whereas the second section of a Fonte is “one step lower,” that of a Monte (It., “a mountain”) is one step higher. Like the Fonte, the Monte involves a sequential transposition of its first material. Unlike the Fonte, however, it may continue the sequence through more steps. In Riepel’s dialogues, the teacher instructs his student that the Monte can be employed immediately after the double bar in a minuet. That was a common usage, though the Monte was not limited to that position and was not as common there as was the Fonte. For a model Monte, Riepel gave only a melody, following his custom.\(^1\)

**Ex. 7.1** Riepel, a Monte melody (1757)

As mentioned in chapter 4, Riepel’s readers could have associated the melody with the typical complete context, mentally supplying an appropriate bass. In this C-major context the implied bass would normally include the leading tone and tonic first of F major and then of G major. In example 7.2, an excerpt from a partimento by Zingarelli gives the important thoroughbass cue of “6/5” to begin the ascending chromatic line created by this rising sequence.\(^2\)
Viewed in the larger context of an entire minuet, Riepel’s Monte focuses first on the subdominant (IV) and then rises to the dominant (V). Like the Fonte, the Monte coordinates each $\overline{5\overline{4}}$ ascent in the bass with a $\overline{3\overline{2}}$ descent in the melody, with these dyads straddling a metrical boundary, usually a bar line. And again like the Fonte, the bass’s minor degrees on $\overline{7}$ will have $6/3$ or $6/5/3$ sonorities, and the ensuing tonic basses will have $5/3$ sonorities. The Monte prototype of four events arranged into two pairs of events is thus very similar to that of the Fonte, with the main differences being the relative transposition of the second dyad and less specificity in the mode of each half (the Fonte is always major-then-minor):

In an earlier treatise, Riepel had combined a melody very similar to the one shown above (ex. 7.1) with a bass very similar to Zingarelli’s (ex. 7.2). The result was a Monte prototype (see ex. 7.3).
ex. 7.3  Riepel, a Monte with both melody and bass (1752)

An E bou major episode from a rondo by the celebrated keyboard player Muzio Clementi (1752–1832) presents a more elaborate and much later exemplar:

ex. 7.4  Clementi, Opus 4, no. 5, mvt. 2, Allegretto, m. 97 (London, 1780)

Clementi, who learned the galant traditions in Rome from his Naples-trained maestro Antonio Boroni (1738–1792), makes the required harmonic moves, the first being toward
the subdominant (Ab) and the second being the move up a step to the dominant (B♭). Clementi’s melody, however, is ornate and approaches C6, the 3 of the subdominant (Ab), both from below (B♭5) and from above (D♭6), thus keeping the schema’s main melodic tones within the diatonic scale of E♭ major. For ease of comparison with the Monte prototype, I have marked 5–6–3 above both halves of Clementi’s melody. That is, however, an oversimplification. Rather than adapt the key of his melody to each local tonic, he maintained a more global melodic adherence to the scale of E♭ major. Thus 1–7–6 for the first half and 3–1–7 for the second half would better reflect the diatonic nature of his melody. Further differences between chromatic and diatonic variants of the Monte will be discussed later in the chapter.

In his extensive writings, Riepel described a broad range of possibilities open to the musician who wished to use a Monte. One could, for example, write a three-part Monte. Because the norm is a two-part Monte with a one-step rise, Riepel noted that a listener, upon hearing the Monte rise yet a second time, might feel “deceived,” though that was not necessarily a bad thing.4 In fact Riepel’s fourth “chapter” or treatise focuses specifically on the denial of expectation for artistic effect. His example of this technique moves from a local F major to G major, as before, and then continues on to A minor:5

EX. 7.5 Riepel, a three-part Monte (1765)

The three-part Monte could also appear in both chromatic and diatonic guises. Two additional examples by Clementi may help to clarify the differences between them. In a chromatic example (ex. 7.6), which occurs in the typical location immediately following the double bar, Clementi guides his Monte first toward the key of the subdominant (IV), then toward the key of the dominant (V), and finally on to the key of the submediant (VI), emphatically marking the tonal closure of each part with a High 2 Drop. Note that each new part is a transposition of the previous one into a new key, with the accidentals adjusted for an implicit II–V–I chord progression in each new tonal context.
The first half of the same movement (ex. 7.7) Clementi penned a three-part diatonic Monte. Unlike the chromatic example 7.6, with its shifting key centers, the Monte of example 7.7 stays within the tonal orbit of a single key, B♭ major, with its third part morphing into a clausula vera cadence (see chap. 11) on F major, the dominant of B♭ major. Save for chromatic neighbor tones (e.g., the B♭s in m. 4), the tones are all taken from the scale of B♭ major until the slight shift toward F major at the cadence. There are changes of harmonic color, to be sure, as when the second part ends on a G-minor chord. But that is technically different from a shift of key center, with a possible shift of mode.
Apart from the difference in detail, both types of Monte still go “up a mountain,” and they both share an underlying “5–6” interval pattern, a centuries-old means of skirting prohibitions against parallel fifths. To make the 5–6 pattern clearer, example 7.8 shows a simplification of the bass in Clementi’s diatonic three-part Monte (ex. 7.7), with thorough-bass figures added:
As with the Fonte, the different sections of a Monte mediate local and global meanings that seem incompatible when expressed in any single system of symbols. One could try to define the Monte as pure counterpoint, but that would obscure the quite specific scale degrees and tonal functions usually employed. There is, after all, an audible difference when one section of a Monte concludes with a minor, as opposed to a major, chord, or when the underlying scale changes slightly for each new part. Conversely, expressing the Monte as merely a pattern of scale degrees and key centers obscures the close relationship between its chromatic and diatonic variants. This dilemma was evident in the eighteenth century. At one point in Riepel’s fictional dialogue between teacher and student, the student notes that an ascending diatonic 5–6 sequence “really seems like a Monte.” The teacher agrees, but describes the plain, diatonic 5–6 as an archaism that “has yet to be fully obliterated.”

Part of the difficulty resides in the word “key.” By the second half the century—Clementi’s time—the meaning of “key” was approaching its modern sense, as in “the key of B♭ major.” In the first half of the century, “key” could also imply a note in a scale that received some temporary focus, as in “G—the sixth key in the hexachord on B♭.” If we examine a repertory from the first half of the century, we ought to find more of the practices that were not yet “obliterated.”

Domenico Scarlatti (1685–1757) was raised in a musical family. Much of this precocious musician’s training was already completed in the late seventeenth century. He was thus familiar with many of the older schemata that would eventually fall out of favor during the course of the eighteenth century. His early experiences included training in Naples, in Rome (where Clementi would study years later), and, as mentioned, in Venice, where his work with Gasparini made him a distant musical relative of Riepel. Scarlatti went on to become a chapel master in both Rome and Lisbon, harpsichordist to the Queen of Spain, and one of the most flamboyant keyboard artists of the age. He seems to have been quite comfortable in taking a Monte through almost any three adjacent “keys.” At times, as in his sonata K. 220 (ex. 7.9), the three keys may fit within a single modern key. That is, the ascending sequence of keynotes C, D, and E could be construed as anchoring, in the modern key of A minor, (1) the mediant or relative major, (2) the subdominant, and (3) the dominant.
Note that each stage of the above Monte is tonally self-contained, with a clear cadential bass and a descending melodic 6–5–4–3. In a modern notion of key, the passage could be described as leading smoothly from the relative major back toward the global key of A minor, the same type of move one might encounter in Viennese sonatas by Haydn or Mozart.

At other times, however, one senses that the modern notion of key would be misapplied. A three-part Monte in a different A-major sonata, K. 219 (see ex. 7.10), also presents
descending 6–5–4–3 melodies and a three-stage ascent. But its keynote sequence of B, C#, and D#, with all three in the minor mode, is impossible to ascribe to any single modern key. As “keys” in the older meaning, however, B, C#, and D# fit comfortably in the hexachords on B or F#, which though still relatively distant are not impossibly so, especially given an A-major context as the point of departure. Scarlatti is justly famous for this type of extravagant tonal excursion, although modern critics are more likely to ascribe such moves to his personality than to the traditions in which he was trained.

His Neapolitan contemporary Francesco Durante (1684–1755), who went on to become one of the most influential and revered of all the maestros, favored two additional,
older types of Monte. Durante’s great authority, and the success of so many of his students, ensured that these archaic seventeenth-century Montes continued to form part of the pedagogical curriculum long after they had left common usage in fashionable court music. The first type is described by one of his students, Fedele Fenaroli (1730–1818), as having a bass that “rises a fourth and falls a third.” Fenaroli provided a realization of this bass in a famous set of partimenti that eventually became, in printed form, a staple of nineteenth-century conservatories:

EX. 7.11 Fenaroli, *Partimenti*, book 3, no. 10, m. 1 (ca. 1770s)

The result is a diatonic Monte in which all chords are in 5/3 position. Or put another way, the G-major diatonic Monte heard in the upper three voices is accompanied by its chordal roots in the bass, in what the Neapolitans called *movimento principale* (“root-position motion”)—hence my term “Monte Principale.”

Fenaroli describes another pattern as having a bass that “rises a fifth and falls a fourth,” and he again presents a series of chords in root position. Here is his realization in melodic “second position” (the chordal third begins the melody):

EX. 7.12 Fenaroli, *Partimenti*, book 3, no. 12, m. 1 (ca. 1770s)
Because this pattern begins like a Romanesca but then rises where the Romanesca would fall, I term it a “Monte Romanesca.” It could equally well be treated as a separate schema, given its different series of sonorities, or even as a variant of the Romanesca. The affinity with the Romanesca seems to have been noticed by C. P. E. Bach (1714–1788), who used a standard Romanesca in the first half of one of his more advanced keyboard movements and then replaced it with a Monte Romanesca at the analogous location in the second half. The two passages are shown one above the other for ease of comparison:

**Ex. 7.13 C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in A Major (H. 186), mvt. 1, Allegro assai, mm. 5, 47 (ca. 1765–66)**

“Mannerist galant” might be a useful description of C. P. E. Bach’s flamboyant and willful manipulations of galant conventions. In many cases, his manipulations would be difficult to explain if one did not assume a prior and quite sophisticated knowledge of the basic galant schemata. Riepel ascribed the interchangeability of musical patterns to what philosophers then termed the *ars combinatoria.* In the same movement, Bach further explored this “art of combinations” by substituting a “textbook” Fonte for the reprise of what had been a Monte (ex. 7.14).
Durante filled his compositions with all the types of Montes that would be passed down through his students’ partimenti. In his set of six keyboard sonatas of the late 1740s, each of which pairs a studio (It., “study”) with a divertimento, one can find all three “genres” of Montes discussed above—the galant Monte with the 5–6 pattern, either chromatic or diatonic, the Monte Principale, and the Monte Romanesca. The standard galant Monte with chromatic bass occurs in the Adagio opening of the sixth “study.” Because of Durante’s central position in the Neapolitan tradition, it may be worth quoting the entire first section (see ex. 7.15). Durante’s Romanesca invites comparison with those of Sammartini, J. C. Bach, and Jommelli given at the conclusion of chapter 2 (exx. 2.22–24). Durante’s Prinner, although thoroughly ornate, “hits its mark” for each stage of the modulating version. The modulation to F major seems provisional, since the passage in measures 4–5 (what Riepel will term a Ponte) appears to expand on F as the dominant of B♭ major, the original tonic key. That B♭ focus is reinforced by the following Monte, which highlights IV and then V in B♭:

ex. 7.14  C. P. E. Bach, Sonata in A Major (H. 186), mvt. 1, Allegro assai, mm. 13, 95 (ca. 1765–66)
The Monte Principale is obvious in the theme of Durante’s second study (see ex. 7.16). Allowing for transposition, Durante’s bass sounds the very notes of the partimento by his student Fenaroli shown earlier in this chapter (ex. 7.11). Indeed, almost every collection of partimenti features at least one such bass as an opening gambit. Closer inspection of Durante’s Monte Principale reveals a canon between melody (leading by one eighth-note) and bass. This particular setting of two parts in canon, each with a movimento up a fourth and down a third, was much prized and replicated in Naples.
Finally, the Monte Romanesca provides a scaffolding for the playful triads in Durante’s sixth and final divertimento:

ex. 7.17 Durante, Divertimento no. 6, Allegro, m. 1 (Naples, 1747)

The odd-numbered chords of the Monte Romanesca will likely have the mode appropriate to their place in the current hexachord, while the even-numbered chords will be either diatonic as well, or applied dominants of the preceding chord (as in ex. 7.17 above). As its bass passes through ②, ⑥, and ③ of the local key, a Monte Romanesca will take on a minor-mode cast (an observation made by the partimento maestro Giovanni Furno [1748–1837]) and, though not seen in Durante’s Divertimento, a series of 4–3 suspensions. In a description of how two soloists could perform an improvised cadenza, Gasparini’s student Johann Joachim Quantz (1697–1773) presented the “intervals” shown in example 7.18 (the upper parts are his; the bass is mine). He was providing the upper parts, with 4–3 suspensions, to a Monte Romanesca which leads, by way of a small Fonte, to a cadenza doppia (“double cadence”; see chap. 11) with a double trill on the penultimate tones.
The Monte Romanesca was an important part of the “strict” or sacred style taught in many partimenti. As in Quantz’s example, there was often a series of 4–3 suspensions, a trait made explicit in a partimento given by Mozart to his student Thomas Attwood (the bass and figures are Mozart’s, the realization is mine):

**Ex. 7.19**  
Mozart, *Attwood Studies* (1785–86)
Attwood had come to Mozart after completing two years of study with conservative teachers in Naples. Perhaps that is why Mozart gave him an assignment that ends with the signature cadence of the Italian partimento, the *cadenza doppia*. This cadence, a vestige of seventeenth-century practice, had become rare in Mozart’s time outside of partimenti. Mozart’s notation of explicit figures for all the 4–3 suspensions was unusual by Italian standards. For the Neapolitans, the 4–3 suspensions were implicit parts of the schema. The following unfigured partimento by the Neapolitan maestro Giacomo Tritto presents a slightly less severe review of many of the same schemata that Mozart assigned to Attwood (the bass is Tritto’s, the realization is mine).³²

**Ex. 7.20 Tritto, *Partimenti* (ca. 1790s)**
Tritto’s combination of a small Do-Re-Mi with a larger Prinner (mm. 7–10) is very similar to the previously presented partimento of Zingarelli (ex. 3.20) probably used by Isabelle de Charrière, and to the exercise by Mozart (ex. 3.21) written for Barbara Ployer. That combination of schemata seems to have been a “usual scene” that any student of galant music needed to know.

In spite of the wide range of Montes available to them, younger generations of galant composers hewed to the line described by Riepel at midcentury. They probably shared the view of Riepel’s fictional teacher who, when the student played for him first a Romanesca and then a Monte Romanesca, described them as sounding “old.”

The very first page of Wodiczka’s Opus 1 contains a Monte of the standard type advocated by Riepel:

**Ex. 7.21** Wodiczka, Opus 1, no. 1, mvt. 1, Largo, m. 18 (1739)

One of Riepel’s many model Montes, if transposed to the key of B♭ major for comparison with Wodiczka’s Monte, shows how closely his summary of the galant style matched the actual practice of his generation and its younger followers.

**Ex. 7.22** Riepel, a model Monte (1755)

But note how Riepel goes slightly beyond Wodiczka by adding a small variation to the second half of this Monte (m. 4 compared to m. 2). When his fictional student wrote two halves of a Monte that, like Wodiczka’s, were identical, the teacher rebuked him with a
pronouncement that, in a world governed by ideas of good taste, the student could hardly gainsay: “two identical statements one after the other sound bad.” Since there are many, many Montes with identically notated halves, it remains unclear whether Riepel’s voice of authority was articulating an idiosyncratic view, whether performers always added variations during performance, whether there were regional preferences for or against “elegant variation,” and so forth. In any case, to understand the issue is to have already become something of a connoisseur. Riepel’s treatises were addressed to the educated amateur, and questions such as this were tailor-made to stimulate discussions of taste, style, and the standards of elegant musical behavior.