THE “RISING FIGURES” described in the discussion of Somis’s minuet (chap. 5) were each part of a Do-Re-Mi schema.¹ The French violinist Jean-Marie Leclair (1697–1764), a famous pupil of Somis, knew all forms of the Do-Re-Mi common in the early 1720s and presented them in his first set of sonatas. Here is his version of the basic type, with _do–re–mi_ (❶–❷–❸) in the melody and _do–si–do_ (①–⑦–①) in the bass:

**Ex. 6.1** Leclair, Opus 1, no. 3, mvt. 2, Allegro, m. 1 (1723)

As the example implies, the schema’s first and last stages feature stable tonic chords while the middle stage, with a mi-degree (see chap. 2) of Ⅶ in the bass, sounds a less stable 6/3 or 6/5/3. In abstract form, the schema could be represented as shown in figure 6.1.
Like the Romanesca, the Do-Re-Mi was a favored opening gambit in the galant style. In fact, both patterns could be presented simultaneously if the melody’s ❶ were held or implied through the beginning of the Romanesca. We heard examples of this combination by Bononcini, Handel, Aprile, and L'Abbé le Fils in chapter 3. Leclair was in fact maestro to L'Abbé. One could imagine a young L'Abbé learning how to combine the Do-Re-Mi with the Romanesca by studying some of Leclair’s simpler works, like this example in gavotte rhythm:

**Ex. 6.2**  Leclair, Opus 1, no. 3, mvt. 4, Allegro ma non troppo, m. 1 (1723)
Leclair’s normal style, however, was rarely that simple or direct. To aid the reader in unpacking his sometimes densely written scores, let me first explain his use of the “2–3” suspension in a Do-Re-Mi. In the standard Do-Re-Mi, the melody’s \( \text{Ⅱ} \)-\( \text{Ⅲ} \) ascends in parallel thirds (or tenths) with the bass’s \( \text{Ⅰ} \)-\( \text{Ⅰ} \). If, however, the bass holds on to its initial \( \text{Ⅰ} \) when the melody rises to \( \text{Ⅱ} \), the result is a dissonance highly prized by the school of Corelli and marked in the thoroughbass with a “2” to indicate the second between the simultaneous \( \text{Ⅱ} \) and \( \text{Ⅰ} \). When the bass then resumes its “suspended” descent to \( \text{Ⅱ} \), the dissonant second expands to a consonant third, hence “2–3.” The explanation is more complex than the effect, which should be evident in example 6.3:

**Ex. 6.3**  Leclair, Opus 1, no. 11, mvt. 3, Allegro, m. 1 (1723)

In his study of oral traditions in the epic poetry of the Balkans, Albert Lord pointed to “enjambment” as one mark of a literary, learned style. Enjambment means that an individual poetic line is not an autonomous and self-contained unit; its syntax or sense overlaps the next line or lines. In contrast to literary poetic traditions, oral traditions often avoid enjambment because an improvising bard has greater freedom to mix and match good lines if they are self-contained and interchangeable. Suspensions obviously create small forms of musical enjambment, since they force one event to overlap another. But Leclair also favored larger forms of enjambment where one schema either overlaps another or morphs into another. The following two musical examples are thus literary in the ways in which each (1) embeds elements of the Romanesca in an opening Do-Re-Mi, (2) overlaps the close of the Do-Re-Mi with the beginning of what we might call a “false” Prinner, leading to a cadence, and then (3) presents the “real” Prinner with great clarity. We thus
see Leclair giving two quite different “readings” of the same galant script, the first more assertive and showy (ex. 6.4), the second more pensive and restrained (ex. 6.5):

ex. 6.4  Leclair, Opus 1, no. 8, mvt. 2, Vivace, m. 1 (1723)
A contemporary of Leclair referred to his Opus 1 as “a kind of algebra capable of rebuffing the most courageous musicians.”1 The general taste for complexities of the type favored by Leclair’s own generation (J. S. Bach, Handel, Domenico Scarlatti, Rameau, Marcello, Porpora, and Somis) waned rapidly after the 1720s. By the late 1730s, younger composers like Wodiczka were crafting streamlined versions of the earlier, richer combinations. Examples 6.6 and 6.7 from Wodiczka’s Opus 1 bear comparison with the previous two examples by Leclair. Gone are the embedded Romanescas, the false Prinners, and the chains of suspensions. What remains is a simpler script of Do-Re-Mi, cadence, and modulating Prinner.
ex. 6.6  Wodiczka, Opus 1, no. 1, mvt. 1, Largo, m. 1 (Paris, 1739)

DO-RE-MI

ex. 6.7  Wodiczka, Opus 1, no. 1, mvt. 2, Allegro ma non troppo, m. 1 (Paris, 1739)

DO-RE-MI
The Do-Re-Mi remained a staple throughout the eighteenth century. If we turn to keyboard sonatas by Domenico Cimarosa (1749–1801), one of the premier opera composers of the second half of the century and a chapel master sought after by imperial courts, we can find a number of cases where stock Do-Re-Mi opening gambits lead to clear Prinner ripostes. A pair of C-major examples features Cimarosa’s tendency to add a melodic third above the main melodic tones, as in Do–(mi)–Re–(fa)–Mi–(sol). The first is in a very light style, with an inverted Do-Re-Mi added after the Prinner riposte:

ex. 6.8  Cimarosa, Sonata C.48, Allegro, m. 1 (ca. 1780s)
In the second example from the same set of keyboard works, Cimarosa lengthens his Do-Re-Mi to five measures and follows it with a four-measure Prinner riposte, again maintaining a rough parity between them.

ex. 6.9  Cimarosa, Sonata C56, Allegro, m. 1 (ca. 1780s)
In the 1970s, Leonard B. Meyer noticed that many eighteenth-century phrases resembled the opening of the hymn tune “Adeste Fidelis.” Its melody, believed to date from the early eighteenth century, opens with a variant of the Do-Re-Mi that features melodic leaps down to, and up from, ❺:

**Ex. 6.10  “Adeste Fidelis”**

Meyer’s observation certainly applies to Cimarosa. Both of the preceding examples use the Adeste Fidelis variant, with its leaps to and from ❺. The consistency with which Cimarosa presents the combination of Do-Re-Mi with both added upper thirds and lower Adeste Fidelis leaps suggests that he considered this a unitary package—a Gestalt. And because Cimarosa was a product of the conservatory system in Naples, it also suggests that this nexus of patterns was something taught there. For example, a partimento by Zingarelli, Cimarosa’s classmate in Naples, calls for *prima posizione* and hence a starting ❶ in the melody over a bass that clearly invites this type of Do-Re-Mi (treble-staff realization mine):

**Ex. 6.11  Zingarelli, from a partimento in D Major, Allegro molto, m. 1 (ca. 1790s)**

The trend toward using a pair of musical events that could function as a call and response, or question and answer, may have encouraged a replaying of the *re* in the
Do-Re-Mi. Instead of three events, one could have four—*do–re . . . re–mi* (❶–3 . . . 3–❶). As might be expected, Wodiczka furnishes a clear example that has affinities to the Adeste Fidelis variant:

**ex. 6.12** Wodiczka, Opus 1, no. 2, mvt. 3, Menuetto, m. 1 (1739)

![Diagram of Wodiczka's music with annotations](image)

More than fifty years later, this paired Do-Re-Mi was still popular enough for Mozart to use it in his D-major horn concerto. Note how closely Mozart preserves the schematic norm represented by Wodiczka, even though Mozart adds a lovely one-beat delay of the final ❶ and bridges his two subsections with a thematically significant bass:

**ex. 6.13** Mozart, Horn Concerto (KV386b), mvt. 1, Allegro, m. 1 (1791)

![Diagram of Mozart's music with annotations](image)

Mozart and Cimarosa were masters of adding delicate touches to the melodies of the standard schemata. In their approach to the paired Do-Re-Mi in the major mode, it appears that they both recognized the two ascending melodic whole steps as opportunities for inserting matching chromatic embellishments. In example 6.14, a short fragment from
another keyboard work by Cimarosa, one sees how chromatic passing tones can be added to the paired Do-Re-Mi. Adding the same chromaticism to both halves of the schema enhances the musical rhyme.

ex. 6.14  Cimarosa, Sonata C86, Andante grazioso, m. 12 (ca. 1780s)

The resulting network of patterns—a paired Do-Re-Mi schema with Adeste Fidelis leaps and matching chromatic passing tones—became very popular. Mozart used it in another of his horn concertos:

ex. 6.15  Mozart, Horn Concerto (KV447), mvt. 3, Allegro, m. 1 (ca. 1787)

Note how the chromatic passing tones participate in the delay first of 2 and then of 3—what François-Joseph Fétis called *prolongations* (1844)—just as they did in the previous example by Cimarosa.
The type of paired Do-Re-Mi promoted by Mozart and Cimarosa in the 1780s was still viable three decades later. Gioachino Rossini (1792–1868), who had studied with the partimento maestro Stanislao Mattei in Bologna, conceived a grand, eight-measure version of this schema for his overture to *The Barber of Seville*:

### Ex. 6.16  Rossini, *Il barbiere di Siviglia*, Overture, Allegro, m. 68 (Rome, 1816)

The excellent fit between the melody of the paired Do-Re-Mi and the tones of the natural horn might have explained the pattern’s prevalence in Mozart’s horn concertos, but in truth the Do-Re-Mi was ubiquitous across music for all instruments throughout the eighteenth and well into the nineteenth century. Composers were clearly fond of beginning a movement by figuratively climbing the first three rungs of the melodic ladder, *do–re–mi*. If we were to include the thousands of movements that begin with *do–mi–sol* (the first three rungs of the triadic ladder) under the same rubric of initial three-stage ascents, we would account for a significant fraction of all galant movements, and an even larger fraction of opening movements.7

In the mid-twentieth century the American lyricist Oscar Hammerstein II penned the phrase “When you sing you begin with *do–re–mi*.”8 His observation would have seemed like reasonable advice to any galant composer. When Hammerstein’s collaborator Richard Rodgers set the chorus that begins “Doe, a deer . . .” and used scale degree ❶  for *doe*, ❸  for *deer*, ❷  for *ray*, ❹  for *drop*, and so forth, he was probably unaware of how closely he was following in the footsteps of Cimarosa. What both composers shared was a recognition of the abiding utility of this schema.