Giacomo Tritto began his *Scuola di contrappunto* [The School of Counterpoint] by citing his pedigree. He had studied “under the direction of the renowned maestro Signore Pasquale Cafaro, who was a student of the celebrated Signore Leonardo Leo.” This pedigree, which was impeccable by eighteenth-century standards, meant that he had received a pure form of the largely oral tradition of instruction. Indeed, Tritto’s own book contains more pages of partimenti than pages of verbal explanation. When Tritto began one of his *partimenti semplici* as follows, he was making a clear reference to part of that tradition:

Ex. 9.1 Tritto, from his *Scuola di contrappunto* (Naples, ca. 1816)

Other insiders would have recognized the reference as pointing toward the type of opening phrase shown in example 9.2 (the bass is Tritto’s, the upper parts are mine). I surveyed the history of that small but highly characteristic tradition in *A Classic Turn of Phrase*, a study inspired by one of my own renowned maestros, Leonard B. Meyer (1918–). He had identified a musical “archetype” that featured a melodic contour resembling the musical turn sign, $\infty$, which he termed the “changing-note archetype.” The Tritto partimento
has this shape in the bass and, in an abstract form, the reverse contour in the melodic dyads that close each half of my realization (C5–B §4 and F4–Eb descend following the ascents C3–D3 and B2–C3 in the bass).

In terms of the schemata discussed in previous chapters, the coordinated moves by the dyads in the melody and bass associate Tritto’s pattern with the schemata for the Fonte and Monte. But whereas those schemata are tonally mobile, this schema is tonally stable, which may explain why it was a preferred choice for important themes. I now call this schema “the Meyer,” after the scholar who first drew attention to its importance. In the diagram below, the words open and closed refer to the ancient terms still common in the eighteenth century for musical phrase endings that, respectively, lack and possess a sense of finality or closure:

![Figure 9.1](image-link)
Examples of this schema become very common by the 1750s and 1760s. Here is one from a symphony that Haydn wrote in 1767:

**Ex. 9.3** Haydn, Symphony in B♭ (Hob. I:35), mvt. 1, Allegro di molto, m. 17 (1767)

Haydn, recently promoted from assistant chapel master to chapel master by the Prince of Esterházy, provided a sprightly if nonetheless conventional theme whose drumlike bass was very much in vogue. Dittersdorf, who not long before had succeeded Haydn’s brother Michael as chapel master to the bishop of Grosswardein, had penned a very similar theme the previous year:

**Ex. 9.4** Dittersdorf, Symphony in C (K. 1), mvt. 1, Allegro moderato, m. 1 (1766)

In Haydn’s theme the melodic 1–3 of measures 19–20 sounds a fifth lower than the initial 1–7 of measures 17–18, whereas in Dittersdorf’s theme it is played above. An indifference toward the register of the 1–3 is a common characteristic of this schema. Its second half “answers” its first half, but the exact register of the melody is of small significance.

This simple, sturdy scaffold could support a number of subsidiary patterns. For instance, Carl Heinrich Graun (1703/4–1759), chapel master at the court of Frederick the
Great in Berlin, embedded a two-measure Prinner within a four-measure Meyer in such a way that both schemata come together to close on the same fa–mi in the melody (6–8, heralded by a High 3 Drop):

ex. 9.5  C. Graun, Trio Sonata, mvt. 2, Adagio, m. 1 (ca. 1750)

If a Prinner can be embedded within a Meyer, so can a Meyer be embedded within a Prinner. The “la-to-sol flourish” marked on example 9.6 was an ornamental motif closely associated with Prinners. We will encounter it again in the works of Mozart:

ex. 9.6  Haydn, Symphony in D (Hob. I:73, “La chasse”), mvt. 1, Allegro, m. 27 (ca. 1781)
As a final instance of a Meyer in combination with another schema, example 9.7 shows a large Fonte by Wodiczka. Each of the Fonte’s two sections presents a Meyer, and the second half of each Meyer features the Prinner melody above a cadential bass (cf. Castrucci, ex. 3.5). Because both parts of the Fonte modulate—from the preceding G major to D minor, and then from D minor to C major—the first stage of each Meyer involves subdominant rather than tonic harmonies. This passage is unusually complex for Wodiczka. Such pilings up of schemata became rare after the 1740s, returning only in the 1780s with any frequency.

ex. 9.7  Wodiczka, Opus 1, no. 1, mvt. 2, m. 18 (1739)

The fluid mixing and matching of schemata would seem to exemplify perfectly the *ars combinatoria*. As mentioned earlier, this was a philosophical tradition cited by Riepel and other eighteenth-century musicians. Yet paradoxically these same writers seem loath to ascribe more than one pattern to each moment of music. In describing eighteenth-century scientific and philosophical writers—those in his “classical episteme”—Michel Foucault observed that they believed “words . . . are a constitution and evident manifestation of the order of things.” For Riepel, terms like Fonte, Monte, and Ponte seem to have signified unities that could no more be blended than could the words themselves. Riepel’s position is not unusual. Even today most people do not think of the word “arm” as existing within the word “harm,” or “harm” within “harmony.” The meanings are too divergent. People do, of course, recognize that “harm” is a constituent of words like “unharmed” or “harmless,” and eighteenth-century writers on music could certainly describe patterns as having musi-
cal prefixes, suffixes, or other modifications. But the inability of Riepel and others to separate a schema’s imagined essence from its composite construction or its overlapping deployment meant that a Monte would always be a unitary schema and never something contained in or containing something else. So the rich *ars combinatoria* of professional compositional practice found its only verbal explanation in the description of simple sequences of independent figures. In place of describing an *ars combinatoria* that includes nesting, blending, reference, and allusion, eighteenth-century writers described parlor games in which a fixed set of musical fragments could be placed in a simple series governed by the laws of chance.\(^8\) It was left to the nonverbal traditions of partimenti, solfeggi, and actual composition to demonstrate the richer possibilities of the art.

**The Jupiter**

Mozart begins the final movement of his last symphony, known to later generations as the “Jupiter,” with a melodic motto of four whole notes, C⁵–D⁵–F⁵–E⁵. He then pairs this opening gambit with a standard Prinner riposte:

![Mozart, Symphony in C (KV551, “Jupiter”), mvt. 4, Molto allegro, m. 1 (1788)](image)
What I and many others call the “Jupiter” motto, which itself had an extensive history prior to Mozart’s use of it, fits very well into a number of contrapuntal combinations. In the example above, Mozart matched it with the bass of a deceptive cadence. In example 9.9, which is the continuation of example 9.8, he changed the bass to $1\rightarrow 5\rightarrow 5\rightarrow 1$ and added an upper voice to create a pair of 7–6 suspensions (in relation to the Jupiter motto):

**Ex. 9.9** Mozart, Symphony in C (KV 551, “Jupiter”), mvt. 4, Molto allegro, m. 9 (1788)

Extensive training in fugal partimenti and imitative solfeggi helped an aspiring composer to master a repertory of these stock contrapuntal combinations. The fruits of this training were most clearly evident in sacred music, especially in Amen fugues and the like. It is a characteristic of Mozart’s late style that he took these techniques of counterpoint favored in sacred genres and developed them in genres associated with the court chamber or theater.

**The Pastorella**

Lerner and Loewe’s 1960 musical *Camelot* featured actor Richard Burton, in the role of King Arthur, singing the question “What do the simple folk do?” Among the real kings and courtiers of Europe the question seems to have been of perennial interest. Eighteenth-century answers, as represented by paintings, ballets, and operas, appear every bit as contrived as that scene in *Camelot*. The shepherds and shepherdesses of ordinary rural life became conflated with mythical Arcadian figures like Pan or Orpheus to represent an eternal type of “natural” person untouched by the stresses and temptations of court or urban life. Perhaps the ultimate case of the imagined pastoral was the construction for Marie Antoinette of a *ferme ornée* (“ornamental farm”) known as the *Hameau de la Reine* (1783), a complete faux village where the queen could pose as a milkmaid. A contemporary treatise on gardens (1776) commented that an ornamental farm should “announce itself by its
country air, careless and without pretension; like a naive shepherdess without guile whose simplicity would be her only ornament.”

The musical depiction of the pastoral was itself a rich tradition not limited to the literally rustic. Among the many ways to depict in sound a world where “simplicity would be [the] only ornament” was to use a schema that featured a melody, often accompanied in parallel thirds, that gently oscillated around the tones of the tonic triad. Near the close of the Missa pro defunctis by François-Joseph Gossec (1734–1829), where one leaves behind the terror of its famous Tuba mirum to contemplate “rising again” to a guileless paradise, two sopranos present an instance of what I term “the Pastorella,” the “shepherdess”:

ex. 9.10 Gossec, Missa pro defunctis [Requiem], mvt. 15, [Andante], m. 26 (1760)

The Pastorella schema shares with the Meyer and Jupiter a 1–3 melodic termination, a similar harmonic pattern, and its function as opening gambit or important theme. In the larger context of Gossec’s mass, the above phrase is part of the “Lacrimosa.” That movement begins in a doleful F minor, which eventually leads to a half cadence followed by a grand pause. When the Pastorella begins in Ab major, it is clearly the opening theme of a new section. The prized effect of “noble simplicity and quiet grandeur” (“edle Einfalt und stille Grösse”), an influential phrase from Johann Joachim Winckelmann’s description (1755) of ancient Greek art, is here musically abetted both by the dearth of melodic diminutions and by the way in which the opening 3 in measure 26 leads broadly through the 1 in measure 28 all the way to the high point of the 5 in measure 30. The avoidance of vocal display is likewise evident in the mere five-note range of the melody.

Vocal display was the stock-in-trade of the great castrato Farinelli (1705–1782), a Neapolitan who studied with Porpora. Yet Farinelli was also renowned for his affecting performance of a simple, direct melody. One of his signature arias was Hasse’s “Per questo dolce ampesso” (“For this sweet embrace”). The aria debuted in Hasse’s first Metastasian opera, Artaserse (Venice, 1730). Farinelli took the aria with him to London (the version shown in ex. 9.11) and later used it to assuage the melancholia of Phillip V of Spain. Hasse’s radiant yet restrained aria presents the “noble simplicity” of a young man wrongly accused
yet willing to die to save his father. The example gives the beginning of the opening ritor-nello. Farinelli’s entrance with this same theme (not shown) is even simpler, with the dotted rhythms replaced by two sixteenth-notes or plain eighth notes.

ex. 9.11  Hasse, Artaserse, “Per questo dolce amplesso,” m. 1 (London, 1734)

The first two measures present the Pastorella’s parallel thirds in the treble and its 1–5–5–1 pattern in the bass. A Prinmer riposte then leads to a half cadence. Note that Hasse’s melody also presents the Adeste Fidelis variant of the paired Do-Re-Mi, that is, Do-Re (m. 1) … Re-Mi (m. 2). The downbeats of measures 1–2 emphasize the Do-Re-Mi, while the middle beats of the same measures emphasize the Pastorella. Had the second measure begun with a prominent A5, one might hear the Jupiter. These schemata were each subtly distinguished in the galant style. Only much later, when the distinctions no longer had any force, were they all assimilated into the category “antecedent-consequent phrase” or worse, “I–V–V–I.”

One of the many concertos of the great Venetian musician Antonio Vivaldi (1678–1741) was actually titled “La pastorella”:

ex. 9.12  Vivaldi, Concerto in D, “La pastorella” (RV95), mvt. 2, Largo, m. 1 (Venice, ca. 1710)
Its slow movement carries many of the external markers of the pastoral—simple texture, gently oscillating neighbor tones in triple rhythm, calm bass, the pipes of Pan (a recorder plays the melody)—and yet it presents the generic schemata of the Romanesca with Prinner riposte. Hence I do not want to suggest too strong a link between an abstract schema and the pastoral theme or “topic,” to use Leonard Ratner’s term. Most of the galant schemata were adaptable to any topic, just as a particular dress pattern could be realized in any number of fabrics.

Nevertheless, the Pastorella schema did seem to have a certain affinity with the pastoral topic. In a similarly bucolic slow movement for the same instrumentation (ex. 9.13) Vivaldi chose to present the Pastorella along with the Jupiter. Note the Pastorella’s characteristic ①–⑤–⑤–⑥–① bass, its mid-measure resolution of the melodic dyads, and its very simple melody. The Jupiter’s characteristic ① falls squarely on the downbeat of the second measure:

ex. 9.13  Vivaldi, Concerto in G Minor (RV105), mvt. 2, Largo, m. 1 (Venice, ca. 1710)

The Adeste-Fidelis–like melodic leaps down to and up from ③ are a further indication that the Jupiter and Pastorella have close relationships with the Do-Re-Mi. Leonard Meyer grouped the Pastorella together with the Meyer (my terms) under the category of the “changing-note archetype.” While those schemata do share a turnlike or sigmoid melodic contour of the core tones, the Pastorella has more in common with the Jupiter and the paired Do-Re-Mi. For instance, whereas the Meyer’s second event features a prominent melodic ⑩, these other schemata all require a ⑩ at that point: paired Do-Re-Mi (⑩–⑩–⑩), Jupiter (⑩–⑩), Pastorella (⑩–⑩). From the point of view of the galant composer, the psychological question of schema similarity or affiliation was less important than the pragmatic one of which schemata could be superimposed if one desired to achieve, in Leonard Meyer’s apt phrase, both “grammatical simplicity and relational richness.”

Three opening themes from the solfeggi of Giacomo Insanguine (1728–1795) can demonstrate how, for instance, a young musician could learn to distinguish the Pastorella from the Meyer. A Neapolitan collection of maestro Insanguine’s solfeggi for bass voice
and partimento is preserved in the Noseda Collection of the Milan Conservatory Library. The first example below, no. 10 of that collection, presents the Meyer with its standard ①–②–⑦–① (or ③–②–⑦–①) bass. The melody descends a step for the first dyad ①–⑦, and then continues to descend through a Prinner melody:

Ex. 9.14  Insanguine, solfeggi nos. 10–12, all beginning with m. 1 (Naples, ca. 1770s)

The second example, no. 11, presents the Pastorella. The ①–⑤–⑦–① bass is a variant of the ①–③–⑤–① basses seen earlier. The melody, after sounding the ⑤–③ dyad, restates the ③
as part of a scalar High ♯ Drop. The third example, no. 12, presents another Pastorella, this
time forming another Prinner melody by transposing measures 1–2 up one step in mea-
ures 3–4. Solfeggi for bass can be instructive for the analysis of schemata because they
generally present the basic forms, avoiding complex types of ornamentation. Solfeggi for
soprano, as we shall see below, were written for more agile voices.

The Aprile

Giuseppe Aprile (1732–1813) had a brilliant career as a singer. Trained in Naples, where he
later became a maestro, he premiered many of the choice operatic roles, including that of
Timante in the Stuttgart premiere of Jommelli’s Demofonte (1764; see chap. 24). The
solfeggi, or vocal exercises, that he, Durante, Leo, David Perez (1711–1778), Porpora,
Insanguine, Nicola Sala (1713–1801), Pasquale Cafaro (1715/16–1787), and others wrote for
students in Naples were not the arid scales and arpeggios that the term calls to mind today.
Instead, they were often beautifully crafted melodies paired with partimento-like unfig-
ured basses. Students thus practiced and absorbed a complete melody-bass framework.
The lovely vocal gestures in Cimarosa’s operas may owe a great deal to the time he spent
as a student of Aprile. Castrati, among whom Aprile was one of the most prominent, have
not been given much credit for composition, whether through prudery in Victorian times
or through ignorance of the rich tradition of eighteenth-century solfeggi. Yet they were
crucial carriers of galant traditions, and their knowledge of how to craft a moving melody,
shaped as it was by their years on stage, could be matched by few others.

The Aprile schema, which I name in his honor, is closely associated with the Meyer.
Both share the same pair of initial events. But whereas the Meyer closes with a ♩–♩ dyad,
the Aprile closes a third lower with ♩–♩. Example 9.15, taken from one of Aprile’s
Neapolitan solfeggi for soprano (meaning a boy or a castrato in the male-only world of the
conservatories) begins with the “open” half of a typical Meyer (mm. 1–2). Its “closed” half
(mm. 3–4), with its ♩–♩ dyad, is what distinguishes it from the Meyer. This four-bar
Aprile opening gambit leads to a four-bar Prinner riposte, with the la-to-sol ornament
(mm. 5–6) applied twice. The Prinner’s normal tenor voice is in the bass. Though the
solfeggio looks very spare with its barely moving bass, the accompanist would have been
expected to add, where appropriate, parallel thirds or sixths beneath the melody, thereby
considerably enriching the texture and sonority. Such textures are quite common in the
arias of Cimarosa, Paisiello, Piccinni, and Mozart. The rising scale in measure 8 “flees” the
closure of the Prinner, ascending to begin in measure 9 a second descent toward a special
type of galant half-cadence. A discussion of these and many other varieties of galant “closes”
or clausulae will be the focus of chapter 11.

As shown earlier in example 9.9 from Mozart’s Jupiter symphony, the Jupiter motive
can form an alternate bass for an Aprile melody. Mozart fully exploited this ars combina-
toria in the slow movement of his famous G-minor symphony, written the same summer as
the Jupiter symphony. Examples 9.16–20 sketch the melody and bass of some of the combinations and transformations that abound in this movement, focusing on those that relate to the schemata previously introduced. Articulating Mozart’s series of schemata are a variety of clausulae with differing strengths and functions.

Mozart selected a four-measure presentation of the Jupiter schema (see ex. 9.16) for the opening of his Andante. Its “melody”—that is, what a listener attends to as the theme unfolds—emerges from the composite effect of three successive entries by the violas, second violins, and first violins. The violas and second violins leap up from ❶ in a manner characteristic of the Adeste Fidelis Do-Re-Mi (see chap. 6). They perform a variant of the Corelli “leapfrog” (cf. ex. B.7 in appendix B). The violas leap first to E♭4. As they repeat that tone in a series of equal eighth notes, the second violins leap to F4 a second above it. The ensuing iterated clash of E♭4 and F4, the “2” of a 2–3 suspension, continues for a whole measure, resolving only in measure 3 when E♭4 descends to D4. The bass supporting the Jupiter is a variant of the standard bass clausula (③–④–⑤–①; see chap. 11). In measure 2 (at the asterisk), beneath the “2” of the 2–3 suspension, Mozart chromatically ornaments ❹ and its movement toward ❸. His Jupiter is followed by the traditional Prinner riposte. For its first half, Mozart prefaces each core tone in the melody with a lower chromatic appoggiatura (highlighted with starbursts in ex. 9.16). For the Prinner’s second half, Mozart accelerates the pace, fitting two statements of the ❶–❹ dyad (with High ❷ Drops) in measure 7. The general descent of the Prinner melody thus pushes on to the ❶ in measure 8, ending in a chromatic slide to a half cadence.
In his first transformation (ex. 9.17), he placed the “melody” in the lowest string parts and the bass in the first violins, thus exchanging the registers of melody and bass. In a further transformation, he simplified and extended the chromatic ornament (see the double asterisk, mm. 10–11), which first appeared in the bass of measure 2. As for the Prinner, with its “melody” in the bass, the close functions as a conventional preface to a strong cadence, first evaded and then completed.

**ex. 9.16** Mozart, Symphony in G Minor (KV550), Andante, m. 1 (Vienna, 1788)

**ex. 9.17** Mozart, Symphony in G Minor (KV550), Andante, m. 9 (Vienna, 1788)
After a complete cadence in the main key (not shown), Mozart introduced a new theme in Bb major. It features the Jupiter melody in the bass and an Aprile melody in the first violins (cf. ex. 9.9 from the Jupiter symphony). In place of the 2–3 suspensions of the opening theme (m. 2), this new theme features 7–6 suspensions (mm. 21, 23). A small Fonte ensues, followed by a clausula vera (see chap. 11) that closes with Fs in both bass and treble. That is, the music emerges from the digression of the Fonte to focus on Fs as both ♭1 and ♭♭1 of a local but relatively stable F-major context:

**Ex. 9.18** Mozart, Symphony in G Minor (KV550), Andante, m. 20 (Vienna, 1788)
The next transformation takes as its point of departure the 2–3 suspension that occurs in measure 2 when the second violins leap to a tone a step above the tone being reiterated by the first violins. At the end of the previous example, rescored below as the beginning of example 9.19, all the principal parts play or ornament an F as ① or ❶. In measure 28, an analogue of measure 2, the upper parts introduce a dissonant Gb one step above the F. The resolution of this unexpected 2–3 suspension leads quickly to the remote key of D♭ major (m. 29). There Mozart repeats the bass and composite melody of measure 1, with the addition of the decorative descending scale first heard in measure 27 (itself a transformation of the descending thirds of measure 16). What follows in measure 30 transforms the expected 2–3 suspension into the closely related 4–3 suspensions of a “textbook” Monte Romanesca (see chap. 7). In the late 1780s the Monte Romanesca was an archaism, and the overlay of the descending scales (not shown) gives this remarkable passage a Handelian grandeur:

ex. 9.19  Mozart, Symphony in G Minor (KV550), Andante, m. 28 (Vienna, 1788)

The opening theme returns unaltered in measure 74 (not shown). After the Prinner riposte, the second Jupiter and its expected exchange of parts follows, with the “melody” moving to the bass, and the prior bass moving to the first violins. This second Jupiter (ex. 9.20), now with both forms of the chromatic ornament in the first violins (marked with single and double asterisks), dissolves in a modulation to F minor before its Prinner riposte can appear.
Ex. 9.19  Mozart, Symphony in G Minor (KV550), Andante, m. 82 (Vienna, 1788)
In between the dissolving Jupiter and its interrupted Prinner, Mozart inserted a huge Fonte. Heinrich Christoph Koch (1749–1816; see chap. 29, exx. 29.1–2) described this technique as a musical “parenthesis” in the “connecting of melodic parts.” Mozart’s Fonte is so complex that it can only be described piecemeal, although it has a close analog in the large Fonte by Wodiczka shown earlier (ex. 9.7). As in the Wodiczka Fonte, each half of Mozart’s Fonte is a Meyer. The second half of each Meyer presents the Prinner melody. The first half of each Meyer employs the motivic material of the Aprilé (ex. 9.17), an association facilitated by the Meyer and the Aprilé sharing the same opening dyad (❶–❷ with ❸–❹). Within this large Fonte measure 89 warrants special mention. In a hypothetical simpler version, Mozart might merely have ended the first Meyer there, and then, in measure 90, begun the second one. In the actual version, Mozart takes the eighth-note melodic motive of measure 88 and echoes it, one step lower (shifted up an octave to the flute part) in measure 89. The flute’s high C₁b (❷) makes this a hermaphrodite Fonte within a larger, normal Fonte. The result is that measure 90 differs from its analog in measure 86. Whereas measure 86 merely begins a Meyer, measure 90 both begins a Meyer and ends an embedded Fonte-within-a-Fonte (note the small ❶–❷ in measure 90). After this grand “parenthesis” Mozart returns to the Prinner riposte as if nothing had happened. He then proceeds directly to the clausula vera, skipping the already employed Fonte. The Handelian Monte Romanesca follows as before (not shown). All the component parts from earlier in the movement are reused, but in amazing new combinations—a true ars combinatoria.