

CHAPTER V

SOME HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES ON THE MONTEVERDI VESPERS

It is one of the paradoxes of musicological research that we generally become acquainted with a period, a repertoire, or a style through recognized masterworks that are tacitly or expressly assumed to be representative. Yet a masterpiece, by definition, is unrepresentative, unusual, and beyond the scope of ordinary musical activity. A more thorough and realistic knowledge of music history must come from a broader and deeper acquaintance with its constituent elements than is provided by a limited quantity of exceptional composers and works.

Such an expansion of the range of our historical research has the advantage not only of enhancing our understanding of a given topic, but also of supplying the basis for comparison among those works and artists who have faded into obscurity and the few composers and masterpieces that have survived to become the primary focus of our attention today. Only in relation to lesser efforts can we fully comprehend the qualities that raise the masterpiece above the common level. Only by comparison can we learn to what degree the master composer has rooted his creation in contemporary currents, or conversely, to what extent original ideas and techniques are responsible for its special features. Similarly, it is only by means of broader investigations that we can detect what specific historical influence the masterwork has had upon contemporaries and younger colleagues, and thereby arrive at judgments about the historical significance of the master composer.

Despite the obvious importance of systematic comparative studies, our comprehension of many a masterpiece still derives mostly from the artifact itself, resulting inevitably in an incomplete and distorted perspective. An archetypical case in point is Claudio Monteverdi's *Vespro della Beata Vergine* of 1610, which has received widespread attention in recent years, but almost entirely as an isolated phenomenon.¹ This is hardly surprising in view of the fact that Vesper psalms and Magnificats of the seventeenth century have been the subject of very few scholarly studies, and the few-voiced motet repertoire of the early *Seicento* (there are four such motets in the Monteverdi Vespers) has scarcely fared better.²

As a result, studies of the Monteverdi Vespers have hardly begun to treat the major historical issues posed by the publication's relationship to contemporary and subsequent Vesper repertoire. Most research has focused instead upon the liturgical question raised by the alternation of psalms and *sacri concentus* throughout the original print.³ But even this troublesome problem might be further illuminated by an investigation of contemporary Vesper music. It is through just such an examination of the historical context of the *Vespro della Beata Vergine* that a broadening of our perspectives on this important work will be attempted in this essay.

I

A survey of extant Vesper music prints from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries reveals several different categories of publications. The main type of print in the late *Cinquecento* consists of single settings of psalms "*per tutte le solennità*" (the actual number may vary from thirteen to twenty-one), following the example established by Willaert and Jachet of Mantua in their celebrated collection of 1550.⁴ These prints supply polyphonic psalms for all the major feasts of the liturgical year (excluding ferial Vespers), frequently incorporate one or more Magnificats, and sometimes begin with a polyphonic setting of the Vesper respond, *Domine ad adiu-vandum*. *Falsibordoni* may also be included, and a few Vesper collections after 1589 contain a single mass setting. Such publications form a rather homogeneous repertoire, each collection designed to fill the same liturgical needs.

Late in the sixteenth century, however, some new types of Vesper collections embracing a greater diversity of compositions began to appear alongside the old. In addition to Vesper psalms for all the major feasts, a small number of motets was sometimes admitted; frequently the four Marian antiphons for Compline were included; and *falsibordoni* in all the tones were common. This diversity of contents became especially significant during the last decade of the century, confirming further the breakdown of traditional formulas and techniques often observed in music of this period.⁵

These complex collections could easily grow to unwieldy proportions. By the time a composer assembled a complete Mass Ordinary, settings of all the Vesper psalms, some five or six motets, two or three Magnificats, *falsibordoni*, and perhaps even four Marian antiphons, his publication had become inordinately large and correspondingly expensive.⁶ The practical response to this problem was to reduce the number of psalm settings, leaving just enough to cover most efficiently the largest possible number of feasts. A collection first published in 1599 by Antonio Mortaro of Milan illustrates this solution.⁷ Mortaro's print contains a parody mass, the Vesper respond,

the psalms *Dixit Dominus*, *Laudate pueri*, *Laetatus sum*, *Nisi Dominus*, *Lauda Ierusalem*, *Confitebor tibi*, *Beatus vir*, and *Laudate Dominum*, four motets, two *Magnificats* (one a parody *Magnificat*), and a set of *falsibordoni*. The eight psalms represent a substantial reduction in the number of psalm settings, but they are carefully chosen. The first five are those required for all Marian feasts and feasts of other virgins as indicated in the Common of the Saints. The last three, in conjunction with *Dixit Dominus* and *Laudate pueri*, serve for a variety of feasts from the Common, including first Vespers for feasts of Apostles and Evangelists, Confessor Bishops, One or Several Martyrs, and One or Several Pontiffs. The first group of psalms may be characterized as the "female *cursus*" and the second as the "male *cursus*."⁸ These eight psalms, therefore, while not covering the entire liturgical year, could still prove quite useful to any choir-master.

In fact, Mortaro's entire collection is designed with a multiplicity of practical purposes in mind. The mass setting, of course, is part of a completely separate rite which preceded Vespers during the day. The motets might have been employed in a variety of ways: possibly during the performance of the mass, perhaps in the Vesper service, in church on other occasions when their texts were suitable, or even in secular surroundings. The *Magnificats* are part of the Vesper Ordinary, and the textless *falsibordoni* provide alternative possibilities for singing the psalms (including all those omitted from the collection). They could even have been used for ferial Vespers or other services requiring psalms, such as Compline.

Not only does Mortaro's collection possess considerable flexibility in its practical application, but it also furnishes a more complete body of music for a single Vesper service than the collections "*per tutte le solennità*." In the one publication a *maestro di cappella* had enough music to perform an elaborate polyphonic Mass and Vespers on an appropriate feast day. Not only are all the major items supplied, but there is also a polyphonic setting of the response and several motets from which to choose.

Mortaro's collection is illustrative of several related tendencies in sacred music publications around the turn of the seventeenth century. First, the contents affirm the aforementioned breakdown of the homogeneous collection. Second, this breakdown reveals a desire for more flexible practical applications of the single publication. And third, the provision of enough music for an elaborate polyphonic service reflects an interest in expanding the scope of polyphony at Vespers. That all three are broad-based historical trends is demonstrated by the fact that during the period 1600-1610 such complex publications, often with widely varying contents, more than tripled in quantity in comparison to the last decade of the sixteenth century.

The reduction in the number of psalm settings in a single collection is occasionally carried a step further than in Mortaro's print of 1599. A com-

paratively small number of publications survive that include only five Vesper psalms, placing even further limitations on the collection's use during the liturgical year. The earliest extant print restricted to just five psalms is a large and complex compilation by Diego Ortiz dating from 1565.⁹ This publication contains a large number of hymns, a *Magnificat* in each of the eight tones, music from Compline, thirteen motets (mostly Marian antiphons), and the five Vesper psalms comprising the "male *cursus*." Ortiz's collection appears to be the first of such complexity and with such a multiplicity of purposes. It anticipates by a quarter century any significant trends in these directions. What is of particular interest, however, is the inclusion of psalms for only a few specific categories of feasts, a situation anticipating Monteverdi's own Vespers by forty-five years.

A 1590 publication for double choir by Orfeo Vecchi of Milan likewise contains only five psalms, though the remainder of the collection is more comparable to the 1599 print of Vecchi's Milanese colleague, Mortaro.¹⁰ The five psalms in Vecchi's print, *Dixit Dominus*, *Confitebor tibi*, *Beatus vir*, *Laudate pueri*, and *In exitu Israel*, form the series for Sunday Vespers as indicated on the title page. Vecchi also includes a single mass, a setting of the Vesper respond, a *Magnificat*, three motets, and *falsibordoni*. Vecchi's collection does not lend itself to as many uses as Mortaro's, but like his, it contains enough music for an elaborate polyphonic Mass and Vespers, this time limited to Sundays. The function of the three motets is not entirely clear; in fact, they are not even listed in the title of the publication. Evidently, they may be inserted into the mass or Vesper service as desired. The *falsibordoni*, on the other hand, could serve the variety of functions cited above in connection with the *falsibordoni* of the Mortaro print.

After the turn of the seventeenth century, publications like those of Mortaro and Vecchi increased in number. I have been able to locate some sixteen collections from between 1600 and 1620 that limit their psalms to either the "male *cursus*" or the "female *cursus*," the latter holding the numerical edge with ten.¹¹ Several of those with the "female *cursus*" (including Monteverdi's) are specified on the title page as pertaining to feasts of the Virgin Mary, though, as mentioned earlier, they would also be suitable for feasts of other virgin saints. But the inclusion of the five Marian Vesper psalms is not the only ground for comparison between some of these collections and Monteverdi's Vespers. In several, the remaining contents are also similar, though nowhere identical.

Monteverdi's collection begins with the famous parody mass *In illo tempore*, which is then succeeded by the Vesper respond, *Domine ad adiu-vandum*. Next comes a regular alternation between the five psalms and five *sacri concentus*, followed by the hymn *Ave maris stella* and two *Magnificats*.¹² A 1601 collection by Francesco Terriera is similar but a little

smaller in dimensions.¹³ A single mass is succeeded by the five Marian Vesper psalms, one *Magnificat*, and four motets. A 1606 print by Don Serafino Patta is somewhat more expansive, with the Vesper respond inserted between the mass and the first psalm, *falsibordoni* added after the *Magnificat*, the motets increased to five, and a setting of the Litany of the B.V.M. appended at the end. Ioannis Righi's publication from the same year is very similar.¹⁴ The contents follow the same pattern as Patta's, but Righi adds a second *Magnificat*, includes only four motets, and places the Litany and *falsibordoni* last. In 1608, Pompeo Signorucci positioned a mass at the conclusion of his print, added a sixth psalm, *Laudate Dominum*, and incorporated three motets, but did not supply a Litany or *falsibordoni*.¹⁵

These are the only Marian Vesper collections antedating Monteverdi's that I have been able to find. The main differences between Monteverdi's and the others are his interspersal of the motets *between* the psalms, his inclusion of the Marian Vesper hymn, and his omission of anything else not directly connected with the Mass or Vespers, such as the Litany. It is the first of these differences that has given rise to so much controversy over the collection. It has been argued on the one hand that the motets are extraneous to the Vesper service, and on the other that they serve as substitutes for the plainchant antiphons normally required by the liturgy, a function indicated by their position between the psalms in the original print.¹⁶

The most recent and persuasive evidence has been gathered on the side of the antiphon-substitute theory, but even these arguments have taken limited cognizance of the evidence supplied by comparable contemporaneous collections.¹⁷ The question why motets were included in Monteverdi's publication if they were not to be used in the Vesper service can also be asked about the other prints just listed, even if the motets come only at the end of each part-book. If these Marian Vesper collections, in contrast to those "*per tutte le solennità*" and those with multiple functions, were designed to provide a greater quantity of polyphonic music for a single category of feast, the reasonable assumption is that the few motets included are also usable as part of the liturgical performance.

More direct evidence of antiphon substitutes is found in a 1619 publication by the Roman composer Paolo Agostini.¹⁸ The succession of works in this print is as follows:

Dixit Dominus, secondo tono
Dum esset Rex, antifona prima
Dixit Dominus, primo tono
Sub tuum praesidium
Laudate pueri, sesto tono
Leva eius, seconda antifona

Laudate pueri, intonazione del sesto tono
Virgo prudentissima
Laudate pueri, intonazione del quarto tono
Beata es Virgo
Laetatus sum, sesto tono
Nigra sum, tertia antifona
Laetatus sum, quarto tono
Cantate Domino
Nisi Dominus, secondo tono
Iam hiems transiit, antifona quarta
Nisi Dominus, ottavo tono
Veni in hortum meum
Lauda Hierusalem, ottavo tono
Speciosa facta es, quinta e ultima antifona
Lauda Hierusalem, primo tono
Gaudeamus omnes
Ave Maris Stella
Ave Maris Stella
Magnificat, ottavo tono
Beata Mater, antifona ad Magnificat
Magnificat, secondo tono
Ego dormio
Magnificat, secondo tono
Ab initio
Veni de Libano

The table of contents at the end of each part-book actually obscures this order. Instead of following the succession of pieces, the index groups all compositions in a single genre together, with the motets and antiphons for one, two, and three voices following after the psalms, hymns, and *Magnificats*.

Agostini's collection is another of those devoted exclusively to Vespers of the Virgin, but it differs from all earlier examples in presenting multiple settings of each of the psalms. It is also the only collection besides Monteverdi's to include the hymn *Ave maris stella* (in two settings), but most importantly, Agostini follows Monteverdi's precedent in interspersing the antiphons and motets between the psalms. His method is systematic and clearly indicates the liturgical function of the motets. Each psalm in the collection has two settings, except *Laudate pueri*, which has three. The first version of a psalm is followed by a polyphonic composition on the appropriate antiphon text for Marian feasts from the Common of the Saints. These pieces are labelled "*antifona prima*," "*antifona seconda*," etc. However, these antiphon texts are not suitable for *all* Marian feasts. Those

feasts listed in the Proper of the Time require their own antiphons. Agostini resolves the problem of the proliferation of antiphons by furnishing single substitute texts, set polyphonically and placed after the second (and third in the case of *Laudate pueri*) version of each psalm in the print. Thus every motet occupies the same position relative to the preceding psalm as does each of the polyphonic antiphon settings derived from the Common of the Saints. There seems to be no alternative but to accept these motets as antiphon-substitutes for use in Marian feasts from the Proper of the Time. The analogy with Monteverdi's collection is obvious and offers further support for performing his *sacri concertus* in place of plainchant antiphons.

Stephen Bonta, arguing in favor of the antiphon-substitute theory, notes that it is impossible to find in the *Liber Usualis* liturgically correct plainchant antiphons that fit the tonalities of Monteverdi's five psalms.¹⁹ The same observation may be made with regard to all the collections of Marian Vespers published between 1600 and 1620. In none of these does the succession of psalm tonalities match the *Liber's* modes for plainchant antiphons from the Common of the Saints or from any Marian feast in the Proper. This difficulty, which Bonta suggests was resolved by substituting polyphonic motets that did not have to agree with the psalm in tonality, has implications extending beyond Monteverdi's own Vespers and the Marian Vespers of other composers.

The fact is that any polyphonic setting of a Vesper psalm necessitated a choice of a single tonality, thereby limiting the number of modally compatible plainchant antiphons with which the psalm could be sung. Since it is the *antiphon* that is proper to a particular feast day or group of feasts (as in the Common), the ability of the psalm to match the mode of the antiphon was crucial to whether or not the psalm could be used for a particular feast. Thus a polyphonic psalm composition would be limited to fewer feasts than its Gregorian counterpart. Presumably it could only be sung when the plainchant antiphon happened to be in the same mode.

One of the earliest means of circumventing this dilemma, initially engendered by the desire for polyphonic music at Vespers, was to supply *falsibordoni* psalms in all the tones. These chordal harmonizations of the psalm chant, typically with an additional melisma appended at the mediant and end, were normally textless and most often appeared in manuscripts and prints in all tones. Thus any psalm text could be fitted to a *falsobordone* in whatever tone was required.

Once a specific psalm text was set in *canto figurato*, however, this flexibility was lost and the tonality was fixed. Thus a question is raised about the practical use of polyphonic Vesper psalms, which began appearing with some frequency in manuscripts of the first half of the sixteenth century, increasing greatly in number after the early publications of the 1550s. It

seems that the possibilities for using a given psalm in a fixed tonality would have been rather limited. The problem is further complicated by an examination of the tones of polyphonic settings as designated in the indices of a good many sixteenth-century prints. Frequently a Vesper collection begins with the psalms *Dixit Dominus*, *Confitebor tibi*, *Beatus vir*, and *Laudate pueri* (Psalms 109, 110, 111, and 112). Traditionally, these four psalms were in the first four tones, though at times other tones were also indicated. This custom even antedates the earliest published Vesper psalms, being traceable in manuscripts as far back as the late fifteenth century.²⁰

But if one examines the *Liber Usualis* for the most common modes of antiphons for these four psalms, major discrepancies are revealed. Antiphons for *Dixit Dominus* most frequently fall in the eighth mode and to a lesser extent in the seventh. Antiphons for *Confitebor tibi* and *Laudate pueri* are likewise most often in the seventh and eighth modes. Similarly, the majority of *Beatus vir* antiphons are in the eighth mode, although a lesser number are distributed fairly evenly among the first, fourth, and seventh modes. Thus the first four Vesper psalms were normally not even set in the most common modes of their antiphons, at least as far as the *Liber Usualis* is concerned. Here, however, we must call into question the accuracy with which modern liturgical books represent sixteenth- and seventeenth-century liturgical conditions. Though the Church was constantly pressing for a more unified liturgy after the Council of Trent (1545-1563), there still remain many divergences between the practices manifested in publications of the period and those standardized in modern books.²¹

For example, some of the psalm intonations given in collections of Vesper music do not match any found in the *Liber Usualis*. Other discrepancies emerge from Adriano Banchieri's *L'Organo Suonarino* of 1605.²² In the *Secondo registro*, Banchieri supplies organ basses to be alternated with chant for eight psalms, each in one of the eight tones. Feasts for which these psalms are proper are listed at the head of each. But in several cases the feasts named call for antiphons that in the *Liber* are in different modes from Banchieri's psalms. For instance, Banchieri's setting of *Laetatus sum* in the sixth tone is specified as appropriate to the Marian feasts of the Nativity, Visitation, Conception, and Presentation.²³ But the *Liber* has sixth mode antiphons for this psalm only for the feast of the Nativity of the Virgin. For the other feasts listed by Banchieri, the *Liber* calls for the third, eighth, and third modes respectively. Similar disparities are posed by the rubrics of two more of Banchieri's organ basses.²⁴

The larger question, how polyphonic psalm settings were used during this period and what their relationship to plainchant antiphons actually was, is still in need of clarification. As Bonta suggests, it is quite likely that the problem of matching a Gregorian antiphon to a polyphonic psalm (most often beginning with a plainchant intonation) was frequently sidestepped by

the substitution of a polyphonic motet for the proper antiphon.²⁵ This appears to have been Monteverdi's solution as well as that of Agostini and some of the other composers of Marian Vespers mentioned above. James Armstrong's study of the Anerio *Antiphonae* reinforces this view.

It is worth re-emphasizing that even though the antiphon-substitute theory appears valid, Monteverdi, more than the authors of most such collections, stresses the flexible uses of the motets and other music of his publication.²⁶ Yet his title page, which suggests that the *sacri concentus* (and perhaps other items) could be performed outside the church and apart from a liturgical service, has contributed to the confusion of modern scholars over his intentions. It is even possible that the ambiguity of the title was deliberate. Monteverdi's designation of at least part of the contents as "*ad Sacella sive Principum Cubicula accommodata*," "suitable for chapels or the chambers of princes," may have been intended not only to suggest optional uses for various pieces in the collection, but also to veil the role of the *sacri concentus* as possible antiphon-substitutes from the casual observer, such as an ecclesiastical censor. Substitutions were outside officially sanctioned liturgical practice, and it must be recalled that the Mass and Vespers were dedicated to Pope Paul V. The only complete table of contents is in the organ *partitura* and one would have had to look there to realize the liturgical role the *sacri concentus* could play. Such a mild deception may also have been the reason behind Agostini's listing of antiphons and motets *after* the psalms, hymns, and *Magnificats* in the index of his 1619 Marian Vespers rather than in their actual order of appearance in the part-books. Twentieth-century controversies over the liturgical use of these motets ironically may bear witness to the success of such a ploy.

II

The musical aspects of the *Vespro della Beata Vergine* present a complex picture, both in their own right and in comparison with the contemporaneous Vesper repertoire. Just as it proved necessary to examine the historical background of Vesper collections in order to obtain a perspective on the contents and organization of Monteverdi's print, it is equally essential to investigate the compositional techniques and styles of Vesper music, both before and after 1610, to understand the relationship between Monteverdi's work and the efforts of others.

A few general points of reference may be established at the outset. First, Monteverdi's seems to be the earliest Vesper publication requiring *obbligato* instruments. The use of instruments to double or replace vocal lines *ad libitum* had been suggested on the title pages of many sixteenth-century motet collections, and *obbligato* instrumental parts appear in a few early *Seicento* motet books. But in the Vesper repertoire I have found no prior ex-

amples of *obbligato* orchestration, and even Monteverdi's optional instrumentation has very few precedents.²⁷

A second peculiarity of Monteverdi's collection is the extensive employment of a *cantus firmus* in the psalms and *Magnificats*. While *cantus firmi* do appear sporadically in Vesper music, as demonstrated below, they are nowhere as ubiquitous as in Monteverdi's print of 1610.

Third, all of the music of the *Vespro* is composed in an elaborate style. This is true not only with regard to the virtuoso character of much of the vocal and instrumental writing, but also with respect to Monteverdi's large-scale, complicated structures. The psalms and *Magnificats* are more expansive and possess more internal stylistic contrasts than any previous examples. The motets are musically more sophisticated than most such contemporary pieces, and *Duo Seraphim* exhibits more virtuoso embellishment than any other motet from the early *Seicento* I have seen. The *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* is ampler in both size and sonority than the several models on which it is based. Even the respond and hymn are larger and more grandiose than the settings of other composers. Consistent with such complexity and diversity, Monteverdi's is the only collection of Vesper music up to this time to vary the number of voices required from one piece to the next.

In sum, we may begin with the general observation that the Monteverdi Vespers are on an unparalleled level of musical splendor in the exploitation of vocal and instrumental colors and virtuosity, in the complexity of structures and textures, in the variety of styles and techniques, and in the magnitude of individual pieces. This musical opulence may be traced to a number of sources: Monteverdi's obvious desire to establish himself through this one collection as an eminent composer of sacred music in both the old style (the *Missa In illo tempore*) and almost every new style then in the process of development; the possible origin of at least part of the Vespers as music for a lavish celebration in Mantua; or the personal taste of Duke Vincenzo Gonzaga, reflected in the designation on the title page "*ad Sacella sive Principum Cubicula accommodata*," which suggests the duke's private chapel and rooms in contrast to "*ad Ecclesiam*," a public church.²⁸ Whatever the genesis of the stylistic idiosyncrasies of the Vespers, our *historical* perspective can be enhanced only by an examination of the precedents upon which Monteverdi has expanded and an investigation of the impact of his novel approach to Vesper music in the period immediately following his publication of the work in 1610.

The Vesper psalm repertoire of the first decade of the seventeenth century is an extension of the styles and techniques of the late *Cinquecento*. The revolution in secular music and the motet, already in progress around the turn of the century, had had by 1610 only a limited effect on polyphonic psalmody. In one sense this is paradoxical, for psalm settings, which had always relied heavily on a chordal style originating in harmonization of the

psalm tone, were by their very nature closer to the newly evolved concepts of homophony and intelligible declamation than were many other forms of sixteenth-century music. In addition, the verse structure of psalm texts automatically divided a composition into discrete sections, both in *alternatim* and through-composed settings. Such sectionalization of large compositions into smaller components, often contrasting in texture, meter, or style, was another of the characteristic developments of the early *Seicento*.

But opposing those aspects of polyphonic psalmody that were compatible with modern trends was the conservative aesthetic view of this liturgical genre, exemplified by the brief remarks of Pietro Cerone in 1613:

In composing psalms, even to omit imitating the psalmody will be no error, for if one were to imitate the plainsong in all the parts, repeating the motives, the verse would be very long, very elaborate, and overly solemn, solemnity being unsuited to psalmody. . . . Be it further observed that the music should be such as does not obscure the words, which should be very distinct and clear, so that all the parts will seem to enunciate together, no more, no less, as in a falso bordone, without long or elegant passages or any novelty other than ordinary consonances, introducing from time to time some short and commonplace imitation. . . . To conclude, I say that any invention used in the verses of the psalms should be very short, formed of few notes and these of small value, and also that the parts should enter in succession after rests of not more than one, two, three, or sometimes four measures. And this should be observed both to avoid making the verses long and to avoid falling into the style of the three privileged canticles.²⁹

Although Cerone reproaches Italian composers for sometimes violating the simplicity of psalmody, his aesthetic orientation is corroborated by countless psalm collections of the time. Whether completely homophonic or incorporating polyphonic imitation, whether set for a single choir or *cori spezzati*, Vesper psalms were not the place for a composer to display his prowess, nor were they considered suitable for instrumental doubling after the fashion of masses and motets. Psalms were more purely functional than decorative. They tended to be unpretentious and lacking in the artifice and solemnity bestowed on masses, motets, and even Magnificats. In many respects, Vesper psalmody represented the ideal type of liturgical music when measured against the precepts of the Council of Trent. The clearly declaimed homophony of psalm settings matched perfectly the Council's requirements for sacred music, though the reformers' main concern was the mass.³⁰

Despite the conservative tendencies of Vesper psalmody, a few impulses in the direction of modernity can be witnessed in the first decade of the seventeenth century. The natural subdivision of a psalm into several sections invited contrasts among those sections, and composers in the early *Seicento* gradually began to take advantage of such opportunities. A 1601 through-composed setting of *Nisi Dominus* by Monteverdi's Mantuan colleague, Giovanni Giacomo Gastoldi, not only utilizes antiphonal,

In va - num la - bo - ra - ve - runt qui ae - di - fi - cant e -
 In va - num la - bo - ra - ve - runt qui ae - di - fi - cant
 In va - num la - bo - ra - ve - runt qui ae - di - fi - cant
 In va - num la - bo - ra - ve - runt qui ae - di - fi - cant e -

- - - - - am,
 e - - - - - am,
 e - - - - - am,
 - - - - - am,
 ni - si Do - mi - nus cu - sto - di - e -
 ni - si Do - mi - nus cu - sto - di - e -
 ni - si Do - mi - nus cu - sto - di - e -
 ni - si Do - mi - nus cu - sto - di - e -

The image displays a musical score for Giovanni Gastoldi's 'Nisi Dominus'. It consists of two systems of music, each with five staves. The first system features vocal lines with lyrics: 'fru - stra vi - gi - lat qui - rit ci - vi - ta - tem,'. The second system continues with 'cu - sto - dit e - am.' and 'Va - num est vo - bis'. The score includes various musical notations such as clefs, time signatures, and dynamic markings.

fru - stra vi - gi - lat qui - rit ci - vi - ta - tem,

fru - stra vi - gi - lat qui - rit ci - vi - ta - tem,

fru - stra vi - gi - lat qui - rit ci - vi - ta - tem,

fru - stra vi - gi - lat qui - rit ci - vi - ta - tem,

cu - sto - dit e - am.

cu - sto - dit e - am.

cu - sto - dit e - am.

cu - sto - dit e - am.

Va - num est vo - bis

Va - num est vo - bis

Va - num est vo - bis

Va - num est vo - bis

EXAMPLE 1. Giovanni GASTOLDI, *Nisi Dominus*

homophonic four-voice choirs in duple time, but also shifts to triple meter three times in the course of the piece and includes a passage of *falsobordone* as well.³¹ The block-like exchanges between the two choirs, frequently comprising entire lines of text (see example 1), denote a forerunner of Monteverdi's own *Nisi Dominus*, though the latter work employs a plainchant *cantus firmus* throughout and is considerably longer with its second choir echoing precisely each line sung by the first. Monteverdi's rhythms are also more varied than Gastoldi's and his part-writing is more complex, even though *Nisi Dominus* is the simplest and least progressive of the five psalms of the *Vespro*.³² This type of antiphonal setting is common in the Vesper repertoire, though the dimensions of Monteverdi's version are typically larger.

Contrasting sections within a psalm are more fully exploited by Gastoldi in his 1607 six-voice setting of *Memento Domine David*.³³ This lengthy text requires considerable variety of treatment in order to maintain musical interest. Gastoldi employs homophonic textures for all six voices, chordal antiphony between the upper three and the lower three, polyphony in varying combinations of parts, *falsibordoni* followed by polyphonic melismas, sections in triple meter, and passages in faster note values than the prevailing rhythms. This may well be the most complex and varied psalm setting before 1610, but the styles of its component parts are rooted in the past and not comparable to the modern aspects of Monteverdi's even more complex psalms.

Composers outside the Mantuan circle also occasionally contrasted successive sections of a psalm, and there even survive a few compositions from before 1610 with emphasis partly or entirely on ornamented solo voices and the newest vocal styles. Both features are combined with *falsobordone* in a three-voice *Dixit Dominus* published in 1606 by Leone Leoni, employed at the time in Vicenza.³⁴ Leoni's *Dixit* contrasts the polyphonic texture of its first and last segments with internal sections of unmeasured recitation for one, two, and three voices.³⁵ The ornamental element consists of melismas following each half-verse in *falsobordone*. The melodic shapes and rhythmic patterns of these melismas are similar to much of the vocal writing in few-voiced motets from Viadana onward. They are not yet in the faster sixteenth notes favored by Monteverdi (see example 2).

Another example of the rather rare appearance of solo voices in psalm composition is found in Don Severo Bonini's *Compline* psalm, *Cum invocarem*, published in 1609.³⁶ This piece is an unabashed monody modeled on those of Bonini's Florentine compatriot Caccini, particularly in the extensive use of the most modern ornaments. As in Leoni's *Dixit Dominus*, the ornamental passages follow the initial part of each line, which is set in *falsobordone* (see example 3).

Cantus solo

Dominus o dex - - - tris tu - - - - - is

confregit in die irae su - ae re - - - ges.

[#]

EXAMPLE 2. Leone LEONI, *Dixit Dominus*

Mi - se - re - re me - - - i et exaudi o - -

- ra - ti - o - - - - - nem me - - - - -

#10 11 #10 #10 11 #10

- - om.

Et scitote quoniam mi - ri - fi - ca - vit Do - mi -

- nus san - - - - - ctum su - - - - - um

11 10

EXAMPLE 3. Don Severo BONINI, *Cum invocarem*

It is significant that both the Leoni and Bonini psalms were not printed in collections of Vesper music, but in books of motets (madrigals and motets in the case of Bonini). The inclusion of occasional Vesper psalms in motet books seems to have led to the assimilation by these psalms of the style of their companion pieces. It is actually in this peripheral part of the psalm repertoire that we find the forerunners of the few-voiced sections of Monteverdi's *Dixit Dominus*, *Laudate pueri*, and *Laetatus sum*. Monteverdi's is thus the first publication of Vesper music to amalgamate the full-choir techniques common to psalmody with the newer few-voiced virtuoso style.

Many of the precedents for Monteverdi's separate *obbligato* and optional instrumental parts in the Vespers also derive from the motet repertoire.³⁷ A book of *Concerti Ecclesiastici* published in 1608 by Arcangelo Crotti of Ferrara includes several pieces for one or two soloists with notated instrumental accompaniments, most of which are marked *si placet*.³⁸ In Caterina Assandra's motet collection of 1609, one piece, *O salutaris Hostia*, is set for soprano and bass supported by a violin and *violone* in addition to the basso continuo.³⁹

The most famous example of *obbligato* instrumentation in motets, of course, is Giovanni Gabrieli's *Sacrae Symphoniae* of 1615.⁴⁰ Since Gabrieli died in 1612, the contents of this collection antedate its publication by at least three years and in some cases by many more, as determined from concordances.⁴¹

A few instances of the use of instruments in connection with Vesper music may also be noted. Giulio Radino Padovano's *Concerti per sonare et cantare* of 1607 contains a sixteen-voice, *coro spezzato Magnificat* with the rubrics "*Choro de Violini, Choro de Cornetti, Choro de Tromboni,*" and "*Capella*" in various part-books.⁴² The ensembles of instruments in this *Magnificat* seem perfectly natural in a collection devoted primarily to wholly instrumental music. One of the psalms in Agostino Agazzari's *Psalmi Sex* of 1609 is headed by the direction: "*Prima si fa una Sinfonia di stromenti,*" though this must be improvised because no music is given.⁴³ Denis Arnold describes a *Laudate pueri* by the Venetian Giovanni Croce, who died in 1609, in which one of three four-part choirs consists of a tenor and three instruments, "two of which are specified to be trombones."⁴⁴ The date of this piece is unknown, since its first appearance is in an anthology published in 1630.⁴⁵

That *notated* instrumental parts became significant in sacred music at Mantua at about this time is evident not only from Monteverdi's Vespers, but also from Amante Franzoni's *Apparato Musicale* of 1613.⁴⁶ The Mass in this collection, which according to the preface was performed in the Ducal Church on the feast of Santa Barbara, contains an instrumental *En-*

trata in place of the Introit, an instrumental *ritornello* to be fitted between the segments of the *Kyrie*, a *canzona francese* to accompany the Epistle, *sinfonie* to be inserted between sections of the Offertory, two more *sinfonie* to precede the *Sanctus* and *Agnus*, and a *canzona* to conclude the service. As indicated on the title page, these instrumental pieces could be omitted, and they are not integral elements in any of the mass sections.⁴⁷

The pervasive diffusion of the plainchant *cantus firmus* throughout the psalms and *Magnificats* of the *Vespro della Beata Vergine* has been cited by Denis Arnold as evidence of Monteverdi's concern for structural cohesion in these expansive and variegated compositions.⁴⁸ But the monotony of the psalm tone also poses difficult aesthetic and organizational problems, as can be observed in the few other settings of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries that rely heavily on the plainchant. While harmonization of the psalm tone had been practiced with some frequency in the early part of the *Cinquecento*, by late in the century most composers employed the *cantus firmus* sparingly. The reason is obvious: harmonic and tonal tedium are the almost inevitable result. One has only to look at some of the rare instances where the chant *was* used extensively. Victoria's *Dixit Dominus*, published in 1581, illustrates the harmonic limitations resulting therefrom.⁴⁹ The effect is much worse in Giovanni Croce's eight-voice, double-choir *Domine probasti me* of 1603.⁵⁰ This particular psalm text is of unusual length, and the desire to unify the composition is probably what prompted Croce to employ the chant in the first place. But even though the primary texture is relieved by several two-voice sections in the middle of the piece, the monotony of Croce's setting is almost overwhelming.

Most composers pay rather limited attention to the psalm tone if they use it at all. In the numerous psalms beginning with a plainchant intonation, the chant often continues in the tenor or soprano once the polyphony starts. Almost invariably, however, the psalm tone is abandoned after the completion of the first verse of the text. Similar treatment may be accorded interior sections of *alternatim* settings. Here too the plainchant begun in an even or odd verse may continue in one voice in the succeeding polyphonic segment. But this procedure rarely occurs in more than one or two sections in psalms of the late sixteenth or early seventeenth centuries.⁵¹

Aside from the continuation of the plainchant into a polyphonic texture, the psalm tone may also be confined entirely within a polyphonic segment itself. Most often this takes the form of single verses cast in unmeasured *falsibordoni*. In other instances the method may be harmonization in *canto figurato*. Occasionally the psalm tone appears as a long-note *cantus firmus*, serves as an imitative subject, or is even treated in canon.⁵²

Such sophisticated contrapuntal procedures are exceptional and normally are found in only a single section of a composition. Whatever technique

may be chosen, it is usually an isolated special occurrence within the polyphonic piece as a whole. Except for the Croce psalm mentioned above and a work by Giovanni Francesco Capello to be discussed below, Monteverdi seems to be the only composer in the early seventeenth century to use the *cantus firmus* as a pervasive organizational device. It is a tribute to his imagination and genius that he was able to achieve both the desired structural cohesion and the harmonic, tonal, textural, and stylistic variety necessary to avoid the monotony that would otherwise have resulted.

The first stage in Monteverdi's compositional process throughout the Vespers consisted of the selection of relatively simple techniques and formal concepts derived from a variety of traditional and modern sources. These diverse materials were then combined in a new synthesis to forge large-scale, elaborate structures whose size and impact far surpass the creations of other composers. Nowhere is this more evident or striking than in the psalm *Dixit Dominus*. The symmetrical structure of this expansive setting may be seen in diagram II, p. 92.⁵³

Structural symmetry was especially important to Monteverdi at this period in his life, as demonstrated by the Vespers and *L'Orfeo*, but the sequence of sections outlined in diagram 2 also represents a complex fusion of techniques practiced separately by other composers.⁵⁴ The opening imitative chorus employs as its main subject the psalm tone of the fourth mode. Such imitation based on the chant was nothing new, though ordinarily it can be found only in the most elaborate and sophisticated psalm settings. The passages of *falsibordoni*, commencing immediately after the opening, are quite common in Vesper psalmody, but Monteverdi's concluding melismas are more polyphonically elaborate than usual. Unique is the fact that each of these melismas is a rhythmic and melodic variant of a single basic harmonic pattern.⁵⁵ In addition, each of the optional instrumental *ritornelli* is a varied repetition of the immediately preceding melisma.

These *ritornelli* are without precedent in the Vesper repertoire. Their models may well have been the *ritornelli* of Monteverdi's own *L'Orfeo*, but as has been pointed out, separate instrumental parts were also gaining ground in sacred music at this time.

In *Dixit Dominus*, the section immediately following the first *ritornello* exhibits a modern style and texture based upon an old structural technique. Here a typical Baroque trio, consisting of two imitative voices in the same range supported by an independent bass part, makes its first appearance in Vesper psalmody. Similar trios are found in *Laudate pueri*, *Laetatus sum*, *Pulchra es*, *Duo Seraphim*, the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*, and both *Magnificats*. While such textures are common in Monteverdi's madrigals after 1600, they also occur frequently in the few-voiced motet books beginning with Viadana's *Cento Concerti Ecclesiastici* of 1602.⁵⁶ This

underscores once again the influence of the motet repertoire on Monteverdi's collection.

What makes this passage in *Dixit Dominus* of particular interest is the character of the bass line. At first provided solely by the organ continuo, it is formed primarily from a single sustained chord. But as the second soprano enters in imitation of the first, a bass voice is also added, and the sustained chord in the organ proves to have been a simplification of the measured psalm-tone recitation in the bass. This same pattern of imitative upper voices supported by a psalm-tone bass recurs after the *ritornello* in each of the tripartite groups bracketed in diagram II. In the first two of these sections the old-fashioned technique of *falsobordone* serves as a foundation for the modern trio texture of the combined parts.

In the structure of *Dixit Dominus* as a whole, it is apparent that aside from the opening and closing polyphonic choruses, the remainder of the work is actually based on the extremely simple and traditional *alternatim* procedure whereby verses in *falsobordone* alternate with plainchant. But the *falsibordoni* are embellished by means of large polyphonic melismas and instrumental *ritornelli*, while the plainchant is rhythmicized and elaborated by the addition of imitative upper parts. The overall dimensions of the setting with its *falsibordoni*, *ritornelli*, trio textures, imitative choral polyphony, and extended six-voice melismas are so expansive as to obscure the humble origins of this very complex and splendid composition.

The remainder of the psalms in the *Vespro* also draw on a variety of both traditional and modern styles and techniques.⁵⁷ *Laudate pueri*, for example, embraces antiphonal writing, imitative polyphony, eight-voice homophony, virtuoso duets in counterpoint with the psalm tone, plainchant accompanied solely by the organ, and a concluding polyphonic melisma. *Laetatus sum*, on the other hand, is built on a series of varying textures unfolding over four separate bass patterns, which are themselves repeated in the sequence ABACD, ABACD, ABD. This complicated procedure has its roots in the strophic variations of *L'Orfeo* and the secular works of other early seventeenth-century composers, but is previously unknown in music for Vespers. *Nisi Dominus* bears a close relationship to antiphonal psalms by Gastoldi, as already described above. *Lauda Jerusalem* is reminiscent of *Nisi Dominus* in its greater consistency of texture and absence of few-voiced virtuoso passages. The seven parts form two three-voice choirs around the *cantus firmus* in the tenor, and the texture is both antiphonal and polyphonic with more rhythmic complexity and closer interaction between the vocal ensembles than in *Nisi Dominus*.

Thus the stylistic complexity and diversity witnessed in each individual psalm of the Vespers is reflected in the succession of pieces as well. The variety of sources from which Monteverdi has drawn and the constantly changing manner in which he has combined his materials is truly

astonishing. Cohesion and diversity have been brought together in a dynamic synthesis that is one of the most significant factors in the aesthetic impact of these compositions.

The dialectical forces of cohesion and diversity also focus attention on the antithetical tendencies of conservatism and progressiveness. The pervasive *cantus firmus* is a thoroughly conservative device, no longer utilized by other composers of Vesper psalms. Monteverdi is fully conscious of this, for he openly advertises his approach to the psalm tone by inscribing in the basso continuo part-book the rubric "*composto sopra canti fermi.*" On the other hand, the old-fashioned *cantus firmus* is adorned in the several psalms with the most modern musical styles and textures, emphasizing contrast and heterogeneity, especially in the first three pieces. This dichotomy and tension between the old and the new is another fundamental aesthetic feature of these works.

While many detailed technical differences between Monteverdi's psalms and those of other composers may be cited, the larger issue of comparative aesthetic effect and the elements that create it is an equally important concern, though rather more elusive and difficult to verbalize. Monteverdi's psalms doubtless make a stronger impression on the listener than those of his colleagues. Although many factors contribute to this, there can be little question that among the most important are the dynamic tensions between cohesion and diversity, between conservatism and modernity described here.

In brief summary, Monteverdi's psalms are shaped from a variety of traditional techniques in combination with modern stylistic developments derived primarily from the motet repertoire. This fusion of diverse materials results in complex, expansive structures which are much more ornate, elaborate, and impressive than anything produced by either his predecessors or his contemporaries.

III

Monteverdi's two *Magnificats* (one a close variation upon the other) are even more unusual in comparison with the repertoire of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries than are his psalms.⁵⁸ The Cantic of Mary has a longer history of polyphonic composition than Vesper psalmody, and it was customarily treated in a more elaborate style.⁵⁹ Cerone emphasizes this relationship in his commentary on the three principal canticles:

As is the custom, the three principal canticles, namely, the Magnificat, the Nunc dimittis, and the Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel, are always made solemn; for this reason, they must be composed in a more lofty style and with more art and more skill than the other canticles and the psalms.⁶⁰

As in psalm settings, the importance of the plainchant *cantus firmus* in Magnificats gradually subsided as the sixteenth century progressed.

In Costanzo Festa's *Magnificats* from the 1530s, a paraphrase of the Magnificat tone serves as the subject for imitation at the beginning of almost every verse.⁶¹ From time to time the *cantus firmus* surfaces in longer note values in a single part, usually the topmost. As the chant approaches its cadence, the tone is almost invariably ornamented. Most of Festa's *Magnificats* have at least one segment in which the Magnificat tone is treated in strict canon between two voices.

Similar techniques are employed in the *Magnificats* of Morales and Victoria, published in 1545 and 1576 respectively, although the Magnificat tone is not so omnipresent as in the works of Festa.⁶² The plainchant is much less significant, however, in the *Magnificats* of Palestrina.⁶³ Palestrina rarely uses more than the *initium* of the chant melody, usually as the imitative subject of his polyphonic texture. In those instances where the chant does continue beyond the opening of a section, it is so highly embellished as to be virtually unrecognizable; the recitation tone appears only occasionally as a single pitch in an active, flowing line. Many sections of the Palestrina *Magnificats* show no evidence of the Magnificat tone whatsoever.

Interest in the Magnificat-tone *cantus firmus* continued to decline into the seventeenth century. *Alternatim* settings, of course, which constitute perhaps half of all Magnificats from the early *Seicento*, would still have every other verse sung in plainchant in the same manner as *alternatim* psalms. But printed Magnificats having any reference to the chant in their polyphonic verses comprise less than half the extant repertoire. Where a borrowed plainsong does occur, it is normally confined to the continuation of a solo intonation into the first part of the polyphonic setting, equivalent to the practice in psalmody. In some compositions the *initium* of the Magnificat tone opens a polyphonic segment other than the first, but rarely does the chant appear in more than one such section. The custom of setting the Doxology in canon based on the Magnificat tone survives only marginally.⁶⁴ By the time of Monteverdi's *Vespro*, only vestiges of the earlier significance of the Magnificat chant remain. The usages one meets in the early seventeenth century do not differ substantially from those encountered in psalmody.

The waning importance of the chant sets in striking relief Monteverdi's highly original approach to the *cantus firmus* in his two *Magnificats* of 1610. In his psalms Monteverdi usually gave to the *cantus firmus* rhythmic values commensurate with the other voices. As a result, even though the chant regulates the basic harmony, the tone itself is often absorbed into the larger texture. In the *Magnificats*, however, the chant is set in long notes and stands apart from the other voices and instruments. This type of strict,

long-note *cantus firmus* has no precedent in the history of the Marian canticle. Monteverdi ignored the traditions of this repertoire and revived instead the oldest *cantus firmus* technique of the mass, applying it to his *Magnificats* with great rigor.

The result is a continuous series of variations on the Magnificat tone, with the other parts disporting themselves in the most progressive styles.⁶⁵ Once again the multiplicity and diversity of Monteverdi's sources is revealed, and once again the virtuosity with which they are combined is astounding.

Monteverdi's utilization of modern techniques is more pronounced in the canticles than in the psalms. With the exception of choral textures in the first and last verses of the seven-voice *Magnificat* and in the first and final two verses of the six-voice setting, the remaining sections are devoted to solo writing, trio textures, vocal and instrumental virtuosity, dialogues, echo duets, *ritornello* structures, *obbligato* instrumental accompaniments, and rapid note values; in short, a dazzling array of the most recently developed styles and structures, all unified by the severe and unremitting presence of the *cantus firmus*. The tension between diversity and cohesion, between modernity and conservatism, is even more starkly evident here than in the psalms.

Though one may search vainly in the early seventeenth-century sacred repertoire for anything comparable, adumbrations of a few of Monteverdi's techniques do appear between 1600 and 1610. In this decade contrasts in sonority, texture, and style among successive sections began to emerge in Magnificats as they did in Vesper psalms. Variations in sonority assume importance in an *alternatim Magnificat* from Viadana's *Cento Concerti Ecclesiastici* of 1602. While the polyphonic texture remains three-voiced throughout, the combination of voices changes at several stages along the way. Initially the trio comprises soprano, alto, and bass, but the parts shift to soprano and two altos at the *Et misericordia*; alto, tenor, and bass at the *Deposuit*; soprano, alto, and tenor at *Suscepit Israel*; and then return to the original voicing for the *Gloria Patri*. There are no changes in style in the course of the piece, however, aside from a short passage of *falsobordone* in the *Deposuit*.

Contrasts in style are manifest in a five-voice *alternatim Magnificat* by Gastoldi, also published in 1602.⁶⁶ Most of the piece is conceived in imitative polyphony, but the *Deposuit* is set in *falsobordone*, the *Et misericordia* employs a reduced number of voices (a long-standing tradition in Magnificat composition), and the Doxology deviates to triple meter.

Even greater contrasts may be observed in a four-voice *alternatim Magnificat* by Leone Leoni from 1606.⁶⁷ The traditional reduction in number of voices is retained in the *Fecit potentiam* and the *Esurientes*, but

Fe - cit po - ten - ti -

- am in brä - chi - o su - o, in brä - chi - o, in brä - chi - o su -

- o, di - sper - sit su - per - bos men - te

cor - dis su - i, men - te cor - dis su - i.

EXAMPLE 4. Leone LEONI, *Magnificat*

the resulting duets for soprano and tenor, alto and bass, display a more embellished vocal line than the four-voice sections (see example 4). The other segments rely heavily on *falsibordoni* followed by polyphonic textures, which are sometimes melismatic. There is even a sequential imitative passage very similar to the polyphonic melismas of Monteverdi's *Dixit Dominus* (see example 5).

EXAMPLE 5. Leone LEONI, *Magnificat*

Trio textures and virtuoso solo writing are prominent in a 1607 *alternatim Magnificat* by Tiburtio Massaino, who, like Monteverdi, was in the employ of the Duke of Mantua.⁶⁸ In this setting for two voices and organ continuo (the organ part-book is missing from the British Museum copy), Massaino writes particularly elaborate parts, amply endowed with ornaments in small note values and modern dotted rhythms. Massaino adheres to custom by reducing the number of voices for two interior sections, but the outcome is a very untraditional florid monody. The duet passages are consistently imitative, and the parts frequently proceed in parallel thirds and sixths after an initial point of imitation, a favorite device of Monteverdi's (see example 6).

The last few years of the first decade of the century witnessed mounting interest in virtuoso writing in Magnificats. Giovanni Luca Conforti's *Passaggi sopra tutti li salmi* of 1607 applies diminutions, often reaching extraordinary proportions, to his *Magnificat* as well as his psalms (see example 7).⁶⁹ The two *Magnificats* in Ottavio Durante's *Arie Devote* of 1608 are also prolific in their ornamentation, but the embellishments are conceived as an integral part of the melodic line (see example 8).⁷⁰

Significantly, all of the few-voiced, virtuoso *Magnificat* settings

(- xit) hu - mi - li - ta - tem an - cil - lae su - -

hu - mi - li - ta - tem an - cil - lae su - - ae,

- - - ae, ec - ce e - nim ex hoc be - a - tam me di - cent

ec - ce e - nim ex hoc be - a - tam me di - - - cent om - nes

om - nes ge - ne - ra - ti - o - - - - - nes.

ge - ne - ra - ti - o - - - - - nes.

EXAMPLE 6. Tiburtio MASSAINO, *Magnificat*

described here, with the exception of Conforti's, were published in motet books rather than Vesper collections. While Vesper psalms appeared only rarely outside prints devoted specifically to Vesper music (cf. the Leoni and Bonini examples discussed above), Magnificats are found not only in psalm and Magnificat publications, but also in books of *mottetti*, *concerti ecclesiastici*, *sacri concertus*, etc. As a result, several types of Magnificat developed in the early seventeenth century. Those canticles incorporated into Vesper collections tended to be similar to the psalms with which they were printed, whether the style was homophonic, imitative, or *coro spezzato*. Magnificats in motet books likewise corresponded to the style of the pieces they accompanied. Since the motet was the genre in which few-voiced writing first penetrated into sacred music in the early *Seicento*, Magnificats frequently assumed the new textures by association. As virtuoso embellishments invaded the motet repertoire around 1604, increasing in intensity during the next several years, Magnificats were also affected, as illustrated by those of Massaino and Durante.

These observations demonstrate that in composing his canticles Monteverdi once again took the motet books rather than contemporary Vesper collections as his point of departure. It is in the motet repertoire that one finds the precedents for his few-voiced virtuoso writing in the *Magnificats* and the psalms, even though the inventory of pieces in the *Vespro della Beata Vergine* is modeled on the other Marian Vesper publications described in part I of this essay.

et nunc et sem

per

et in sae-cu-la sae-cu-lo-rum, A

mon.

[#]

EXAMPLE 7. Luca CONFORTI, *Magnificat*

The image displays a musical score for Ottavio Durante's *Magnificat*. It consists of five systems, each with a vocal line (treble clef) and a basso continuo line (bass clef). The lyrics are in Latin and are written below the notes. The score includes various musical notations such as clefs, time signatures, notes, rests, and ornaments. The lyrics are: "Et ex-ul-ta-ritus me-us in De-o, in De-o sa-lu-ta-ri, sa-lu-ta-ri me-o. ta-ri me-o." The basso continuo line includes figured bass notation, such as "10[2] 11 11 10[4]".

EXAMPLE 8. Ottavio DURANTE, *Magnificat*

Despite the foreshadowing of a few of Monteverdi's techniques in several early seventeenth-century motet books, his *Magnificats* emerge as even more original expressions of his artistic genius than his psalms. The dialectical synthesis of modern styles and an antiquated form of the *cantus firmus*, the expansive dimensions of both settings, and the extensive use of *obbligato* instruments in the *Magnificat* à 7 are all unparalleled in the previous history of the Marian canticle. While Monteverdi's psalms employ both traditional and contemporary styles and devices in new and original combinations, his unique *Magnificats* exhibit only minimal connections with the remainder of the repertoire.

IV

The *sacri concentus* of the *Vespro della Beata Vergine* comprise the celebrated *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* and the motets, *Nigra sum*, *Pulchra es*, *Duo Seraphim*, and *Audi coelum*. It is indicative of the limited state of our knowledge of early seventeenth-century sacred music that even recent biographies of Monteverdi discuss these pieces only in relation to the composer's madrigals and *L'Orfeo*.⁷¹ While similarities between the *sacri concentus* and Monteverdi's secular music cannot be denied, it is important to note that Monteverdi was not the first to employ the monodic style, virtuoso embellishments, quick dotted rhythms, trio textures, echo effects, rhetorical declamation, affective text expression, and orchestral sonatas in sacred music. All of these procedures and styles are found in the motet repertoire in the decade 1600-1610, most noticeably in the last five years of this period. In fact, all five *sacri concentus* are considerably more representative of main currents in early seventeenth-century sacred music than either Monteverdi's psalms or his *Magnificats*.

Some of the *sacri concentus* are actually based upon individual models by other composers. The *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*, with its Litany of the Saints intoned eleven times by the *Cantus* part over a large-scale instrumental sonata, is a more elaborate version of a type of piece cultivated in the second half of the *Cinquecento* and the early *Seicento*.⁷² Denis Arnold was the first to locate a forerunner in a collection of *Concerti Ecclesiastici* by Arcangelo Crotti of Ferrara published in 1608.⁷³ Crotti's piece is of much smaller scope than Monteverdi's, and the richness of the latter's imagination in varying rhythmic patterns, textures, sonorities, bass lines, and structural features stands out in comparison with Crotti's pedestrian regularity of phrase lengths, cadences, melodic motives, appearances of the *cantus firmus*, and structural repetitions. Similar differences exist between Monteverdi's *Sonata* and another comparable work by Amante Franzoni of Mantua, published in his *Apparato Musicale* of 1613.⁷⁴

These instrumental sonatas with ostinato *cantus firmus* had their origins in ostinato motets where a vocal ensemble accompanied the repeated motive or chant. Such motets can be traced in French sources as far back as the thirteenth century. Edward Lowinsky has studied ostinato motets from the Renaissance, beginning with Clemens non Papa's *Fremuit spiritu Jesu*, and notes the popularity of this form in Venice.⁷⁵ Denis Arnold has called attention to Andrea Gabrieli's *Judica me* of 1587 specifically in connection with the Monteverdi *Sonata*.⁷⁶ Arnold's discovery in the surviving part-books of hand-written suggestions for instrumentation in several of the voices establishes a close link between the ostinato motet and the instrumental sonata with litany.⁷⁷ Another Venetian motet, *Beatissimus*

Marcus, published by Antonio Gualteri in 1604, employs the same Litany of the Saints as Monteverdi's work, but addresses "*Sancte Marce*" instead of "*Sancta Maria*."⁷⁸ The text of the other voices lauds the martyrdom of the patron of Venice, and the piece therefore functions simultaneously as both a song of praise and a supplication.

The instrumental sonata with ostinato motive was also practiced by Giovanni Gabrieli in a composition first described by Christiane Engelbrecht.⁷⁹ This piece has a short melody in two voices with the text "*Dulci Jesu patris imago*," which is repeated intermittently at different tonal levels against a large-scale instrumental sonata of three choirs comprising a total of twenty parts. It is not clear when this piece, found only in manuscript, was written, though its instrumental emphasis suggests that it is probably a late work.

Ostinato motets are also found in the few-voiced motet repertoire after the turn of the century, as witnessed by two examples in a collection of Ignatio Donati published in 1612.⁸⁰ One of these pieces pits the Litany of the Saints against the text "*Beatus vir qui inventus est*" sung by a solo vocal quartet, each voice of which is to be positioned in a different part of the church and provided with its own continuo.⁸¹ Donati suits his litany to any saint simply by omitting a specific name and adding the rubric, "*Questo motetto serve per ogni festa di Santo o Santa*." The other motet, which is to be performed in a similar manner, has two ostinato voices continually reiterating the phrase "*Vanitas vanitatum et omnia vanitas*."

At this point some general remarks about the relationship between Monteverdi's *Sonata* and the canzonas and sonatas of Giovanni Gabrieli are in order. Gabrieli is the only other composer of the period to create instrumental works on such an extravagant scale, and it is only natural that many writers have claimed that the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* reveals his influence.⁸² The multi-sectional structure of Monteverdi's piece, characterized by frequent changes of meter, rhythm, and texture, certainly resembles the organization of many of Gabrieli's canzonas from the posthumous *Canzoni e Sonate* of 1615.⁸³ But upon comparison of specific compositional details, Monteverdi's independence from the Gabrieli idiom emerges.

One of the most important differences lies in the character of Monteverdi's melodic lines. Throughout the *Sonata* they tend to be conjunct, based on shorter or longer scale patterns. Their rhythms are comparatively even, normally involving only three adjacent rhythmic levels within a single section. The forward impetus of these smoothly flowing melodic lines is further enhanced by the imitative texture.

Gabrieli, by contrast, usually employs shorter, more angular melodic motives with much more rhythmic differentiation. His lines tend to end abruptly, either through cadential harmony or antiphonal exchange with

another part. A single melodic phrase may also contain several different types of motives, while Monteverdi maintains much greater motivic consistency, not only within a single phrase, but throughout the entire *Sonata*. This motivic consistency depends upon the repeated use of certain intervals and the universally binding effect of scalar motion. How characteristic of Monteverdi these features are can be seen by comparison with Gabrieli, who rarely employs scalar basses or melodic patterns and whose linear intervals cover a wider range. Canzonas XV and XVIII of Gabrieli's 1615 collection are exceptional in utilizing motives more like those in the Monteverdi work.

Most of Gabrieli's larger canzonas and sonatas are conceived in terms of antiphonal choirs of instruments with frequent, abrupt exchanges of short melodic phrases. Even the smaller canzonas, which rely more heavily on imitative techniques, display their share of antiphonal responses. But Monteverdi uses antiphonal effects rather sparingly; moreover, his interchanges are less clearly articulated than Gabrieli's because of the absence of strong cadential harmony in the bass. Monteverdi's antiphonal passages thus do not beget the sectionalization and discontinuity typical of the Venetian. In addition, Monteverdi's greater interest in melodic and harmonic flow is logically accompanied by more frequent reliance on melodic and harmonic sequences.

Monteverdi's *Sonata*, while scored for eight separate instrumental parts plus basso continuo, has numerous sections in which duets supported by the organ prevail, similar to those in other pieces of the *Vespers*. Duets of like instruments also occur in many of Gabrieli's canzonas and sonatas, but consistent with his melodic style, they tend to be short and composed of brief motives, and they are often treated antiphonally. These passages are almost invariably ornamental in conception, frequently involving rhythmic values as small as thirty-second notes. Monteverdi's duets, on the other hand, are more extended and form a more integral part of the structure of his work.

Although the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* bears a closer relationship to the music of Gabrieli than any other piece in the *Vespro della Beata Vergine*, the foregoing comparisons demonstrate that Monteverdi's style was still very personal, with only the broadest outlines reminiscent of the music of the Venetian organist.

Of the four motets in the 1610 *Vespers*, *Duo Seraphim* represents by far the most frequently composed text. I have been able to locate some twenty-two published settings besides Monteverdi's in the period 1600-1615.⁸⁴ There are doubtless more, and the popularity of these verses goes back at least as far as Victoria's 1583 version.⁸⁵ Marc-Antonio Ingegneri, Monteverdi's teacher at Cremona, published a setting in 1589.⁸⁶

Several distinctive ways of treating this text, some originating as early as the Victoria example, were repeated, developed, and expanded in subse-

quent interpretations well into the seventeenth century. The opening phrase, "*Duo Seraphim clamabant*," was with rare exceptions set for two voices, even when the overall setting was for many more. Similarly, the beginning of the second half of the text, "*Tres sunt qui testimonium dant*," was almost invariably cast in three parts. Both traditions were followed by Monteverdi.

The continuation of the second half, "*Pater et Verbum et Spiritus Sanctus*," was normally subjected to one of two types of treatment. Either the three witnesses, Father, Word, and Holy Spirit, were named successively, each by a single, different voice part, or the entire phrase was organized cumulatively with one voice singing "*Pater*," two intoning "*Verbum*," and three following with "*Spiritus Sanctus*." It is the latter method that Monteverdi chose. The succeeding phrase, "*et hi tres unum sunt*," was interpreted symbolically by many composers with a shift to triple meter, the new signature denoting the proportion 3/1. Monteverdi, however, sought a more dramatic, affective treatment of this line by joining all three voices in unison at "*unum sunt*" and then repeating the entire phrase a step higher. While this is a relatively minor detail, it is typical of Monteverdi to avoid intellectual symbolism in favor of more overt dramatic effects. Giovanni Francesco Anerio's 1609 setting is the only other example to treat these words in a comparable fashion by suddenly reducing the texture from three voices to one.⁸⁷

After the turn of the seventeenth century, when virtuoso ornamentation became a characteristic, at times a *raison d'être*, of some motet collections, the *Duo Seraphim* text with its description of heavenly jubilation often gave rise to a florid style. Although Monteverdi's version is more profusely embellished than any of its counterparts, some of the types of ornamentation he employed do appear in the motet repertoire from 1607 onward. Melismas in these collections often consist of sixteenth notes or dotted rhythms of eighths and sixteenths, with some embellishments comprehending as many as fifty or sixty notes. Occasional groupings of thirty-seconds also appear, as well as the cadential ornament Caccini designates a trill, consisting of the rapid reiteration of a single pitch.⁸⁸ Both the trill and melismas in small note values are features of the first motet book of Giovanni Francesco Capello, published in 1610 (see example 9).⁸⁹

Despite the fact that Monteverdi's *Duo Seraphim* has numerous precedents, this composition is illustrative of his propensity for working on a larger, more complex scale than his contemporaries. His *Duo Seraphim* not only is longer than any other setting of this text, but also is more complicated contrapuntally and makes more extensive use of virtuoso ornamental devices than any other few-voiced motet I have yet observed. *Duo Seraphim*, like the psalms, *Magnificats*, and *Sonata*, confirms once more Monteverdi's disposition toward musical opulence and extravagance.

Tenor

Tenor

Reductio

San - - - - - . cta

San - - - - - . cta

EXAMPLE 9. Giovanni Francesco CAPELLO, *Sancta et immaculata virginitas*

While both the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* and *Duo Seraphim* have numerous antecedents, I have been able to locate only one other setting of the text *Audi coelum*, published in 1609 by Ercole Porta.⁹⁰ Porta's version of this text is shorter than Monteverdi's by three lines, and since it lacks the phrase "*Omnes hanc ergo sequamur . . .*," the texture does not burst forth in full choral polyphony at the end like Monteverdi's. But in all of the lines shared by the two pieces, the echo puns are identical (e. g., "*Audi coelum verba mea plena desiderio et perfusa gaudio*" [Echo: "*audio*"]).

Musical relationships between the two compositions are of a more general nature. Porta calls for a pair of sopranos rather than Monteverdi's tenors (the two ranges were often considered interchangeable in the early seventeenth century), but in both works the second voice is reserved exclusively for the echo. While the two settings have numerous structural similarities, a comparison of parallel passages reveals Monteverdi's much more concentrated sense of melodic direction (see examples 10a and 10b). Where Porta meanders aimlessly, Monteverdi avails himself of the

Cantus

Organo

- cis pre-di-ca-ta a pro-phe-tis E-ze-chi-el, E-ze-chi-el, E-ze-chi-el por-ta o-ri-en-ta-lis

EXAMPLE 10a. Ercole PORTA, *Audi coelum*

Tenor

Organo

- cis pre-di-ca-ta a pro-phe-tis E-ze-chi-el por-ta o-ri-en-ta-lis

EXAMPLE 10b. MONTEVERDI, *Audi coelum*

recitative style and rising sequences to shape an intense, goal-directed phrase. Indicative of the sophistication and complexity of Monteverdi's musical thought is that the brief passage in example 10b also functions on a larger architectural level. This phrase is only the first in a series of three, each of which is a variation upon the preceding one. Porta, on the other hand, continues on to a new, unrelated melodic idea. It is a distinguishing characteristic of Monteverdi throughout the Vespers, indeed, throughout his *oeuvre*, that he carefully integrates details of melody and harmony with broader structural considerations.

Monteverdi's *Audi coelum* also differs from Porta's in its extensive ornamentation, especially in some of the echoes. Porta's rendering, by contrast, is mostly syllabic and shows little of Monteverdi's interest in appropriate text declamation and affective expression.

Although the texts of the two remaining motets, *Nigra sum* and *Pulchra es*, were reasonably popular in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, few significant traditions in the musical setting of particular words and phrases seem to have evolved.⁹¹ In the case of pieces with the incipit *Nigra sum*, there are so many textual variants, many bearing little resemblance to Monteverdi's version or to one another, that it was impossible for traditions of word treatment to develop. The text *Pulchra es*, derived like *Nigra sum* from the Song of Songs, does not seem to have inspired musical composition as frequently. It enjoyed some popularity in Rome, as witnessed by a 1588 setting of Palestrina and early seventeenth-century interpretations by Agazzari and G. F. Anerio. It was also set to music by northerners such as Banchieri, Usher, Monteverdi, and others. A device encountered in many of these compositions, including Monteverdi's, is special harmonic emphasis on the word *suavis* in the opening line "*Pulchra es amica mea suavis et decora.*" The rendering of this word usually involved some kind of chromatic alteration relative to the first part of the phrase. A few other common approaches to specific textual passages are also evident, but none is of sufficient importance to detain us here.

Monteverdi's *Nigra sum* and *Audi coelum* are especially notable for their utilization of the recitative style. Monteverdi was by no means the first to apply the recitative to sacred music, however. Two composers mentioned above who were strongly influenced by Caccini, Ottavio Durante and Don Severo Bonini, both employed recitative in earlier sacred publications.⁹² The opening of Durante's *Filiae Jerusalem* may be quoted as an illustration (see example 11). Like Monteverdi, Durante did not adhere exclusively to the one style but mixed it with arioso. Bonini followed much the same practice.

Two other motet books that appeared in the same year as Monteverdi's Vespers deserve at least passing mention. These are the first sacred publications of Alessandro Grandi and Giovanni Francesco Capello, both

fi - li - ae Je - ru - sa - lem, Fi - li -
 - ae Je - ru - sa - lem, ve - ni - te, ve - ni -
 - - - te et vi - da - - - - - te

EXAMPLE 11. Ottavio DURANTE, *Filiae Jerusalem*

of which contain pieces that either closely resemble some of Monteverdi's motets or share a number of distinctive features with them.⁹³ Both collections emphasize again the intimate relationship between Monteverdi's *sacri concertus* and developments discernible elsewhere in the motet repertoire of the early seventeenth century.

V

The remaining two pieces of the *Vespro*, the respond *Domine ad adiuvandum* and the hymn *Ave maris stella*, further confirm Monteverdi's penchant for grandiloquent forms of expression. Many Vesper collections begin with the Vesper respond, but it is invariably a short, modest piece in keeping with the brevity of its text. *Falsobordone* and measured chordal homophony are frequently used techniques. Monteverdi himself draws on the tradition of *falsobordone*, but when this is superimposed on an adaptation of the toccata from *L'Orfeo*, and the entire structure is enlarged by the addition of triple meter *ritornelli*, a much more extended and elaborate composition ensues with a wholly new aesthetic purpose. The respond becomes a large-scale vocal and instrumental *sinfonia*, introducing the magnificence of the entire Vesper service with its own musical brilliance. As with other pieces of the *Vespro*, Monteverdi has discerned the possibility of combining originally simple types of music with divergent purposes to fulfill both the required liturgical function and the need for an appropriately ostentatious introduction to his sumptuous collection.

Hymn settings, in contrast to the respond, are extremely rare in publications of Vesper music, and Monteverdi's inclusion of *Ave maris stella* is an indication of his wish to supply a complete musical service.⁹⁴ His setting is based on a strophic format, frequently encountered in hymn collections of the sixteenth century, consisting of harmonization of the *cantus firmus*, which remains in the topmost voice throughout. But as we have seen so often, Monteverdi is never content with a simple and unassuming structure, and he elaborates on this basic plan in an ingenious fashion. The details of his setting have been described in chapter III and need not be repeated here; I need only observe that an unpretentious, traditional technique has once again been combined with modern elements to produce a piece of larger than normal dimensions and complexity.

VI

A summary overview of the comparisons made in the preceding sections of this essay reaffirms that different aspects of Monteverdi's *Vespro* have different relationships with the contemporary repertoire. The contents of the 1610 print place it within a small group of collections devoted to music for a single category of Vesper feasts. These collections are not applicable to as many feasts as the mainstream of Vesper publications, but most of them attempt to provide a greater quantity of polyphonic music for the feasts they do serve. Within this specialized repertoire, Monteverdi's is the only collection before Agostini's Marian Vespers of 1619 (which itself may well have been influenced by Monteverdi) to intersperse motets between psalms and to include a setting of an appropriate hymn.

Monteverdi's approach to musical style is considerably more inventive and individualistic than his selection of pieces for the collection. The psalms and *Magnificats* draw not only from traditional, even outmoded, procedures in their respective genres, but also from the most progressive tendencies, especially those originating in publications of few-voiced motets. Monteverdi's complex synthesis of highly diverse materials and techniques results in more expansive and variegated compositions than appear anywhere else in the contemporary Vesper repertoire. The *Magnificats* in particular exhibit a unique combination of elements. In sheer musical magnificence, the only works comparable to Monteverdi's psalms, *Magnificats*, respond, and hymn are the late motets of Giovanni Gabrieli. Gabrieli, however, shows little interest in Vesper music and the details of his style differ substantially from Monteverdi's.

The five *sacri concentus*, on the other hand, are commensurate with developments in the motet and instrumental canzona and sonata after the turn of the seventeenth century. But even in his motets and the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*, Monteverdi's large dimensions, virtuoso embellishments,

structural cohesion, and rhetorical treatment of texts far surpass the achievements of most other composers.

VII

The very originality of the *Vespro della Beata Vergine* should greatly facilitate a study of the impact and influence of Monteverdi's publication on subsequent Vesper compositions. It is probable that any Vesper collection from the years immediately after 1610 that exhibits characteristics of Monteverdi's music not found in the repertoire prior to that year has been directly or indirectly influenced by him. The discussion of this material will be limited here to the decade 1610-1620.

Two collections published in 1611, one by Don Giovanni Flaccomio⁹⁵ and the other by Don Grisostomo Rubiconi,⁹⁶ already reveal probable Monteverdian influence. Although only five of nine part-books survive from each collection, they contain enough rubrics and other indications of style and structure to determine with reasonable accuracy the character of the music. In both publications psalm and Magnificat settings for double choir are subdivided into sections of contrasting sonority, sometimes entailing a soloist or ensemble of two, three, or four voices. Table I illustrates the organization of Rubiconi's *Dixit Dominus* as itemized in the original print.

TABLE I

<i>Dixit Dominus</i>	basso e 2 tenori
<i>Donec ponam inimicos</i>	alto e doi soprani
<i>Virgam virtutis</i>	alto, basso e tenor
<i>Tecum principium</i>	alto e basso
<i>Iuravit Dominus</i>	a 2 canti e a 8
<i>Dominus a dextris tuis</i>	basso e doi tenori
<i>Iudicabit in nationibus</i>	a doi bassi
<i>De torrente</i>	doi bassi e 2 canti
<i>Gloria Patri</i>	a 8
<i>Sicut erat</i>	[a 8]

Rubiconi's reliance on few-voiced textures is even more palpable than Monteverdi's. The full eight-voice choir appears in only a single interior section and the Doxology. In the other verses, the voices are not always matched in pairs of the same range as with Monteverdi. Rubiconi employs a greater variety of combinations, though at times he pits two soloists in one register against a third in another (cf. Monteverdi's *Dixit Dominus*).

Flaccomio is equally attracted to contrasts in sonority and texture. His *Nisi Dominus*, for example, marked “*da concierto*,” alternates between odd-numbered verses distributed among soloists from the first choir (descending from soprano through tenor) and even-numbered verses set *à 4* for the second choir. The two verses of the Doxology are each assigned to one of the four-voice ensembles. The influence of the *alternatim* technique, at the basis of Monteverdi’s *Dixit Dominus*, is also evident here. In his *Magnificat*, Flaccomio adds instrumental coloring, requesting doubling “*cum corneta*” and “*cum basonicco*” in two separate duos.

These extended, sectionalized compositions, with their conspicuous changes in texture and their dependence on solo voices, are apparently direct responses to Monteverdi’s example, since there are no other precedents in the Vesper repertoire. Not all peculiarities of the *Vespro*, however, were equally influential, for neither Rubiconi’s nor Flaccomio’s surviving part-books give any hint of the psalm tone, nor does their solo writing approach Monteverdi’s extraordinary virtuosity. As we shall see, the psalm tone was avoided as assiduously after 1610 as it had been before; indeed, Monteverdi himself never used it as a systematic *cantus firmus* again.⁹⁷ The absence of virtuosity in Rubiconi’s and Flaccomio’s collections may be attributed to the fact that few places in Italy had the quality of singers available in Mantua and Ferrara. Even in Venice Gabrieli provided comparatively modest parts for his soloists.

A rare instance of the plainchant in a significant role is found in a collection of music for Holy Week by Giovanni Francesco Capello, published in 1612.⁹⁸ Capello’s eight-voice setting of the Cantic of Zacharia, *Benedictus Dominus Deus Israel*, accompanied solely by the basso continuo, carries the rubric “*Del primo Tono in Sol sopra il Canto fermo*.” No other composition I have seen aside from Monteverdi’s psalms and *Magnificats* uses a *cantus firmus* so extensively as to call attention to the fact in print. The plainchant melody for the cantic closely resembles a psalm tone and is repeated for each verse of the text in the same manner as the psalm chants. A large portion of Capello’s piece consists of chordal harmonization of the *cantus firmus*, which appears successively in different voices and alternately at its initial tonal level and a fourth below.

Many aspects of Capello’s music bear a remarkably close relationship to Monteverdi.⁹⁹ His motets have already been mentioned, and in his 1612 *Lamentationi*, *obbligato* instruments are prominently featured. Another composition from this collection, the psalm *Miserere mei Deus*, is scarcely conceivable without the example of Monteverdi’s *Vespro*. This five-voice setting depends heavily on solo writing and an instrumental ensemble comprising a *violetta*, two violas, a *violone*, and *chitaroni*. The sectionalization of Capello’s psalm is as pronounced as any of Monteverdi’s. *Ritornelli* are interspersed throughout the piece and the instrumental en-

semble also serves in whole or in part as an accompaniment in several sections. Two imitative duets closely resemble Monteverdi's duet style (see example 12). The segments for solo voices approximate the recitative passages of *Nigra sum* and *Audi coelum* (see example 13). Virtuoso embellishments are lacking, but they are abundant in other pieces in the *Lamentationi*, as well as in Capello's 1610 collection of motets.¹⁰⁰

Among the most striking illustrations of Monteverdi's influence are the *Salmi Intieri* of 1613 and the *Messa, Salmi, et Motetti Concertati* of 1615 by Don Antonio Burlini, from sometime in 1612 organist at Monteoliveto Maggiore in Siena.¹⁰¹ The *Salmi Intieri* are large-scale, through-composed, and highly diverse settings of considerable musical interest. Burlini's four-voice choir is supported not only by an organ continuo but also at times by separate parts for an *instrumento acuto* and an *instrumento grave*, both "se

Am - - - pli - us

Am - - - pli - us la -

ta - - - va me, la - - - va me ab i - ni -

- va me, la - - - va me ab i - ni - - qui.

- qui - ta - te - - - me - a et

ta - te me - - - a

EXAMPLE 12. Giovanni Francesco CAPELLO, *Miserere*

Tener solo Ti-bi se-li pec-ca-vi et ma-lum co-ram te

fe-ci, ut iu-sti-fi-ce-ris in ser-mo-

-ni-bus tu-is et vin-cas cum iu-di-ca-ris.

EXAMPLE 13. Giovanni Francesco CAPELLO, *Miserere*

piace.” Each verse of a psalm is confined to a distinct section and these sections are differentiated from one another by significant changes of style. Solo and duet textures are frequently encountered, though in these segments all parts may briefly combine for a four-voice passage. Imitative duets with instrumental accompaniment are also common. *Falsibordoni* and block chordal style appear occasionally, and some passages shift from the prevailing duple meter to triple time. Within a single section the verse is often split into segments of only a few words, repeated several times before the text continues.

Not only is the general character of Burlini’s *Salmi Intieri* reminiscent of the *Vespro della Beata Vergine*, but there are a few passages that appear to be directly imitative of Monteverdi. The opening of Burlini’s *Laudate pueri* employs the same psalm tone as Monteverdi’s *Dixit Dominus*, with its characteristic dip to the seventh degree both at the beginning and part way through the chant. As in *Dixit Dominus*, Burlini’s plainsong serves as a subject for imitation, leading to a full-voiced chordal passage (see example 14). But Monteverdi’s six voices, two of them carrying a countersubject, result in a more complicated texture than Burlini’s four. In the *Quia fecit* of Burlini’s first canticle, the Magnificat tone emerges in long note values in a solo voice accompanied by the organ and a pair of instruments, a procedure directly comparable to the *Quia respexit* of Monteverdi’s *Magnificat à 7* (see example 15). Similarly, the *Gloria Patri* of Burlini’s setting is a florid echo piece analogous to Monteverdi’s.

Se piace

Lou - da - te pu - e - ri Do - mi - num, lau -

[Psalm tone] Lou - da - te pu - e - ri Do - mi - num, lau -

Lou -

- da - te pu - e - ri Do mi - num,

- da - te pu - e - ri Do - - mi - num,

- da - te pu - e - ri Do - - mi - num,

- da - te pu - e - ri Do - - mi - num,

EXAMPLE 14. Antonio BURLINI, *Laudate pueri*

Voce sola

Qui - a - - - - - fe - - - - - cit mi - hi ma - - - - -

- - - - - gne qui po - - - - - lens est

et san - - - - - ctum no - - - - - men

EXAMPLE 15. Antonio BURLINI, *Magnificat*

The second canticle of the *Salmi Intieri* is similar in style to the first, although there is more emphasis on the full chorus. The *Et exultavit* of this piece bears a remarkable resemblance to the *Et exultavit* of Monteverdi's seven-voice *Magnificat*. Both versions begin with a melismatic passage in two-voice imitation followed by sequential repetition at a higher level (Monteverdi's sequence rises by a fifth, Burlini's by a fourth). In both settings there is a subsequent slowing of the pace at "*spiritus meus*" succeeded by a short melismatic figure treated imitatively at "*in deo.*" Although Burlini dispenses with the *Magnificat* tone and calls for four voices rather than Monteverdi's two, the derivation of his setting of this verse is obvious (see example 16, pp. 165-166).

Despite the parallels between Burlini's and Monteverdi's *Magnificats*, significant differences are also apparent. Burlini employs his full vocal ensemble (only four voices in comparison to Monteverdi's seven) much more often, especially as the piece progresses. Burlini's instruments function differently too; their style is less ornamental and, like the voices, they do not approach Monteverdi's characteristic virtuosity. The instruments also perform a *sinfonia* before the beginning of the first *Magnificat*, following the example of several motets in Giovanni Gabrieli's *Sacrae Symphoniae* of 1615. The Gabrieli collection, of course, postdates Burlini's, but as noted earlier, Gabrieli died in 1612 and many of his works were probably widely known before publication. Burlini himself was resident in Venice prior to his removal to Siena in 1612.¹⁰²

Burlini's collection of 1615 is somewhat more conservative, while still revealing Monteverdi's influence. The psalms and *Magnificat* are for eight-voice *cori spezzati*, and homophonic textures and antiphonal effects are correspondingly prominent. Nevertheless, there are intervening passages for one, two, three, and four voices in the first choir, all in a modest vocal style. In addition to the organ continuo, a part for a single *obbligato* instrument is provided. These pieces, like those of the *Salmi Intieri*, are large-scale works of considerable stylistic variety whose overall dimensions reflect the impact of the *Vespro della Beata Vergine*.

Among *Magnificats* published in motet books, one by Don Serafino Patta from 1613 displays Monteverdi's influence in its highly varied and complex structure as well as in some individual details.¹⁰³ This five-voice piece shows a heavy concentration on solos and duets in the virtuoso style, with only a minority of the verses requiring the full ensemble (see example 17). Some of the few-voiced sections are cast in *falsibordoni*, but others are reminiscent of the solo writing of Ottavio Durante. The duets tend to be imitative and comparable to Monteverdi's (see example 18, p. 168). The *Magnificat* tone even appears in long note values at the beginning of the *Deposuit*, while the *Gloria Patri* employs a choral echo.

Et exul - ta - - - - vit,
Et ex.ul.
Et ex.ul - ta - - - - vit,

The first system of the musical score consists of six staves. The top staff is a vocal line in G-clef with a key signature of one flat and a common time signature. The second staff is a vocal line in G-clef with lyrics. The third staff is a vocal line in G-clef with lyrics. The fourth staff is a lute accompaniment in C-clef with a 6/8 time signature. The fifth and sixth staves are bass lines in F-clef. The system concludes with a fermata over the final note of the lute accompaniment.

- ta - - - - vit,
et exul - ta -
et exul.
Et ex.ul - ta - - - -

The second system of the musical score continues the composition. It features the same vocal and lute parts as the first system. The lyrics continue across the vocal staves. The lute accompaniment features a prominent sixteenth-note pattern. The system concludes with a fermata over the final note of the lute accompaniment.

EXAMPLE 16. Antonio BURLINI, *Magnificat* (cont. on next page)

at exul-ta-vit spi-ri-tus me-us in
 - - - vit spi-ri-tus me-us in De-o,
 - ta - - - vit spi-ri-tus me-us in De-o,
 - - - vit spi-ri-tus me-us in De-o,

7 8

De-o,
 in De-o.
 in De-o.
 in De-o,
 in De-o.
 in De-o.

b q [q]

EXAMPLE 16 continued.

A - ni - ma me - - a Do - mi - num, a - ni - ma me - - a Do - -
 - - mi - num, a - - ni - ma me - a Do - - - - mi - num

8 [5] q [10#] [11] [10#]

EXAMPLE 17. Serafino PATTÀ, *Magnificat*

In 1613 Monteverdi assumed his new post as *maestro di cappella* at St. Mark's in Venice, and various aspects of his music seem to have had their effect on a few composers in the Venetian state shortly thereafter. The 1614 psalms of Francesco Usper, organist at the Church of San Salvatore in Venice, manifest an unusual interest in thin textures.¹⁰⁴ Usper's *Laudate pueri* in particular, marked *concertato senza intonazione*, utilizes its full five voices only at the conclusion of a few sections. Imitative duets prevail instead, and passagework is frequent.

Much grander in design is a 1616 collection by Amadio Freddi of Treviso.¹⁰⁵ An *obligato cornetto* and *violino* accompany the vocal parts in some pieces and perform additional *sinfonie* in others. The psalm and Magnificat settings imitate Monteverdi in their elaborate style and in their variety of textures, rhythms, meters, and melodic patterns. Change and contrast are almost continuous in these pieces. Short passages of text, sometimes only a few words, are isolated for individual musical treatment. Soloists are juxtaposed with the five-voice *tutti* and chordal writing is interchanged with imitation. Even the psalm tone appears with some frequency, though without the pervasive structural function of Monteverdi. The passages for soloists, however, shun vocal virtuosity.

It is in the collections of Usper and Freddi that the influence of Monteverdi began to supersede that of Giovanni Gabrieli in Venetian music. The antiphonal style shows evidence of yielding to the thinner textures and soloistic passages of San Marco's new *maestro di cappella*, although neither Usper nor Freddi made the extraordinary virtuoso demands that Monteverdi did.

Gabrieli normally confined antiphonal contrasts to his multi-choir pieces, while in his works for fewer voices the textures fluctuate in accord with sixteenth-century practice—through the entrance and exit of parts without cadences and without breaking the continuity of the forward motion. The

Su - sce - pit
 Su - sce - pit i - sra - el pu - e - rum su - um
 i - sra - el pu - e - rum su - um
 re - cor - da -
 re - cor - da - tus, re - cor - da - tus
 - tus, re - cor - da - - - - - tus
 mi - se - ri - cor - di - ae su - ae, mi - se - ri - cor - di - ae su - ae.
 mi - se - ri - cor - di - ae su - ae, mi - se - ri - cor - di - ae su - ae.

EXAMPLE 18. Serafino PATTÀ, *Magnificat*

five-voice pieces of Usper and Freddi, however, are much more clearly sectionalized by means of sudden contrasts and deliberate discontinuities. In this respect they follow Monteverdi and arrive at the *concertato* style without indulging in the massed antiphony of Gabrieli. Gabrieli's gigantic polychoral works were rapidly eclipsed with the advent of Monteverdi in Venice, and variety, contrast, and color became dependent upon factors other than large masses of sound. As a result, Usper and especially Freddi reveal their progressive tendencies not through antiphony, but by their emphasis on thin textures, solo voices and instruments, vocal and instrumental duets, and sudden juxtapositions of contrasting rhythms, textures, and sonorities.

All of the collections heretofore discussed emanated from northern Italy, where Vesper psalms had enjoyed a special prominence throughout the sixteenth century. The papal seat of Rome, on the other hand, had shown little interest in polyphonic psalmody, either before or after the Council of Trent. There are relatively few Vesper psalms in Roman manuscripts and prints of the *Cinquecento*, and it is only in the early seventeenth century that collections of Vesper music began to proliferate there. It is hardly surprising, therefore, that the modern approach to Vespers as established by Monteverdi and his followers did not appear in the post-Tridentine environment of Rome until 1620. In that year an unusual collection, containing both conservative and modern settings of psalms and Magnificats, was published by Paolo Tardito.¹⁰⁶ The modern compositions are double-choir pieces with the addition of a lute to the first chorus and a *cornetto* to the second. In these works Tardito's style does not differ significantly from Amadio Freddi's. Despite the division into two four-voice choirs, antiphonal effects are subordinate to such techniques as abrupt contrasts and thin textures. Solo duet passages, especially duets for voices in the same range, suggest the influence of Monteverdi. Virtuoso writing is much more in evidence than in Freddi's compositions, but it does not quite approach Monteverdian proportions (see example 19).

There is little to be gained by attempting to weigh the relative impact of Monteverdi's psalms and *Magnificats*, for it is apparent from the collections of Burlini, Freddi, and Tardito that these composers did not distinguish stylistically between the two liturgical genres as Monteverdi did. The greater consistency of style among their psalms and *Magnificats* indicates that the latter were probably influenced as much by Monteverdi's psalms as by his canticles. All three composers utilized the full ensemble much more often in their *Magnificats* than did Monteverdi, and their solo writing was more restrained, avoiding his extravagant ornamentation. Although all three employed *obbligato* instruments, the instruments discharge a more modest function, adding their color to the total sonority, but assuming very little individuality or idiomatic purpose. The *Magnificats* of Burlini, Freddi, and Tardito imitate Monteverdi's in their grand and

Glo - ri - a et
 Glo - ri - a Pa - - - - - tri

fi - - - - - li - a, et Spi - ri - tu - i San - -
 et Spi - ri - tu - i San - -

- - - - - cto,
 - - - - - cto,

et Spi - ri - tu - i San - - - - - cto.
 et Spi - ri - tu - i San - - - - - cto.

EXAMPLE 19. Paolo TARDITO, *Magnificat*

ostentatious manner based on clearly articulated contrasts, but they do not follow him in his concentration on intimate sonorities and relegation of the chorus to a merely framing role.

Despite the authority exerted by Monteverdi's unique Vesper music in the decade after 1610, it must be stressed that the publications revealing this influence are an exceptional few in a vast repertoire which continued and developed oblivious to the example of Italy's foremost composer. This conclusion is not unexpected, given the widespread devotion to Vesper music and the practical use of Vesper collections in surroundings much more humble than the court of the Gonzagas or the church of Venice's patron saint. The fact is that few churches commanded the vocal and instrumental resources required for such opulent music. But as the taste for elaborate *concertato* settings grew over the years, so did the abilities of many performers and churches to cope with the new styles. The lengthy, varied compositions of Monteverdi, Rubicœni, Flaccomio, Burlini, Patta, Freddi, and Tardito gradually inspired greater quantities of comparable pieces, and by the mid-1630s extensive Vesper psalms and Magnificats employing instruments and soloists permeated the repertoire. After the middle of the century Bologna in particular became a center for this kind of music under Maurizio Cazzati, the prolific *maestro di cappella* of San Petronio.¹⁰⁷

But while the *concertato* style unquestionably informed a large part of the Vesper repertoire of the seventeenth century, it is also true that it did not drive out altogether the older, more conservative styles, which continued unabated alongside the modern. Numerous collections of psalms for five voices or for double choir "*per tutte le solennità*" testify to the continuation of traditions and techniques formulated in the sixteenth century and still practiced widely. The stylistic dichotomy between the old and the new witnessed at the beginning of the *Seicento* by so many theorists and composers, including Monteverdi himself, was still in evidence as the century progressed.

Nevertheless, the importance of Monteverdi's Vespers in the development of the large-scale *concertato* has been securely established. The influence of his music, which at first proceeded slowly, gradually accumulated momentum as more and more composers in the 1620s and 1630s were attracted to the elaborate style. And Monteverdi, of course, made further contributions to the tide with later Vesper psalms of his own. But as time went on, his influence undoubtedly became less direct, with many composers responding to the stimulus of his followers rather than to Monteverdi himself. This may already have been the case with regard to Tardito in 1620. What had begun as a highly individual approach to music for Vespers on feasts of the Virgin gradually became a general aesthetic outlook shared by many composers, most likely without any precise knowledge of

its origins. As the elaborate *concertato* style of Vesper music spread, it also influenced mass composition and inevitably commingled with other modern developments. It was out of these streams that evolved the trends which were to dominate sacred music for two centuries to come.

NOTES

This essay was originally published in *Analecta Musicologica* 15 (1975): 29-86. It has been revised and updated for republication in this volume with the kind permission of the editor of *Analecta*, Dr. Friedrich Lippmann.

1. The only attempt at a comprehensive survey of Italian sacred music of this period is by Jerome Roche, "North Italian Liturgical Music in the early 17th century; its Evolution around 1600 and its Development until the Death of Monteverdi" (Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge University, 1967), which is currently being revised by the author for publication. Among the most important articles devoted to the *Vespro* in recent years are Hans F. Redlich, "Claudio Monteverdi: Some Problems of Textual Interpretation," *Musical Quarterly* 41, no. 1 (January 1955): 66-75; Denis Stevens, "Where are the Vespers of Yesteryear?" *Musical Quarterly* 47, no. 3 (July 1961): 315-330; Giuseppe Biella, "La 'Messa,' il 'Vespro' e i 'Sacri Concerti' di Claudio Monteverdi nella stampa Amadino dell'anno 1610," *Musica Sacra*, serie seconda 9 (1964): 104-115; Denis Arnold, "Notes on two Movements of the Monteverdi 'Vespers,'" *Monthly Musical Record* 84 (March/April 1954): 59-66; Arnold, "Monteverdi's Church Music: some Venetian Traits," *Monthly Musical Record* 88 (May/June 1958): 83-91; Arnold, "The Monteverdi 'Vespers'—a Postscript," *Musical Times* 104 (January 1963): 24-25; Arnold, "Monteverdi and the Technique of 'Concertato,'" *The Amor Artis Bulletin* 6, no. 3 (April 1967): 1-8; Stephen Bonta, "Liturgical Problems in Monteverdi's Marian Vespers," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 20, no. 1 (Spring 1967): 87-106; Wolfgang Osthoff, "Unità liturgica e artistica nei *Vesperi* del 1610," *Rivista italiana di Musicologia* 2, no. 2 (1967): 314-327; Jürgen Jürgens, "Urtext und Aufführungspraxis bei Monteverdis *Orfeo* und *Marien-Vesper*," *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; Andreas Holschneider, "Zur Aufführungspraxis der *Marien-Vesper* von Monteverdi," *Hamburger Jahrbuch für Musikwissenschaft*, vol. 1 (Hamburg: Karl Dieter Wagner, 1974), pp. 59-68; and Iain Fenlon, "The Monteverdi Vespers," *Early Music* 5, no. 3 (July 1977): 380-387. See also the liner notes to the Telefunken recording of the *Vespro della Beata Vergine* written by Wolfgang Osthoff, the liner notes to the Musical Heritage Society's recording of the *Vespro* by Denis Stevens, and the preface to Denis Stevens, ed., *Claudio Monteverdi: Vespers* (London: Novello and Company Ltd., 1961). The best modern edition of the Vespers, though lacking the six-voice *Magnificat* and needing correction of some details, is by Gottfried Wolters, *Claudio Monteverdi: Vesperae Beatae Mariae Virginis* (Wolfenbüttel and Zürich: Mösel Verlag, 1966). I have not yet seen a new version, edited by Jürgen Jürgens (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1977). For a review by Denis Arnold of this edition, see *Early Music* 6, no. 3 (July 1978): 459-464.

2. See Adam Adrio, *Die Anfänge des geistlichen Konzerts* (Berlin: Junker und Dünnhaupt, 1935); Hugo Leichtentritt, *Geschichte der Motette*, vol. II of "Kleine Hand-

bücher der Musikgeschichte" (Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel, 1908); Hans F. Redlich, "Early Baroque Church Music," *The Age of Humanism, 1540-1630*, ed. by Gerald Abraham, vol. IV of "The New Oxford History of Music" (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), pp. 520-546; Jerome Roche, "The Duet in early seventeenth-century Italian Church Music," *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association* (1967), pp. 33-50; William H. Schempf, "Polychoral Magnificats from H. Praetorius to H. Schütz (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Rochester, 1960); and James Foster Armstrong, "The Vesper Psalms and Magnificats of Maurizio Cazzati" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1969). I have also written a paper entitled "The Development and Diffusion of Italian Sacred Monody, 1600-1620: A Preliminary Study," to be published in *Rassegna di studi musicali*.

3. This question is discussed in most of the articles listed in note 1. See also the Introduction, pp. 2-4, and James Armstrong, "The *Antiphonae, seu Sacrae Cantiones* (1613) of Giovanni Francesco Anerio: A Liturgical Study," *Analecta Musicologica* 14 (1974): 89-150.

4. *Di Adriano et di Jachet i Salmi appertinenti alli Vesperi Per tutte le Feste Dell'anno, Parte a versi, & parte spezzadi Accomodati da Cantare a uno & a duoi Chori . . . In Venetia Apresso di Antonio Gardane. 1550.* See RISM, 1550¹.

5. As an example one may cite the *Salmi Interi à Cinque Voci* of Orfeo Vecchi, published in Milan in 1598. The print contains sixteen psalms, two *Magnificats*, the four Marian antiphons, and two sets of *falsibordoni*. See Claudio Sartori, *Bibliografia della Musica Strumentale Italiana Stampata in Italia fino al 1700*, 2 vols. (Florence: Leo S. Olshki, 1952-1968), vol. I, p. 101.

6. A case in point is Giovanni Matteo Asola's *Vespertina omnium solemnitatum psalmodia* of 1590. This very large collection consists of fifteen Vesper psalms, two *Magnificats*, one Marian antiphon, a complete Mass Ordinary, and five motets. See Claudio Sartori, *Assisi, La cappella della basilica di S. Francesco. Catalogo del Fondo Musicale nella Biblioteca Comunale di Assisi*, vol. I of "Bibliotheca musicae" (Milan: Istituto Editoriale Italiano, 1962), p. 28.

7. *Messa, Salmi, Motetti, et Magnificat, a Tre Chori. Di Antonio Mortaro da Brescia . . . In Milano appresso l'herede di Simon Tini, & Gio. Francesco Besozzi. 1599.* See Emilio Maggini, *Lucca, Biblioteca del Seminario. Catalogo delle musiche stampate e manoscritte del fondo antico*, vol. III of "Bibliotheca musicae" (Milan: Istituto Editoriale Italiano, 1965), p. 162.

8. Stephen Bonta has coined the term "Regular" to refer to those liturgical items that fall between the Ordinary and the Proper, such as groups of Vesper psalms that remain the same for all feasts of a certain category, but do not serve all feasts throughout the year. See Bonta, "Liturgical Problems," p. 90.

9. *Musices Liber Primus Hymnos, Magnificat, Salves, Motecta, Psalmos, aliquae diversa cantica complectens. Venetiis, apud A. Gardanum, 1565.* See Argia Bertini, *Roma, Biblioteca Corsiniana e dell'Accademia nazionale dei Lincei: catalogo dei fondi musicali Chiti e Corsiniano*, vol. II of "Bibliotheca musicae" (Milan: Istituto Editoriale Italiano, 1964), p. 36.

10. *Missa, Psalmi ad Vesperas Dominicales, Magnificat et Psalmorum modulationes,*

quae passim in Ecclesiis usurpantur. Auctore Orpheo Vecchio Medio. Presb. apud S. Mariae a Scala Capellae Magistro. Octonis vocibus. Mediolani, apud Franciscum et haeredes Simonis Tini. 1590. See Maggini, Lucca, Biblioteca del Seminario, p. 197.

11. For a complete list of these collections along with their contents, see Jeffrey Kurtzman, "The Monteverdi Vespers of 1610 and their Relationship with Italian Sacred Music of the Early Seventeenth Century" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1972), Appendices B and C, pp. 414-425.

12. See the list of contents in the Introduction, p. 2.

13. *Messa Salmi per i Vesperti, et Motetti, a otto voci Con il Basso per sonar nell'Organo, di Francesco Terriera da Conegliano. Libro Primo . . . In Venetia, Appresso Giacomo Vincenti. 1601. See Sergio Paganelli, "Catalogo delle opere musicali a stampa dal '500 al '700 conservate presso la Biblioteca Comunale di Cesena," Collectanea historiae musicae 2 (1957): 337.*

14. *Ioannis Righi Civitatis Mirandulae Canonici, ac Musices prefecti: Missa, Motecta, Psalmi ad vespertas, cum duobus Canticis, ac Litanijs in omnibus B. Mariae Virginis Festivitatibus, Octo Vocibus decantanda . . . Venetiis, Apud Iacobum Vincentium, 1606. See Francesco Bussi, Piacenza, Archivio del Duomo. Catalogo del Fondo Musicale, vol. V of "Bibliotheca musicae" (Milan: Istituto Editoriale Italiano, 1967), pp. 89-90.*

15. *Il Secondo Libro de Concerti Ecclesiastici à otto voci di Pompeo Signorucci I. C. Accademico Unisono di Perugia, Maestro di Capella nel Duomo di Pisa. Cioè Salmi, Magnificat, Motetti, & una Messa dell'Ottavo Tono . . . Et con il Basso continuato, potendosi cantare in Capella, e sonar nell'Organo con ogni sorte d'Instrumento. Opera Undecima. In Venetia, Appresso Giacomo Vincenti. 1608. See Emil Bohn, Bibliographie der Musik-Druckwerke bis 1700 welche in der Stadtbibliothek, der Bibliothek des Acad. Inst. für Kirchenmusik, und der K. und Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Breslau aufbewahrt werden (Berlin: A. Cohn, 1883), p. 397.*

16. See the Introduction, pp. 2-4. Of the authors of the articles cited in notes 1 and 3, Redlich, Biella, and Stevens present the negative arguments, while Bonta, Osthoff, Armstrong, and to a lesser extent Arnold provide evidence favoring the antiphon-substitute theory. Bonta's "Liturgical Problems" and Armstrong's "The Antiphonae" are by far the most comprehensive treatments of the subject.

17. Bonta brings to bear contemporary theoretical treatises, while Armstrong's study of Anerio's *Antiphonae* provides evidence of the practice of substituting polyphonic motets without strictly liturgical texts in place of officially sanctioned antiphons. Robert J. Snow has suggested in personal conversation, however, that Anerio's *Antiphonae* are the officially sanctioned texts for certain mendicant orders. Much work remains to be done on the vagaries of pre-Tridentine and post-Tridentine liturgy.

18. *Salmi della Madonna Magnificat à 3. voci. Hinno Ave Maris Stella, Antifone à una, 2. & 3. voci. Et Motetti Tutti Concertati. Di Paolo Agostino Maestro di Cappella in San Lorenzo in Damaso, Discepolo, & Genero di Gio. Bernardino Nanini. Con il Basso continuo per sonare . . . Libro Primo. In Roma, Per Luca Antonio Soldi. 1619. See Gaetano Gaspari, Catalogo della Biblioteca Musicale G. B. Martini di Bologna, reprint ed. by Napoleone Fanti, Oscar Mischiati, and Luigi Tagliavini, 5 vols. (Bologna: Arnaldo Forni, 1961), vol. II, p. 156 (hereafter cited as Gaspari).*

19. Bonta, "Liturgical Problems," pp. 95-96.

20. Specifically, in Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, Ms. 759. While no systematic study of manuscript Vesper psalms has yet been made, it is clear that numerous sixteenth-century manuscripts group these four psalms in the same order. In some manuscripts the distribution of tones is different from that described above, but many manuscripts do not list the tones at all and may agree with the order given here. Codex III of the Archivio Capitolare of Modena presents this particular series of psalms twice, each time with one discrepancy in the ascending numerical tonal sequence. See David Crawford, "Vespers Polyphony at Modena's Cathedral in the First Half of the Sixteenth Century" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois, 1967), pp. 75-78.

21. Robert J. Snow's research in this field indicates much more diversity in liturgical practice than is reflected by the *Liber Usualis*.

22. *L'Organo Suonarino di Adriano Banchieri Bolognese . . . In Venetia appresso Ricciardo Amadino. 1605*. Facsimile edition published by Frits Knuf, Amsterdam (n.d.).

23. *Ibid.*, p. 52.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 54 (*Confitebor tibi*) and p. 56 (*Dixit Dominus*).

25. Bonta, "Liturgical Problems," pp. 95-96. Bonta has recently studied the use of instrumental music in the liturgical service, including its role as a substitute for both Ordinary and Proper items. See Bonta, "The Uses of the Sonata da Chiesa," *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 22, no. 1 (Spring 1969): 54-84. See also Armstrong, "The Antiphonae." A small number of contemporary letters, descriptions of performances, and official documents similarly attest to the role of motets in the Vesper service. See the passages quoted in Bonta, "Liturgical Problems," pp. 97-98; Osthoff, "Unità liturgica," p. 319; and Arnold, "The Monteverdi Vespers," p. 25.

26. See the discussion of this issue in the Introduction, pp. 2-4, and chapter I, pp. 28-40.

27. A discussion of the use of instruments in both motets and Vesper music follows below.

28. See chapter I for a fuller discussion of the old and new styles in the print as well as an assessment of possible performances in Mantua.

I wish to acknowledge the assistance of Prof. William Harris of Middlebury College for his comments on the grammatical structure of Monteverdi's title and the distinction between "*ad Sacella*" and "*ad Ecclesiam*."

29. Translated in Oliver Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1950), pp. 269-270. James Armstrong, in an as yet unpublished article entitled "How to Compose a Psalm: Ponzio and Cerone Compared," demonstrates Cerone's dependence on Pietro Ponzio's *Ragionamento di musica* of 1588. I am grateful to Prof. Armstrong for the opportunity to study this article prior to its publication.

30. See the extensive discussion of the Council and the mass in chapter II of Lewis Lockwood, *The Counter-Reformation and the Masses of Vincenzo Ruffo*, vol. II of "Studi di Musica Veneta" (Venice: Fondazione Giorgio Cini, 1970), pp. 74-135. The

Council's canon for the mass is quoted in Gustave Reese, *Music in the Renaissance* (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1954), p. 449.

31. In *Del Reverendo M. D. Gio. Giacomo Gastoldi, Maestro di Capella nella Chiesa Ducale di Santa Barbara di Mantova. Tutti li Salmi che nelle Solennità dell'anno al Vespro si cantano, à otto voci. Con duoi Cantici della B. Vergine, uno del Settimo tuono, & uno del Secondo tuono, che risponde in Eco . . . In Venetia appresso Ricciardo Amadino. 1601.* See Gaspari, vol. II, p. 229. Complete transcriptions of this and most of the other unpublished compositions mentioned in this essay are found in Kurtzman, "The Monteverdi Vespers."

32. See chapter I, pp. 19-20 and chapter III, pp. 99-102 for further commentary on *Nisi Dominus*.

33. In *Salmi Intieri che nelle Solennità dell'anno al Vespro si cantano, Con il Cantico della B. Vergine. A sei voci. Di Gio. Giacomo Gastoldi Maestro di Capella nella Chiesa Ducale di Santa Barbara di Mantova. Con il Basso continuo per l'Organo. Libro Secondo . . . In Venetia, Appresso Ricciardo Amadino. 1607.* See Bussi, Piacenza, p. 48.

34. In *Sacri Fiori Mottetti à due, à tre, et à quatro voci per cantar nel organo di Leon Leoni Maestro di Capella nel Duomo di Vicenza, Con la sua partitura corrente à commodo delli organisti. Libro Primo . . . In Venetia, appresso Ricciardo Amadino. 1606.* See Gaspari, vol. II, pp. 449-450, and Sartori, Assisi, pp. 82-83.

35. These passages of unmeasured recitation are frequently labeled *falsibordoni* in the prints themselves, even though they may be for only one voice accompanied by organ continuo. The organist would have had to play a full chordal harmonization of the psalm tone, so the rubric *falsibordoni* in connection with a solo voice is not an inconsistency in terminology.

36. In *Il Secondo Libro de Madrigali, e Mottetti à una voce sola per cantare sopra gravicembali, chitarroni, et organi, Con Passaggi, e senza del Molto R. P. D. Severo Bonini Monaco di Vallambrosa . . . In Firenze: Appresso Cristosano Marescotti. 1609.* See Nigel Fortune, "A Handlist of Printed Italian Secular Monody Books, 1602-1635," *R. M. A. Research Chronicle* 3 (1963): 32.

37. See chapter I, pp. 34-37 for an extensive examination of the role of instruments in the Vespers. The function of *ad libitum* instrumentation with regard to performance conditions is discussed in the Introduction, pp. 3-4.

38. *Il Primo Libro de' Concerti Ecclesiastici à 1. à 2. à 3. à 4. & à 5. Parte con voci sole, & parte con voci, & Instrumenti di Fr. Archangelo Crotti da Ferrara Agostiniano Eremita Osservante . . . In Venetia, Appresso Giacomo Vincenti. 1608.* See Gaspari, vol. II, p. 412.

39. *Motetti à dua, & tre voci, Per cantar nell'Organo con il Basso continuo, di Caterina Assandra Pavese . . . Opera Seconda . . . In Milano, Per l'herede di Simon Tini, & Filippo Lomazzo. 1609.* See Gaspari, vol. II, p. 341.

40. Modern edition by Denis Arnold, *Giovanni Gabrieli: Opera Omnia* (Rome: American Institute of Musicology, 1956—), vols. IV and V.

41. See Egon Kenton, *Life and Works of Giovanni Gabrieli*, vol. XVI of "Musicological Studies and Documents" (American Institute of Musicology, 1967), pp. 163-166, 179, and 185-188.

42. *Concerti per sonare et cantare. Di Giulio Radino Padovano Cioè Canzone, & Ricercari à Quattro, & Otto, Mottetti, Messe, Salmi, & Magnificat, à Cinque, Sei, Sette, Dieci, Dodeci, & Sedeci Voci . . . In Venetia, Appresso Angelo Gardano, & Fratelli. 1607.* See Sartori, *Bibliografia*, vol. I, p. 142 (item 1607a).

43. *Psalmi Sex, qui in Vesperis ad Concentum varietatem interponuntur, Ternis vocibus. Eisdem sequitur Completorium Quaternis vocibus. Cum Basso ad Organum. Auctore Augustino Agazario Armonico Intronato. Opus Duodecimum. Venetijs, Apud Ricciardum Amadinum. 1609.* See Edith B. Schnapper, *The British Union-Catalogue of Early Music Printed before the Year 1801* (London: Butterworths Scientific Publications, 1957), vol. I, p. 8.

44. Denis Arnold, "Giovanni Croce and the 'Concertato' Style," *Musical Quarterly* 39, no. 1 (January 1953): 44.

45. Though not precisely specified by Arnold, the collection in question is entitled *Raccolta Terza di Leonardo Simonetti Musico nella Capella della Serenissima Repubblica. De Messa et Salmi del Sig. Alessandro Grandi et Gio † Chiozotto à 2. 3. 4. con Basso continuo. Aggiuntovi li Ripieni à beneplacito . . . In Venetia. 1630. Appresso Bartholomeo Magni.* See Gaspari, vol. II, pp. 83-84.

46. *Apparato Musicale di Messa, Sinfonie, Canzoni, Motetti, & Letanie della Beata Vergine. A otto voci. Con la partitura de Bassi, & un novo ordine, con che si mostra, come, & con Istromenti, & senza si possa nell'Organo rappresentare. Opera Quinta. D'Amante Franzoni Servita Academico Olimpico Maestro di Capella nella Chiesa Ducale di Santa Barbara di Mantova. Libro Primo. . . . In Venetia, Appresso Ricciardo Amadino. 1613.* See Paganelli, "Catalogo delle opere musicali," pp. 324-325.

47. See also Bonta, "The Uses of the Sonata da Chiesa," pp. 62-63. Carol MacClintock notes the importance of instruments in the services at the Ducal Church of Santa Barbara during the tenure of Giaches de Wert as *maestro di cappella*. See MacClintock, *Giaches de Wert: Life and Works*, vol. XVII of "Musicological Studies and Documents" (American Institute of Musicology, 1966), pp. 148 and 154.

48. Arnold, "Monteverdi and the Technique of 'Concertato,'" p. 7.

49. Modern edition by Philippo Pedrell, *Thomae Ludovici Victoria Abulensis: Opera Omnia* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1902-1911), vol. VII, pp. 1-10.

50. In *Vespertina Omnium Solemnitatum Psalmodia octonis vocibus decantanda, Auctore Ioanne A Cruce Clodiense In Ecclesia Divi Marci Musices Vice Magistro . . . Venetijs, Apud Iacobum Vincentium. 1603.* See Gaspari, vol. II, p. 213.

51. Further discussion of the role of the psalm tone in polyphonic psalm settings is found in Armstrong's as yet unpublished article, "How to Compose a Psalm."

52. An example of a psalm tone in canon is found in the *Sicut erat* of Gastoldi's

Lauda Jerusalem in Vespertina Omnium Solemnitatum Psalmodia quinis vocibus decantanda. Io. Iacobi Gastoldi in Ecclesia Ducali Inclitae urbis Mantuae Musices Praefecti. Liber Secundus . . . Venetijs Apud Ricciardum Amadinum. 1602. See Gaspari, vol. II, pp. 229-230.

53. An extended discussion of variation techniques in *Dixit Dominus* is found in chapter III, pp. 91-93.

54. Structural symmetry in the Vespers and *L'Orfeo* is discussed in chapter III, pp. 69-70, 86, 91-93, and 112 note 19. See also Donald J. Grout, *A Short History of Opera* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1947), pp. 60-68.

55. See examples 14a, b, and c on pp. 93-95.

56. Modern edition by Claudio Gallico, *Lodovico Viadana: Cento Concerti Ecclesiastici, Parte Prima*, vol. I of "Monumenti Musicali Mantovani" (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1964). A *Magnificat* with a trio texture antedating Monteverdi's Vespers is found in *Musica per Cantare con L'Organo ad Una, Due, & Tre Voci, Di Tiburtio Massaino. Opera Trentesima seconda . . . In Venetia, Appresso Alessandro Raverij. 1607.* See Schnapper, *British Union-Catalogue*, vol. II, p. 660. Once again an early instance of a modern technique occurs in a *motet* collection.

57. For a more extended study of the musical organization and structure of the psalms, see chapter III, pp. 91-104 and Kurtzman, "The Monteverdi Vespers," pp. 121-170.

58. A detailed study of the relationship between the two *Magnificats* in the *Vespro* is found in chapter III, pp. 71-86.

59. The early history of polyphonic *Magnificats*, hymns, and psalms is treated in Masakata Kanazawa, "Polyphonic Music for Vespers during the Fifteenth Century" (Ph.D. dissertation, Harvard University, 1966). On *Cinquecento Magnificats* see Carl-Heinz Illing, *Zur Technik der Magnificat-Komposition des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Wolfenbüttel, Berlin: G. Kallmeyer, 1936).

60. Strunk, *Source Readings*, p. 270. Cerone's dependence on Ponzio in his treatment of the *Magnificat* is discussed in Armstrong, "How to Compose a Psalm."

61. Modern edition by Alexander Main, *Costanzo Festa: Opera Omnia* (American Institute of Musicology, 1962—), vol. II.

62. Modern editions by Higinio Anglés, *Cristóbal de Morales: Opera Omnia: XVI Magnificat*, vol. XVII of "Monumentos de la Música Española" (Barcelona: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1956); and Pedrell, *Thomae Ludovici Victoria*, vol. V.

63. Modern edition by Raffaele Casimiri, *Le Opere complete di Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina* (Rome: Edizione Fratelli Scialoja, 1939—), vol. XVI. The only book of *Magnificats* published by Palestrina in his lifetime did not appear until 1591.

64. See, for example, the *Magnificats* by Luigi Mazzi in *Li Salmi à cinque voci Che si cantano dalla Santa Chiesa Romana nelli Vesperi delle Solennità di tutto l'Anno, Con doi Magnificat et il Basso per l'Organo di Luigi Mazzi Organista & Maestro di Musica*

dell'Altezza Serenissima di Modena. Libro Primo . . . In Venetia Appresso Giacomo Vincenti. 1610. See Maggini, Luca, *Biblioteca del Seminario*, p. 153.

65. See chapter III, pp. 71-86.

66. In *Vespertina Omnium Solemnitatum Psalmodia . . . 1602*.

67. In *Sacri Fiori Mottetti . . . 1606*.

68. In *Musica per Cantare . . . 1607*.

69. *Passaggi sopra tutti li salmi che ordinariamente canta Santa Chiesa. Ne i Vesperti della Dominica, & ne i giorni Festivi di tutto l'anno. Con il Basso sotto per sonare, & cantare con Organo, o con altri stromenti. Fatti da Gio. Luca Conforti della Città di Mileto, Cantore nella Capella di sua santità. Libro Primo . . . In Venetia Appresso Angelo Gardano & Fratelli. 1607.* Copy at Vercelli, Archivio della Cattedrale. See *Fontes Artis Musicae*, 1958/1, p. 24.

70. *Arie Devote Le quali contengono in se la Maniera di cantar con gratia l'imitation delle parole, et altri affetti . . . In Roma appresso Simone Verovio. 1608.* See Gaspari, vol. II, p. 418.

71. See Leo Schrade, *Monteverdi: Creator of Modern Music* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1950), pp. 256 and 258; Hans F. Redlich, *Claudio Monteverdi: Life and Works*, trans. Kathleen Dale (London: Oxford University Press, 1952), pp. 127-128; Denis Arnold, *Monteverdi* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons Ltd., 1963), pp. 142-143; and Guglielmo Barblan, Claudio Gallico, and Guido Pannain, *Claudio Monteverdi* (Turin: Edizioni RAI Radiotelevisione italiana, 1967), p. 337. Arnold discusses a few related pieces by other composers in "Notes on two Movements of the Monteverdi 'Vespers'" and "Monteverdi's Church Music: some Venetian Traits."

72. Structural aspects of the *Sonata* are discussed in chapter III, pp. 86-91.

73. Arnold, "Notes," pp. 60-63.

74. See note 46 above.

75. Edward E. Lowinsky, *Secret Chromatic Art in the Netherlands Motet* (New York: Russell & Russell, 1946), pp. 16-26. A recent dissertation on this subject, which I have not yet seen, is by Mary E. Columbro, "Ostinato Technique in the Franco-Flemish motet: 1480-ca. 1562" (Case Western Reserve University, 1974).

76. Arnold, "Monteverdi's Church Music," pp. 84-86.

77. *Ibid.*

78. In *Motecta Octonis Vocibus Antonii Gualterii in terra D. Danielis Musices Magistri, Liber Primus. Venetiis, Apud Iacobum Vincentium. 1604.* This composition was kindly called to my attention by Don Siro Cisilino of the Cini Foundation in Venice.

79. Christiane Engelbrecht, "Eine Sonata con voce von Giovanni Gabrieli," *Bericht über den internationalen musikwissenschaftlichen Kongress Hamburg 1956* (Kassel:

Bärenreiter Verlag, 1957), pp. 88-89. This piece is as yet unpublished.

80. *Ignatii Donati Ecclesiae Metropolitanae Urbini Musicae Praefecti. Sacri Conventus Unis, Binis, Ternis, Quaternis, & Quinis vocibus, Una cum parte Organica . . . Venetiis, Apud Iacobum Vincentium. 1612.* See Gaspari, vol. II, p. 414 and Bohn, *Bibliographie der Musik-Druckwerke*, p. 114.

81. Part of Donati's preface, describing the manner of performance, is translated in Arnold, "Monteverdi's Church Music," p. 87.

82. See, for example, Redlich, *Claudio Monteverdi*, p. 127; Schrade, *Monteverdi*, p. 262; and Arnold, *Monteverdi*, p. 141.

83. Modern edition by Michel Sanvoisin, *Giovanni Gabrieli: Canzoni e Sonate*, vol. XXVII of "Le Pupitre" (Paris: Heugel & Cie., 1971).

84. For a complete list of the publications in which these settings are found, see Kurtzman, "The Monteverdi Vespers," Appendix D. Several additional settings, including some by German composers, are found in the second part of Johannes Donfrid's *Promptuarum Musicum* published in 1623. See RISM 6123². See also chapter III, pp. 108-110. The text is derived from Isaiah 6:2-3 and the First Epistle of John 5:7.

85. Pedrell, *Thomae Ludovici Victoria*, vol. I, pp. 36-39.

86. In *Liber Sacrarum Cantionum quae ad septem, octo, novem, decem, duodecim, sexdecim voces choris . . . 1589.* See Bussi, *Piacenza*, p. 59.

87. In *Ioannis Francisci Anerii Sacerdotis Romani, Musicorum in Ecclesia Deiparae Virginis ad Montes Conventuum Compositoris. Singulis, binis, ternisque vocibus. Liber Primus. Cum Basso ad Organum. Romae, Apud Io. Baptistam Roblettum. 1609.* See Sartori, *Assisi*, p. 20.

88. See the translations of the foreword to Caccini's *Le Nuove Musiche* of 1602 in Strunk, *Source Readings*, pp. 384-389, and in H. Wiley Hitchcock, ed., *Giulio Caccini: Le Nuove Musiche* (Madison: A-R Editions, Inc., 1970), pp. 43-56.

89. *Gio. Francisci Capello Veneti Fesulanae Congregationis Filij Sacrorum Conventuum Unica, & Duabus Vocibus cum Litanijis B. Virginis Mariae. Opus Primum. Venetijs, apud Ricciardum Amadinum, 1610.* See Gaspari, vol. II, pp. 390-391. This collection and other music by Capello is discussed in my article "Giovanni Francesco Capello, an Avant-Gardist of the Early Seventeenth Century," *Musica Disciplina* 31 (1977): 155-182.

90. In *Giardino di Spirituali Concerti A Due, A Tre, e A Quattro Voci, Con il Basso per l'Organo. Di Hercole Porta Organista della Colleggiata di S. Giovanni Impersicetto . . . In Venetia, Appresso Alessandro Raverij. 1609.* See Bohn, *Bibliographie der Musik-Druckwerke bis 1700*, p. 312.

91. For a list of publications in which settings of these texts are found, see Kurtzman, "The Monteverdi Vespers," Appendices E and F.

92. Durante, *Arie Devote . . . 1608* and Bonini, *Il Secondo Libro de Madrigali, e Mottetti . . . 1609*.

93. Capello, *Sacrorum Concentuum . . . 1610*. Alessandro Grandi, *Il Primo Libro de Motteti à due, tre, quatro, cinque, & otto voci, con una Messa à quatro. Accommodati per cantarsi nell'Organo, Clavicembalo, Chitarone, o altro simile Stromento. Con il Basso per sonare di Alessandro Grandi Maestro di Capella del Spirito Santo in Ferrara . . . In Venetia, Appresso Giacomo Vincenti, 1610*. See Gaspari, vol. II, pp. 390-391 and 430. For a discussion of the relationship between these two collections and the Monteverdi Vespers, see Kurtzman, "The Monteverdi Vespers," pp. 383-387. See also note 89 above.

94. See above, pp. 124-127.

95. *Liber Primus Conventus, in Duos Distincti Choros, In quibus Vespere Missa, sacraeque Cantiones in Nativitate, Beatae Mariae Virginis aliarumque Virginam Festivitatibus decantandi continentur. Authore, R. Don Io. Petro Flaccomio Siculo, e Civitate Milatis. Venetiis, Apud Angelum Gardanum, & Fratres. 1611*. See Rafael Mitjana, *Catalogue critique et descriptif des imprimés de musique des XVIIe et XVIIIe siècles, conservés à la Bibliothèque de l'Université Royale d'Upsala*, 3 vols. (Uppsala: Impr. Almqvist & Wiksell, 1911-1951), columns 112-113. Flaccomio's is another of the collections devoted specifically to Marian Vespers.

96. *Concerti Ecclesiastici alla moderna dove si contengono Messa, Salmi per il Vespero, e Compieta, & Magnificat à Tre, à Quattro, à Cinque, à Sei, à Sette, & à Otto di D. Grisostomo Rubiconi da Rimini Monaco Olivetano Organista di S. Benedetto Novello in Padua Con il Basso continuo per Sonare nell'Organo. Opera Seconda . . . In Venetia, Appresso Giacomo Vincenti. 1611*. See Gaspari, vol. II, p. 135; Schnapper, *British Union-Catalogue*, vol. II, p. 906; and Paganelli, "Catalogo delle opere musicali," p. 335.

97. Monteverdi's *Magnificat à 4 in genere da Capella*, published in the *Selva Morale e Spirituale* of 1640 (1641), employs the Magnificat tone as a *cantus firmus* in several verses, but without its assuming the structural significance witnessed in the 1610 Vespers. This later *Magnificat* is in the *stile antico* and resembles the Marian canticles of Victoria.

98. *Lamentationi Benedictus, e Miserere da cantarsi il Mercordì, Giovedì, e Venerdì Santo di sera à Matutino. Concertate à Cinque Voci, et Istromenti à beneplacito. Dal R. P. Gio. Francesco Capello da Venetia, della Congregat. Fiesolana. Opera Terza . . . In Verona, Appresso Angelo Tamo. 1612*. Attention was first called to Capello's *Lamentationi* by Denis Arnold in "Giovanni Croce and the 'Concertato' Style," p. 42.

99. See notes 89 and 93.

100. *Sacrorum Concentuum . . . 1610*.

101. *Salmi Intieri che si cantano al Vespro In alcune Solennità de l'Anno con due Magnificat. Il tutto concertato à Quattro Voci co'l Basso continuo per l'Organo. Aggiuntevi ancora le parti per due Istrumenti Gravi, & Acuto per chi hà tal commodità. Opera Quinta. Di D. Antonio Burlini da Rovigo Monaco Olivetano . . . In Venetia, Appresso Giacomo Vincenti. 1613*. See Giuseppe Turrini, *Il patrimonio musicale della Biblioteca Capitolare di Verona dal sec. XV al XIX* (Verona: La Tipografica Veronese, 1952), p. 41. *Messa Salmi, et Motetti Concertati à Otto Voci in due Chori col Basso*

continuo per l'Organo, & una parte per un Violino per chi n'hà commodità. Opera Ottava. Di D. Antonio Burlini Monaco Olivetano . . . In Venetia, Appresso Giacomo Vincenti. 1615. See Gaspari, vol. II, p. 46.

102. Burlini's *Riviera Fiorita di Concerti Musicale*, published in Venice in 1612, names him as "Organista di Santa Elena di Venetia." However, his *Fiori di Concerti Spirituali*, also published in Venice in 1612, indicates that he is now "Organista di Monteoliveto Maggiore di Siena." See Gaspari, vol. II, p. 388.

103. In *Sacrorum Canticorum una, duabus, tribus, quatuor, et quinque vocibus, D. Seraphini Pattae Mediolanensis Monachi Cassinensis, & in Ecclesia Sancti Salvatoris Papiae Organistae Liber Secundus cui inseruntur Cantiones quaedam instrumentis tantum accommodatae, cum parte infima pro Organo . . . Venetijs Apud Iacobum Vincentium. 1613.* See Gaspari, vol. II, p. 477 and Sartori, *Bibliografia*, vol. II, pp. 58-59.

104. *Messa, e Salmi da Concertarsi nel'Organo et anco con diversi Stromenti, à Cinque Voci, & insieme Sinfonie, & Motetti à Una, Due, Tre, Quattro, Cinque & Sei Voci di Francesco Usper Organista nella Chiesa di S. Salvatore di Venetia . . . In Venetia, Appresso Giacomo Vincenti. 1614.* See Gaspari, vol. II, p. 147. Usper's psalms constitute the "male cursus."

105. *Messa Vespro et Compieta à cinque voci col suo basso continuo Aggiuntovi un Violino, & Corneto per le Sinfonie, & per li Ripieni. Di Amadio Freddi Maestro di Capella nel Duomo di Treviso . . . In Venetia, 1616. Appresso Ricciardo Amadino.* See Gaspari, vol. II, p. 72. Freddi's is another of the collections containing the five psalms for Vespers of the Virgin.

106. *Psalmi Magnif. cum quatuor antiphonis ad Vesperas Octo Vocib. Una cum Basso ad Organum Decantandi Auctore Paulo Tardito Romano in Ecclesia SS. Iacobi, & Illelonsi Hispanicae Nationis, Musices Moderatore. Liber Secundus. Romae. Apud Luca Antonium Soldum 1620.* See Bussi, *Piacenza*, p. 97. Tardito's five psalms in the conservative style form the "male cursus."

107. See Armstrong, "The Vesper Psalms," and Anne Schnoebelen, "Cazzati vs. Bologna: 1657-1671," *Musical Quarterly* 57, no. 1 (January 1971): 26-39. Catalogues of Italian and other European libraries reveal the enormous quantity of music for Vespers that poured from Cazzati's pen. The survival of these collections in many locales suggests that their use was widespread in the seventeenth century.