

CHAPTER I

THE MASS AND VESPERS OF 1610: THE SOURCES AND THEIR INTERPRETATION

All musical notation is ambiguous and in need of interpretation, even the most extravagantly detailed notations of the twentieth century. But the musical sources of the early Baroque era pose especially difficult problems for scholars precisely because flexibility and ambiguity in notation and the manner of performance were primary elements of early seventeenth-century style. There can be no absolute determination of "authentic" interpretation in a period whose documents unequivocally testify to a wide range of acceptable performing methods. Seventeenth-century musicians themselves sometimes strayed beyond the bounds of what many composers considered good taste. Admonitions to performers appended to numerous early *Seicento* music prints demonstrate how important appropriate execution was to composers and how often they thought it necessary to describe aspects of performance that could not be taken for granted. Some of these prefaces grew to be treatises of major significance, providing modern scholars with invaluable evidence about contemporary techniques. These sources are themselves often mutually contradictory, however, still leaving room for legitimate disagreement on many issues. The most the modern scholar or musician can hope for is that experience with the documentary and musical evidence as well as with Baroque instruments will eventually lead to judgment and taste compatible with the performance concepts and practices of this problematic period. The term "authentic" can only have meaning for the early Baroque within this framework of uncertainty and ambiguity. Definitive answers are out of the question.

Ricciardo Amadino's print of Monteverdi's Mass and Vespers of 1610 is one of those documents whose close study, coupled with additional evidence from other sources, yields useful information on the range of possibilities envisioned by the composer for his music. At the same time, this print is rife with problems and questions demanding interpretation and resolution. Just as the Mass and Vespers constitute a compendium of nearly every style of sacred music of the early seventeenth century, Amadino's print poses virtually all the problems of interpretation encountered by the

modern scholar or performer in attempting to come to grips with the music of that era.

The Introduction to this volume has already outlined the liturgical ambiguities of Monteverdi's collection and the various combinations of pieces that could be presented, depending upon the solemnity of the Marian feast being celebrated, the instruments and singers available, or the surroundings in which the music was to be heard.

This multiplicity of possibilities concerns merely the initial selection of pieces, or even parts of pieces, from the print. But in addition to these options, other purely musical questions and ambiguities arise from the improvisatory character of early Baroque music. Basso continuo realization, organ registration, *ad libitum* accompanying and doubling of vocal parts with instruments, instrumental and vocal ornamentation, and *musica ficta* were all issues to be settled anew each time the music, especially the Vespers in the new style, was to be performed. Monteverdi's notation is actually much more detailed with regard to some of these matters than that of his contemporaries, but he nevertheless left many elements of performance unspecified.

Other problems of interpretation emerge from errors in Amadino's print and from differences between the two sources of the *Missa In illo tempore*. A comparison between the sources of the Mass and a close study of errors in the print are essential for obtaining the best possible reading for a critical edition. Fortunately, it is usually much easier to arrive at decisions in these matters than in questions of performance practice, and the preference of one version over another can often be adequately demonstrated.

The present essay will examine the uncertainties and problems in Amadino's print and the manuscript of the Mass, beginning with the sources and their relationship to one another, proceeding to a study of errors and inconsistencies in the print, and concluding with an examination of the *Bassus Generalis* part-book and performance practice.

THE SOURCES

Amadino's print of 1610, containing both the Mass and Vespers, comprises seven part-books, *Cantus*, *Altus*, *Tenor*, *Bassus*, *Quintus*, *Sextus*, and *Septimus*, plus a separate part-book in folio entitled *Bassus Generalis*.¹

The *Missa In illo tempore* also exists in a second source, *Cappella Sistina* Ms. 107 of the *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana*, whose version of the work is not identical to Amadino's. Its title reads: *Sanctiss. Virgini/Missa/Senis Vocibus/A Claudio Monteverde/Nuper Effecta/ac Beatiss. Paulo V. P.O.M./Consecrata*. This manuscript is not a holograph copy, for the inscription continues: *quam/ab Edaci Atramento/Penitus Fere Corrosam/Ioseph Vecchius/Magister Cap. Pont. Nunc Existens/ob Supradicti*

Pontificis/Memoriā/et Tanti Viri Excellentiam/Sedente/Innocentio XI. P.O.M./Restitui Curavit/An. M.DC.LXXXIII. At the bottom of the page in very small script is the name of the copyist: *Bartholomaeus Belleschus scribebat Anno ut supra.* Even this restoration, necessitated by the corrosive effects of the original ink, did not suffice permanently, for the title page is preceded by another folio testifying to a second restoration: *Sedente/Benedicto XIII/P.O.M./Sub protectione Eñi, & Rñi D. Petri Presbyt./Card. Otthoboni/Tit. S. Laurentii in Damaso/S.R.E. Vice Cancelarii/R.D. Petro Bastianello de Trivignano/Magistro Capp. Pont. pro tempore existente/Restauravit Anno D./MDCCXXIV.* The manuscript contains the same dedication to Pope Paul V as Amadino's print with only slight differences of orthography. There is no *Bassus Generalis* in the Vatican manuscript since performances in the Sistine Chapel did not use accompanying instruments of any kind.

Yet a third version of the Mass survives in an organ *partitura* compiled by a certain Lorenzo Tonelli and appended to a Brescian copy of the Amadino print lacking only the *Bassus Generalis*.² Tonelli's *partitura* includes all of the voices plus the *Bassus Generalis*, proving that the latter part-book was available to him at one time. This manuscript is therefore not a primary source for the work, but it is instructive with regard to performance practice, as will be seen below.

Questions and uncertainties concerning the Mass and Vespers begin with the relationship between the two principal sources of the former. The restored Vatican manuscript carries no original date, not even at the conclusion of the dedication. The dedication in the Amadino print, on the other hand, is dated with precision *Venetijs Calendis Septemb. 1610* (September 1, 1610). What documentary information exists surrounding the presentation of the Mass to Pope Paul V in Rome and the publication of the entire Mass and Vespers in Venice is at some points contradictory. In addition, a misdated letter of Monteverdi's has contributed to further confusion and untenable speculations.³

The first mention of the Mass and Vespers is in a letter from the Mantuan singer Bassano Casola to Cardinal Ferdinando Gonzaga in Rome, dated July 16, 1610.⁴ In this correspondence Casola describes Monteverdi's recent compositional activity and his intention to visit the Holy City:

Il Monteverdi fa stampare una Messa da Cappella a sei voci di studio et fatica grande, essendosi obligato maneggiar sempre in ogni nota per tutte le vie, sempre più rinforzando le otto fughe che sono nel motetto, *in illo tempore* del *Gomberti* e fà stampare unitamente ancora di Salmi del Vespero della Madonna, con varie et diverse maniere d'inventioni et armonia, et tutte sopra il canto fermo, con pensiero di venirsene a Roma questo Autunno, per dedicarli a Sua Santità. Và ancho preparando una muta di Madrigali a cinque voci, che sarà di tre pianti quello dell'Arianna con il solito canto sempre, il pianto di Leandro et Hereo del Marini, il terzo, datoglielo, da S.A.Sma. di Pastore che sia morta la sua Ninfa. Parole del figlio del Sigr. Conte Lepido Agnelli in morte della Signora Romanina.⁵

Casola's description of the Mass and Vespers is neither complete nor accurate in every detail. The *otto fughe* from the Gombert motet are actually ten in number. In mentioning the *Salmi del Vespero, tutte sopra il canto fermo*, Casola has in mind the five Vesper psalms and very probably the two *Magnificats*, but he omits any reference to the respond, motets, hymn, and *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*, which are also included in Amadino's print. Whatever inaccuracies and omissions there may be in Casola's remarks, it is nevertheless evident that Monteverdi's work seems to have been largely if not entirely finished by this date, a circumstance that would certainly have been necessary for the publication to be issued on September 1.

Also of some note in Casola's letter is the list of laments in preparation, two of which were published four years later in the Sixth Book of Madrigals.⁶ There was often a substantial time lag between the completion of Monteverdi's compositions and their eventual publication. Some of the madrigals from Book IV (1603) and Book V (1605) were already in circulation by 1600, as proven by the discussion and quotation of excerpts in *L'Artusi, ovvero, Delle imperfezioni della moderna musica*, printed in that year.⁷ *L'Orfeo* was premiered in the spring of 1607 but not published in its first edition until 1609. Casola's letter shows a four-year delay in the appearance of the laments.

These apparently normal time lags suggest that part or perhaps even all of the Mass and Vespers may have been completed well before the late summer of 1610. The close connections between portions of the Vespers and *L'Orfeo* also imply an early date for some of the pieces, especially the respond *Domine ad adiuvandum*, which is contrafacted from the opera's *Toccata*. It is, in fact, quite possible that the compositions in Amadino's very large print of 1610 represent a gradual accumulation of material over the span of several years. Preparations for the Gonzaga wedding celebration of 1608, about which Monteverdi complained bitterly in a letter long after the festivities were over, occupied all his time in the fall of 1607 and the spring of 1608, leaving him exhausted at the beginning of the summer.⁸ But work on the Mass and Vespers may have progressed during the summer of 1607, the summer and fall of 1608, and throughout much of 1609. Some of the pieces in the print, particularly the conservative psalm *Nisi Dominus*, could conceivably date from even earlier than 1607, although there is no substantiating evidence.

Unlike *L'Orfeo* and *Arianna*, the Mass and Vespers do not seem to have been written on command for a special occasion, and there is no record of a Mantuan presentation of any of this music, although performance of at least some pieces is highly likely.⁹ Monteverdi may not have been under any pressure in the composition of these works other than his own wish to publish proof of his abilities in multiple styles of sacred music. His desire to escape the Gonzaga court, expressed in his father's letters to the Duke and

Duchess, may have led to the preparation of a collection designed to open opportunities for a church position free from the demands and intrigues of the Gonzaga household as well as from the poverty in which the composer lived.

The next reference to the Mass and Vespers appears in a letter written on September 14, 1610, by the Gonzaga prince, Francesco, to his brother the cardinal. Francesco remarks that Monteverdi is coming to Rome to have some religious compositions published and to present them to the pope.¹⁰ The discrepancy between Francesco's letter and the evidence of Amadino's print, dedicated in Venice on September 1, is probably the result of a misunderstanding on the prince's part. The letter was posted from Pontestura, west of Casale Monferrato, where Francesco was on holiday, and his knowledge of Monteverdi's intentions and of the publication of the Mass and Vespers by Amadino may have been incomplete and imprecise.¹¹

When Monteverdi actually departed for Rome is unknown, though it must have been after September 14, since Francesco's letter requests Ferdinando's aid in obtaining a papal audience.¹² There is no evidence that Monteverdi ever had an audience with Pope Paul, but he did make a favorable impression on the Cardinals Montalto and Borghese (the latter the pope's nephew), for they wrote to Duke Vincenzo in Mantua on November 23 and December 4 respectively, describing the composer in glowing terms.¹³ If Monteverdi was not still in Rome at the time of these letters, he must have returned to Mantua only shortly before. His next extant letter is dated Mantua, December 28, 1610, and discusses aspects of his trip.¹⁴

Hans Redlich has advanced the thesis that Francesco's description of Monteverdi's purpose in going to Rome was accurate in all respects and that the dedication date of Amadino's print does not reflect the actual date of issue. Redlich supports his contention with a letter of Monteverdi's apparently dated January 6, 1611, published by Malipiero.¹⁵ This letter was mailed from Venice and presumably shows that Monteverdi had traveled there almost immediately after the December 28 date of the Mantuan letter mentioned above. Redlich assumes that the purpose of this trip was to oversee the Amadino publication, which was arranged only after Monteverdi's failure to get the collection printed in Rome:

That the first-print could not have been issued during the month of September is proved by the corroborative evidence of a handwritten copy of the Mass which survives in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana (Cappella Sistina No. 107). This was the actual dedication copy presented to Pope Paul V on the occasion of Monteverdi's visit to Rome. That copy was renewed—presumably because of wear and tear owing to repeated use—under the Pontificate of Innozenz [*sic*] XI and Benedict XIII in 1683 and 1724 respectively. In addition: We know that Monteverdi was back in Mantua by December 28, 1610, proceeding from there hurriedly to Venice from where he wrote a letter on January 6, 1611. What else could have necessitated this hectic journey, coming so soon after the return from Rome, but the pending

publication in Venice of his sacred music of 1610? Thus, there is a strong probability that the Mass (and its companion pieces: The Vespers of the Blessed Virgin and the two settings of the Magnificat) was only published around New Year 1611. In that case the Vatican copy would represent an earlier editorial stage of the "Missa". The fact that it differs in several respects from the version of the first-print can only underscore that probability.¹⁶

The letter supposedly placing Monteverdi in Venice at the beginning of 1611 considers the proposed composition of a theatrical work, *Le Nozze di Tetide, favola Maritima*, which was the subject of a series of exchanges between Monteverdi and the Mantuan court secretary (and librettist of *L'Orfeo*), Alessandro Striggio. These letters do not fall in 1611, however, but between December 1616 and February 1617. Monteverdi's side of the correspondence is all posted from Venice, since he had already been employed at San Marco for more than three years. Malipiero uncritically accepted the year on the January 6 letter without regard to its contents, although Henri Prunières had earlier noted the discrepancy and assigned the letter to its proper sequence according to the subject matter.¹⁷ In his recent edition of the correspondence, De' Paoli has also correctly placed this letter.¹⁸ Redlich's theory is thus lacking foundation. There was no "hectic journey" to Venice in January of 1611, the Mass and Vespers were indeed issued in the *Serenissima* on September 1, 1610, and Francesco was simply mistaken in thinking Monteverdi was seeking a publisher in Rome.

In this light, the preservation of only the Mass in the *Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana* is of interest. The manuscript copy, as noted above, is without *basso continuo*, since the choir of the *Cappella Sistina* sang without benefit of organ or other instruments. Either Monteverdi did not personally offer the Amadino *print* to the pope, even though the entire collection is dedicated to Paul V, or the copy he presented has vanished. In either event, the elaborate modern style of the Vespers was completely unsuited to Roman conservatism and the pope's strong Counter-Reformation attitudes. In fact, polyphonic Vesper music was confined for the most part to northern Italy, and comparatively little of it was produced in Rome before 1620. If Monteverdi was indeed seeking a new position in Rome, as both De' Paoli and Denis Arnold suggest (quite probable in view of Monteverdi's discontent at Mantua), the Mass would have been an appropriate vehicle of introduction.¹⁹ The Vespers, however, were much more suited to Venice, where Monteverdi finally did obtain employment in 1613.²⁰

It seems, therefore, that Monteverdi was advertising himself as a composer of sacred music in two musical capitals at once: Rome with the Mass and Venice with the Vespers. The stylistic dichotomy between the two parts of the Amadino print reflects the cultural and political differences between the two cities, which had grown in intensity throughout the sixteenth century and had finally resulted in a papal interdict between 1606 and 1607, imposed upon the republic by Monteverdi's dedicatee, Paul V.²¹

Although the reason that two sources for the Mass survive is sufficiently clear, the musical relationship between these sources is not so obvious. Both versions of the work contain errors, and each has better readings than the other in certain passages. In some instances two divergent readings are equally satisfactory. Where there are differences in text underlay, which are at times substantial, the manuscript is almost always superior to the print. A peculiar deviation between the two sources is an interchange of the *Cantus* and *Sextus* parts in the first section of the *Sanctus*. At the *Benedictus* the two parts are once again in agreement in both versions. This reversal of voices has no real bearing on the sonority of the composition, though, since both parts are notated in the C_1 clef, share the same range, and frequently exchange identical material.

The equally good readings of several different passages in the two sources suggest that neither can be considered an original version. The differences may have resulted from corruptions introduced by copyists and typesetters in working from the composer's lost autograph. The copy Monteverdi originally presented to Pope Paul may even have differed in some details from the source used by Amadino in preparing his print. The Vatican version may also have been altered in the process of restoration. It is probable that errors encountered by *Cappella Sistina* singers in the initial manuscript were corrected in the first restoration. On the other hand, new errors may have crept into the restorations through miscopying. Only the superiority of the text underlay argues for the priority of the Vatican manuscript as a source for a modern edition. Even the differences in text underlay reveal nothing about the original relationship between the first Vatican manuscript and the copy given Amadino, however, for Amadino's poor underlay is likely the result of negligence on the part of the typesetter, a not uncommon occurrence in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century printed music.

Another feature in which the Vatican and Venetian sources differ is the quotation at the beginning of the Mass of the ten *fughe* from the parodied Gombert motet. The two sequences of motives are not identical, and there are even slight discrepancies in the notation of a few *fughe* (see example 1). The *Fuga prima* is the chief motive of the Mass, and the first two motives in both sources are in the order they appear in Gombert's work, but otherwise the sequences seem to be random. The differences between the manuscript and the print, therefore, have no particular meaning.

The dedication in the two sources is relatively brief in comparison to the lavish encomiums heaped on secular and sacred princes in many publications of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.²² It should be noted, though, that most dedications were addressed to individuals from whom an author had already received patronage or with whom he had had enough contact to justify the hope for future patronage. Many composers, therefore, were more verbose in eulogizing their dedicatees than is Monte-

1 Vatican Ms. Amadino Print

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

EXAMPLE 1

verdi in the rather concise, impersonal remarks he addresses to the pope. Aside from the ordinary formulas of praise customary in such prefaces, Monteverdi does make two specific references to himself. One of his purposes in publishing this music, he says, is so that "the mouths of those speaking unjust things against Claudio may be closed."²³ This remark is evidently aimed at Artusi's censure of Monteverdi's contrapuntal skill, about which the composer may still have chafed in 1610.²⁴ Monteverdi's sensitivity to detractors was apparently of long standing, for he had alluded to his need for protection from "*malevolorum linguis*" in the dedication of his youthful *Sacrae Cantiunculae* of 1582.²⁵ The other personal reference in the 1610 dedication is to his "nocturnal labors," which, if it is not merely a conventional phrase, may be suggestive of the composer's working habits.

Monteverdi's boldness in dedicating his first major collection of sacred music to the pope deserves comment. Although the composer's reputation

had undoubtedly been expanding steadily since the late 1590s, beginning in 1600 he found himself the object of calumny and notoriety through the attacks of Artusi. But with the success of *L'Orfeo* in 1607 and *Arianna* in the next year, Monteverdi achieved a degree of fame which must have substantially bolstered his confidence, even if it left him physically exhausted and as penurious as ever. He may have been emboldened to approach the pope not only because of dissatisfaction with his financial condition and the pressures of Mantuan court life, but also because of an increasing awareness of his own reputation and stature. It must have been a grave disappointment that he did not find a position in Rome and was unsuccessful in obtaining the free admission to the papal seminary that he ardently sought for his son Francesco. But these failures ultimately led to his good fortune, for the position he finally attained as *Maestro di Cappella* at San Marco was eminently more suited to his musical and dramatic interests and capabilities than anything Rome could have offered.

ERRORS AND INCONSISTENCIES IN THE PRINT

Errors in Amadino's print may be of three different origins: mistakes by the composer, copying errors in the manuscript from which the printer worked, and misprints resulting from faulty typesetting. Although it is often impossible to determine the source of an error, inconsistencies of notation can at times be traced to the composer, while some specific categories of errors were almost certainly made at either the copying or the typesetting stages.

Examples of the latter are errors in which a repeated or sequential phrase was either omitted or reiterated once too often in a single part-book. This type of mistake evidently resulted from the eyes of the copyist or typesetter moving back and forth from his source to his own work. In returning to the source, his vision may have lighted on the correct passage, but the wrong repetition, yielding one too few or one too many reiterations in his own copy. This is one of the most common types of error in the print, easily emended through comparison with the other part-books.

Another common error is the notation of rhythms in either augmentation or diminution of their proper values. Such flaws occur not only in isolated notes, but also in dotted rhythms; for example, a dotted minim followed by a semiminim may have been inscribed as a dotted semiminim and *fusa* or vice versa. A mistake of this kind could have arisen at any of the three stages of preparation and was probably the result of the composer, copyist, or typesetter establishing an aural image of the rhythm in his mind, but then actually notating it at the wrong level. Once again such errors are easily corrected by analogy with other parts.

Yet another type of error, which probably derives from faulty copying or

in bar 14 toward G major, where Monteverdi has placed a sharp in front of the quarter-note f' in the *Altus*. A firm cadence in G does not actually arrive until bar 16. The sequence in the *Tenor* in bar 15, imitating the *Altus*, should probably also have an f' -sharp, but the descending passing tones in the *Sextus*, *Altus*, and *Quintus* in bars 14-16 could probably remain unaltered.

These ambiguities continue in the following measures. The extension of G major after bar 16 suggests an f'' -sharp in the *Cantus* in bar 17, but the motive there is a direct imitation of the *Sextus* and *Quintus* in bars 15 and 16 where an F-natural seems appropriate. The melodic sequences and G major tonality from bar 17 onward, however, suggest F-sharps throughout, including the neighboring-tone first note of the *Altus* in bar 19, which produces a diminished triad at that point.

From bars 20-23 the employment of *ficta* alterations is more problematic. The middle voices in bar 20 seem to require f' -sharps, thereby forcing one in the organ as well. But as the same sequence continues in bars 21-23, the harmonic movement is toward a deceptive cadence in the key of C major in the second half of bar 23. The full C major cadence is finally reached in bar 24, overlapping with the beginning of the next phrase. This sequence and harmonic direction suggest sharps in bar 21 for the first f' in the *Altus* and f in the *Bassus*, but unaltered F's in the *Sextus* and *Bassus* at the end of the bar. All F's would thereafter remain natural until bar 25, where Monteverdi once again notates an f' -sharp in the *Altus*, signaling movement back toward another G major cadence. The remainder of the passage is then clearly notated through the cadence in bars 27-28. Only the last f' in the *Altus* in bar 25 is left unaltered and probably should remain so because of the brief C major cadence at that point.

This passage demonstrates how complicated the interpretation of *musica ficta* can become in the Mass because of the absence of accidentals. It is fortunate indeed that the use of sharps and flats in the Vespers is much clearer, if not totally unambiguous and free of errors.

Other mistakes in the print affect only individual items in the musical notation. A single note may be incorrectly placed or omitted; an isolated rhythmic value may be faulty; a rest or tie may be missing. Lengthy rests are frequently notated inaccurately, with the total values too small or too large. It is also common for the meter signs C and C to be interchanged. This ambivalence reflects a widespread confusion among printers as to the meaning of the two signs and their relationship to one another. Although theorists are largely in agreement regarding the general tempo relationship between C and C as well as the size of note values appropriate to each, the two are often mixed indiscriminately in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century publications. In Amadino's print it is quite common to find a C in one voice conflicting with a C in another.

15

Cantus
- ta - - - tis Lau - da - mus

Sextus
- ta - - - tis Laudamus te Be - ne - di - ci - mus

Altus
- - - - - tis Lau - damus te Be - ned - i -

Tenor
bo - nae volun - ta - - - - - tis Lau - - - damus te

Quintus
- - ni - - bus bo - nae volun - ta - - tis Lau - damus te Be -

Bassus
- nae vo - lun - ta - - tis bo - nae volun - ta - - tis Lau -

Bassus
Generalis

20

te Be - ned - i - ci - mus te A - do - ramus te Glo - ri - fi - ca - - -

te A - do - ramus te Glo - ri - fi - ca - - - - -

- ci - mus te A - do - ramus te Glo - ri - fi - ca - - - - -

Be - ned - i - ci - mus te A - do - ramus te Glo - ri - fi - ca - - - mus te

- ne - di - ci - mus te A - do - ramus te Glo - ri - fi -

- da - mus te Be - ned - i - ci - mus te A - do - ramus te Glo - ri -

25

EXAMPLE 2: *Gloria*

Recognition of categories of errors and their possible origins not only helps clarify questionable or problematic passages, but also can be suggestive about the relationship between the sources and even between individual compositions in the print. Of particular interest are the wide differences in the number of errors among the various pieces in the Vespers. Most of the compositions have what may be termed a "normal" number of mistakes for a publication from this period. The quantity of errors is not excessive, yet there are enough to create occasional transcription problems and to betoken inattentive proofreading at one or more stages of the copying or typesetting process. In contrast to this admittedly vague norm are those pieces with either very few errors or an extraordinarily high proportion of mistakes.

An example of the former is the psalm *Nisi Dominus*, which, despite its thick ten-part texture and great length, reveals only two notational errors. This exceptionally small number indicates that the typesetter had an excellent manuscript copy from which to work. The quality of that copy may in turn be informative about the chronological relationship between *Nisi Dominus* and other pieces in the Vespers, since the almost perfect manuscript evidently resulted from ample opportunity to correct the original score. In other words, *Nisi Dominus* probably underwent rehearsals and performances through which mistakes could be discovered and carefully corrected in a clear, accurate final draft. The psalm *Lauda Jeru-*

salem is almost as remarkable in its accuracy in the print, possibly presupposing the same conditions. If these two psalms were sent to the printer in such excellent copies, it may well be that they were composed somewhat earlier than the other works in the collection, allowing time for rehearsals, performances, and emendations.

This hypothesis correlates with stylistic differences between these two pieces and the other three psalms of the Vespers. With its long-note *cantus firmus* in the two tenors and its strict *coro spezzato* technique, *Nisi Dominus* is certainly the most conservative of all the psalms. *Lauda Jerusalem* is somewhat more flexible and complex, but its scoring, consisting of a tenor surrounded by two three-voice groups continually alternating and overlapping, approximates the *spezzato* style. Like *Nisi Dominus*, the *cantus firmus* is in the tenor, except for the Doxology, although the rhythmic movement of the chant resembles the other psalms in its rapidity.

Both of these pieces, in employing traditional textures and techniques, contrast with the three more modern *concertato* psalms. In addition, neither *Nisi Dominus* nor *Lauda Jerusalem* corresponds to the basic tonal scheme of the Vespers. While Monteverdi's tonal plan cannot be termed systematic, the primary key centers of the Vespers are D major and minor and G major and minor. The first psalm, *Dixit Dominus*, in A minor, is an exception. *Nisi Dominus*, however, is in F major and *Lauda Jerusalem*, although never settling firmly into any tonality, is for the most part in C major with frequent full cadences in A major. *Lauda Jerusalem* is also the only psalm notated in *chiavette* instead of *chiavi naturali*.²⁷ The evidence of Amadino's print, therefore, coupled with stylistic considerations, suggests that both *Nisi Dominus* and *Lauda Jerusalem* antedated other compositions in the Vespers and are not closely unified in style, technique, and tonality to the other components of the collection.

At the opposite end of the spectrum from *Nisi Dominus* is the immediately following motet, *Audi coelum*. This piece has a bipartite structure: the first section is for two solo tenors in the modern monodic style (the second tenor functions strictly as an echo), while the second section is in six-voice polyphony. *Audi coelum* is replete with errors. In view of the accuracy with which *Nisi Dominus* and *Lauda Jerusalem* were printed, it seems improbable that the blame should be laid on a careless or overly hasty typesetter. More likely is that the motet had been completed only shortly before its publication, perhaps had never been performed, and was submitted to the printer in a faulty, slipshod copy.

Of particular note in *Audi coelum* is a melisma in the *Tenor* and *Quintus* part-books that differs rhythmically and melodically from the version in the *Bassus Generalis*, where the two voices are reproduced above the bass line. Most of the melismas are identical between the part-books and the *partitura*, but in this instance there are two different, but equally good readings

Quintus

Tenor

Bassus Generalis

Forte

Piano

15

17

Au - - - - - dio

gau - - - - - dio

EXAMPLE 3. *Audi coelum*

(see example 3). The only factor suggesting the priority of the *Bassus Generalis* version is the rhythmic consistency between the first melisma and its echo. The *Tenor* and *Quintus* part-books differ slightly at this point.²⁸

Similar discrepancies between the *Bassus Generalis* and the vocal part-books exist at the conclusion of the *Deposuit* in the *Magnificat à 6* (see example 4). This time the *Bassus Generalis* is definitely a better version, for the part-books have a major break in rhythmic motion in the antepenultimate bar.²⁹

Cantus

Sextus

Tenor

Bassus Generalis

- ta - - - - - vit humiles.

- - - - - ta - - - - - vit humi - les.

EXAMPLE 4. *Magnificat à 6: Deposuit*

In other instances where the part-books and the *Bassus Generalis* diverge in their notation of the same material, the *Bassus Generalis* is usually the superior reading. This observation, coupled with the unique performance rubrics in the *partitura*, illustrates the greater significance of the *Bassus Generalis* to the composer and performers. For the organist, who may well have been the musical director for rehearsals and performance, the *partitura* served as a guide, apprising him of some or all of the upper parts of a composition. Where a separate *maestro di cappella* was responsible for preparation of the work, the *Bassus Generalis* could have served additionally as a conductor's short score. It is only natural, therefore, that the *Bassus Generalis* would contain information and performance directions not in the other books and might have been prepared with greater care before being given to the printer.

210

Primus Chorus

Secundus Chorus

Cantus
- lo - rum A - - - - - men.

Altus
- - rum A - - - - - men.

Tenor
- - rum A - - - - - men.

Quintus
- - rum A - - - - - men.

Bassus
- - rum A - - - - - men.

EXAMPLE 5: *Nisi Dominus*

An understanding of the types of errors in the print can also assist in developing better readings than have heretofore appeared in modern editions for certain faulty passages. A case in point is the conclusion of *Nisi Dominus*, where one of the psalm's two errors occurs. The passage is notated in the part-books as in example 5. Several editors of the Vespers have emended this passage identically (see example 6). This correction postulates two simultaneous misprints in the *Altus* and *Sextus* part-books in a composition that to this point has witnessed only one other mistake.³⁰ A simpler and more logical assumption is that there is only one error, in the *Quintus* of the first choir (*Altus* part-book) in bar 211. Here there is an extraneous semibreve *c*, occasioned by one too many repetitions of that pitch (albeit all in different rhythmic values). Elimination of this semibreve produces a slightly altered conclusion to the psalm (see example 7).³¹

N.B. 210

Primus Chorus

Secundus Chorus

- - - rum A - - - - - men.

EXAMPLE 6. *Nisi Dominus*

210

The image displays a musical score for two choirs, Primus Chorus and Secundus Chorus, performing the piece 'Nisi Dominus'. The score is written for five voices in each choir: Cantus, Altus, Tenor, Quintus, and Bassus. The music is in a single system with five staves per choir. The lyrics are '- lo - rum A - - - - - men.' The score includes various musical notations such as notes, rests, and slurs. The number '210' is written above the first staff of the Primus Chorus.

EXAMPLE 7. *Nisi Dominus*

An error of omission, one of the few faulty readings in *Lauda Jerusalem*, has also been resolved by editors of the *Vespers* without reference to either the passage in which it occurs or the types of errors a copyist or typesetter is likely to make. The passage in the part-books reads as in example 8. Modern editors have filled in the missing pitches in the *Bassus Generalis* by supplying root-position notes for each change of chord (see example 9). But by analogy with the next two bars, the *Bassus Generalis* should double alternately the two bass voices as in example 10. This resolution of the gap sheds light on how it originated. The melodic motive of the *Bassus Generalis* in bars 153-154 is simply a reiteration of the one in bar 152, and either the copyist or the typesetter simply overlooked the repetition in preparing his version.³²

152 153 154 155 156

Cantus
- - - - men A - - - - men A - - - -

Altus
A - - - - men A - - - - men A - - - -

Tenor
A - - - - men A - - - - men A - - - -

Sextus
A - - - - men A - - - - men

Septimus
A - - - - men A - - - - men A -

Quintus
[Bassus I]
A - - - - men A - - - - men

Bassus
[II]
A - - - - men A - - - - men

Bassus
Generalis
Missing

EXAMPLE 8. *Lauda Jerusalem*

EXAMPLE 9

EXAMPLE 10

A similar mistake of omission arises in *Laetatus sum* in the *Tenor*, where an entire minim beat is missing (see example 11). Editors have assumed that the error lies in the absence of a later rest, which has been added in various places in different editions (see example 12).³³ However, this assumption inevitably forces parallel unisons between the *Tenor* and *Quintus*, regardless

152 153 154 155

Cantus

Sextus

Altus

Tenor

Quintus

Bassus

Pro - - -

Pro - - - pter

Pro - - -

EXAMPLE 11. *Laetatus sum*

157

Cantus

Sextus

Altus

Tenor

Quintus

Bassus

- pter

- pter

propter fratres propter

propter fratres propter fratres

pro - pter

Added rest

propter fra-tres propter

- pter

pro - pter fratres meos et

- pter

propter fratres propter fratres

EXAMPLE 12. *Laetatus sum*

of where the rest is positioned (see example 13). Denis Stevens noticed this difficulty in preparing his version of the Vespers, and therefore transposed the *Tenor* in the first half of bar 154 of example 13 downward by a third (see example 14).³⁴ The transposition provides acceptable counterpoint between the *Tenor* and *Quintus*, but creates an octave doubling of the leading-tone *f'*-sharp of the *Sextus* and fails to resolve it in the *Tenor*, leaping upward instead to the following *d'*. Stevens's solution presumes either a compositional error or a temporary misreading of the clef in the copying or typesetting of this passage. A much simpler explanation is that the eye of the copyist or typesetter merely skipped over a beat in the sequence and omitted four notes from the *Tenor*, producing the gap seen in example 11. By observing the *Quintus*, which the *Tenor* imitates precisely until just before the end of the phrase, it is apparent that the *Tenor* should read as in example 15. Further corroboration is provided by the *Cantus*, which is in imitation of the *Tenor* and concords precisely with the emendation suggested here.³⁵

Musical score for Example 13, showing Tenor and Quintus parts for measures 153, 154, and 155. The Tenor part has a gap in measure 154. The Quintus part has an "N.B." marking above it in measure 154.

EXAMPLE 13. *Laetatus sum*

Musical score for Example 14, showing Cantus, Sextus, Altus, Tenor, Quintus, and Bassus parts for measures 153, 154, and 155. The Tenor part is transposed in measure 154. The Cantus part has lyrics "Pro" and "pter".

EXAMPLE 14. *Laetatus sum*: Stevens edition

The image shows a musical score for two voices: Tenor and Quintus. The Tenor part is on a treble clef staff with a key signature of one flat (B-flat). The Quintus part is on a bass clef staff with a key signature of one flat. The score covers measures 153, 154, and 155. In measure 153, the Tenor has a melodic line of eighth notes, and the Quintus has a rhythmic accompaniment of eighth notes. In measure 154, the Tenor continues with a similar melodic line, and the Quintus accompaniment continues. In measure 155, the Tenor has a long note, and the Quintus has a few notes before the measure ends.

EXAMPLE 15. *Laetatus sum*THE *BASSUS GENERALIS* AND PERFORMANCE PRACTICE

The greatest ambiguities and problems of interpretation in the Mass and Vespers emerge from the *Bassus Generalis*. In contrast to many contemporary publications, this part is not labelled *Basso per l'organo* or *Partitura per l'organo*, but quite literally, "general bass." The role of this bass and the ways in which the part-book can be utilized involve fundamental issues of performance practice, many aspects of which Monteverdi has deliberately left unspecified, enabling the music to be performed in various manners under varying circumstances.³⁶ The two different sources of the Mass illustrate this flexibility, since the Vatican version has no instrumental bass at all, in keeping with the previously mentioned tradition of the Sistine Chapel.

The *Bassus Generalis* is primarily for organ, as demonstrated by detailed organ registrations in the two *Magnificats* and by the *partitura* format of numerous pieces, where the continuo player is provided with vocal or instrumental parts in addition to his own bass line.

The organ, of course, was the appropriate keyboard instrument for sacred music, although harpsichords were also used in the Church on occasion.³⁷ In addition, a variety of plucked instruments could furnish the continuo for few-voiced motets, as indicated by the title pages of many sacred collections and by contemporary descriptions of actual performances.³⁸ Instruments other than the organ, therefore, may well have supported Monteverdi's more intimate compositions, *Nigra sum*, *Pulchra es*, *Duo Seraphim*, and *Audi coelum*, particularly if they were to be "ad Principum Cubicula accommodata" as described on the title page. A change of continuo instruments in the course of a single piece is also not out of the question, especially in the *concertato* psalms where radically different styles and textures are juxtaposed.³⁹

The score for the organist or other continuo player is notated differently from one composition to the next. In the *Missa In illo tempore* the part is labelled *Basso Continuo* and consists mostly of the simple organ bass line.⁴⁰ But in the *Crucifixus*, composed for only the four upper voices instead of the normal six, Monteverdi provides a complete, four-part organ *partitura*. Does this *partitura* signify any change in the manner of performance?

The reduction of the texture to four high voices for the *Crucifixus* was

a widespread tradition in late sixteenth- and early seventeenth-century polyphonic masses, and after the turn of the century it was not unusual for this thinner texture to be notated fully in the organ *partitura*.⁴¹ The purpose of this procedure is not entirely clear. It is presumed that an organist would have had to write out some kind of *partitura* from the organ bass and part-books of a polyphonic composition in order to accompany it satisfactorily. Numerous seventeenth-century writers attest to the necessity for making such an organ score, and the *partitura* by Lorenzo Tonelli is a specific instance of this practice with regard to Monteverdi's Mass. Some publications spared the organist the extra trouble by printing a full *partitura* or a reduced score with at least one upper part.⁴² Perhaps Amadino did not find it too expensive to provide a *partitura* of the relatively short *Crucifixus* in order to relieve the organist from writing out his own score for that portion of the *Credo*. The amount of copying spared, however, is minimal in relation to the entire Mass. It is more likely that the solemnity of the *Crucifixus*, signaled by the reduced texture and lighter choral sound, was to be emphasized by as faithful a doubling of the vocal polyphony as the organist could achieve. In other sections employing the full choir, the organist could only play whatever parts of the texture conveniently adapted to his fingers and keyboard technique.

The full *partitura* in the *Crucifixus* may also indicate a change in other aspects of accompaniment. It is well known that instruments were often used to double the vocal parts of polyphonic sacred music in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and there is evidence of extensive use of instruments in the ducal church of Santa Barbara in Mantua.⁴³ If other instruments in addition to the organ participated in a performance of the Mass, they may have ceased during the reduced *Crucifixus*, leaving the entire accompaniment to the organist alone. The organ, in the absence of other doubling, would have needed to reproduce faithfully the complete polyphonic texture.

In the Vespers the treatment of the continuo is more complicated and varied than in the Mass. Because of the rhythmic diversity of the upper parts in many of the pieces, Monteverdi often furnishes at least one of these parts as a guide in the *Bassus Generalis*. The respond *Domine ad adiuvandum*, for example, has the topmost instrumental line notated over the bass. The rhythm of the voices in this piece can be determined only through the *Bassus Generalis*, since in the part-books the *falsobordone* setting of the text entails unrhythmicized long notes. Only in the *partitura* is the *falsobordone* given a rhythmic shape, with the text underlaid beneath the organ bass and the syllables distributed according to their appropriate rhythmic declamation.

Monteverdi uses two separate approaches to the organ notation of the five psalms. Three of the psalms, *Dixit Dominus*, *Nisi Dominus*, and *Lauda*

Jerusalem, are represented simply by their bass lines. *Laudate pueri* and *Laetatus sum*, on the other hand, also have two other staves because of the virtuoso melismas integral to their structure. The first three psalms conceivably could be accompanied by the organist without the aid of a *partitura*, since their textures are homophonically derived and their rhythmic movement is straightforward. The latter two works, however, include *passaggi* in rapid rhythms for virtuoso singers, undoubtedly soloists. These melismas may necessitate both flexibility in rhythm and changes in tempo. Since the organist plays sustained chords in these passages, Monteverdi supplies him with cues in the form of whatever upper parts can assist in following the rhythm and harmony. Most often these added parts consist of the top two lines in any given section, but not always. Monteverdi's choice is dictated by the information most useful to the organist, so inner parts that reveal the harmony more clearly or that contain rhythmic motion difficult to follow may be included in place of the topmost lines.

Performance rubrics for some of the psalms are an additional ingredient exclusive to the *Bassus Generalis* part-book. *Dixit Dominus* is headed by an instruction that the instrumental *ritornelli* may be omitted *ad libitum*: "*Li Ritornelli si possano sonare & anco tralasciare secondo il volere.*" This leaves open the use of instruments according to their availability and their appropriateness for a particular performance. The psalm *Laudate pueri* carries the rubric "*à 8. voci sole nel Organo.*" This caption not only calls for solo voices instead of the choir, but possibly also signifies the absence of accompanying instruments, which could easily overwhelm the soloists. The other three psalms are marked simply with the number of voice parts and are presumably to be sung chorally. Nevertheless, the virtuoso passagework in *Laetatus sum* certainly demands solo voices at those moments. The necessity for soloists would have been obvious without rubrics to seventeenth-century musicians from the *passaggi* themselves.

The hymn *Ave maris stella* is another piece provided merely with the bass line in the *Bassus Generalis*. Once again it is only through rubrics in this part-book that performance by soloists of the fourth, fifth, and sixth verses is specified. There is no indication, as in *Dixit Dominus*, that the instrumental *ritornelli* are optional, but if Monteverdi intended to make the strictly liturgical parts of the Vespers performable with or without instruments, then it may be assumed that these *ritornelli* are *ad libitum* as well.

The *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*, with its soprano *cantus firmus* intoned over a very large instrumental sonata, has a complicated continuo notation. The *Cantus*, which sings only intermittently, is equipped with its own continuo in the *Cantus* part-book itself. This continuo is an exact duplicate of the organ bass in the *Bassus Generalis* except for a few minor rhythmic discrepancies. Its function is to act as a guide for the soprano or sopranos (there is no indication in the part-book or *Bassus Generalis* whether or not a

soloist is required) in much the same way that vocal parts are at times furnished to assist the organist. With this continuo part in view, the *Cantus* can follow the progress of the *Sonata* and enter at the appropriate points.⁴⁴

In the *Bassus Generalis* the organ part of the *Sonata* consists primarily of a single bass line. Part way through the composition, however, when paired violins begin virtuosic *passaggi* similar to those in the vocal portions of the Vespers, a second continuo line is added. This second line is not intended as merely a visual aid to the organist, since it does not reproduce the rapid rhythms of the violins. Instead, both the bass line and this second part outline in semiminims the notes ornamented more elaborately in the violins and later in the *cornetti* (see example 16). In this instance the organ is obviously not to play harmony, but to double in simpler rhythm the underlying melodic movement of the instruments. This heterophonic doubling continues as long as there is no bass part supporting the virtuosic pair. As soon as a lower instrumental part enters, the top line of the organ score rests while the bottom line drops down to double the supporting instrument. When another high-instrument duet begins and the lower instruments exit, the organ resumes its own high-register doubling of the duet. This procedure ends quite suddenly the last time that lower instruments enter. At that point the upper continuo line ceases abruptly and disappears altogether from the *Bassus Generalis* part-book, since the lower instruments continue through the remainder of the *Sonata*.

The four motets, *Nigra sum*, *Pulchra es*, *Duo Seraphim*, and *Audi coelum*, all have complete vocal parts above the bass in the *partitura*. These vocal scores are essential for the continuo player not only to follow the complex rhythms of the singers, but also to adjust to the elasticity of rhythm and tempo normally expected of soloists. Of the four pieces, only *Audi coelum* is actually designated for solo voice in the *Bassus Generalis*, the rubrics for the others merely indicating the number of voice parts. Nevertheless, the style of these pieces, derived from monody and virtuosic duets,

EXAMPLE 16. *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*

unquestionably requires soloists.⁴⁵ The annotation for *Audi coelum* reads in full, “*prima ad una voce sola, poi nella fine à 6 voci.*” This caption was obviously necessitated by the structure of the piece, which advances to six parts after the initial solo with echo. The specification of a single voice points up the contrast with the six-part section, which probably should be sung by a choir.

In the first section the melismatic echoes, assigned in the part-books to the *Quintus*, are notated in the *Bassus Generalis* on the same staff as the tenor voice. Each melisma is marked *forte* and each echo *piano*, instructing the continuo player to adjust his dynamics accordingly.

When *Audi coelum* expands to six parts in a polyphonic style, the voices are dropped from the *Bassus Generalis* except for those passages where the *Tenor* and *Quintus* re-enter with melismas. Presuming that a chorus is to be used for the polyphonic section, these melismas should revert to soloists because of their affinity with the earlier part of the motet and their reprise of the echo technique.

In *Nigra sum* and *Pulchra es* there are some curious discrepancies between the notation of the voices in the part-books and in the *Bassus Generalis*. At the beginning of *Pulchra es*, the top line of the three-staff continuo score is an ornamental counterpoint to the voice rather than a duplication of it (see example 17). In fact, this top line is nearly identical to the *Sextus*, or second soprano, which first enters several bars later (see example 18). This brief counterpoint, apparently to be performed by the continuo, raises the issue of how closely the continuo player is to follow the upper parts printed in the *Bassus Generalis* in this and the other motets. Is he merely to play a simple underlying harmony, or should he actually double most of the vocal lines? The testimony of early seventeenth-century composers and theorists is contradictory on this point. Some writers suggest that

EXAMPLE 17. *Pulchra es*

solo vocal lines be supported by the upper part of the accompaniment, while others are opposed to doubling of the topmost voice.⁴⁶ In virtuoso motets like those in the Vespers, it is often impractical for a single player to duplicate the ornamentation and complex rhythm of the voices. Yet the continuo player may have been expected to double the melodic outline of the vocal parts in a heterophonic manner similar to that which Monteverdi himself notates in the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*. In the duet *Pulchra es*, the character and relationship of the parts are such that a cembalist or organist *could* double the voices almost verbatim. Whether or not the continuo supports the singers with doubling or partial doubling may also depend on the continuo instrument chosen, the strength of the voices and the size and acoustics of the room in which the work is to be performed. As will be seen below in the discussion of melody instruments, it might also prove feasible to double the voices with separate instruments apart from the continuo.

The reason for Monteverdi's counterpoint at the beginning of *Pulchra es* probably lies in the thinness of the texture at that point, where the solo *Cantus* sings slow, sustained tones. In order to alleviate the rhythmic inactivity of the voice, a more lively counterpoint is given the continuo, the same variant of the *Cantus* part that will soon appear in the *Sextus*. The ornamented version in the continuo also suggests that the singer should not improvise embellishments during this passage, for the ornamental role is clearly assigned to the supporting instrument.

In *Nigra sum* the differences between the tenor and *Bassus Generalis* part-books mostly involve vocal dotted rhythms, which are notated evenly in the continuo score (see example 19). Monteverdi is inconsistent in this piece, accurately duplicating some of the vocal rhythms in the continuo part while altering others. Where the continuo is at odds with the voice, the *Bassus*

The image shows a musical score for three parts: Cantus, Sextus, and Bassus Generalis. The Cantus part is on a single staff with a treble clef, starting at measure 15 and ending at measure 20. The Sextus part is on a single staff with a treble clef, starting at measure 15 and ending at measure 20. The Bassus Generalis part is on a single staff with a bass clef, starting at measure 15 and ending at measure 20. The lyrics are: Pul - chra es a - mi - ca me - a su - a - - . The score shows a complex counterpoint between the parts, with the Cantus part having a more melodic line and the Sextus and Bassus Generalis parts having more rhythmic activity.

EXAMPLE 18. *Pulchra es*

Tenor

et di-xit mi - a - mi - ca me - a

Bassus Generalis

EXAMPLE 19. *Nigra sum*

Generalis is merely a simplification of the rhythm, which does not affect the player's ability to follow the soloist. These inconsistencies and discrepancies between the two parts may be attributable either to carelessness in copying or to changes Monteverdi decided to make in the part-book version after the *Bassus Generalis* had been completed. If changes were made, perhaps even at the last minute before publication, corresponding alterations in the *Bassus Generalis* were neglected.

The most elaborate performance directions in the Vespers are contained in the organ scores for the two *Magnificats*. Registration for the organist is specified in detail, in some cases even changing in the middle of individual verses.⁴⁷ These annotations are carefully considered with regard to expressive effects and the sonorities of voices and *obbligato* instruments. The *Bassus Generalis* comprises primarily the single bass line, its registration, indications of the vocal scoring, and occasional references to musical style (*echo*, *dialogo*, etc.). In the *Quia respexit* of the *Magnificat à 7* there is even an instruction for the *obbligato* instruments to play as loudly as possible, and in the same segment of the *Magnificat à 6*, the voice is directed to sing loudly. In some instances rubrics specify solo voices, while in others the virtuoso style obviously requires soloists and no rubric is necessary.

In several *Magnificat* sections the organist is instructed to play slowly because of rapid movement or echo technique in the upper parts.⁴⁸ In these passages Monteverdi expects the organist to get along without the vocal lines in view, and the rhythmic regularity of their melismas would indeed make that possible. In the *Deposuit* of both *Magnificats* and the *Gloria Patri* of the *Magnificat à 7*, however, the *Bassus Generalis* incorporates a full score of the instrumental and vocal parts. In all three instances the voices and instruments have such lively, rhythmically complex echoes and imitations that the upper parts are essential for the organist to keep track of the other performers. A full *partitura* might also have proved helpful in those sections where the organist is directed to play slowly, but Monteverdi has provided the full score in the *Magnificats* only where absolutely necessary.

Although the role of the organ in the Vespers seems sufficiently clear,

both from Monteverdi's *Bassus Generalis* and what is known of early *Seicento* continuo practice, the question still remains as to what part other instruments might have played in performances of the music. *Obbligato* instruments are specified in the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* and the *Magnificat à 7*. Instrumental *ritornelli* separate several verses of the hymn. Optional instrumental accompaniment and instrumental *ritornelli* appear in the respond and *Dixit Dominus*. Are instruments to be employed elsewhere in the Vespers as well? Amadino's print offers no additional information. However, the *obbligato* and *ad libitum* orchestration in five of the pieces, the frequent use of instruments in the Gonzaga church of Santa Barbara and other north Italian churches, and contemporary accounts of improvising instruments all strongly suggest instrumental participation in other portions of the Vespers. Mention has already been made of continuo instruments that could possibly have replaced the organ, especially in the four motets. In the hymn and psalms, with the exception of *Laudate pueri à 8 voci sole nel Organo*, the thick textures and full choral sonorities may have been supported by multiple foundation instruments.⁴⁹ To the organ could have been added *chitarroni* or the low strings and brass that so firmly bolster the respond. If so, the number of foundation instruments would likely have depended upon the size of the choir and the dimensions and acoustical properties of the room in which a performance was to take place.

The middle and high register instruments named in the print might similarly have doubled voices in the Mass, the psalms, and the hymn. Except for the polyphonic section of *Audi coelum*, doubling in the motets is less plausible because of the delicacy of the solo voices and the imperative for expressive freedom—Caccini's *nobile sprezzatura*.⁵⁰ Doubling would be more feasible in *Pulchra es* and *Duo Seraphim* than in the other motets, since in these two pieces the voices must adhere to a regular beat sufficiently to sing simultaneous melismas. The addition of instruments, however, might tend to overburden the vocal sonority. Nevertheless, delicate doubling with flutes or *pifare* might prove acceptable in *Pulchra es*. A recent recording of the Vespers doubles the voices effectively in *Duo Seraphim* at the climactic points where the text reads "*plena est omnis terra gloria eius*."⁵¹ Seventeenth-century sources are either silent or vague on the use of doubling instruments in few-voiced motets, offering little in the way of concrete guidelines.⁵²

As with the motets, doubling of voices in the *passaggi* of the psalms seems unlikely, though not out of the question. These rhythmically even melismas are of a type often encountered in instrumental as well as vocal music of the early *Seicento*, and coordination of several steadily flowing parts is not overly difficult. The recording of the Vespers noted above employs such doubling successfully in *Laetatus sum*. However, the instrumental doubling of the melismas in this performance does have the effect of decreasing the

difference in sonority and character between these solo passages and the other, choral parts of the psalm where instrumental doubling is also used.

In the *Magnificats* it is highly unlikely that the solo voices would have been doubled *ad libitum*. The *Magnificat à 6* is expressly designed to be performed without instrumental participation, while the extensive orchestration of the *Magnificat à 7* consists entirely of *obbligati* and explicitly specified doublings in the opening and closing full-choir sections. Doubling of the voices in the segments for soloists would destroy the sensitive balance Monteverdi has established between vocal and instrumental sonorities. Perhaps in the polyphonic dialogue, *Et misericordia*, instrumental doubling would be acceptable, but care would have to be taken since Monteverdi calls for “6 voci sole.” It may even be that *voci sole* refers not only to solo voices but also to voices alone, i.e., without instrumental participation.⁵³

In early seventeenth-century vocal music, melody instruments served an even broader purpose than merely doubling voices in the middle and upper registers. According to Agazzari and other sources, instruments often engaged in improvisation as well.⁵⁴ The agility of early Baroque violins, *flauti*, and *cornetti* was both a temptation and an invitation to the improvisation of melodic lines and ornaments around the basic notes of the choir or instrumental *ritornelli*. In fact, in those portions of the Vespers where the instruments are not already provided with *passaggi*, improvisation was very likely a part of seventeenth-century performances. The *quantity* of improvisation, however, is the chief issue, and in this regard the Vespers should be approached with two specific cautions.

First, elaborate improvisation is probably more appropriate to purely instrumental passages, such as *ritornelli*, than to sections with large vocal forces. Too much ornamentation in the latter could well obscure the already dense vocal textures, producing contrapuntal confusion. The *ritornelli*, on the other hand, are notated comparatively simply and may gain from tasteful embellishment.

Second, the very explicitness of Monteverdi's orchestration and ornamentation should warn against excessive improvisation. Monteverdi was much more precise and detailed in such matters than any of his contemporaries, and this care bespeaks a shying away from improvisation toward greater control on the part of the composer over the smaller aspects of performance. Monteverdi was leery of abandoning too many details of execution to the judgment of singers, instrumentalists, and *maestri di cappella*. He consequently included many specific performance instructions, including ornamentation, himself.

This argument applies no less to vocal than to instrumental improvisation. The number of treatises describing the art of vocal embellishment in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries is impressive and testifies to a widespread tradition.⁵⁵ Yet many composers complained of tasteless orna-

mentation by virtuosi more concerned with projecting their own fame than the qualities of the music.⁵⁶ Monteverdi was scarcely adverse to embellishment, but even more than with instruments he notated vocal ornamentation in minute detail. Amadino's print gives the appearance of a more elaborate vocal style than any publication of psalms or motets from that period, yet many pieces by other composers might actually have been sung almost as ornately as Monteverdi's Vespers. The difference lies in notation versus improvisation, with Monteverdi choosing to exert control over ornamentation, to indicate it himself. Monteverdi takes exactly the opposite approach from Caccini, who leaves his melodies in *Le Nuove Musiche* relatively unadorned but attaches a lengthy preface describing appropriate methods of embellishment and expression.

None of this implies that vocal improvisation is to be abjured altogether in the Mass and Vespers. Especially in the motets, small additional embellishments might be suitable and within the bounds of propriety. In the larger choral works cadential ornaments would certainly be appropriate and perhaps a modest amount of other improvisation as well, but in any of the compositions elaborate ornamentation beyond what Monteverdi has specified would defeat the very purpose of his notation.

In a summary overview of the *Bassus Generalis*, the most striking feature is Monteverdi's extraordinary care in supplying performance information and instructions. As with vocal ornamentation, Monteverdi attempts to exercise his authority over as many aspects of execution as practical. Practicality is also at the heart of the scoring in the *partitura*, for Monteverdi seeks always to furnish the organist and/or other continuo players with as much information as necessary to fulfill their roles. His choice of parts for inclusion in the *Bassus Generalis* is ingenious in its variety, purposefulness, and simplicity. The *Bassus Generalis* was obviously prepared with painstaking attention to its various functions, and through it we have much more precise ideas about suitable ways to perform the music than in the vast majority of publications of the early *Seicento*.

Before closing this discussion of performance practice in the Mass and Vespers, the issue of *chiavette* must also be considered. The Mass, *Lauda Jerusalem*, and the two *Magnificats* are all notated in the high clefs, or *chiavette*.⁵⁷ Studies have shown convincingly that high *chiavette* often indicated downward transposition by a fourth or some other interval in actual performance, depending on the tuning of accompanying instruments and the ranges of available voices.⁵⁸ Because pitch was not absolute in the modern sense and was fixed only by the instruments at hand, transposition by the continuo player was frequently necessary to accommodate voices. If the normal series of clefs would have required more than one ledger line in the vocal parts, *chiavette* were often used instead to facilitate notation and reading. The *chiavette* thus produce the impression of a higher register than

was actually intended to be sung. By transposition downward the organist set a lower standard of pitch for the voices, the degree of transposition depending on the tuning of the organ. Most often the high *chiavette* seem to have denoted transposition by a fourth.⁵⁹

That the practice of transposition is applicable to Monteverdi's publication of 1610 is proved by the organ *partitura* of the Mass by Lorenzo Tonelli preserved at Brescia and briefly described at the beginning of this essay. Tonelli's *partitura* comprises a full score incorporating all voice parts plus the organ bass, but with everything transposed down a fourth. The *partitura* is therefore in G major, the same tonality as several other compositions in the print.⁶⁰

A comparison of the notated ranges of the voice parts of those compositions in *chiavi naturali* with the Mass in *chiavette* illustrates the higher *notated* register of the Mass:⁶¹

Ranges in
chiavi naturali

Ranges in
Mass
(*chiavette*)

Cantus Sextus Altus Tenor Quintus Bassus Septimus

Cantus Sextus Altus Tenor Quintus Bassus Septimus

ILLUSTRATION 2

In Tonelli's transposition the voices of the Mass actually sound slightly *lower* than in the pieces with *chiavi naturali*:

Cantus Sextus Altus Tenor Quintus Bassus Septimus

ILLUSTRATION 3

While *D* may appear as a rather low note for basses (though certainly not out of the bass range), the absolute pitch varied from organ to organ, and from all indications was somewhat higher than modern pitch.⁶² At the top of the untransposed bass range (illustration 2), the *e'* is at the upper extremity for most singers and would probably be out of reach when adjusted to the pitch standards of the seventeenth century. Tonelli's transposition places this note in a more practical register.

At the other end of the gamut, the *Cantus* and *Sextus* are notated in *chiavette* as high as *a''*. This is the highest practical note for boy sopranos in modern pitch and would exceed that maximum when adjusted even higher.

Transposition by a fourth, however, brings this note well within a usable range.

In Tonelli's transposition the *Altus* falls more within the range of a modern tenor and might well have been sung in Monteverdi's day by tenors using *falsestto* to encompass the upper fourth or fifth.⁶³ The *Tenor* and *Quintus* similarly approximate a modern baritone, with the upper part of the *Tenor* again requiring *falsestto*.

By analogy with the Mass, the psalm *Lauda Jerusalem* could likewise be transposed a fourth downward. The notated ranges of the voices are as follows:



ILLUSTRATION 4

Transposition would not only return the voices to manageable registers, but would also bring *Lauda Jerusalem* within the circle of keys of most of the other compositions in the print, aside from the anomalous *Nisi Dominus*.

Clefs in the *Magnificats* are a more complicated problem. It was customary in the early seventeenth century to notate high instrumental parts in the G clef without denoting transposition. The treble clef was simply more convenient for accommodating the higher registers that instruments could play. Consequently, in the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* all the higher instrumental parts are written in G clefs, while the normal tenor and bass clefs are used for the lower instruments and a C_1 clef for the vocal *cantus firmus*. Mixed clefs are also in evidence in *Domine ad adiuvandum*. Here the high and mid-range instruments are notated in G, C_1 , and C_3 clefs, while the lower instruments are in tenor and bass clefs. The vocal parts all utilize the *chiavi naturali*. The instrumental *ritornelli* in *Dixit Dominus* and *Ave maris stella*, on the other hand, are fully integrated with the voices in the part-books and therefore retain the normal clefs.

In the two *Magnificats*, *chiavette* are found in all parts. Could these pieces also have been transposed down a fourth? The notated high registers in the canticles are not so troublesome as in the Mass and *Lauda Jerusalem*, since most of the sections with a high tessitura are designed for solo virtuosi. In the choral sections high registers are infrequent, though not altogether absent. Transposition would bring the *Magnificats* into the same vocal ranges as the transposed Mass and *Lauda Jerusalem*, and is perhaps justified for that reason. The resultant change of register would also be feasible for all the *obbligato* instruments in the *Magnificat à 7*.⁶⁴ Additionally, transposition would shift the tonality to D minor, the same tonic as the opening respond. As balanced as an opening and closing on D may

seem, however, Monteverdi's approach to tonality in the Vespers is insufficiently systematic to imply that tonal symmetry is a primary consideration, especially since the *Magnificats'* notated G minor accords with several other compositions in the print.

The issue of transposition in the Mass, *Lauda Jerusalem*, and the *Magnificats* is not to be settled by any hard and fast rule. Sufficient evidence has been marshalled to warrant transposition of all four pieces, but instability of pitch in the seventeenth century may have allowed local conditions and resources to hold sway in determining the interval of transposition and even whether or not to transpose at all. With modern fixed pitch, lower than in the seventeenth century, transposition downward by a fourth forces the basses into a register at least as uncomfortable as the high range demanded of sopranos when the score is performed as notated. The vocal sonority of most modern performances is also significantly altered through the replacement of boy sopranos and male altos by female voices. Thus changes in pitch and singers have alleviated some of the conditions that led to transposition in Monteverdi's time. The absence of a truly systematic tonal plan in the Vespers leaves modern performers free to make choices according to the same criteria as in the seventeenth century: the instrumental and vocal resources at hand. Where practical, transposition by a fourth might have a greater air of authenticity and would reproduce Monteverdi's original tonal relationships, but it is by no means essential.

NOTES

1. For the full title of the collection, see the Introduction, p. 6, note 7. The locations of copies of the part-books are listed in Claudio Sartori, *Bibliografia della Musica Strumentale Italiana* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 1952-1968), vol. I, p. 173, and vol. II, pp. 53-54. Sartori's listings, complete with mistakes, are reproduced in *International Inventory of Musical Sources: Einzeldrucke vor 1800* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1976), vol. VI, p. 10. According to Sartori, the University Library in Wrocław, Poland, possesses a copy of the *Cantus, Altus, Bassus, Septimus*, and *Bassus Generalis*. However, according to Emil Bohn, *Bibliographie der Musik-Druckwerke bis 1700* (Berlin: Commissions-Verlag von Albert Cohn, 1883; reprint edition Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1969), p. 288, a complete copy of the work is in the Stadtbibliothek in Wrocław. My own microfilm is from the University Library and contains the *Cantus, Altus, Tenor, Bassus*, and *Septimus*. This particular copy contains handwritten corrections, *musica ficta*, and Arabic numerals indicating the lengths of rests and long notes.

2. No documentary evidence exists on Lorenzo Tonelli. I am most grateful to Prof. Giovanni Bignami of Brescia for checking local archives and documents in search of information. The paleography of Tonelli's *partitura* places it in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century. I wish to express my gratitude to Prof. Anne Schnoebelen for assistance in examining a microfilm copy of the *partitura* and estimating its date.

3. The letter is printed as No. 11 in G. Francesco Malipiero, *Claudio Monteverdi* (Milan: Fratelli Treves Editori, 1929), pp. 147-149. The dating of this letter and its repercussions will be discussed below.

4. Some confusion exists on the precise dating of this letter. Davari and De' Paoli give July 16, while Vogel dates it July 26. See Stefano Davari, *Notizie biografiche del destinto Maestro di Musica Claudio Monteverdi* (Mantua: G. Mondovi, 1885), p. 23; Domenico De' Paoli, *Claudio Monteverdi* (Milan: Editore Ulrico Hoepli, 1945), p. 159; and Emil Vogel, "Claudio Monteverdi," *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 3 (1887): 430.

5. "Monteverdi is having printed an *a cappella* Mass for six voices, of much study and labor, since he was obliged to manipulate continually, in every note through all the parts, always further strengthening, the eight motives that are in the motet *In illo tempore* of Gombert. And he is also having printed together [with it] some Vesper psalms of the Virgin with various and diverse manners of invention and harmony, and everything over a *cantus firmus*, with the intention of coming to Rome this autumn to dedicate them to His Holiness. He is also in the midst of preparing a group of madrigals for five voices, which will consist of three laments: that of Arianna, still with its usual soprano, the lament of Leandro and Hero by Marini, the third, given him by His Highness, about a shepherd whose nymph has died. The words [are] by the son of Count Lepido Agnelli on the death of the little Roman [the singer Caterina Martinella]." Vogel, "Claudio Monteverdi," p. 430.

6. These are the cycles *Lamento d'Arianna* and *Lagrima d'Amante al Sepolcro dell'Amata*.

7. Excerpts in English translation are found in Oliver Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1950), pp. 393-404. The polemics between Artusi and Monteverdi, lasting until 1608, are discussed in Claude V. Palisca, "The Artusi-Monteverdi Controversy," in *The Monteverdi Companion*, ed. Denis Arnold and Nigel Fortune (London: Faber and Faber, 1968), pp. 133-166.

8. Monteverdi's letter is dated December 2, 1608. An English translation by Denis Arnold and Nigel Fortune is in *The Monteverdi Companion*, pp. 26-29. Monteverdi's father, Baldassare, also wrote two letters to the Duke and Duchess of Mantua in the fall of 1608 seeking his son's release from ducal service. See Domenico De' Paoli, *Claudio Monteverdi: Lettere, Dediche e Prefazioni* (Rome: Edizioni de Santis, 1973), pp. 30 and 33. The political circumstances surrounding this wedding are documented in Stuart Reiner, "La vag'Angioletta (and others)," *Analecta Musicologica* 14 (1974): 26-88. See also chapter III, note 1, of this volume.

9. Pierre Tagmann has speculated that composition of the Vespers was stimulated by the birth of the Duke's granddaughter, Maria, on July 29, 1609, and that portions of the Vespers may have been performed on August 15 or September 8, 1609, both feasts of the Virgin. There survive letters from Monteverdi to Alessandro Striggio, however, dated Cremona, August 24, 1609, and September 10, 1609. Both the dates and the contents of these letters render Tagmann's speculations impossible. See Pierre Tagmann, "The Palace Church of Santa Barbara in Mantua, and Monteverdi's Relationship to its Liturgy," in *Festival Essays for Pauline Alderman*, ed. Burton L. Karson (Brigham Young University Press, 1976), pp. 53-60. Monteverdi's letters are translated by Arnold and Fortune in *The Monteverdi Companion*, pp. 30-34. Even more recently Iain Fenlon has advanced the more plausible theory that the Vespers were first performed on Sunday, May 25, 1608, at "a special ceremony in Sant'Andrea in-

augurating a new order of knighthood in honour of Christ the Redeemer." This ceremony marked the beginning of the 1608 wedding festival. According to the court chronicler Follino, the ceremony was followed by a chanting of the *Te Deum*, an oration by the Bishop of Mantua, and the celebration of solemn Vespers. See Iain Fenlon, "The Monteverdi Vespers: Suggested answers to some fundamental questions," *Early Music* 5, no. 3 (July 1977): 380-387. The chief argument against Fenlon's hypothesis is the liturgical specificity of the Vespers to feasts of the Virgin and other virgin saints. See chapter V, pp. 124-125. Whether or not the wedding festivities would have justified celebration of Vespers of the Virgin is unknown. I do not agree with Fenlon's assumption that Monteverdi's Vespers would have had to have been performed in their entirety. See the Introduction, pp. 3-4, and chapter V, p. 131.

10. See De' Paoli, *Lettere*, p. 50; and De' Paoli, *Claudio Monteverdi*, p. 160.

11. Casola's letter distinguishes clearly between Monteverdi's intention to have the Mass and Vespers published and his plan to go to Rome to dedicate them to the Pope. It is only Francesco who connects the publication of the collection with the journey to Rome.

12. De' Paoli, *Lettere*, p. 50.

13. Vogel, "Claudio Monteverdi," p. 356.

14. De' Paoli, *Lettere*, pp. 50-52.

15. Malipiero, *Claudio Monteverdi*, pp. 147-149.

16. Hans Redlich, ed., *Missa "In Illo Tempore" a 6 by Claudio Monteverdi* (London: Ernst Eulenburg, 1962), p. IV. De' Paoli seems at one time to have held a similar view; see De' Paoli, *Claudio Monteverdi*, pp. 160-162.

17. Henri Prunières, *Monteverdi: His Life and Work*, trans. Marie D. Mackie (New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1926; reprint edition New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1972), p. 214, note 123.

18. De' Paoli, *Lettere*, pp. 95-97.

19. See *ibid.*, p. 50; and Denis Arnold, *Monteverdi*, revised edition (London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1975), p. 24.

20. The appropriateness of the Mass and Vespers to Rome and Venice respectively may account for the much-noted difference in the size of the lettering of the two items on the title page. The larger print for the Mass corresponds with the naming of the dedicatee on the title page itself. Pope Paul would very likely have had little interest in music for Vespers, whose title is given a decidedly secondary place.

21. See William J. Bouwsma, *Venice and the Defense of Republican Liberty* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1968), especially pp. 339-555.

22. Printed in De' Paoli, *Lettere*, pp. 410-411. I am grateful to Prof. Kristine Wallace for the following translation: "When I wished to send forth into the light certain ecclesiastical pieces in musical modes to be sung in chorus, I had decided to dedicate [them] to your Majesty, Pontiff of Pontiffs, than which truly none in the world of mortals approaches nearer to God, but because I recognized that to the greatest and highest, things very mean and small were not

politely dedicated, plainly I would have changed my plan if it had not finally come into my mind that material concerning divine matters by a certain right of its own demands that the title page of the work be inscribed, or rather imprinted, with the name of him who has the keys to Heaven in his hands and holds the helm of empire on earth. Therefore that the sacred harmonies, illuminated by your extraordinary and almost divine glory, may be resplendent and that by [your] supreme blessing being given, the humble hill of my talent may daily grow more and more green, and that the mouths of those speaking unfair things against Claudio may be closed, having thrown myself at your most holy feet, I offer and present these my nocturnal labors, of whatever sort they are. Wherefore, again and again I beg that you may deign with kindly countenance and cheerful mind to accept what I humbly offer, for thus it will happen that with more lively mind after this and with greater labor than before I shall be able to serve both God and the Blessed Virgin and you; farewell and live long, happy."

23. " & claudantur ora in Claudium loquentium iniqua."

24. See note 7 above.

25. De' Paoli, *Lettere*, p. 374.

26. For a detailed discussion of cautionary signs see Don Harrán, "New Evidence for Musica Ficta: The Cautionary Sign," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 29 (Spring 1976): 77-98; see also "Comments and Issues," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 31 (Summer 1978): 385-395.

27. The significance of the *chiavette* with regard to transposition will be discussed below.

28. In the copy of the *Tenor* part-book at the University Library in Wrocław, Poland, the part is emended to agree with the version in the *Bassus Generalis*.

29. The Wrocław copy of the *Cantus* part-book is emended to agree with the *Bassus Generalis*.

30. The errors are actually assumed to be in the *Quintus* of the first choir, which is printed in the *Altus* part-book, and the *Tenor* of the second choir, which is notated in the *Sextus* part-book.

31. Subsequent to my having made this correction in my own transcription of *Nisi Dominus*, an examination of a microfilm copy of the part-books at the University Library at Wrocław revealed that the semibreve *c* in the *Quintus* of the first choir had been erased, resulting in the same closing for the psalm suggested here.

32. The solution in example 9, given in several editions, assumes that the *Bassus Generalis* is a *basso seguente*, merely doubling the lowest part at any given time. However, the *partitura* in both the Mass and Vespers departs from the *segunte* principle with some frequency.

33. The position of the added rest as shown in example 12 is found in the editions by Denis Stevens, *Claudio Monteverdi: Vespers* (London: Novello and Company, Ltd., 1961), p. 55; and Gottfried Wolters, *Claudio Monteverdi: Vesperae Beatae Mariae Virginis* (Wolfenbüttel: Mösel Verlag, 1966), p. 75.

34. Stevens, *Claudio Monteverdi: Vespers*, p. 55. Used with permission. Stevens's edition omits the motets, *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*, and *Magnificat à 6*.

35. The *Tenor* part-book at Wroclaw contains a handwritten correction identical to the one in example 15.

36. This discussion will treat general aspects of the relationship between the *Bassus Generalis* and performance practice and will not attempt a detailed catalogue of performance suggestions. The latter will appear in my edition of the Mass and Vespers to be published by the *Fondazione "Claudio Monteverdi"* of Cremona. Literature on the subject of seventeenth-century performance practice is vast and is most easily located through Mary Vinquist and Neal Zaslaw, eds., *Performance Practice: A Bibliography* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1971). A discussion of performance practice in the Mass and Vespers, with views somewhat different from mine, can be found in Andreas Holschneider, "Zur Aufführungspraxis der Marien-Vesper von Monteverdi," *Hamburger Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft* (Hamburg: Karl Dieter Wagner, 1974), vol. I, pp. 59-68. See also Jürgen Jürgens, "Urtext und Aufführungspraxis bei Monteverdis *Orfeo* und *Marien-Vesper*" in *Claudio Monteverdi e il suo Tempo, Atti del Congresso internazionale di Studi monteverdiani, May 3-May 7, 1968*, ed. Raffaello Monterosso (Verona: La Stamperia Valdonega, 1969), pp. 269-304. A recent article on organ scores in early Baroque music prints, which appeared after this chapter was completed, generally concurs with the conclusions drawn here. See Imogene Horsley, "Full and Short Scores in the Accompaniment of Italian Church Music in the Early Baroque," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 30, no. 3 (Fall 1977): 466-499.

37. Evidence on the use of harpsichords is sketchy. At San Petronio in Bologna they seem to have served mainly as substitutes when organs were in disrepair. See Anne Schnobelen, "The Concerted Mass at San Petronio in Bologna: ca. 1660-1730. A Documentary and Analytical Study" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1966), pp. 327-328. Harpsichords also appeared at Santa Maria Maggiore in Bergamo well before the turn of the seventeenth century. See Jerome Roche, "Music at S. Maria Maggiore, Bergamo, 1614-1643," *Music and Letters* 47, no. 4 (October 1966): 297. According to information discovered and communicated to me by Stephen Bonta, it was the practice at Santa Maria Maggiore to use harpsichords during Holy Week services.

38. A detailed eyewitness account of a performance of Mass and Vespers at the Scuola San Rocco in Venice in 1608 cites theorbos among the continuo instruments. See Stephen Bonta, "Liturgical Problems in Monteverdi's Marian Vespers," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 20 (Spring 1967): 97-98.

39. A recording of the Vespers by the Monteverdi-Chor Hamburg and Conventus Musicus Wien under the direction of Jürgen Jürgens (Telefunken, *Das Alte Werk* SAWT 9501/02) changes continuo instruments regularly in these psalms. The propriety of the extensive use of harpsichord in this recording is questionable.

40. The bass line is mostly, but not exclusively, a *basso seguente*.

41. See Otto Kinkeldey, *Orgel und Klavier in der Musik des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, 1910; reprint edition Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1968), pp. 197 and 201.

42. *Ibid.*, pp. 195-215.

43. See Carol MacClintock, *Giaches de Wert: Life and Works* (American Institute of Musicology, 1966), p. 223. The 1613 collection *Apparato Musicale* by Amante Franzoni, *maestro di cappella* at Santa Barbara at that time, contains instrumental music for use in the mass.

44. In the *Seicento* the use of boy sopranos would probably have required several singers for the part to be heard above the Sonata. In modern performances a single female soprano suffices and is very effective. There is a possibility—remote in the absence of specific instructions—that the bass line in the *Cantus* part-book was also to serve for a separate continuo instrument, to play only while the *Cantus* was singing. This would make sense only if a solo soprano or small number of boys were positioned at some distance from the main organ.

45. The relationship between these motets and contemporary sacred monody and few-voiced motets is treated in chapter V, pp. 150-156.

46. See F. T. Arnold, *The Art of Accompaniment from a Thorough-Bass* (London: Oxford University Press, 1931; reprint edition New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1965), pp. 52 and 70. Agostino Agazzari is one of those opposed to doubling the soprano. Giovanni Paolo Cima comments on the purpose of the voice part in the *partitura* of his *Concerti ecclesiastici* of 1610 "*Et benche nel Partito in molti luoghi ci siano le gratie, come stanno nelle parti, l'ho fatto acciò si veggia lo stile; oltreche anco è di molto agiuto al cantore suonargli talvolta l'ornamento. Ma per lo più giudicarei essere bene, toccare solo il fermo. . .*" Quoted in Luigi Ferdinando Tagliavini, "Registrazioni organistiche nei Magnificat dei 'Vespri' monteverdiani," *Rivista italiana di musicologia* 2, no. 2 (1967): 366-367.

47. These registrations are discussed in Tagliavini, "Registrazioni organistiche," pp. 365-371.

48. In the *Et exultavit*, *Quia fecit*, and *Suscepit Israel* of the *Magnificat* à 7 and the *Et misericordia* of the *Magnificat* à 6.

49. The most extensive contemporary description of foundation and improvising instruments is Agostino Agazzari's *Del sonare sopra'l Basso con tutti li Stromenti e dell'uso loro nel Concerto* (Siena, 1607). English translation in Strunk, *Source Readings*, pp. 424-431. Agazzari's treatise has been correlated with other seventeenth-century sources in Gloria Rose, "Agazzari and the Improvising Orchestra," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 18 (Fall 1965): 382-393.

50. See the preface to Caccini's *Le Nuove Musiche* of 1602. English translation in Strunk, *Source Readings*, pp. 377-392 and in H. Wiley Hitchcock, *Giulio Caccini: Le Nuove Musiche* (Madison: A-R Editions, Inc., 1970), pp. 43-56.

51. Telefunken SAWT 9501/02. See note 39 above.

52. Gloria Rose suggests that because Agazzari's treatise was reprinted in a collection of his motets in 1608, its description of foundation and improvising instruments would pertain to those motets. This may be true, but Giulio Cesare Monteverdi's famous *Dichiaratione* on the *prima pratica* and *seconda pratica* was printed in the *Scherzi Musicali* of 1607, to which it is largely irrelevant. Agazzari may simply have found his forthcoming motet collection of 1608 a convenient means of propagating his treatise. See Gloria Rose, "Agazzari and the Improvising Orchestra," p. 382. In my opinion the voices in all four of Monteverdi's motets are best left undoubled.

53. Note the similarity to the rubric à 8. *voci sole nel Organo* for the psalm *Laudate pueri*. Both rubrics may have the dual meaning of solo voices without instrumental doubling.

54. See Gloria Rose, "Agazzari and the Improvising Orchestra."

55. A survey of ornamentation treatises is found in Max Kuhn, *Die Verzierungskunst in der Gesangs-Musik des 16.-17. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Breitkopf and Härtel, 1902). See also Ernest T. Ferand, *Improvisation in Nine Centuries of Western Music*, vol. 12 of *Anthology of Music* (Cologne: Arno Volk Verlag, 1961); and Howard Mayer Brown, *Embellishing Sixteenth-Century Music* (London: Oxford University Press, 1976).

56. See, for example, Caccini's preface cited in note 50. Caccini was only one of many who expressed their opinions on tasteless virtuosi.

57. The *chiavette* in Amadino's print are the treble G clef, C₂ and C₃ clefs, and the F₃ clef.

58. The most comprehensive treatment of pitch and *chiavette* is in Arthur Mendel, "Pitch in the 16th and Early 17th Centuries," *The Musical Quarterly* 34 (1948): 28-45, 199-221, 336-357, and 575-593. A somewhat different view from Mendel's is presented in Siegfried Hermelink, "Zur Chiavettenfrage," *Bericht über den Musikwissenschaftlichen Kongress Wien, Mozartjahr 1956*, ed. Erich Schenk (Cologne: Verlag Hermann Böhlhaus Nachf., 1958), pp. 264-271. See also Caroline Anne Müller, "Chiavette: A New Approach" (Master's thesis, University of California at Berkeley, 1960).

59. Mendel, "Pitch," pp. 336-357.

60. *Nigra sum, Laudate pueri, Pulchra es, and Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*. Giambattista Martini prints the first *Agnus Dei* of the Mass as an example for young composers of *Musica Ecclesiastica*. Martini's version, like Tonelli's *partitura*, is notated in *chiavi naturali* and transposed a fourth downward to the key of G. See Giambattista Martini, *Esemplare o sia Saggio fondamentale pratico di Contrappunto fugato, Parte seconda* (Bologna: Lelio dalla Volpe Impresore dell' Instituto delle Scienze, 1776), pp. 242-250.

61. The void notes indicate the primary tessituras. The solid note heads indicate the extreme high and low notes, encountered less frequently.

62. Mendel, "Pitch," pp. 199-221. See especially p. 206 and Table II on p. 221. From Mendel's discussion of Praetorius, it seems most likely that the pitch in use in northern Italy was approximately a half-step higher than modern pitch, which means that a notated pitch of the seventeenth century should sound higher today. Tonelli's *partitura*, therefore, would have sounded, at modern fixed pitch, approximately in A-flat instead of its notated G, and the lowest note in the bass would have approximated our E-flat. However, the fluctuation in pitch from one organ to another could have increased significantly the difference between Tonelli's notation and modern pitch.

63. Giovanni Gabrieli remarked on the scarcity of good male altos in Venice. See Denis Arnold, *Giovanni Gabrieli* (London: Oxford University Press, 1974), p. 58. The Venetian composer Giovanni Francesco Capello often avoided the alto voice altogether in his works.

64. The compasses of early seventeenth-century instruments are outlined by Praetorius in *Syntagma Musicum, Tomus Secundus, De Organographia* (Wolfenbüttel, 1618). A modern transcription is found in *Publikationen Älterer Praktischer und Theoretischer Musikwerke* (Reprint edition New York: Broude Brothers, 1966), vol. XIII, pp. 22-33. Praetorius's ranges are also reported in Sibyl Marcuse, *A Survey of Musical Instruments* (New York: Harper & Row, 1975).