet without this unwelcome violence we would never be stirred out of ourselves, never prodded into enterprise and achievement. We would lapse back instead into the placid feminine enclosure of the imaginary, where desire is captivated and suspended. Kant associates the sublime with the masculine and the military, useful antidotes against a peace which breeds cowardice and effeminacy. Ideology must not so thoroughly centre the subject as to castrate its desire; instead we must be both cajoled and chastized, made to feel both homeless and at home, folded upon the world yet reminded that our true resting place is in infinity. It is part of the dialectic of the beautiful and the sublime to achieve this double ideological effect. (90)

Mozart presents in this movement an adult’s reminiscence of an experience that might be foundational to subjectivity but that can
never actually be regained. He knows you can't go home again. And thus we return to the public sphere of the finale where identities can seem to be consolidated through struggle, but where traces of that interior world occasionally surface to balance the more aggressive qualities of self-generation.

In the decades that followed Mozart, these tensions between structure and narrative in musical composition became increasingly more vexed—as they did in the social arena of the nineteenth century. The containment so admired during the Enlightenment lost credibility, and the notion that the subject conformed to formal dictates from internal—rather than external—necessity came to appear deluded. Thus, beginning with Beethoven, the forms of the eighteenth century were subjected to sustained attack.

As his career proceeded, Beethoven called into question virtually every aspect of sonata that still operated according to unexamined convention. He cast aside traditional tonal backgrounds in favor of idiosyncratic progressions derived from his own materials; he bashed away at the boundaries separating self-contained movements until they became interlocking segments of overarching narrative entities; he protested within his music against what he marks as the external “necessity” of recapitulation.

Yet even as he shattered the relative complacency of sonata’s conventions, Beethoven put more and more energy into the illusion of rigorous motivic integrity. The split that opened up in the 1810s between the forms required for intelligibility and the desire for narratives of ongoing self-generation became increasingly exacerbated, parallel with the same dilemmas raging in the social world. Many of Beethoven’s successors accepted the terms of the struggle, and a kind of metanarrative unfolds over the course of the nineteenth century in which the contradictions of sonata become ever more pronounced until they break down at the beginning of the twentieth century.

Mozart is usually regarded as speaking to us from a prelapsarian moment before certainty collapses into relativity, before—in Karl Marx’s words—all that is solid melts into air. Because Mozart was
writing at a time when optimism in the emergent bourgeois subject was still warranted, he was able (like eighteenth-century aestheticians and political theorists) to present the possibility of a solution without seeming to compromise himself. As Karol Berger has described it:

It is rather the characteristic sense of life of the pre-revolutionary or better pre-Terror Enlightenment (Kant’s view of history comes to mind as another example of the same trust which similarly escapes the charge of naiveté because it is tempered by the same awareness of the possibility of tragedy), a Lebensgefühl so utterly absent from the art for such a long time now that we cannot but hear in Mozart’s music a voice from a very distant and alien past.39

Mozart’s music strikes a balance between formal constraints and sensitivity, between the conventions that make his music publicly intelligible and the marks of individuality that cause his adherence to those conventions to seem self-determined. Yet the contradictions in subjective formation that eventually proved unsolvable can be detected even here. Is identity guaranteed by narrative coherence? by motivic integrity? by formal propriety? What is the relationship between interiority and the feminine (or the maternal)? Does trafficking in this terrain render the subject vulnerable? How does one strike a balance between interiority and public objectivity in the construction of the self?

By indicating how these concerns inform even his most affirmative compositions, I may be undermining that image of universal, perfect order that makes Mozart the darling of festivals. But I hope to be clarifying how his music, far from holding aloof from the struggles of his day, contributed compelling early models for how bourgeois subjectivity might be constructed in the face of both oppressive authority and the temptation to regress into nostalgia.

Notes

1. See the comparison between the introduction to the Prague and the overture to Don Giovanni in Allanbrook, 198.
2. In "Music as Narrative," Fred Maus has argued that all movements from this repertory—even those that follow the norms—invite narrative readings (17–18). I concur with him and will later suggest that the conventions themselves already have narrative implications. But for now I focus on anomalies that seem to demand special explanation.

3. Jens Peter Larsen, for instance, described the Prague as a Manichaean battle between good and evil. See Larsen, 188.

4. For a fuller discussion of this tendency to reduce Mozart to principles of order, see my "A Musical Dialectic from the Enlightenment."

5. See Newcomb, "Once More ‘Between Absolute and Program Music’" and "Schumann and Late Eighteenth-Century Narrative Strategies"; Kramer, Music as Cultural Practice, 1800–1900 and "Musical Narratology"; and Maus, "Music as Drama" and "Music as Narrative." I have examined some of the ideological premises of the narrative schemata of nineteenth-century music in my Feminine Endings.

6. Abbate, especially chapters 1 and 2. Abbate wants to restrict the word "narrative" along lines prescribed by Paul Ricoeur, who demands one of his criteria a sense of past tense. She thereby eliminates from consideration most instrumental music. This definition seems unnecessarily narrow, for it disqualifies not only music, but also plays, films, and many other media that are regularly discussed in terms of narrative strategies.

7. See Leo Treitler’s elegant narrative reading of the slow movement of Mozart’s Symphony No. 39 in "Mozart and the Idea of Absolute Music," in his Music and the Historical Imagination, 176–214. Treitler, however, seeks to locate Mozart’s instrumental music within the category of “absolute” music: that is, “autonomous instrumental music that is essentially musical because it is not determined by any ideas, contents, or purposes that are not musical,” or music that is “not conditional upon the associations—cultural and personal—that language necessarily carries as its historical baggage” (177). I argue that Mozart’s music likewise is burdened with “historical baggage.”

   For helpful theoretical discussions of plot in literature, see Brooks and Chambers. Brooks and Chambers (and also White) deal with narrativizing as a crucial feature of nineteenth-century culture.

8. It is surely no coincidence that many of the discussions concerning instrumental music and narrative focus on Beethoven (see, for example, Maus, "Music as Drama" and "Music as Narrative," Hatten, and Kramer, "Musical Narrativity"). Yet only Kramer addresses the historical context that predisposed Beethoven to narrative strategies.

9. See the appraisal of Mozart and his social relations in “The Rebel,” chapter 7 of Stafford’s The Mozart Myths, 177–206. See also Pestelli, 142–48.
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10. Eagleton points out that Kant, one of the foremost aesthetic theorists of this movement, manifests many of the same ambivalences with respect to class politics as does Mozart.

11. See Bonds for a study of how eighteenth-century theorists conceived of musical form. See also, however, my discussion of how narrative elements break into Bach’s Brandenburg Concerto No. 5 in “The Blasphemy of Talking Politics,” 21-41.

12. For a discussion of how formal devices begin to regulate the opera aria in the late seventeenth century, see chapter 10 of Rosand. Opera seria itself was a rule-bound attempt at salvaging the spectacularity of opera while purging it of the excesses it had exhibited during its phase as public entertainment in Venice.

13. Indeed, this final section is not even notated. The middle movement concludes with the designation “da Capo” (from the top), and the first section is performed again exactly as before, except with the addition of improvised ornaments.

14. Second themes that pose threats are rarely found before the nineteenth century, when dilemmas involving alterity begin to emerge at the very time the liberal project begins to be threatened from below—by those who must be kept in subordinate positions, such as workers, ethnic aliens, women, and femininity itself. By contrast, the eighteenth-century sonata usually focuses on the viability of the subject per se: its freedom of activity, its depth of feeling, and its capacity for consensual interchange.

15. Some theorists at the time found the repetition quite problematic, even from the point of view of rhetoric. Grétry, for instance, wrote in 1797: “A sonata is an oration [discours]. What are we to think of a man who, dividing his discourse in half, repeats each half? ‘I was at your house this morning; yes, I was at your house this morning to talk with you about something; to talk with you about something’ . . . I speak above all of the long reprises that constitute the halves of an oration. Reprises may have been good at the birth of music, at a time when the listener did not comprehend everything until the second time around. I know that an oration is often divided into two sections; but without a doubt, one does not present each one twice.” Quoted in Bonds, 130–31.

16. Lawrence Kramer draws on Jacques Derrida’s notions of force and structure to make a similar argument in “As If a Voice Were in Them’: Music, Narrative, and Deconstruction,” Music as Cultural Practice, 176–213.

17. Eagleton, 107: “The aesthetic is a kind of fictive or heuristic realm in which we can suspend the force of our usual powers, imaginatively transferring qualities from one drive to another in a kind of free-wheeling experiment of the mind. Having momentarily disconnected these drives from their real-life contexts, we can enjoy the fantasy of reconstituting each
by means of the other, reconstructing psychical conflict in terms of its potential resolution."

18. For a similar argument, see Rosen, 325.

19. Eagleton also argues this position throughout his book. See also Chodorow and Benjamin.

20. For a discussion of how the Kantian categories of the sublime and beautiful are defined in terms of patriarchal law and the mother's body respectively, see Eagleton, 90–93. See also the quotation from Eagleton below.

21. For discussions of how the work of bourgeois social formation was accomplished in the novel, see Moretti and Armstrong.

22. I am using masculine pronouns deliberately because the narratives inscribed in most such stories involve male protagonists. Jane Austen's works foreground women who must learn how to negotiate between the social world and their own subjectivities, but those tensions are quite distinct from both those in novels by male authors and those in Mozart's narratives. This is not to suggest that women listeners cannot identify with the male protagonists in either literature or music, but only to acknowledge important historical differences.

23. See Ballantine, “Beethoven, Hegel and Marx,” *Music and Its Social Meanings*, 34: “Where, in the earlier style, a piece evolves on the basis of what is already there at the beginning, in the later it gropes ever towards a new formulation, one not given but latent within an original contradiction: it strives to become what it is not, on the basis of what it is.” Ballantine specifically includes Mozart in “the earlier style,” yet what he says applies to certain of Mozart's later compositions, especially the *Prague*. See also chapters 6–8 of Meyer.

24. For other discussions of Mozart along these lines, see Subotnik, “Evidence of a Critical Worldview in Mozart's Last Three Symphonies,” *Developing Variations*, 98–111; and Slavoj Zizek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology*, 188–90. I have also benefited from reading Christine Bezat's Foucauldian account in “The Order of Things in the *Prague Symphony*.”

25. Moretti calls the late eighteenth-century Bildungsroman “classic,” because it typically tries to reconcile tensions. Compare Agawu: “Mozart can disrupt a nominally secure conventional tonal world, knowing all along that such disruption is illusory, that the security guaranteed by a closed, hierarchic tonal structure remains an immutable law. This is artistic play of a subtle and alluring kind” (83). Later novels by Stendhal and others insist on the fundamental impossibility of reconciliation, as do many nineteenth-century composers beginning with Beethoven.

26. For an example in which the contradictions seem quite exposed, see my “A Musical Dialectic.”
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27. The remainder of the article presents a reading (by no means the only one feasible) of the Prague Symphony. I have tried to describe the music in such a way as to assist those who cannot read notation, but the reader must consult a recording or score in order to follow the arguments. While performances differ radically, the recording by Nikolaus Harnoncourt on Teldec comes closest to projecting what I describe.


29. Strangely enough, Charles Rosen comments on how little the introduction has to do with the remainder of the piece. See his The Classical Style, 347.

30. See Caplan. Even as late as David Copperfield, tears served as an index of masculine sensitivity. For an account of the cult of eighteenth-century sensitivity in Germany, see Ford, 33–37.


32. See Ford, 34–35, on the political passivity of German Empfindsamkeit and even Sturm und Drang. See also Szondi, “Tableau and Coup de Théâtre: On the Social Psychology of Diderot's Bourgeois Tragedy,” On Textual Understanding and Other Essays, 115–32, for a discussion of how eighteenth-century sentimentality stands as a substitute for genuine action: “[A]s long as the middle-class spectator wants to feel pity in the theater, the model hero of bourgeois tragedy will be the helpless victim of an absolute ruler's arbitrary power. . . . Or, conversely, as long as the bourgeois does not revolt against absolutism and make a bid for power, it will lie solely for its emotions, bewailing in the theater its own misery” (132).

33. For an examination of the relationships between topics and formal structure in this introduction, see Agawu, 17–25. Agawu is reluctant to refer outside the music and its immediate codes; he explicitly insists on “reference without consequence” (38). Indeed, he seems to want to read works from the height of the Enlightenment as perfect instances of what Fredric Jameson disparages as the “blank parody”—the mere “playing with signs”—of postmodernism. Along with Eagleton, I believe there is far more at stake here, that the references do have consequences—both within the domain of the composition and in the realm of social formation.

34. For eighteenth-century confirmation of this point, see Bonds, especially 98–102.

35. I am drawing here (as is Mozart) on the codes that circulated on the operatic stage. In some sense, it does not matter whether we regard this passage as a feminine Other or as the privatized, domestic dimension of the subject.

36. Adorno wrote extensively on this dilemma in many disparate
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37. For more on the topical associations of the siciliano and musette, see Allanbrook, 44 and 52–54. She writes: “The siciliano is closely identified with the pastoral genre; Sicily is, after all, the Italian Arcadia. . . . [I]t often bears an affect of nostalgia and resignation, passions naturally attendant on memories of a better world” (44).

38. See my “Narrative Agendas in Absolute Music.” See also Eagleton for a metanarrative of how these tensions develop within aesthetic theory, and Moretti for how they develop in the later Bildungsroman.


Bibliography

Bourgeois Subjectivity in the Prague Symphony


SUSAN MCCLARY

Solomon, Maynard. “The Image in Form.” Paper delivered at the conference
“Current Issues in the Interpretation of Mozart's Instrumental Music.”
Stanford University, 1991.
Subotnik, Rose Rosengard. Developing Variation: Style and Ideology in West­
Szondi, Peter. On Textual Understanding and other Essays. Trans. by Harvey
Walser, Robert. “Musical Imagery and Performance Practice in J.S. Bach's
63–69.
White, Hayden. The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical

· 98 ·