Two of the early Neapolitan masters of the galant style, Francesco Durante and Leonardo Leo, were viewed by later generations of Italian musicians as having established important artistic lineages. Conservatory lore in Naples described two camps—the Durantisti and Leisti—with different approaches to the art of composition. Modern scholars, however, have found it difficult to substantiate this divide. Perhaps the relevant eighteenth-century distinctions were contingent on very specific contexts. That is, perhaps they represented conflicting preferences for how to handle the details of a given schema.

In his Sei Sonate per cembalo divisi in studii e divertimenti (ca. 1747–49), Durante included the following canon at the octave in C minor:

Ex. 16.1 Durante, Studio no. 1, mvt. 1, m. 1 (ca. 1747)
The canon begins with a Do-Re-Mi (dotted horizontal braces indicate the bass as dux or leader, anticipating the treble as comes or follower). Then, in the second half of the fourth measure, where a third voice enters by repeating the dominant ⑤, the two outer voices combine in a pattern that coalesced as a popular schema. The rising scale ⑦–①–②–③ in the bass is a crucial feature, but the upper voice’s descending ⑥–④–⑧–① is also important as a countermelody. Also worth noting are (1) the sense of one voice chasing another, guaranteed by the canon, and (2) the anchor provided by the repeated ⑤s.

Durante’s importance as a font of galant tradition stems in part from his widely admired sacred works, in part from his many partimenti, and in part from the enormous pedagogical reputation of his student Fedele Fenaroli (1730–1818). Fenaroli wrote the famous collection of partimenti that, after about 1790, was used by generations of Italian and French musicians. As late as 1871, Fenaroli’s partimenti received praise from no less a figure than Giuseppe Verdi. Fenaroli thus served as a bridge between the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, passing on the Neapolitan repertory of galant schemata. To recognize his role in the inculcation and transmission of this important tradition, I call the above schema “the Fenaroli.”

The twenty-eighth of Durante’s fifty-seven partimenti numerati, or “figured” partimenti, opens with a twofold presentation of this Fenaroli schema (ex. 16.2). The bass staff shows Durante’s partimento, and the treble staff, in smaller notes, shows my conjectured realization. The repeated ⑤s of example 16.1 are replaced in example 16.2 with a pedal point in the soprano (F5). Durante’s countermelody in example 16.1 is replaced with a canonic countermelody that lags behind the bass by two tones:

ex. 16.2  Durante, partimenti numerati, no. 28, m. 1 (Naples, ca. 1730s–40s)

J. S. Bach, Durante’s contemporary, was aware of the Neapolitan’s music and his high status. Bach had even copied one of Durante’s masses for his own use (BWV Anh 26, 1727). In Bach’s sonata for flute and harpsichord (BWV 1030) we can recognize a similar twofold
presentation of the Fenaroli schema (ex. 16.3). Bach places the repeated 5s in the sustained tones of the flute. He employs the same type of canonic countermelody, though animated in sixteenth notes that leap between the tenor and alto ranges. The leap down from 2 to 4–5 is the much favored High 2 Drop.

ex. 16.3 J. S. Bach, flute sonata, BWV 1030, mvt. 1, Andante, m. 1 (Leipzig, ca. 1736)

Durante’s student Fenaroli wrote his own partimenti, originally in manuscript and then printed (ca. 1800) and reprinted for more than a century as a set of six books (libri). Though based on Durante’s models, Fenaroli’s partimenti were organized more like a modern textbook. That is, they start simply but become increasingly difficult as one advances through the collection. The first book treats the harmonization of ascending and descending scales in whole notes, guided by the “Rule of the Octave,” and includes the “simple,” “compound,” and “double” cadences (see chap. 11). The second book introduces more musically representative basses of medium difficulty, still provided with some thoroughbass figures. Example 16.4 presents the twelfth partimento from the second book (the annotations are mine, the figures Fenaroli’s). Note that, for a younger composer like Fenaroli, the Fenaroli schema was no longer used as an opening gambit.

All the components of a small movement—a minuet, for instance—are present in this partimento. An opening schema of some type begins the movement in the key of E minor, with a following cadence played twice (the “ABB” form common to opening themes from the 1740s and 1750s, more Durante’s era than Fenaroli’s). Then in measure 6 a modulation to the key of G major leads in measure 8 to two statements of a Fenaroli. The half note G3 in measure 12 ends the first half of the movement where, were it a minuet, one would find the double bar (the double bar line shown above the staff following measure 12 is not present in the partimento).
As Riepel might have predicted, a Fonte begins the second half of the movement, followed by a Monte in measure 17 that climbs to the main key of E minor. In measure 20 there begins the first of two statements of the Fenaroli in E minor. They lead to the cadence and final half note on E3 in measure 25, ending the second half of the movement. In terms of a nineteenth-century notion of sonata form, the Fenaroli would be the “second theme,” which occurs first in the “second key” and then is later transposed back to the main key. What Joel Lester described as the cyclical quality of “second themes,” with their regular alternation between tonic and dominant chords, is perhaps due, at least in part, to the legacy of the many Fenarolis used in that location.

In attempting to reconstruct the full polyphonic fabric of the Fenarolis in example 16.4, we could begin with the fact that the pedal point on ⑤ is already written into the bass part as a second “voice” (the repeated D3). For a third voice, we could use the descending countermelody of Durante (cf. ex. 16.1), or we could choose to imitate, in canon, the rising scale in the bass. Were we to investigate Durante’s many manuscripts of solfeggio, we would see that he himself had already set a pattern quite similar to the above Fenaroli as a canon.
for bass voice and partimento. The voice leads and the partimento follows (the local key is G major, in spite of the D-major key signature):

**ex. 16.5** Durante, *Solfeggi*, Noseda Collection, MS F.42, p. 93, m. 3 (ca. 1740s)

The Fenaroli schema seems to have been easily incorporated into other, larger patterns. For example, in the eighteenth partimento of the same book, Fenaroli presents the descending Durante countermelody (cf. ex. 16.1) in each half of a large Fonte, with the Fenaroli melody to be inferred by the student:

**ex. 16.6** Fenaroli, *Partimenti*, book 2, no. 18, m. 45 (ca. 1770s?)

Fenaroli’s reputation as a teacher was ensured by the success of his students, among them Domenico Cimarosa and Niccolò Zingarelli, who was mentioned in chapter 3 as a teacher of Isabelle de Charrière and Bellini. Cimarosa worked in illustrious circles. For
various high courtiers he composed many small keyboard works that are almost ideal realizations of the schemata sketched in the partimenti of Durante and Fenaroli. Cimarosa seems to have preferred setting the descending Durante countermelody in the bass when employing the Fenaroli schema:

**ex. 16.7** Cimarosa, Sonata C24, m. 8 (ca. 1780s)

The above excerpt, from a sonata in F major, presents the two Fenaroli's in the “second key” of C major. Like his teacher, he could also set a Fenaroli in each half of a Fonte:

**ex. 16.8** Cimarosa, Sonata C51, Allegro, m. 19 (ca. 1780s)
Note the double presentation of the Fenaroli, first twice in minor and then twice in major. Cimarosa follows the tradition of Durante and Fenaroli by interleaving tones of the Fenaroli melody with tones of the dominant pedal (the B₄ sixteenth notes), and he includes his personal touch of adding a third above each of the core tones of the Fenaroli, as he did with the Do-Re-Mi (cf. ex. 6.8).

Cimarosa could also set a Fenaroli in each half of a Monte, in this case choosing only a single presentation before the rising modulation:

**Ex. 16.9** Cimarosa, Sonata C₃₁, Allegro, m. 4₀ (ca. 1780s)

As these examples confirm, Cimarosa preferred to write a Fenaroli with the descending Durante countermelody as the bass. Even if he reduced the countermelody to its bare essentials, ③–⑦–①, Cimarosa would still set it in the bass voice, as shown in example 16.1₀. Notice that he gives reiterated pedal points on ③ to both the tenor and the soprano voices.

Giovanni Paisiello studied with Durante the year before the master’s death in 1755. Much later, during Paisiello’s tenure at the court of Catherine the Great of Russia, he published a collection of partimenti (1782) dedicated to the future Tsarina Maria Feodorovna, then Grand Duchess of All the Russians. In example 16.1₁ I have provided an extended excerpt from the middle of one of Paisiello’s more advanced partimenti. It presents the Fenaroli six times in succession, the first three in a sequence of descending thirds and the last three in a sequence of descending fifths. I have marked the probable entry of
ex. 16.10 Cimarosa, Sonata C57, Allegro, m. 18 (ca. 1780s)

each of the six Fenarolis and indicated the relevant scale degrees. Save for a “#4” and “Imitazione” in measure 26, the original partimento was devoid of words or figures:

ex. 16.11 Paisiello, Regole, p. 36, m. 20 (St. Petersburg, 1782)
In the tradition of partimenti, “imitazione” was a hint to set a recent motif—here presumably the Fenaroli sixteenth notes—against the written bass. The thoroughbass “♯⁴” meant that an E♯ should sound above the B♭ in the bass. A third clue is given by the rapid leapfrogging between soprano and bass clefs, signaling the entry of a high voice, most likely the pedal point ♩. With those clues, and a knowledge of the Fenaroli schema, a three-voice realization of the partimento becomes possible:

ex. 16.12  A realization of Paisiello’s partimento from example 16.11
Understanding this schema dramatically simplifies the task of realizing the partimento. Instead of deciding on 106 voice-pairings above 106 separate bass notes, one can focus on choosing appropriate registers for the pedal point and the countermelody of each Fenaroli. Worth noting is the elegant way that Paisiello manages to incorporate both the Durante countermelody and a canon in each of the Fenaroli’s six presentations.

Paisiello seems to have been more comfortable with setting the Fenaroli bass in the bass voice than was Cimarosa. One account of technical differences between the Durantisti and Leisti concerned whether or not one should treat the interval of a fourth above the second degree of the scale as a consonance. In the key of C major, that would allow a G above a bass D, as for example when continuo players freely added G to a plain “6/3” chord above ②. For the Fenaroli schema, this type of fourth could occur at its third stage if the bass sounds ② while an inner or upper part sounds the pedal point’s ⑤. Perhaps a composer like Cimarosa represented one camp in preferring to avoid that interval of a fourth by placing the “bass” in the treble range, while Paisiello represented the other camp by being willing to treat that fourth as a type of consonance. The idea that these two preferences might not depend solely on who studied with whom could help explain why attempts to tie lineages of students to different styles have proven difficult. Comparing two distinct practices within the context of a single schema does help to bring out differences between what, at a distance of two and a half centuries, sound like very similar styles. As with Jonathan Swift’s eighteenth-century description of the “schism” between Lilliput and Blefuscu over table manners, the technical distinctions between imagined Durantist and Leist practices may come down to some very small things. Still, small things can matter. When Riepel, writing in the Bavarian city of Regensburg, wished to make a point about an acceptable use of a fourth, one sanctioned by “several famous maestros,” he presented a canonic Fenaroli (repeated) and marked that very interval—part of what harmony texts call a “passing” 6/4—with a Maltese cross:

\[ \text{ex. 16.13} \quad \text{Riepel, from a discussion of an allowable fourth (1757)} \]
Whether for a Durantista, a Leista, or a galant musician far removed from the Italian scene, a schema like the Fenaroli was so well known and overlearned that either of its outer voices could act as a cue for the other. In one of the many compositional exercises that he wrote in the *zibaldone* of his pupil Barbara Ployer, Mozart provided the following melodic cue:

**Ex. 16.14**  Mozart, an assignment for Barbara Ployer, p. 41 [mod. ed.], m. 6 (1785–91)

Ployer, who was among Mozart’s most talented pupils, seems to have recognized a common variant of the Fenaroli bass, ⑦–①–④–③, in the first four half-notes of her assignment. She responded by adding a note-perfect Durante countermelody that leads smoothly into a Converging cadence:

**Ex. 16.15**  Ployer, completion of Mozart’s assignment, p. 41 [mod. ed.], m. 6 (1785–91)

Had her task been one solely of “harmonizing” the melody, any of a hundred basses might have resulted. Instead, she recognized or intuited the schematic contexts and responded with one of the handful of solutions that would demonstrate her fluency in the galant style. In the courtly sense, her musical behavior was impeccable.

To be sure, the young Ployer had one of the supreme galant stylists for a maestro. Mozart, when eight or nine years old in London (1764–65), had been set a similar task. The report of Daines Barrington (1769) states that “he had a thorough knowledge of the fundamental principles of composition, as, upon producing a treble, he immediately
wrote a base under it, which, when tried, had very good effect.” During the 1780s, the time of Ployer’s apprenticeship, Mozart continued to pass on, through his teaching and through the examples of his own compositions, the “fundamental principles” of galant composition. Take, for instance, the following excerpt from one of his late “Prussian” string quartets, KV575,$^{12}$

![Mozart, String Quartet, KV575, mvt. 3, Trio, Allegretto, m. 12 (Vienna, 1789)](attachment:diagram.png)

Its location is just after the double bar in the Trio, where Mozart provides the typical Fonte schema. In each half he embeds a Fenaroli with the variant bass, $\text{⑦} - \text{①} - \text{④} - \text{③}$. A simplified version of the Durante countermelody is obvious in the minor-mode section (mm. 13–16), and a florid variant of that countermelody can be discerned in the major-mode section (mm. 17–20). Choosing to make this a Trio in the old meaning of the word, he wrote only three voices: (1) the Fenaroli bass played in the low register of the viola, (2) the Durante countermelody played in the high register of the cello (shown, for visual clarity, an octave higher than it sounds), and (3) a busy, staccato inner voice, played by the first violin, that provides both the pedal point on $\text{③}$ and the broken-chord or tremolo figuration typical of the Fenaroli. We earlier saw the Fenaroli schema embedded within a Fonte in
example 16.8 by Cimarosa. Fenaroli himself was teaching this combination of schemata (cf. ex. 16.6), and the same combination of patterns occurs in the famous opera La buona figliuola (1760) by Durante’s favorite student, Niccolò Piccinni (1728–1800) (see ex. 25.9). Mozart’s practice is thus almost indistinguishable from that of the best-known representatives of the Neapolitan conservatories. On the small but telling point of how to treat the fourth above ♪—a reputed Durantist/Leist fault line—Mozart deftly avoided the problem by substituting ♫ for ♪ (m. 15).

It has never been difficult to imagine Mozart—who signed his name on early works as “Signore Wolfgang Mozart,” who proudly wore the pontifical decoration Cavaliere dello Sperone d’Oro (Knight of the Golden Spur), who was a member of the Bolognese Academica Filarmonica, and who was a master of both opera seria and opera buffa—as a composer of “the Italian school.” The same cannot be said of Beethoven. Generations of biographers have depicted him as so archetypically the German musician that his deep roots in the Italian galant style have been easy to overlook. Even a cursory description of his complex development as a composer would go far beyond the scope of this volume. But perhaps a single example from an early piano sonata can suggest how faithfully he had absorbed the traditions of the galant schemata, even as he was dilating and dramatizing them in unexpected ways.

Before turning the page to view this example, imagine if you will the choices that a galant composer might consider for a transition to the “second key” of an Adagio in the major mode. If the movement were planned to be expansive, a direct modulation through the modulating Prinner might be too rapid. One might instead arrange for a digression by way of a Fonte. Then a cadence on the dominant of the new key could be tantalizingly stretched out through a Ponte. For the “second theme” itself, two presentations of the Fenaroli could suffice if they were set forth broadly enough to match an expansive opening theme. The second presentation could then have the customary addition of some melodic embellishments. The preceding commentary in fact describes the slow movement of Beethoven’s piano sonata Opus 10, no. 1 (see ex. 16.17). As commonly played today, the example lasts almost a full minute, with as much as seven or eight seconds between the stages of the Fonte (approaching the practical limits of short-term memory). One can almost imagine characters from the commedia dell’arte slowed down into living statuary.

Still more complex were the relationships between the first generation of avowedly Romantic composers and a repertory of galant practices that formed a significant part of their musical heritage. Galant practices remained vital for quite some time in Italy, France, and Eastern Europe (Italian masters had been brought to St. Petersburg and other eastern capitals in the eighteenth century, and the careers of their students stretched well into the nineteenth century). In opera, partimento-trained Italian composers like Bellini, Donizetti, Rossini, and Spontini dominated the scene. Their influence on the melodic style of someone like Fryderyk Chopin (1810–1849) was obvious at the time. Franz Liszt (or his consort Princess Carolyne von Sayn-Wittgenstein), commenting on the operatic sources of
Chopin’s highly decorative melodies, wrote that “he gave to this type of ornament, originating solely in the fioritures of the great and venerated school of Italian song, the ele-
ments of surprise and variety beyond the capacity of the human voice which, until then, had been slavishly imitated by the piano in stereotyped and monotonous decoration.”

Liszt’s use of the word “stereotyped” is characteristic of a Romantic rhetorical disdain for past formalisms. Yet consider this example from Chopin’s arch-Romantic Scherzo No. 2:

ex. 16.18  Chopin, Opus 31, Scherzo No. 2, Sostenuto, m. 306 (Paris, 1837)
Obviously the negotiations and accommodations of Liszt’s generation vis-à-vis galant tradition could be more involved than their rhetoric might suggest. The above example from Chopin’s second Scherzo presents the galant Fenaroli down to the smallest detail. It has a canon between bass and tenor (⑦–①–②–③), elements of the Durante countermelody in the soprano part (❶–❹–❸), a rearticulated pedal-point ➋ in the alto, and the double presentation so characteristic of this schema. Appearing first in the key of C♯ minor, the schema then shifts to F♯ minor for a second double presentation. The passionate effect of the whole passage is thoroughly Romantic. The schema on which it was built, however, is securely galant.