

I. CONTEXT



I

Sources, Controversies, and Speculations: The Early and Modern History of Monteverdi's Vespers



THE two seventeenth-century sources for Monteverdi's Vespers are discussed and compared in the critical notes to my Oxford University Press edition of the Vespers.¹ The primary source, the only one containing all of the music, is the original 1610 print by Ricciardo Amadino, complete and partial copies of which are located in a number of European libraries.² The full text of the title-page reads:

SANCTISSIMAE/ VIRGINI/ MISSA SENIS VOCIBVS./ AC VESPERAE PLVRIBVS/
DECANTANDAE./ CVM NONNVLLIS SACRIS CONCENTIBVS./ ad Sacella sive
Principum Cubicula accommodata./ OPERA/ A CLAVDIO MONTEVERDE/ nuper effecta/
AC BEATISS. PAVLO V. PONT. MAX. CONSECRATA./ [coat of arms of Paul V]/ Venetijs,
Apud Ricciardum Amadinum./ M D C X.

The initial five lines of the title appear in a slightly amplified and different form on the frontispiece of the Bassus Generalis part-book:

SANCTISSIMAE/ VIRGINI/ MISSA SENIS VOCIBVS./ AD ECCLESIA RV M CHOROS/
Ac Vesperae pluribus decantandae/ . . .

The first two compositions in the Vespers portion of the print, *Domine ad adiuvandum* and *Dixit Dominus*, were reprinted in

RELIQVIAE/SACRORVM/CONCENTVVM/GIOVAN GABRIELIS,/ IOHANLEONIS
HASLERI,/ utriusq; praestantissimi Musici:/ Et aliquot aliorum praecellentium aetatis nostrae
artificum/ Motectae, VI. VII. VIII. IX. X. XII. XIII. XIV. XVI. XVIII./ XIX. vocum, noviter
expromtae/ à GEORGIO GRUBERO NORIMB./ [printer's mark]/ NORIMBERGAE./
Typis & sumptibus Pauli Kauffmanni./ M.DC.XV.³

Controversies over Monteverdi's print begin with Amadino's title-page itself. Denis Stevens, in interpreting the Bassus Generalis version, placed special

¹ The sources for the *Missa in illo tempore*, which, with the exception of Amadino's print, differ from those of the Vespers, are discussed and compared in my edition of the *Missa in illo tempore* (Stuttgart: Carus-Verlag, 1994).

² A complete list is given in RISM, *Einzeldrucke vor 1800* and in the critical notes to my edition.

³ RISM, *Recueils imprimés XVI^e–XVII^e siècles*, 1615².

emphasis on the size of type of each line of the title.⁴ Since the type size of *MISSA SENIS VOCIBUS* is larger than that of any of the other musical items, Stevens claimed that 'Monteverdi wanted his six-part Mass to occupy the most important position on the title page'.⁵ Noting the very small type size of the phrase *Ac Vespere pluribus decantandae* in relation to the phrase *cum nonnullis . . . nuper effecta*, he translated the latter as meaning 'with some sacred pieces, works recently composed by Claudio Monteverdi and intended for princely chapels and apartments'.⁶ On the basis of the differential in type size, Stevens considered the *sacri concentus* to be 'obviously equal if not superior in importance to the phrase about Vespers' and 'quite apart from the Mass and Vespers'.⁷ Consequently, his edition omitted the *sacri concentus* as well as the Magnificat *a* 6. While the phrase *cum nonnullis sacris concentibus* certainly requires interpretation, there is nothing to be learned from type sizes on the frontispiece. Except for the names of dedicatees, type size figures primarily in the graphic design of title-pages in sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Italian music prints, not in the relative importance of compositions in the publication. There are countless publications in which the largest and most significant musical items are not reflected by the largest type.

In fact, the meaning of the phrase *ad Sacella sive Principum Cubicula accommodata* and the items to which it applies is not unequivocally clear. In Latin grammar, *accommodata*, a neuter plural, could not modify *cum nonnullis sacris concentibus* alone, but must modify more than one item in a series, perhaps all three of the items listed in the title (*Missa*, *Vesperae*, *sacri concentus*). To modify the phrase *cum nonnullis . . .* alone, the ending would have had to have been *accommodatis*. If the music had originally been intended for the ducal chapel of Santa Barbara, it would have been fully appropriate to use the final phrase *cum nonnullis . . .* to refer to the *Missa in illo tempore* as well as the *Vesperae* and the *sacri concentus*.⁸ On the other hand, Monteverdi specifies the intended ensemble for the Mass on the Bassus Generalis title-page: *ad ecclesiarum choris* (for church choirs). This added phrase, referring to the Mass alone, may have been intended to distinguish the Mass, as a work for church, from the Vespers and *sacri concentus*, which were suited to chapels or princely chambers, thereby limiting *cum nonnullis . . . accommodata* to the second and third items of the series.

In the fourth line of the title, *pluribus* refers back to *vocibus*, that is, *pluribus* is an adjective modifying the dative form of *voces* (Vespers to be sung by 'several

⁴ 'Where are the Vespers of Yesteryear?', *Musical Quarterly*, 47 (1961), 316–17; and the preface to *Claudio Monteverdi: Vespers*, ed. Stevens (London: Novello, 1961), p. iv.

⁵ 'Where are the Vespers', 316.

⁶ *Ibid.* 316–17.

⁷ *Ibid.* 317.

⁸ Denis Arnold noted already in the first edition of his biography of Monteverdi that 'in accordance with normal Latin usage *accommodata* goes with both *Missa* and *Vespere*.' See Arnold, *Monteverdi* (London: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd., 1963), 137 n. 1.

voices' or 'many voices' in contrast to the six voices [*senis vocibus*] of the Mass, not 'several Vespers'). The insertion of *ad ecclesiarum choro*s on the Bassus Generalis title-page does not alter the relationship between *vocibus* and *pluribus*. *Decantandae* could refer either to the *Vesperae* alone or to the *Missa ac Vesperae*.⁹ A reasonable literal translation of the principal title-page, therefore, reads: 'For the Most Holy Virgin, a Mass for Six Voices and Vespers to be sung by several voices, with several sacred songs, [the whole, or at least the Vespers and the sacred songs] suited for chapels or the chambers of princes. Works by Claudio Monteverdi, made [composed] not long ago and dedicated to His Holiness Pope Paul V'.¹⁰ Roger Bowers proposes a slightly different interpretation of the title-page from mine and offers a more literary translation: 'To be sung to the most holy Virgin: a Mass for sixfold voices and Vespers for more, with some sacred symphonies—works suited to the chapels or chambers of princes, lately wrought by Claudio Monteverdi and dedicated to the most blessed Paul V. Pontifex Maximus'.¹¹ The previously published translation that most accurately represents Monteverdi's meaning is that by Denis Arnold in 1963 (omitting the dedications): 'Mass for six voices suitable for church choirs, and vespers to be performed by larger forces (together with some motets) suitable for chapels or the apartments of princes'.¹²

While the separation of the *sacri concentus* from the *Vesperae* on the title-page fuelled Stevens's argument that the *sacri concentus* were 'quite apart from the Mass and the Vespers', the matter is further complicated by the heading that appears

⁹ Gottfried Wolters's German translation of the title-page correctly notes that if *accommodata* were to modify *cum nonnullis sacris concentibus*, its ending would have to be *accommodatis* (Wolters incorrectly spells *accommodata* with a single *m*). However, he also suggests that *accommodata* may modify *cubicula*, which is grammatically impossible. See *Claudio Monteverdi: Vesperae beatae Mariae Virginis*, ed. Wolters (Wolfenbüttel: Mösseler Verlag, 1966), 204–5. Wolfgang Osthoff's Italian translation incorrectly attached *accommodata* only to the *sacri concentus*. See Osthoff, 'Unità liturgica e artistica nei *Vespri* del 1610', *Rivista italiana di musicologia*, 2 (1967), 315.

¹⁰ I am grateful to Profs. William Harris, Kristine Wallace, and James Patout Burns for assistance with the Latin grammar of the title.

¹¹ Bowers sees *decantandae* as referring to *Santissimae Virgini*, while I have interpreted it as referring to *Vesperae*. Either interpretation is grammatically correct, but it does not make sense for *decantandae* to refer to *Santissimae Virgini* for several reasons: (1) mass and Vespers are sung to God, not to the Virgin, even if they are dedicated to the Virgin; (2) the position of *decantandae* would exclude the *sacri concentus* from those works 'sung to the Virgin'; (3) the *sacri concentus* include the only works in the print whose texts are actually addressed to the Virgin: the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* and *Pulchra es*. Bowers's translation also interprets *Principum* as a genitive referring to *Sacella* as well as *Cubicula*, whereas the presence of *sive* before *Principum* and the placement of *Principum* before rather than after *Cubicula* tend to separate this word from *Sacella* (but this does not mean that Monteverdi might not have had princely chapels in mind). Bowers considers the full stop after *accommodata* a printing error. The full stop makes no difference in the interpretation, however. Bowers acceptably sees *accommodata* on the principal title-page as referring to all three sets of musical items, and the purpose of inserting *ad ecclesiarum choro*s on the Bassus Generalis title-page as distinguishing between church choirs as the suitable medium for the Mass and the other items as suited to the types of musicians found in 'ducal and princely households'. See Bowers, 'Some Reflection upon Notation and Proportions in Monteverdi's Mass and Vespers of 1610', *Music & Letters*, 73 (1992), 396.

¹² *Monteverdi*, 137 n. 1.

at the beginning of *Domine ad adjuvandum* in the Bassus Generalis part-book: *Vespro della B. Vergine da concerto, composto sopra canti fermi* (Vespers of the Blessed Virgin in the concerted style, composed over cantus firmi). This rubric would seem to apply to everything that follows, including the *sacri concentus*, though the latter, apart from the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*, are not based on cantus firmi. Aside from questions about the role of the *sacri concentus*, the purpose of the second Magnificat is not immediately clear. These matters will be considered further in the course of the discussion below.

The first two words of Monteverdi's title have until now escaped discussion because of their obvious relationship to the contents of the print, but the naming of the Blessed Virgin may have had particular significance for Monteverdi and the Gonzagas. The city of Mantua, like Venice, considered itself to have a special relationship with the Virgin. The seventeenth-century Mantuan historian Ippolito Donesmondi, under the heading 'Special Prerogatives of Mantua', declared that 'the Blessed Virgin promised to S. Anselm that she would eternally be its [Mantua's] protector'.¹³ Therefore Monteverdi's leading dedication of his music to the Virgin represented not only recognition of the print's liturgical contents, but very likely an acknowledgment of the special role of the Virgin in the life of Mantua and its ruling family.¹⁴ Donesmondi also claimed a close relationship between Pope Paul V and the Gonzagas. At the request of Duke Vincenzo, the Pope came to Mantua in 1607, granting a large number of perpetual indulgences upon the occasion of his visit to the Church of St Andrea and out of reverence for its relic of the Most Precious Blood of Christ.¹⁵ Thus the two dedicatees of Monteverdi's print, the Virgin and the Pope, were evidently chosen for multiple reasons, including their associations with the Gonzagas and Mantua.

The first republication of music from the 1610 print after Monteverdi's time was by the Bolognese scholar, composer, and prelate Giambattista Martini. Martini, whose private collection of prints and manuscripts now forms the Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale in Bologna, published the first Agnus Dei (transposed down a fourth) from the *Missa in illo tempore* in his monumental

¹³ *Cronologia d'alcune cose più notabili di Mantova* (Mantua: Aurelio and Lodovico Osanna fratelli, 1615), 26.

¹⁴ Helmut Hücke has seen the print as principally votive in character. See Hücke, 'Die fälschlich so genannte "Marien"-Vesper von Claudio Monteverdi', *Bericht über den internationalen musikwissenschaftlichen Kongress Bayreuth 1981* (Kassel: Bärenreiter, 1984), 295–305.

¹⁵ 'Favore nell'entrare del presente anno M.DC.VII. il Pontefice Paolo, la Chiesa di Sant'Andrea in Mantova, per rispetto del pretiosissimo Sangue di Christo, d'indulgenze molto ragguardevoli durante in perpetuo, ad istanza del Serenissimo; e fra l'altre, ne'giorni di Sant'Andrea, dell'Ascensione, di Nostro Signore, e per la notte del venerdì santo, è plenaria; . . .'. See Ippolito Donesmondi, *Dell'istoria ecclesiastica di Mantova . . . parte seconda* (Mantua: Aurelio and Lodovico Osanna fratelli, 1616), 409. Donesmondi also claims that the Pope had determined to make the duke's second son Ferdinando, when still quite young, a cardinal because of his devotion to the Church, and that the Holy See had a special affection for the merits of the House of Gonzaga (*ibid.* 414).

counterpoint treatise of 1774–5. For Martini, the *Agnus Dei* served as an example not only of excellent counterpoint, but also of ecclesiastical music designed ‘to arouse in the soul of listeners affects of devotion, obsequiousness, and veneration toward the majesty of God’ in contrast to Monteverdi’s madrigals with their emphasis on expression of the words and free use of dissonance.¹⁶

Music from the Vespers portion of the print was first published by Carl von Winterfeld in his study of the music of Giovanni Gabrieli and his contemporaries in 1834.¹⁷ Winterfeld included in his volume of examples transcriptions of the first part of *Dixit Dominus*, up to the end of the first ritornello, and the first half-verse of the *Deposuit* from the Magnificat *a 7*.¹⁸ Winterfeld also devoted several pages of discussion to the Mass and Vespers, noting the contrast between old and new style, briefly surveying the varied styles found in the collection, and describing in more detail *Dixit Dominus*, the Magnificat *a 7*, the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*, and the hymn *Ave maris stella*.¹⁹ Winterfeld was struck by what he considered the symmetry of the entire Vespers, and was the first to sense a large ground-plan behind the succession of pieces. Nevertheless, he found the motets trifling and shallow and Monteverdi’s music throughout the Vespers lacking in the ‘fullness of an inner, pious life’.²⁰

Around the turn of the twentieth century, the Italian scholar Luigi Torchi published the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* in his series *L’arte musicale in Italia*.²¹ This was the first complete composition from the 1610 Vespers to be published in a modern edition. Torchi’s diplomatic transcription, without continuo realization or any editorial markings, constituted the best edition of music from the Vespers for two generations. Torchi placed the *Sonata* in public view for the first time, leading to transcriptions of the piece for modern ensembles, such as a 1907 version for tenor, string quartet, and piano or harmonium, and a 1919 orchestral setting for soprano choir, brass, harp, harpsichord, organ, and five-part orchestral strings.²²

Nearly one hundred years after Winterfeld had first introduced Monteverdi’s sacred music to the public, the first complete edition of the composer’s 1610

¹⁶ *Esemplare ossia Saggio fondamentale pratico di contrappunto sopra il canto fermo*, 2 vols. (Bologna: Lelio della Volpe, 1774–5), ii. 242–50: ‘il fine principale della Musica Ecclesiastica essendo di eccitare nell’animo degli Ascoltanti affetti di divozione, di ossequio, e di venerazione verso l’infinita Maestà di Dio . . .’ (p. 242). Martini’s commentary on the *Agnus Dei* is reprinted in full in Paolo Fabbri, *Monteverdi* (Turin: E.D.T. Edizioni, 1985), 158–60. For the significance of the transposition down a fourth, see Ch. 17 below.

¹⁷ *Johannes Gabrieli und sein Zeitalter*, 3 vols. (Berlin, 1834; fac. edn. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1965).

¹⁸ *Ibid.* iii. 112–15.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* ii. 52–8.

²⁰ *Ibid.* 58.

²¹ 8 vols. (Milan: G. Ricordi, 1897–1908?), iv, 51–72. This volume also contains editions of the madrigals *Cruda Amarilli* and *O Mirtillo*.

²² The piano quintet version is in MS in the Sibley Music Library, Rochester, NY. The transcription is by Luigi Torri, though the parts are inscribed ‘Pisa 24. Febbraio 1907. Alfredo Luchi’. The orchestral version is edited by Bernardino Molinari (Milan: G. Ricordi & Co., 1919).

print was finally issued in 1932 by Gian Francesco Malipiero in volume xiv of his complete edition of Monteverdi.²³ Malipiero's was not a scholarly edition in the modern sense. There are few critical notes and many errors in both text and music. Its editorial additions are limited for the most part to accidentals and an uncomplicated and not always appropriate realization of the *Bassus Generalis*. Nevertheless, Malipiero's edition was of considerable value, since it made the complete music of the 1610 collection available to musicians for the first time. Moreover, his method was to provide a more or less diplomatic transcription of the original, thereby avoiding the editorial excesses and confusions of several later editions, not to speak of other volumes in his own series.

Hans F. Redlich was involved in correcting the proofs for Malipiero's edition, and, in his own words, 'decided there and then to prepare a practical arrangement. Such an arrangement was necessary because of the peculiar state of incompleteness in which all music of the early baroque period (based on the musical shorthand principle of the *basso continuo*) has been left to posterity by its creators.'²⁴ According to Redlich, 'the modern edition has not only to reconstruct a complete orchestral score, but must add expression-marks galore, alter the time-signatures, revalue cumbersome rhythms and write out complete parts for the organ and the harpsichord'.²⁵ Despite being based on the Malipiero edition, Redlich's version was vastly different from it. He omitted the psalms *Nisi Dominus* and *Lauda Jerusalem* (two pieces of rather shallow choral grandeur, according to Redlich) as well as the Magnificat *a 6* and rearranged the other compositions in the order *Domine ad adjuvandum*, *Dixit Dominus*, *Laetatus sum*, *Laudate pueri*, *Duo Seraphim*, *Nigra sum*, *Pulchra es*, *Audi coelum*, *Ave maris stella*, *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*, and Magnificat *a 7*. To these compositions Redlich added tempo, articulation, and dynamic markings, divided the vocal forces into *solis* and *tutti*, realized the continuo in a very elaborate, contrapuntally complicated, and highly ornamented manner, provided large-scale orchestration for the ritornellos, and added obbligato instruments.

Redlich's edition, originally in manuscript, was executed in 1934 and first performed in Zurich on 24 February 1935 by the Häusermann Choir under the direction of Hermann Dubs.²⁶ The Schola Cantorum in New York, directed by Hugh Ross, performed selections from this edition in 1937; Dubs revived the

²³ *Tutte le opere di Claudio Monteverdi* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1932), xiv/1–2. For a list of modern editions up to 1986, see K. Gary Adams and Dyke Kiel, *Claudio Monteverdi: A Guide to Research* (New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989), 38–9.

²⁴ 'Monteverdi's "Vespers"', *Listener*, 943 (6 Feb. 1947), 260.

²⁵ *Ibid.*

²⁶ *Ibid.* Subsequent performances were given in Winterthur and Lausanne. Dubs and the Häusermann Choir performed *L'Orfeo* on 10 Nov. 1936. The performance information in this paragraph is derived from Redlich's article in the *Listener*, from Redlich, 'Monteverdi's Religious Music', *Music & Letters*, 27 (1946), 209 and the preface to *Claudio Monteverdi: Magnificat Sechsstimmig*, ed. Karl Matthaei (Kassel and Basle: Bärenreiter-Verlag, 1941). Matthaei was familiar with the performances based on Redlich's MS edition, and agreed with Redlich's claims that the continuo tolerated a 'richer, motivic-elastic decoration'. Matthaei's own realization of the Magnificat *a 6*, however, is much more

Vespers in the Großmünster in Zurich on 12 October 1941; and in 1943 the Swiss Radio Beromünster broadcast Redlich's version of the Vespers, under the direction of Hermann Scherchen. Additional Swiss broadcasts followed, and the edition was first performed in England by the Morley College Music Society (whose director was Michael Tippett) under the leadership of Walter Goehr on 14 May 1946. The Morley College Music Society then repeated its performances in July 1946 and January 1947. Paul Collaer also directed a performance in Brussels in 1946. Finally, Redlich's edition of the Vespers was broadcast on the BBC's Third Programme on Thursday, 13 February 1947.

Redlich's edition finally reached print in 1949,²⁷ was reissued in a slightly revised version in 1952, and served as the basis of a gramophone recording in 1953.²⁸ The recording drew scornful criticism, much of it condemning Redlich's edition.²⁹ The response of Leo Schrade, who had prepared his own edition of the Vespers for a separate recording, is a classic of musical invective:

Recently there have been a good many performances of Monteverdi's works, especially numerous in the case of the Vespers, in concerts and over the radio, and all of them so remarkably remote in spirit and letter from Monteverdi's original that the time seems to have come for frank criticism. For arbitrary, inartistic performances will, in time, seriously affect understanding for Monteverdi's work. . . .

The recording of Monteverdi's Vespers here reviewed, shows all the deplorable features we have mentioned: a version over-romantic, with little musical taste and understanding of style, but with serious changes in the original text. The deviations from the original are indeed so serious that they can no longer be regarded as legitimate 'interpretations' but must be qualified as arrangements, violating both scholarship and musicianship. . . .

A first question that the recording brings up concerns the selection of the compositions from the Vespers. For the recording does not present the complete Vespers. . . .

A second question that must be raised concerns the order in which the compositions appear. Monteverdi planned his Vespers as a perfect unity, both liturgical and artistic; and the unity is such that it should not be tampered with. Liturgically, the psalms, the hymn, and the Magnificat occupy the center of importance, and they follow each other as the rite of the Vespers prescribes. While Monteverdi resorted to certain liberties in the choice of antiphons linked to the psalms and Magnificat (not of course to the hymn), he at least was careful to choose related, Marian texts and to keep in mind the proper position of solo compositions as antiphons prefatory to the psalms. . . . It has been stated that the original does not have sufficient indications of either the media or the manner of performance, and this alleged lack of indication was, therefore, the

modest than Redlich's of the Magnificat *a 7*. Matthei also retains Monteverdi's organ registration rubrics, which Redlich had discarded.

²⁷ *Monteverdi: Vespri della Beata Vergine* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1949; rev. 1952). Redlich discussed his edition in 'Claudio Monteverdi—zum Problem der praktischen Ausgabe seiner Werke (Vesper 1610)', *Schweizerische Musikzeitung*, 74 (1934), 609–17, 641–6, as well as in 'Claudio Monteverdi: Some Problems of Textual Interpretation', *Musical Quarterly*, 41 (1955), 68.

²⁸ Vox PL 7902. The Swabian Choral Singers and the Stuttgart Bach Orchestra were conducted by Hans Grischkat. See App. D, item 2.

²⁹ See Hans Nathan, 'Two Interpretations of Monteverdi's *Vespri della Beata Vergine*', *Music Review*, 15 (1954), 155–6, and Leo Schrade, 'Monteverdi: *Vespri della Beata Vergine*', *Musical Quarterly*, 40 (1954), 138–45.

pretext for all kinds of additions and arrangements. Only somebody who never saw the original can make such an assumption. . . . Since the recording follows Redlich's score, the performance exhibits all the errors and shortcomings of that edition. In fact, the deplorable deficiencies of the performance are to a large extent due to the editorial arrangement used by the musicians. . . .

As regards the arbitrary addition of parts, it is vexing enough when a Respighi nonchalantly adds his music to a score of Monteverdi; we have a harder time when the score is enriched by a musicologist. But whether composer or musicologist, he has no right to subject us to a kind of study in a course of 'free composition'.³⁰

Schrade then continues with detailed criticism of various aspects of both the edition and the performance.

Redlich defended his conception of the Vespers, describing the 1610 print as a pot-pourri of unrelated pieces: 'a loose collection of diverse liturgical compositions rather than . . . a single artistic unit'.³¹ Redlich stressed the difference between the printed music of the early seventeenth century and the many treatises and descriptions of performances that discuss ornamentation, doubling instruments, and multiple continuo instruments. He defended his ornamentation of continuo lines on the basis of comments by Heinrich Schütz and Michael Praetorius.³² Aside from disagreement over liturgical and artistic unity in the Vespers, the dispute between Redlich and Schrade was principally over performance practice. Schrade, as will be discussed below, had the more sophisticated view of the liturgical aspects of the Vespers, but he saw Monteverdi's rubrics, detailed ornamentation, and reproduction of the upper parts of some pieces in the Bassus Generalis part-book as indications of the completeness of Monteverdi's score, not to be tampered with. While Redlich misunderstood the liturgical nature of Monteverdi's print, he correctly saw it as incomplete in terms of seventeenth-century performance practice, requiring 'filling out' on the part of performers. Aside from the liturgical impropriety of Redlich's edition, the question at stake is the character of his arrangement and its proximity to or distance from seventeenth-century practices. From Part III of this book, it will be apparent that Redlich understood far more of early seventeenth-century performance practice than Schrade.

Schrade, in his 1950 study of Monteverdi, had already recognized that the response, psalms, hymn, and Magnificats were the standard liturgical items for

³⁰ See Schrade, 139–41. For background on the recording of Schrade's edition and the Schrade–Redlich controversy, see Jim Davidson, *Lyrebird Rising* (Portland, Oreg.: Amadeus Press, 1994), 402–3.

³¹ 'Claudio Monteverdi: Some Problems of Textual Interpretation'. Redlich had already described the succession of pieces under the heading Vespers in the 1610 print as an 'accidental-additive collation'. See Redlich, *Claudio Monteverdi: Leben und Werk* (Olten: Verlag Otto Walter, 1949), 145. In the enlarged English translation of this book, the entire passage is rendered: 'The addition of the "nonnulli sacri concentus" clearly betokens the elastic character of the whole arrangement, whose fortuitous grouping together as a unit implies no further mutual obligation with regard to performance' (Redlich, *Claudio Monteverdi: Life and Works*, trans. Kathleen Dale (London: Oxford University Press, 1952), 128).

³² 'Claudio Monteverdi: Some Problems of Textual Interpretation', 69–70.

Vespers on feasts of the Virgin.³³ He also drew associations between the motets *Nigra sum* and *Pulchra es* and the two liturgical antiphons with these same text incipits. He assumed that the five *sacri concentus* were 'to function in the place of the proper antiphons . . . for the liturgy of the day is observed in the rest of the collection'.³⁴ Schrade's own edition (in manuscript and never published) was recorded at virtually the same time as Redlich's,³⁵ and was reviewed more favourably than Redlich's by Hans Nathan, but Nathan still complained of 'several arbitrary *a cappella* passages (in *Lauda Jerusalem* and occasionally in *Laudate Pueri*) as well as a few disturbing *tempi* which are apparently not the conductor's doing'.³⁶ Nathan also emphasized that the recording and Schrade's edition presented the Vespers in their entirety and their original order (omitting the *Magnificat a 6*).

Schrade's reaction to the Redlich edition and recording not only may have reflected a scholar's indignation at what he considered unscholarly and unmusical work, but may also have been prompted by Redlich's earlier critical reviews of Schrade's own book.³⁷ Redlich, in response, turned some of Schrade's own arguments against him and accused Schrade in his manuscript edition of 'taking from it [Redlich's edition] not only the title and features of general presentation, but also a number of editorial characteristics'.³⁸ Redlich also cited discrepancies between Schrade's edition and the recording based on it and repeatedly criticized Schrade's disinterest in performance practice questions. Thus began the cycle of debate and controversy over interpretations of the Vespers, centred on two principal issues: liturgy and performance practice.

Contemporaneous editions of music from the Vespers included a partial and faulty edition by Georgio Ghedini in 1952, with the motet *O quam pulchra es* from Leonardo Simonetti's anthology of 1625 inserted, and Gottfried Wolters's partial edition of 1954, containing the response, the five psalms, *Audi coelum*, the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*, the hymn, and the doxology of one of the *Magnificats*. This edition was without continuo realization and was derived

³³ *Monteverdi, Creator of Modern Music* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1950), 251–4.

³⁴ *Ibid.* 253. This is also the viewpoint expressed in Schrade's review of Redlich's recording.

³⁵ L'Oiseau-Lyre OL 50021–2 (1953). See App. D, item 3. Live broadcasts by the same performers took place on the BBC's Third Programme on 19 and 21 Feb. 1954. See Redlich, 'Editions of Monteverdi's Vespers of 1610', *Gramophone*, 31 (1954), 503.

³⁶ 'Two Interpretations', 155. Redlich defended his own and Schrade's *a cappella* omission of the basso continuo on the basis of its being a *basso seguente*, and therefore optional. See Redlich, 'Two Interpretations of Monteverdi's Vespers', Correspondence, *Music Review*, 15 (1954), 255–6. Redlich later criticized the tempos in the recording based on the Schrade edition as 'excessively fast'. See Redlich, 'Claudio Monteverdi: Some Problems of Textual Interpretation', 68.

³⁷ Redlich, 'Aufgaben und Ziele der Monteverdi-Forschung: Zu Leo Schrades Monteverdi-Buch', *Die Musikforschung*, 4 (1951), 318–32; and review of Schrade, *Monteverdi, Creator of Modern Music*, *Music Review*, 13 (1952), 316–18.

³⁸ 'Editions of Monteverdi's Vespers of 1610'.

from Malipiero's own faulty version.³⁹ A year later Redlich published another revised version of his own edition, this time based on the original print rather than Malipiero, and evidently responding to the criticism of his earlier omissions, since he now included thirteen of Monteverdi's compositions, excluding only the Magnificat *a 6*.⁴⁰ Redlich's revised edition and Schrade's manuscript version were the first since Malipiero to go back to the original source.

By the late 1950s, new editions of the Vespers were appearing frequently, for Walter Goehr, who a decade before had conducted the first performance of Redlich's initial edition in England, issued his own version in 1957.⁴¹ Goehr followed Schrade, rather than Redlich, in his interpretation of the liturgical order of the print, except that Goehr considered the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* as the antiphon to the Magnificat because of the proximity of its text to the Magnificat antiphon *Sancta Maria succurre miseris*.⁴² The other motets he treated as antiphons, noting, however, that *Duo Seraphim* and *Audi coelum* do not belong to the liturgy of Marian feasts. Goehr, like Redlich and Schrade, based his edition on the 1610 print, but he was a noted performer, not a scholar, and his effort to render the music in a modern form proved extremely clumsy. Reductions in note values, frequent changes in metre, extensive added orchestration, missing parts, exchanges of parts, poor continuo realization, and multiple other editorial sins made this effort highly problematic for practical use.⁴³

Despite Schrade's and Goehr's view that the Vespers represented a liturgical and artistic unity, others were still troubled by the fact that none of the five *sacri concentus* texts is strictly in agreement with any liturgical antiphon for a vespers of the Virgin. Denis Stevens, for example, in the preface of his 1961 edition of the Vespers, proclaimed 'Let us state then, quite categorically, that the following texts are not antiphons, nor have they any connection with Vespers of the Blessed Virgin: *Nigra sum*; *Pulchra es*; *Duo Seraphim*; *Audi coelum*; *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*.'⁴⁴ According to Stevens, Monteverdi 'certainly never envisaged

³⁹ Claudio Monteverdi, *Vesperae Beatae Mariae Virginis (Marien-Vesper) 1610* (Wolfenbüttel: Mösel Verlag, 1954). The five psalms and the hymn were also published as separate editions. See the review by Redlich, 'Monteverdi and Schütz in New Editions', *Music Review*, 19 (1958), 73–4.

⁴⁰ Claudio Monteverdi, *Vespro della beata vergine/Marienvesper* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1955). According to Wolters, Claudio Monteverdi: *Vesperae beatae Mariae virginis* (Wolfenbüttel: Mösel Verlag, 1966), 205, Redlich's edition was published in Kassel and Basle by Bärenreiter.

⁴¹ Claudio Monteverdi: *Vespro della Beata Vergine (1610) da concerto, composta [sic] sopra canti fermi* (Vienna: Universal Edition, 1957).

⁴² Ibid., p. iii. Jürgen Jürgens and Andrew Parrott both place the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* in this position in their recordings of the Vespers. See the discussion below of the article by David Blazey, who argues a similar case.

⁴³ See the reviews by Redlich, 'Monteverdi and Schütz in New Editions', 72–3, and Wolfgang Osthoff, 'Claudio Monteverdi: *Vespro della Beata Vergine (1610)*', *Die Musikforschung*, 11 (1958), 380–1; and Denis Stevens's review of a BBC performance from this edition, 'Monteverdi's Vespers', *Musical Times*, 99 (1958), 673.

⁴⁴ Monteverdi *Vespers*, p. v. Stevens excluded these compositions as well as the Magnificat *a 6* from his edition. See also Stevens, 'Where are the Vespers of Yesteryear?', 316–25; and Giuseppe Biella, 'La "Messa" il "Vespro" e i "Sacri Concenti" di Claudio Monteverdi', *Musica sacra*, 2nd ser., 9 (1964), 105–15.

the kind of performance that has become customary in recent years, with psalms and motets reeled off one after the other just as Amadino had printed them'.⁴⁵ Consequently, Stevens omitted these five compositions and supplied for each psalm a plainchant antiphon. In a plainchant service, the tones of the psalms are selected according to the modes of the liturgically appropriate antiphons for that service, but with polyphonic settings of psalms, each psalm represents a single tone and the choirmaster can no longer choose a psalm in the tone that matches the liturgically correct antiphon (see the discussion of this issue in Chapter 2). Stevens, therefore, did the opposite: he chose antiphons in the same modes as the tones of each of the psalms and the Magnificat, indicating that the antiphon was to be repeated after each psalm (but omitting the rubric after the Magnificat). The result, though, is a series of antiphons that do not represent any single liturgical service. Stevens explained the presence of two Magnificats in the print (the Magnificat *a 6* was omitted from his edition) as serving first vespers (on the vigil of a feast) and second vespers (towards the end of the feast-day itself). With regard to Monteverdi's instrumentation, he recommended the substitution of oboes and possibly even clarinets for Monteverdi's cornettos, and the addition of bassoons to the basso continuo.⁴⁶ Critical notes are somewhat sparse; nevertheless, Stevens's edition is accurate and the basso continuo realization is in seventeenth-century style, making his version a significant improvement over earlier editions, if still not wholly satisfactory. Stevens issued a recording based on his edition in 1967.⁴⁷

In contrast to Stevens, Gottfried Wolters published a new edition in 1966 in which all of Monteverdi's compositions following the rubric *Vespro della Beata Vergine* (except the Magnificat *a 6*) were published in the order of the 1610 print.⁴⁸ This edition was a considerable advance over Wolters's earlier edition as well as all other versions. It was based on Monteverdi's print (editors had finally given up using Malipiero as their source) and was the first to provide a detailed critical report. Numerous suggestions for instrumental doubling, for

⁴⁵ *Monteverdi Vespers*, p. vi. Stevens was even more insistent on this point in a contemporaneous article: 'The lengthy cantata-like texts of . . . [the four motets] could never be used as antiphons, and it is unforgivable to pretend that they are.' See '“Monteverdi's Vespers” Verified', *Musical Times*, 102 (1961), 422. The appearance of Stevens's edition and article sparked another acrimonious debate, this time between Redlich and Stevens. See *Musical Times*, 102 (1961), 422, 564–5, 643, and 713. Stevens later accepted the inclusion of the *sacri concentus* in a vesper service on artistic grounds in the liner notes of the 1966 recording by Michel Corboz (New York: Musical Heritage Society, n.d.; see App. D, item 4): 'When we listen to the “Vespers” in the order of the printed editions, we cannot help being struck by the grandiose architectural design, so carefully thought out, which is responsible for this sequence of masterpieces. The judicious alternation of smaller and larger works, the progression of each category independently of the other, the variety in tonality (for we may speak of tonality in the modern sense, rather than of modes); all this goes to show that the “Vespers” are not simply a collection of magnificent pieces, but a great and unified conception—a monument comparable in importance and grandeur with Bach's B minor Mass.'

⁴⁶ *Monteverdi Vespers*, pp. vi–vii. Stevens notes the unavailability of cornettos at that time and considers an unsatisfactory substitute.

⁴⁷ Vanguard VCS-10001/2. See App. D, item 8.

⁴⁸ *Claudio Monteverdi: Vesperae beatae Mariae virginis*.

instrumental ritornellos, and for use of soloists and choir in the psalms, Magnificat, and hymn are given in an appendix rather than encumbering the score itself as in Redlich's and Goehr's editions. Wolters's basso continuo realization is mostly simple in style, according to the precepts of early seventeenth-century continuo practice, except in the few-voiced motets, where it is more elaborate, perhaps overly so. The chief difficulty with Wolters's edition is its reduction of note values in triple metre and the substitution of numerals for mensuration signs that are not only confusing and inconsistent, but sometimes make triple time look duple. Nevertheless, this edition was the best available at the time and has been widely used by performers.

Wolters considered Monteverdi's publication a liturgical work, and the *sacri concentus* as replacements for the plainchant antiphons that would normally follow each psalm. In an appendix to the edition, Walther Lipphardt gave suggested plainchant antiphons to precede each psalm. Since, like Stevens, Lipphardt could not find antiphons from any liturgical service to fit the succession of tones of Monteverdi's psalms and Magnificat, he selected a series of antiphons, mostly derived from the Song of Songs and traditionally associated with Marian feasts or the Common of Virgins. Four of these came from a modern antiphonal, but one was derived from a twelfth-century manuscript antiphoner. As far as he could, Lipphardt matched the modes of these antiphons with the tones of Monteverdi's psalms, but had to concede defeat in two cases where he could find no antiphons with Song of Songs texts in the matching modes.⁴⁹

With the notion of the 1610 Vespers as a complete liturgical unit becoming more widely accepted, Jürgen Jürgens prepared in 1966, the same year as Wolters's edition, the first complete recording of the series of compositions in Monteverdi's print as a liturgical service, omitting only the Magnificat *a 6* as superfluous.⁵⁰ In the notes to this recording, Wolfgang Osthoff hedged on the role of the *sacri concentus*: 'It is not even said [in the print] whether these are to replace the antiphons or to represent "concertante" insertions independent of them. . . . *Duo Seraphim* presents a special problem from this point of view.'⁵¹ Jürgens's recording inserts plainchant antiphons both before and after the psalms, the *sacri concentus* then following after the repeated antiphons. The *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*, however, as a litany, is displaced until after the hymn and versicle, anticipating the Magnificat antiphon *Sancta Maria succurre miseris*.⁵²

⁴⁹ According to Wolters, the first performance of the Vespers with Gregorian antiphons took place on 5 Aug. 1954 as part of the Festliche Tage Junge Musik in St Michael's church in Passau (ibid. 204 n. 3).

⁵⁰ Telefunken SAWT 9501/02-A. See App. D, item 5.

⁵¹ Ibid., liner notes.

⁵² Walter Goehr, as noted above, had already recognized the relationship between the *Sonata* and the Magnificat antiphon. See also n. 42 above.

Osthoff also notes the impossibility of finding liturgically appropriate plainchant antiphons whose modes match the tones of Monteverdi's psalms; therefore the selection was made from antiphons derived from the Song of Songs which do match the tones of the psalms, but not that of the Magnificat.⁵³ After the antiphon to *Lauda Jerusalem*, the plainchant chapter is sung immediately before the hymn, and the versicle is performed after the hymn. Similarly, the plainchant *Benedicamus Domino/Deo gratias* follows the repetition of the Magnificat antiphon and closes the service. Osthoff admits that the series of antiphons 'cannot . . . be ascribed to any particular festival of the Virgin Mary', but paradoxically concludes that 'this self-contained series of antiphons also seems to us to have first made truly clear and understandable the liturgical order and the structure of Monteverdi's Vespers of the Blessed Virgin'.⁵⁴

Until the time of Wolters's second edition and Jürgens's recording, the liturgical issues raised by the Vespers had been examined rather superficially through modern liturgical books. In 1967, the 300th anniversary of Monteverdi's birth, Stephen Bonta published the first thorough account of the vesper liturgy in relation to seventeenth-century vesper publications and explored the liturgical question posed by Monteverdi's five *sacri concentus* on the basis of seventeenth-century sources. His study supported the notion that these pieces were intended as substitutes for the official antiphon texts, which a celebrant could have intoned *sotto voce* while the motets and *Sonata* were being performed.⁵⁵ The crux of Bonta's argument was that once a composer had set a series of vesper psalms in particular tones in *canto figurato*, it became virtually impossible to find antiphons to match these tones, and even if one could, they were liturgically incorrect. According to Bonta, the solution to this problem was to abandon 'both tonal unity and liturgical propriety'.⁵⁶ The missing antiphon at the Magnificat, Bonta suggested, should be supplied by an instrumental composition, according to the suggestion of the contemporary theorist Banchieri.⁵⁷ Banchieri also recommended playing the organ after the *Sicut erat* of a psalm, indicating that repetition of a plainchant antiphon would not have intervened.

⁵³ Despite the derivation of antiphons for both the Wolters edition and the Jürgens recording from the Song of Songs, they have only one antiphon in common.

⁵⁴ Telefunken SAWT 9501/02-A, liner notes. see App. D, item 5.

⁵⁵ Stephen Bonta, 'Liturgical Problems in Monteverdi's Marian Vespers', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 20 (1967), 87–106. Many of Monteverdi's biographers did not concern themselves with the issue of liturgical or artistic unity in the Vespers until after Bonta's article. Denis Arnold, for example, skirted the question in the first edition of *Monteverdi* (1963), only saying of the print: 'Its size and contents suggest that it was a presentation volume, not meant for ordinary practical use' (p. 138). The second edition of 1975 repeated the same sentence, but in response to Bonta's article added at a later point, 'When the motets, psalms, hymn, Sonata and Magnificat are given, as they usually are today, as an entity (and for this there is a strong case to be made out), the total concept appears to inhabit a world of its own' (p. 147).

⁵⁶ 'Liturgical Problems', 96.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.* 98–101. See the quotation from Banchieri in n. 110 below.

Even the *Caeremoniale Episcoporum*, the official book of rules for liturgical celebrations, sanctioned the practice of the organ substituting for the antiphon, as long as the antiphon was recited by one of those officiating.⁵⁸ This point contradicts Jürgens's repetition of the antiphon after each psalm in his recording as well as Stevens's instructions to repeat the antiphon in his edition.

Complaints and admonitions of church officials against the practice of substituting texts offer evidence of the reality of such practices (see further discussion of this issue below and in Chapters 2 and 4). Indeed, Bonta interpreted the large seventeenth-century repertoire of motets and instrumental music as solving the problem of Proper texts in the mass and office by making available music in *canto figurato* for substitution where plainchant no longer fit modally or aesthetically and where *canto figurato* settings of Proper texts would have been too cumbersome and infrequently used to warrant composition. The anomalous Trinitarian text of *Duo Seraphim* did not enter into Bonta's discussion; in fact, he considered the texts of all the *sacri concentus* as appropriate for Marian feasts. With regard to the two Magnificats, Bonta accepted Stevens's suggestion that they were to serve for both first and second vespers.⁵⁹

In the same year Wolfgang Osthoff argued that the 1610 print constituted a complete service, principally on aesthetic grounds.⁶⁰ Osthoff also offered further evidence, in the form of an eyewitness account, of the practice of performing motets and instrumental music between psalms in vesper services. Corroborating evidence was subsequently provided by Thomas D. Culley in his studies of music at the German College in Rome and in Jesuit colleges in other countries.⁶¹ Anthony M. Cummings also uncovered a widespread practice of

⁵⁸ 'Liturgical Problems', 99–100.

⁵⁹ Ibid. 92, 97, 104–5. If the use of substitute texts had become a common practice, justifying viewing Monteverdi's *sacri concentus* as replacements for plainchant antiphons, then it would also seem possible to borrow Gregorian antiphons from other Marian feasts, as both Wolters and Stevens did, whether to provide texts that are Marian in orientation or to match the tones of Monteverdi's psalms and Magnificats.

⁶⁰ 'Unità liturgica e artistica', 319. Osthoff quotes a letter by the German musician Paul Hainlein, who heard vespers on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception, 8 Dec. 1647, in the church of St Francis in Venice: 'Die psalmen seindt gewest: Dixit Dominus, Laudate pueri, Letatus sum, Nisi Dominus, Lauda Jerusalem, auch ein Himnus vor dem Magnificat, hernach Alma redemptoris mater. Aber zwischen jedweter psalm ein Motetten oder Sonata gemacht, darunter ein Bassist und Discantist, welche von Rom eine gesungen, von der Madona, seindt auch wort auß dem 46 psalm genomen worden dieses inhalts, daß sie deß Türcken macht zerstöhren, bögen und schildt zerbrechen, schiff und Galleen verbrennen und seine gantze macht in den abgründt des Meers stürzten wolle.' However, Osthoff argued the unity of the Vespers principally on aesthetic grounds and considered the addition of plainchant antiphons as extraneous intrusions. Guido Pannain, in the same year, also claimed artistic unity for the Vespers. See Guglielmo Barblan, Claudio Gallico, and Guido Pannain, *Claudio Monteverdi* (Turin: Edizioni RAI Radiotelevisione Italiana, 1967), 343–4.

⁶¹ *Jesuits and Music, i: A Study of the Musicians Connected with the German College in Rome during the 17th Century and of their Activities in Northern Europe* (St Louis: St Louis University, 1970), 78 and 85; and id., 'Musical Activity in some Sixteenth Century Jesuit Colleges with Special Reference to the Venerable English College in Rome from 1579 to 1589', *Analecta musicologica*, 19 (1979), 7.

substitutions for liturgical texts in the mass in Italy in the sixteenth century,⁶² and James H. Moore cited documentary evidence of the performance of motets between the psalms at vespers in Venice.⁶³ James Armstrong's study of Giovanni Francesco Anerio's *Antiphonae* of 1613 demonstrated not only that antiphon texts could be rather freely rearranged, substituted, or altered, but also that the modal relationship between antiphon and psalm was considerably loosened, perhaps even eventually dissolved through the *canto figurato* settings of both psalms and antiphons or antiphon substitutes.⁶⁴ Various church decrees attempting to eliminate the interpolation of unauthorized texts and compositions in both the mass and the Divine Office also testify to the frequency of such practices.⁶⁵

The score Jürgen Jürgens had originally prepared for his 1966 recording was eventually published by Universal Edition more than a decade later.⁶⁶ In the preface to this edition Jürgens had evidently changed his mind about the need for plainchant antiphons and the position of the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*. Taking his point of departure from the Bassus Generalis rubric *Vespro della B. Vergine da concerto, composto sopra canti fermi*, he stated unequivocally,

The sequence of the vesper movements in the printed edition follows strictly the liturgical order of a vesper [*sic*], so that we find here additional confirmation of the compositional unity of the 'Vespers'; all alterations in the order must therefore be seen as arbitrary interference with the unity of the work as it was conceived. . . . The concert character of the work is underlined by the fact that in place of the Gregorian antiphony required by the liturgy, groups of soloists are used; their texts are in part antiphonies and in part free invention.⁶⁷

Jürgens's reasoning for this shift of orientation is rooted in the conclusion that the Vespers do not constitute a liturgical service. According to Jürgens,

⁶² 'Toward an Interpretation of the Sixteenth-Century Motet', *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, 34 (1981), 43–59.

⁶³ *Vespers at St Mark's: Music of Alessandro Grandi, Giovanni Rovetta and Francesco Cavalli* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1981), 151–2.

⁶⁴ 'The *Antiphonae, seu sacrae cantiones* (1613) of Giovanni Francesco Anerio: A Liturgical Study', *Analecta musicologica*, 14 (1974), 89–150.

⁶⁵ Bonta quotes a few such decrees in 'Liturgical Problems', 96. Two decrees from 1628 and 1639 warning against substitutions for the correct antiphons are given in English translation in Graham Dixon, 'Agostino Agazzari (1578–after 1640): The Theoretical Writings', *Royal Musical Association Research Chronicle*, 20 (1986–7), 48. On motets as liturgical substitutions see also Culley, *Jesuits and Music*; Gino Stefani, *Musica e religione nell'Italia barocca* (Palermo: S. F. Flaccovio, Editore, 1975); Moore, *Vespers at St Mark's*; Anthony M. Cummings, 'Toward an Interpretation'; and Jerome Roche, *North Italian Church Music in the Age of Monteverdi* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 40–7. For an unusual approach to the polyphonic setting of all five antiphon texts as a single motet, see the discussion of Pietro Maria Marsolo's *Motecta quinque tantum vocibus . . . liber secundus* of 1614 in Chapter 2.

⁶⁶ *Claudio Monteverdi: Vespro della Beata Vergine* (Vienna, 1977). The Universal Edition catalogue number is 16646. See the review of this edition (which also surveys previous editions) by Denis Arnold in *Early Music*, 6 (1978), 463–4; and my review in *Music Library Association Notes*, 37 (1980), 981–3. Universal Edition also published a miniature score version of this edition with abbreviated preface as Philharmonia No. 470.

⁶⁷ *Claudio Monteverdi: Vespro della Beata Vergine*, pp. viii–ix. Jürgens's preface is published in both German and English.

Ever since Monteverdi's 'Vespers' was rediscovered, musicologists and musicians have been trying to establish the liturgical reference of the work, and a series of reconstruction attempts have been published. None of these has arrived at a satisfactory solution; they all come to the conclusion that the 'Vespers' comprise a single sacred work without reference to a fixed liturgy.

For if a liturgical version were in fact the basis for the work, it would be necessary to place a tonally appropriate antiphony before and after each Psalm and before and after the Magnificat, and to omit the solo concerti which in Monteverdi's concept replace the antiphonies.

All such attempts were bound to fail for this reason alone: Monteverdi had chosen a Gregorian canto fermo which had no corresponding liturgical antiphony which would fit in tonally with Monteverdi's psalm tone. It is thus impossible here to adhere to the liturgical rule whereby antiphonies and psalm-tones should correspond—except by using non-liturgical, i.e. transposed, antiphonies—and this much-discussed theory can finally be eliminated.⁶⁸

Jürgens's view of the unity of the series of compositions, therefore, was based on opposite criteria from Bonta's. Whereas Bonta (and Wolters before him) saw the *sacri concentus* as replacements for plainchant antiphons, Jürgens at this time saw the entire collection as extra-liturgical—a churchly concert in which antiphons no longer played a role and the problem of matching the modes of antiphons to the tones of Monteverdi's psalms and Magnificats simply did not exist. His 1977 edition, therefore, presents all of Monteverdi's music except for the Magnificat *a 6* in the order of Amadino's print, without interpolation of plainchant antiphons (or other vesper chants). Jürgens's edition also provides performance practice suggestions and critical notes, but both are deficient in detail, and the score does not distinguish between Monteverdi's original and Jürgens's frequent editorial interventions in terms of rubrics, *colla parte* doubling, *musica ficta*, varying continuo instruments, and shifts between soloists and tutti. Only Jürgens's ornamentation is notated unambiguously as editorial.

Just when it seemed that the liturgical and/or artistic unity of the *Vespro della Beata Vergine* had been broadly accepted, further questions and suggestions for alternative interpretations began to surface. In the liner notes to his 1984 recording of the Monteverdi Vespers, Andrew Parrott, together with Hugh Keyte, argued that the five *sacri concentus* were indeed 'intended to substitute for liturgical movements', but that their order in Amadino's print was confused.⁶⁹ Parrott recorded the motets *Nigra sum*, *Pulchra es*, and *Audi coelum* in the positions they occupy in the print after the psalms *Dixit Dominus*, *Laudate pueri*, and *Nisi Dominus*. However, he displaced the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* after the Magnificat as an antiphon substitute for the canticle (Monteverdi did not provide any composition at this point in the print); and *Duo Seraphim*, which,

⁶⁸ Claudio Monteverdi: *Vespro della Beata Vergine*, p. ix. Jürgens issued a second recording of the Vespers, Ambitus AMB 383826, based on this thesis in 1989. The performance presents the first thirteen compositions in their order in the print (omitting the Magnificat *a 6*), and eschews all plainchant additions. See App. D, item 29 and the discussion of this recording below. For a related view of the Vespers as non-liturgical, see the discussion of the article by Helmut Huckle below.

⁶⁹ EMI Angel DSB-3963, 1984. See App. D, item 21.

according to Parrott and Keyte, 'cannot be an Antiphon substitute at a Marian vespers, since it is Trinitarian in reference', was moved to near the end of the service as a substitute for the *Deo gratias*. Parrott then placed a *Sonata a 2* by Giovanni Paolo Cima after *Laetatus sum* in the original position of *Duo Seraphim* and a *Sonata a 3* by Cima after *Lauda Jerusalem* in the original position of the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*. Parrott also added Monteverdi's 1624 setting of the *Salve Regina* to the end of the service, since liturgical practice required a performance of one of the seasonal Marian antiphons after vespers if compline were not to follow.⁷⁰ In addition to the polyphonic items, Parrott provided plainchant antiphons from the Feast of the Assumption before each psalm and the Magnificat, as well as all of the other liturgical chants that complete a vesper service on this feast-day (the chapter, prayers, versicle, and responses).⁷¹ Parrott, therefore, accepted the notion that all of the compositions in Monteverdi's print, other than the *Missa in illo tempore*, furnished music for a single vesper service, but a complete liturgical service required a different order from the print itself as well as additional music. Noting the *chiavette* notation of *Lauda Jerusalem* and the Magnificat, Parrott transposed these works down a fourth.⁷²

Also in 1984, Helmut Hücke published a paper, originally read in 1981, in which he argued that there is no such thing as a 'Marian vespers' in the liturgy, and that Monteverdi's collection was never intended as a liturgical service, but rather as 'non-liturgical, princely devotional music in a quasi-liturgical form'.⁷³ Particularly bothersome to Hücke were the non-liturgical texts of the five *sacri concentus* and the absence of a relationship between *Duo Seraphim* and the Marian liturgy. However, I fail to see the difference between a 'Marian vespers' (an invalid concept for Hücke) and Monteverdi's own rubric *Vespro della Beata Vergine* or the rubrics *De Beata Vergine* or *Vespro della Madonna* found in other prints (see Chapters 3 and 4). I also see no incompatibility in Monteverdi's print serving for both a liturgical service and a source of devotional music. Much more interesting in Hücke's article was an interpretation of the texts of many of the compositions from the collection in terms of Renaissance biblical exegesis.

In 1986, Bernhard Meier contributed to the argument in favour of a 'unified' Vespers on the basis of his analysis of the modes of the four motets (excluding the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*). According to Meier, the discovery of the modal basis of the motets places them on the same tonal basis as the psalms, hymns, and

⁷⁰ For the text of the relevant rubric from a contemporary breviary, see Ch. 2 n. 3.

⁷¹ James Moore has documented the practice at St Mark's of still performing the plainchant antiphon before the psalm when organ music substituted for the antiphon after the psalm. See *Vespers at St Mark's*, 176.

⁷² See the discussion of *chiavette* and their role in signalling transposition in Ch. 17. Parrott defended his transcriptions in 'Transposition in Monteverdi's Vespers of 1610: An Aberration Defended', *Early Music*, 12 (1984), 490–516.

⁷³ 'Die fälschlich so genannte "Marien"-Vesper', 298.

Magnificats with their Gregorian cantus fermi.⁷⁴ Meier's case is weak, however, since all of Monteverdi's music of this period, including the secular music, is rooted to some degree in the modal system he inherited.

In the next year, Jürgen Jürgens, who had recorded the first version of the Vespers as a reconstructed liturgy in 1966, complete with antiphons and displaced *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* (see the discussion above), recorded another performance from an exactly opposite point of view.⁷⁵ This time Jürgens performed only the items in Monteverdi's print, in their original order, with no chant other than the versicle *Deus in adjutorium*. In his liner notes Jürgens railed with the zeal of a convert against any interpolations or alterations in the succession of pieces in Monteverdi's print, without, however, mentioning his earlier recording and its vastly different perspective.⁷⁶

A new and very interesting proposal regarding the origin of the Vespers was made by Graham Dixon in 1987, suggesting that most of the music of Monteverdi's 1610 print was not initially intended for a feast of the BVM at all, but rather for the feast of Santa Barbara, celebrated in the Gonzaga ducal church of Santa Barbara.⁷⁷ The ducal church (also known as a basilica) has its own rite, compiled in the late sixteenth century and sanctioned by the Pope, which differs in many details from the Roman rite.⁷⁸ One of these differences lies in the cycle of psalms for various feasts. The psalms for the Common of Virgins, which in the Roman rite are the same as for all Marian feasts, are in the rite of Santa Barbara *Dixit Dominus*, *Confitebor tibi*, *Beatus vir*, *Laudate pueri*, and *Lauda anima*.⁷⁹ Each of the Marian feasts from the Proper of the Time, however, either

⁷⁴ 'Zur Tonart der Concertato-Motetten in Monteverdis Marienvesper', Ludwig Finscher, ed., *Claudio Monteverdi. Festschrift Reinhold Hammerstein zum 70. Geburtstag* (Laaber: Laaber Verlag, 1986), 366.

⁷⁵ See n. 68 above.

⁷⁶ See Jürgens's arguments against liturgical unity in the preface to his 1977 edition of the Vespers, quoted above. Jürgens's preface and liner notes are polemical in tone, based on rather garbled scholarship and *non sequiturs*. Nevertheless, some of his conclusions are probably correct. See my own discussion of the order of compositions in Monteverdi's print below.

⁷⁷ 'Monteverdi's Vespers of 1610: "della Beata Vergine"?', *Early Music*, 15 (1987), 386–9.

⁷⁸ For a brief account of Guglielmo Gonzaga's persistent efforts to establish his own liturgy see Pierre M. Tagmann, 'The Palace Church of Santa Barbara in Mantua, and Monteverdi's Relationship to its Liturgy', in Burton L. Karson, ed., *Festival Essays for Pauline Alderman* (Provo, Ut.: Brigham Young University Press, 1976), 54–5. More detailed is the account in Iain Fenlon, *Music and Patronage in Sixteenth-Century Mantua*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), i. 79–117. Differences between the rite of Santa Barbara and the Roman rite have been studied by Paola Besutti in 'Ceremoniale e repertorio liturgico della basilica palatina di Santa Barbara in Mantova' (thesis, University of Parma, 1984–5); ead., 'Catalogo tematico delle monodie liturgiche della Basilica Palatina di S. Barbara in Mantova', *Le fonti musicali in Italia*, 2 (1988), 53–66; ead., 'Un tardivo repertorio di canto piano', *Tradizione manoscritta e pratica musicale: I codici di Puglia* (Florence: Leo S. Olshcki, 1990), 87–97; ead., 'Testi e molodie per la liturgia della Cappella di Santa Barbara in Mantova', *Atti del XIV congresso della Società internazionale di musicologia* (Turin: E.D.T. Edizioni, 1990), 68–77; ead., 'Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina e la liturgia mantovana', *Atti del II Convegno internazionale di studi palestriniani* (Palestrina: Fondazione G. Pierluigi da Palestrina, 1991), 157–64.

⁷⁹ Santa Barbara Breviary, Prima Pars, fo. 221^v, Pars Secunda, fo. 139^v.

requires the same psalms as the Roman rite for both first and second vespers, or has a separate set for first vespers: *Dixit Dominus*, *Confitebor tibi*, *Beatus vir*, *Laudate pueri*, and *Laudate Dominum*.⁸⁰ This latter set corresponds to the *cursus* common to many vespers of male saints in the Roman rite (but also employed for first vespers on the feasts of St Agnes and St Agatha—see the psalm *cursus* in Appendix A). For the feast of Santa Barbara herself, annually celebrated in the ducal church with considerable ceremony, the psalms for first vespers are this latter *cursus*, while those for second vespers are the same as those for Marian feasts and the Common of Virgins in the Roman rite—the same *cursus* found in Monteverdi's 1610 Vespers.⁸¹ The other major feast of the ducal chapel's patron saint, the Feast of the Translation of Santa Barbara on 22 April, requires the same psalms for first and second vespers as the feast of Santa Barbara itself.⁸²

Therefore, as Dixon argues, the psalm *cursus* of Monteverdi's Vespers need not originally have been planned for a Feast of the BVM, but rather could have originated in connection with second vespers on either of the two feasts of Santa Barbara, 22 April or 4 December. As he suggests, such an elaborate ceremony on the 4 December feast might have been performed in 1607 or 1609.⁸³ December of 1608 seems out of the question, since Monteverdi was at his parents' home in Cremona seeking release from the ducal service (see below).⁸⁴ 1609 is the more likely possibility, since Monteverdi was completely preoccupied during the autumn of 1607 and the spring of 1608 with preparations for the opera *Arianna* and *Il ballo delle ingrate* in connection with the marriage of Margherita of Savoy and Prince Francesco, which, after many delays, took place on 24 May 1608 (see below).⁸⁵ It seems unlikely that he would have had time to complete an elaborate vesper service in the same period, and Monteverdi's and

⁸⁰ The Marian feasts in the Santa Barbara Breviary are the Conception of the BVM on 8 Dec., the Purification of the BVM on 2 Feb., the Annunciation of the BVM on 25 Mar., the Visitation of the BVM on 2 July, Holy Mary of the Snow on 5 Aug., the Assumption of the BVM on 15 Aug., and the Nativity of the BVM on 8 Sept. Of these, the Purification, the Annunciation, the Assumption, and the Nativity are all listed as *duplex maior*. Feasts with the *Dixit–Laudate Dominum cursus* for first vespers are the Visitation, the Assumption, and the Nativity. I am grateful to Paola Besutti for checking my own notes against the Santa Barbara Breviary. Tagmann, in 'The Palace Church of Santa Barbara', 57, is confused in his list of psalms for Marian feasts. Knud Jeppeson, in 'Monteverdi, Kapellmeister am S.ta Barbara?', in Raffaello Monterosso, ed., *Claudio Monteverdi e il suo tempo* (Verona: Stamperia Valdonega, 1969), 312–13, takes the first vespers *cursus* of the Visitation as his basis of comparison with the Monteverdi Vespers, thereby obscuring the identity between the Santa Barbara breviary and the Roman rite in the *cursus* for second vespers and first vespers on most Marian feasts.

⁸¹ Breviary of Santa Barbara, Pars Prima, fos. 223–5.

⁸² *Ibid.*, fo. 264^v.

⁸³ 'Monteverdi's Vespers of 1610', 387.

⁸⁴ See Domenico De'Paoli, *Claudio Monteverdi: Lettere, dediche e prefazioni* (Rome: Edizioni de Santis, 1973), 33–7, and Eva Lax, *Claudio Monteverdi: Lettere* (Florence: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1994), 20–4. Eng. trans. in Denis Stevens, *The Letters of Claudio Monteverdi* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 57–61.

⁸⁵ The complex circumstances surrounding this wedding are described in Stuart Reiner, 'La vag' Angioletta (and Others)', *Analecta musicologica*, 14 (1974), 26–88.

his father's letters to Duke Vincenzo and the duchess describing his pressures and unhappiness during this time mention nothing about the added pressure of a large liturgical work.⁸⁶

A key factor in Dixon's argument is the presumed unsuitability of *Duo Seraphim* for vespers of the Virgin. However, a Trinitarian motet was perfectly appropriate for Santa Barbara, who was martyred for her espousal of the Trinity; indeed, the fourth and fifth psalm antiphons for this feast make reference to her devotion to the Trinity.⁸⁷

Further strengthening the association of at least part of the 1610 Vespers with the ducal church is Paola Besutti's demonstration that the form of the *Ave maris stella* chant used by Monteverdi in his setting of the hymn is closer to the version from the rite of Santa Barbara and to that used by the former *maestro di cappella* of Santa Barbara, Giaches de Wert, than it is to contemporaneous Roman rite versions.⁸⁸ While there are differences between Monteverdi's cantus firmus and its text underlay on the one hand and those of the Santa Barbara chant and Wert's cantus firmus on the other, Wert's is also not identical to the Santa Barbara chant, and two important structural identities differentiate all three versions from contemporaneous Roman chants. Taking Dixon's thesis as her point of departure, Besutti speculates that Monteverdi may have originally intended his Vesper music as a means of applying to Vincenzo Gonzaga for the post of *maestro di cappella* in Santa Barbara, which became vacant at the end of 1608 or the beginning of 1609 with the death of Giovanni Gastoldi.⁸⁹ Gastoldi had been ill for quite some time and his demise was anticipated. In fact, Monteverdi's father's letter to the duke of 9 November 1608, lamenting Claudio's exhaustion, ill health, and poverty (Claudio was at home in Cremona at the time), asked for his son's release from ducal service, or at least, for service limited 'to the church' [Santa Barbara].⁹⁰ However, Antonio Tarone temporarily occupied the

⁸⁶ Monteverdi's father's letters are published in Fabbri, *Monteverdi*, 148–50; Eng. edn., 100–2.

⁸⁷ Breviary of Santa Barbara, Pars Prima, fo. 223^r. For the texts of these antiphons, see Dixon, 'Monteverdi's Vespers of 1610', 387. A brief account of the legend of Santa Barbara and the multiple reasons why Guglielmo may have chosen this saint are given in Fenlon, *Music and Patronage*, i, 100–1.

⁸⁸ 'Ricorrenze motiviche, canti dati e "cantus firmus" nella produzione sacra di Claudio Monteverdi', paper delivered at Convegno, Claudio Monteverdi: Studi e prospettive, Mantua, 21–4 Oct. 1993, published as "'Ave Maris Stella": la tradizione mantovana nuovamente posta in musica da Monteverdi' in Paola Besutti, Teresa M. Gialdroni, and Rodolfo Baroncini eds., *Claudio Monteverdi: Studi e prospettive, Atti del Convegno (Mantova, 21–24 ottobre 1993)* (Florence: Olschki, 1998), 57–78. The basis of Besutti's argument is not only the melodic similarity between Monteverdi's and the Santa Barbara version, but also the peculiar similarities of text underlay. Jeppeson had argued the opposite, but was mistaken in a portion of his comparison between the Santa Barbara chant and Monteverdi's cantus firmus. See 'Monteverdi, Kapellmeister an S.ta Barbara?', 315.

⁸⁹ Liner notes to a 1987 recording, Harmonia Mundi France 901247.48; see App. D, item 24. According to Pierre Tagmann, 'La cappella dei maestri cantori della basilica palatina di Santa Barbara a Mantova (1565–1630): Nuovo materiale scoperto negli archivi mantovani', *Civiltà mantovana*, 4 (1969–70), 380, Gastoldi was last mentioned in the archives as *maestro di cappella* on 3 Jan. 1609.

⁹⁰ Baldassare Monteverdi's letter is reproduced in Fabbri, *Monteverdi* (1985), 149–50.

position until April 1609, when Stefano Nascimbeni was appointed *maestro di cappella*.⁹¹

Circumstantial evidence also suggests an association of at least some of the music in the 1610 print with the ducal church. Dixon connects the adherence to plainchant *cantus firmi* in Monteverdi's psalms and Magnificats with the conservative character of the liturgical practices fostered by Guglielmo Gonzaga in establishing the rite of Santa Barbara. Gastoldi, *maestro di cappella* at Santa Barbara from 1592 to early in 1609, occasionally used a *cantus firmus* in his Vesper psalm settings and often composed in a very conservative, largely homophonic, style.⁹² As Dixon remarks, 'The style which Monteverdi adopts in the Vespers psalms is a compromise between the new compositional tendencies (seen in *Orfeo*) and the traditional chant practice. Such a fusion of idioms would have allowed him to use his most up-to-date techniques in composing for the basilica, while not endangering the traditional ethos of the liturgy there.'⁹³

Dixon similarly sees Monteverdi's use of the toccata from *L'Orfeo* in the Vespers response *Domine ad adjuvandum* as also connecting the 1610 print with the ducal church:

The scoring of the toccata in *Orfeo* for 'Un Clarino con tre trombe sordine' strongly suggests that this piece must have had a particular ceremonial role in the context of the Mantuan court. The designations 'clarino' and 'trombe' are only exceptionally found in art music of this period, and the use of mutes suggests that these are outdoor instruments being allowed inside for a particular purpose. Monteverdi is unlikely to have taken a piece with a particular political connotation for the Gonzaga, and used it in a seemingly haphazard way outside court.⁹⁴

Additionally, the litany *Sancta Maria ora pro nobis* appears in other polyphonic contexts, in one case a motet with the name *Sancte Marce* and in another with *Sancta N.*, the abbreviation standing for *nome*, indicating that the name of any saint may be inserted.⁹⁵ Thus, the original form of the text of this piece could have been *Sancta Barbara ora pro nobis*, as Dixon surmises, perhaps requiring slight alterations in the rhythm of the published setting.⁹⁶

The two texts *Nigra sum* and *Pulchra es*, while long associated with the BVM, might also have been applicable to other female saints. Only *Audi coelum* specifically refers to and names Mary on several occasions; her name is integral to the construction of the text and not subject to substitution.⁹⁷ *Audi coelum*, therefore, must have been composed either for a Marian feast or as devotional music for

⁹¹ Tagmann, 'La cappella dei maestri', 381.

⁹² See Ch. 4. for brief discussions of some of Gastoldi's psalms and Magnificats. Fenlon also comments on the conservative nature of the music for the ducal chapel; see *Music and Patronage*, i. 117.

⁹³ 'Monteverdi's Vespers of 1610', 388.

⁹⁴ Ibid. See the discussion of trumpet mutes and their effect on pitch in Ch. 6 below.

⁹⁵ See the discussion of these pieces in Ch. 4.

⁹⁶ 'Monteverdi's Vespers of 1610', 387.

⁹⁷ See the discussion of *Audi coelum* in Ch. 10.

the court. Similarly, the hymn *Ave maris stella* is 'proper' to feasts of the BVM; the vesper hymn for the two feasts of Santa Barbara is *Exultet celebres virginis inclytae*.⁹⁸ Nevertheless, as mentioned above, the version of the *Ave maris stella* chant used by Monteverdi seemingly derives from the rite of Santa Barbara, so that the hymn was probably composed for a Marian vespers of some kind for the ducal chapel. In fact, the church of Santa Barbara had a separate altar to the Virgin, so it is likely that there would have been numerous solemn celebrations of Marian feasts in the ducal church.⁹⁹

That instruments were used in the ducal church on the feast of Santa Barbara is demonstrated by the dedication of the *Apparato musicale* of 1613 (RISM F1813) by Amante Franzoni, *maestro di cappella* in the ducal church from some time in 1612. In this dedication Franzoni refers to his mass, which contains instrumental music, as 'solemnly sung on that day' [the feast of Santa Barbara in 1612].¹⁰⁰ The *Apparato musicale* also contains a setting of *Duo Seraphim* and a version of the litany *Sancta Maria ora pro nobis*, the latter entitled Concerto and set for soprano solo accompanied by four trombones.¹⁰¹ The appearance of these two compositions in a print expressly connected with the church of Santa Barbara suggests that Monteverdi's settings of the same texts may similarly have been associated with the ducal chapel, though not necessarily with the Feast of Santa Barbara itself.¹⁰²

Dixon's hypothesis is plausible, for it would not have been necessary for most of the music of the 1610 print to have originated in connection with a Marian feast. Moreover, music originally for separate services could have been assembled by Monteverdi into the 1610 publication under the rubric *Vespro della Beata Vergine*. Dixon's assumptions at least provide an explanation for the inclusion of the motet *Duo Seraphim* in the 1610 print, without, however, resolving the question of the relationship of its Trinitarian text to Marian Vespers.

A recording based on Dixon's proposal, performed by 'The Sixteen' under the direction of Harry Christophers, was issued in 1988.¹⁰³ This reconstruction of second vespers on the feast of Santa Barbara inserts the appropriate plain-

⁹⁸ Santa Barbara Breviary, Pars Prima, fo. 223^r.

⁹⁹ Besutti, 'Ceremoniale e repertorio liturgico', 16. Until the construction of the church of Santa Barbara, the Gonzaga family chapel in the cathedral was located in the chapel of Santa Maria dei Voti. See Fenlon, *Music and Patronage*, i. 23.

¹⁰⁰ 'la Messa solenemente in detto giorno cantata'.

¹⁰¹ See the discussion of these pieces in Ch. 4.

¹⁰² While Franzoni is explicit in the dedication about the mass being performed on the feast of Santa Barbara, in reference to the motets of the collection he merely says that they were added to the mass: *pregato ancor da particolari amici, di darla [the mass] alle stampe accompagnata da quei Concerti*. Whether or not the *concerti* originated in connection with the 1612 feast of Santa Barbara, they likely were associated with the ducal church simply by virtue of Franzoni's position as *maestro di cappella* there. See also Graham Dixon, '“Behold our Affliction”: Celebration and Supplication in the Gonzaga Household', *Early Music*, 24 (1996), 250–61.

¹⁰³ Monteverdi: *Second Vespers for the Feast of Santa Barbara*, Hyperion CDA 66311/2. See App. D, item 26.

chant antiphons from the Santa Barbara Breviary before each of Monteverdi's psalms as well as the Magnificat, but reorders Monteverdi's five *sacri concentus*. *Pulchra es* is shifted from its position after *Laudate pueri* in Monteverdi's print to follow *Dixit Dominus* in the recording. Similarly, *Nigra sum* is placed after *Laetatus sum*, the position originally occupied by *Duo Seraphim*. The apparent rationale for this is the role of *Nigra sum* as the third antiphon (for the psalm *Laetatus sum*) in the Common of the BVM.¹⁰⁴ *Duo Seraphim* is shifted from its original position after *Laetatus sum* to follow the final psalm, *Lauda Jerusalem*, and *Audi coelum*, originally positioned after *Nisi Dominus*, is displaced to near the end of the service, substituting for the Advent Marian antiphon that would have been sung if vespers concluded the day's services. The *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria [Barbara]* appears at the very end, after the final prayer, presumably as the litany that was often sung at the end of vesper services (see below). In lieu of the displaced *sacri concentus*, instrumental sonatas from a manuscript compiled by Giovanni Amigoni, a Mantuan musician, are inserted after *Laudate pueri* and *Nisi Dominus*. A motet to Santa Barbara, *Gaude Barbara* by Palestrina, is also added after the post-Magnificat prayers, in accordance with the common sixteenth- and seventeenth-century practice of performing a motet after the Magnificat.¹⁰⁵ The hymn for the Feast of Santa Barbara is presented in plainchant, and other chants completing the service are also included, such as the chapter, blessing, prayers, versicles, and responses. Since *Ave maris stella* has no part in a vespers of Santa Barbara, the hymn is added at the end of the recording in order to present 'the complete 1610 Vespers music'.¹⁰⁶

David A. Blazey, whose dissertation studies the Litany in Italy in the seventeenth century,¹⁰⁷ accepts the idea that Monteverdi's four motets are to serve as antiphon substitutes in the Vespers, but sees a different role for the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*.¹⁰⁸ He demonstrates the close relationship between the litany text *Sancta Maria ora pro nobis* and the Litany of Loreto on the one hand and the Magnificat antiphon for feasts of the BVM, *Sancta Maria succurre miseris*, on the other.¹⁰⁹ Blazey also cites Banchieri's suggestion that an organist should play a

¹⁰⁴ The antiphons for the Common of the BVM in modern liturgical books are derived from the 16th- and 17th-century feast of Holy Mary of the Snow. *Nigra sum* appears as the third antiphon for this feast in the Santa Barbara Breviary (Pars Secunda, fo. 180^v).

¹⁰⁵ See e.g. 'Culley, Jesuits and Music', 81–2.

¹⁰⁶ Hyperion CDA66311/2 liner notes. The 1610 print is not complete, however, for the Magnificat *a 6* is not included. Dixon's hypothesis can lead to a number of different reconstructions, all of which are in some sense arbitrary; only one of these could be chosen for the recording. See my review of this recording in *Early Music*, 17 (1989), 429–35. The music is listed in order in App. D, item 26.

¹⁰⁷ 'The Litany in Seventeenth-Century Italy', 2 vols. (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Durham, 1990).

¹⁰⁸ Blazey, 'The Litany', i. 241–9; id., 'A Liturgical Role for Monteverdi's *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*', *Early Music*, 18 (1989), 175–82.

¹⁰⁹ This is the Magnificat antiphon for second vespers on the feast of Holy Mary of the Snow in the Santa Barbara Breviary (Pars Secunda, fo. 180^v), as well as in the Roman breviary. The liturgy of this feast became the liturgy of the Common of the BVM as early as the 17th century. Monteverdi

'*Franzesa Musicale*, or something else if he likes' after the Magnificat.¹¹⁰ Similarly, Giovanni Battista Fasolo in 1645 gave instructions for short organ pieces called *fughe sopra l'obbligo* as substitutes for the Magnificat antiphon.¹¹¹ Blazey notes that Monteverdi's and other similar sonatas are principally instrumental in character, while their employment of 'the melodic formula of the litany as used in the ostinatos is closely associated with the text of the Magnificat antiphon "Sancta Maria succurre miseris"'.¹¹² Blazey also calls attention to the relationship in character between the *Sonata* with its obbligato instruments and the Magnificat *a 7*, which relies heavily on obbligato instruments.¹¹³ He therefore concludes that the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* was intended as an antiphon substitute for the repeat of the antiphon after the Magnificat rather than for the psalm *Lauda Jerusalem*. This hypothesis also places the *Sonata* at the end of the service, not only in the position where instrumental music was often performed, but also in the position where litanies were sometimes sung in the seventeenth century. To account for the fact that his interpretation renders the position of the *Sonata* in the Amadino print out of liturgical order, Blazey suggests that Amadino merely interspersed the *sacri concentus* between the psalms in ascending order of number of parts, thereby giving them an arbitrary ordering from the standpoint of their position in a liturgical service.¹¹⁴

Blazey's hypothesis is also plausible, though his assumption about the ordering of the *sacri concentus* is troubling. As with the reordering of the *sacri concentus* in the reconstructions of Parrott and Dixon, Blazey's hypothesis requires us to assume that Amadino made some kind of liturgical error in his highly unusual placement of the motets and the *Sonata* after each of the psalms (see below for further discussion of Amadino's placement of the *sacri concentus*). Yet the one piece of hard evidence we have of Monteverdi's intentions is just this ordering. It may be in error, but there is no evidence that the ordering is incorrect or arbitrary, and each of these hypotheses requires us to assume so. Indeed, the difficulties scholars have had in explaining the role of the Trinitarian text of *Duo*

himself published a setting of this Magnificat antiphon in 1627. On the relationship between the antiphon and the Litany of Loreto, see Blazey, 'The Litany', i. 238–44.

¹¹⁰ Quoted in Blazey, 'A Liturgical Role', 178: 'Doppo il Magnificat suonasi una Franzesa Musicale, ò altro se piace'. Banchieri also provided four capriccios to play after the Magnificat in the 1605 edition of *L'organo suonarino*.

¹¹¹ Blazey, 'A Liturgical Role', 178. Fasolo's *Annuale* was previously mentioned in Bonta, 'Liturgical Problems', 99–100.

¹¹² 'A Liturgical Role', 178–9.

¹¹³ Ibid. 179–80. In drawing this relationship, Blazey does not take into consideration the Magnificat *a 6*, which is without obbligato instruments.

¹¹⁴ 'The Litany', i. 21, 55–7, 61–8, 72, 78, 102–6, 108; id., 'A Liturgical Role', 180–1. See also Jerome Roche, 'Musica diversa di Compierà: Compline and its Music in Seventeenth-Century Italy', *Proceedings of the Royal Musical Association*, 109 (1982–3), 63; and Colleen Reardon, *Agostino Agazzari and Music at Siena Cathedral, 1597–1641* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 43 n. 38, 69–70. The most common roles for the litany were in processions, on Saturdays, and after Compline. See Blazey, 'The Litany', ch. 2.

Seraphim or the unusual character of the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* with regard to the other motets have prompted some scholars to seek hypothetical solutions other than the possibility that Amadino actually printed the *sacri concentus* in their intended relationship to the psalms. While the solutions proposed by Parrott, Dixon, and Blazey are plausible and must be given serious consideration, it is also possible that they are solutions to a non-existent problem. It may be that we simply do not understand how freely non-liturgical texts may have been interpolated into liturgical services, or there may have been other reasons unknown to us for Monteverdi including a setting of *Duo Seraphim* in a vespers of the BVM and the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* as an antiphon substitute for *Lauda Jerusalem*. I am more reluctant than Parrott, Dixon, and Blazey to ignore the available hard evidence—the succession of pieces in Amadino’s print—in favour of solutions to what may be problems of our understanding rather than of Monteverdi’s liturgical intentions. For seventeenth-century musicians, the order of pieces in his Vespers may have posed no problem at all.

A few other publications from the first third of the seventeenth century are organized in ways tending to support the assumption that Monteverdi’s *sacri concentus* were meant to serve as antiphon substitutes. Three such prints are discussed in some detail in Chapter 4. The earliest is Giovanni Battista Fergusio’s *Motetti e dialogi per concertar a una sino à nove voci* of 1612, in which there are four sets of six motets, each set followed by a Magnificat. This unique grouping, not seen in any other print of the period, suggests six antiphon substitutes for the psalms and Magnificat of a vesper service, followed by the Magnificat itself. A slightly later print, Paolo Agostini’s *Salmi della Madonna* of 1619, contains multiple settings of each of the five psalms of the Marian *cursus*, each psalm setting followed by a motet.¹¹⁵ One of the motets in each group associated with a single psalm text is labelled *antifona prima*, *antifona seconda*, and so on. These *antifone* are polyphonic settings of the liturgically correct antiphon texts from the feast of Holy Mary of the Snow, in other words, the Common of the BVM, while the texts of most of the other motets, apparently serving the same function in relation to the psalms as the *antifone*, are not liturgical antiphons at all. A third publication, Leandro Gallerano’s *Messa e Salmi concertati* of 1629, has a short motet preceding one setting of *Dixit Dominus* and another preceding one setting of the Magnificat. Each of these motets is described in the table of contents as an *Introduzione*. These motets may well have been intended as substitutes for the plainchant antiphons; they each appear *before* the liturgical item rather than afterwards, as seems normally to have been the case.¹¹⁶ Stephen Bonta had

¹¹⁵ See a list of the contents of this print in Ch. 4.

¹¹⁶ For a discussion of the practice in Venice, see Moore, *Vespers at St Mark’s*, 175–7. Some of the contemporary references speak of a motet or instrumental piece between the psalms, thereby failing to connect the interpolated composition specifically to the psalm before or the one after.

already pointed out that Giovanni Battista Fasolo's *Annuale* of 1645 provides instrumental pieces *loco antiphonae post Magnificat* (in place of the antiphon after the Magnificat).¹¹⁷ Indeed, many prints of vesper music in the seventeenth century include one or more instrumental pieces at the end. Other evidence of motets substituting for antiphons in vespers is described in Chapters 2 and 4.

After the publication of Jürgens's edition of the Vespers in 1977, no further editions appeared until the mid-1980s. The first of these was by Clifford Bartlett in 1986, originally prepared for the recording by Andrew Parrott (see above) and based on Malipiero and Wolters.¹¹⁸ This version included downward transposition by a fourth of *Lauda Jerusalem* and the Magnificat *a* 7, but omitted the Magnificat *a* 6. Bartlett subsequently issued another edition in 1990, produced from a computer, also omitting the Magnificat *a* 6 but presenting the remaining pieces in the same order as the 1610 print.¹¹⁹ The edition contains critical notes, but does not provide a realization of the Bassus Generalis; basso continuo figures are supplied instead. *Lauda Jerusalem* and the Magnificat *a* 7 are transposed down a fourth, but the advantage of an edition produced on the computer is that transposition to any pitch level can be readily accomplished upon request for any of the compositions.¹²⁰ Bartlett has made the Magnificat *a* 6 separately available in a computer-produced score, thereby providing, for the first time since Malipiero, the complete vesper music of the 1610 print.

Bartlett has also made available a liturgical guide, called a 'work in progress', as a companion to the edition. The guide usefully reproduces the rubrics, together with English translations, for all of the office hours except compline from the 1604 edition of the *Directorium chori* of Giovanni Guidetto.¹²¹ The liturgical guide additionally contains antiphons for the principal Marian feasts throughout the year (including Holy Mary of the Snow) for those who wish to perform the antiphons before each psalm and the Magnificat. Bartlett's approach to the antiphons, however, is different from that of Wolters and Stevens, both of whom sought Marian texts in modes matching as closely as possible the tones of Monteverdi's psalms and Magnificat, but in doing so violated the liturgical appropriateness of the antiphons. Bartlett, by contrast, presents the liturgically correct antiphons for each feast, but many of them are transposed to match their psalms. What 'match' means, however, is problematic, for the ver-

¹¹⁷ 'Liturgical Problems', 99–100.

¹¹⁸ *Monteverdi, Vespro della Beata Vergine* (Huntingdon, Cambs.: King's Music, 1986).

¹¹⁹ *Monteverdi, Vespro della Beata Vergine* (Huntingdon, Cambs.: King's Music, 1990). See the brief comments in the review by Paul McCreesh, 'Monteverdi Vespers: Three New Editions', *Early Music*, 23 (1995), 326.

¹²⁰ See Ch. 17.

¹²¹ *Monteverdi Vespers (1610): Guide to Liturgical Context* (Huntingdon, Cambs.: King's Music, 1989). Bartlett refers to the *Guide* as 'work in progress, not a finished document'. The source for Bartlett's rubrics is Ioanne Guidetto, *Directorium chori ad usum omnium ecclesiarum cathedralium, & collegiatarum* (Rome: Stephanum Paulinum, 1604).

sions of antiphons given in some cases conclude with the opening note of the psalm tone cantus firmus, in other cases terminate with the same note as the final of the psalm or Magnificat, in yet others end a fifth above the final of the psalm or Magnificat, in still others end with the final of the transposed Magnificat (down a fourth), and in several cases do not match at all.¹²²

The Monteverdi year of 1993 (the 350th anniversary of his death) stimulated multiple efforts at producing new editions of the Vespers. A facsimile of the 1610 print based on the Bologna copy was issued in 1992 with a very brief introduction by Grreta Haenen.¹²³ A study score by Jerome Roche was published in 1994¹²⁴ and a revised version of Denis Stevens's 1961 edition also appeared in the same year.¹²⁵ Roche's score is the first since Malipiero to include all fourteen compositions within a single edition. In addition to a preface briefly addressing the principal issues surrounding the Vespers, Roche provides critical notes, texts, and translations in a separate appendix, and a liturgical appendix with the vesper liturgies, including untransposed plainchant antiphons for the Common of the BVM and the feast of the Assumption of the BVM. Stevens, in his revised edition, adds the motets he had omitted in 1961, but retains many of the errors of the earlier edition, retains its modern instrumentation, divides *Nigra sum* into a dialogue for two voices, adds two editorial parts to the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*, and ignores much of the research on the Vespers accomplished since 1961.¹²⁶

My own edition published by Oxford University Press serves as companion to the present volume and provides the complete music, with complete critical notes, plainchant antiphons, and original texts with English translations. *Lauda Jerusalem* and the two Magnificats are given both in their original, untransposed notation as well as transposed down a fourth. The complete Bassus Generalis is also included in its original open score format.

Since 1987, a number of new recordings of the Monteverdi Vespers have appeared aside from the *Second Vespers for the feast of Santa Barbara* by Harry Christophers discussed above. It is impossible in this space to discuss them in detail and the reader is referred to the discography, Appendix D, for a list and descriptions of these recordings. I will note here only a few salient characteristics.

Except for the Christophers recording, these recent efforts have tended to present the compositions in the order of Monteverdi's print with the exception

¹²² See Ch. 2 for my discussion of the various ways in which plainchant antiphons may have been accommodated to psalms and Magnificats.

¹²³ Claudio Monteverdi: *Sanctissimae Virgini Missa senis vocibus ac Vesperae* (Peer, Belgium: Alamire, 1992).

¹²⁴ Claudio Monteverdi, *Vespro della Beata Vergine* (London: Eulenburg Ltd., 1994). See McCreesh, 'Monteverdi Vespers'.

¹²⁵ Claudio Monteverdi, *Vespers 1610*, ed. Denis Stevens (London: Novello, 1994).

¹²⁶ See McCreesh, 'Monteverdi Vespers', 326–7.

of three that displace the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* (Wikman, Bernius, and Jacobs, items 25, 27, and 39 in Appendix D) and one that substitutes a Frescobaldi *ricercare* for the *Sonata* (item 33 in Appendix D). Several add plainchant antiphons and other chants from various feasts (Harnoncourt (item 23), Bernius (item 27), Savall (item 28), Pickett (item 30), Jacobs (item 39), Pearlman (item 42)). The antiphons in the recording by Jordi Savall are taken from the feast of Santa Barbara, making his version another 'quasi' vespers of Santa Barbara (Savall does not omit *Audi coelum*, does not alter the text of the *Sonata*, and does not replace *Ave maris stella* with the hymn for Santa Barbara). All of these recordings except Wikman's employ period instruments. Savall transposes *Lauda Jerusalem* down an augmented fourth, Van Asch (item 36) and Junghänel (item 37) transpose it down a whole tone, and Pickett and Renz (item 34) transpose both *Lauda Jerusalem* and the Magnificat *a 7* down a fourth. Only the new recording by John Eliot Gardiner (item 31) includes the Magnificat *a 6* in addition to the Magnificat with instruments, while the recording by Hermann Max (item 33), which eschews obligato instruments, presents the Magnificat *a 6* only.

John Eliot Gardiner's recording was made in connection with performances in St Mark's Basilica, Venice, on 10–11 May 1989, and a video version was also produced (the Magnificat *a 6* did not figure in these performances and was only added later to the CD version). This video is visually and sonically magnificent, though scarcely the 're-creation' that Gardiner contends. Especially problematic is Gardiner's introduction, which associates the Vespers too closely with Venice and unaccountably describes the motets as 'secular' and their texts as not tolerable in Rome (where Palestrina had given a major impetus to Song of Songs settings with his motet collection of 1583–4 based exclusively on texts from the Song of Songs!). The performance itself, with soloists, choirs, and instrumentalists moving frequently among the two pulpits, various balconies, and various parts of the chancel, is designed more for dramatic effect in a concert atmosphere than to represent the character of a liturgical performance from Monteverdi's time. Indeed, there is no evidence to suggest that singers and instrumentalists in St Mark's performed from any more than a very restricted number of locations, depending on the liturgical function.¹²⁷ Gardiner's children's choir (with both male and female voices) and the gestures, such as a tenor kneeling in front of an altar while intoning a doxology or raising his hands towards heaven while singing the Gloria of the Magnificat, make for effective religious theatre but have no historical basis. Gardiner does follow the order of contents of Monteverdi's print, though he does not include any of the plainchants that would be required for an actual 're-creation'.¹²⁸

¹²⁷ What is known of performance practice in St Mark's is documented in Moore, *Vespers at St Mark's*.

¹²⁸ For a critique of Gardiner's recording, see Graham Dixon, 'Fine if Unauthentic Interpretations', *Classic CD* (Feb. 1991), 97.

My own perspective on the contents of Monteverdi's 1610 print was first outlined in my dissertation on the Vespers in 1972.¹²⁹ I agreed with Bonta's position on the use of the *sacri concentus* as antiphon substitutes and provided additional evidence from the prints of Fergusio and Agostini.¹³⁰ I also concurred with Osthoff's contention that the Vespers constitute an artistic unity. Bonta, especially, was quite explicit about this liturgical and artistic unity: 'the weight of both external and internal evidence suggests that it should be published and performed in its original form, with nothing omitted, and with a canzona or two added near the end of the service. Any other type of edition or performance is a violation of Monteverdi's artistic intentions, and runs counter to what we know of the musico-liturgical practice of his time.'¹³¹

My own view, however, as presented in both my dissertation and an article published in 1974,¹³² is more flexible; I do not believe that a complete liturgical service is the only option Monteverdi had in mind. While the Amadino print may be used in the published order to provide music for a large-scale polyphonic vesper service, Monteverdi probably also intended other possibilities. The very phrase *ad Sacella sive Principum Cubicula accommodata* on the title-page suggests a variety of locations for performance. The two Magnificats, one with and one without instruments, suggest two different performance circumstances: if appropriate instruments were available, the Magnificat *a 7* could be presented; if not, the Magnificat *a 6* with organ accompaniment only (as in item 33 in Appendix D). Similarly, Monteverdi indicates that the instrumental ritornellos in *Dixit Dominus* are optional. The same may be true for the ritornellos in *Ave maris stella*, which have no rubric. The hymn certainly could be performed without these ritornellos, or with a reduced version of the ritornellos played by the organ. Even the opening response could conceivably be sung as a simple *falsobordone* without the instrumental accompaniment and interludes, or the organ could play the instrumental interludes. Indeed, the tenor part-book has the rubric *Sex vocib. & sex Instrumentis, si placet* ('For six voices, and six instruments, if one wishes'). It is possible, therefore, to use most of the music from Monteverdi's print for a vesper service without instruments participating other than the organ—only the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* would have to be omitted from the service; the response, too, if not included, could be sung in plainchant.¹³³ The omission of instruments would have made Monteverdi's

¹²⁹ '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), 55–69.

¹³⁰ See the discussion of additional evidence from contemporaneous prints in Ch. 4. See Ch. 2 for a discussion of the tonal problems and performance options entailed in using plainchant antiphons, whether by themselves or in conjunction with Monteverdi's *sacri concentus*.

¹³¹ 'Liturgical Problems', 106.

¹³² 'Some Historical Perspectives on the Monteverdi Vespers', *Analecta musicologica*, 15 (1974), 29–86.

¹³³ Clifford Bartlett makes the same observation about a vespers without instruments in his edition *Monteverdi, Vespri della Beata Vergine* (1990). For a recording that follows this procedure to some degree, omitting the instrumental accompaniment and substituting the continuo ensemble for the

collection more widely usable, although in the early seventeenth century an increasing number of churches had instrumentalists in their permanent employ and many recruited instrumentalists and extra singers for special feasts to be celebrated with unusual pomp, such as the feast of a church's patron saint (see Chapter 4).

Additionally, there is no reason why individual items could not have been extracted from Monteverdi's print without having to utilize others. The four few-voiced motets could each have served as devotional music or been inserted into the office or the mass on any occasion where their texts seemed appropriate. A vesper service, depending on the importance of the feast, might comprise a polyphonic setting of the first psalm, or even two or three psalms, plus the Magnificat, but not the other psalms or antiphons.¹³⁴ A vesper service for another virgin saint might utilize Monteverdi's psalms and one of the Magnificats, but would require a different hymn and quite possibly different motets as antiphon substitutes, if motets were used at all. All of these functions could have been served by Monteverdi's 1610 collection, and it seems likely that he envisaged just such flexibility, ranging from the extraction of a single composition to a complete liturgical service in the order presented.¹³⁵

Part of our difficulty in understanding Monteverdi's intentions in the Vespers stems from our very limited knowledge about the circumstances leading to the composition of the music in the 1610 print and the motivation for publishing it in the form in which it appeared. The most direct evidence we have is from a letter written by Monteverdi's *vice maestro di cappella*, Don Bassano Casola, to Cardinal Ferdinando Gonzaga in Rome, dated 16 July 1610:¹³⁶

Monteverdi is having printed an a cappella Mass for six voices, of much study and labour, since he was obliged to manipulate continually, in every note through all the parts, always further reinforcing, the eight motifs that are in the motet *In illo tempore* of Gombert. And he is also having printed together [with it] some vesper psalms of the Virgin with various and diverse manners of invention and harmony, and everything over a cantus firmus, with the intention of coming to Rome this autumn to dedicate them to His Holiness. He is also in the midst of preparing a group

instrumental interludes in the response, omitting the ritornellos in *Dixit Dominus*, and performing the ritornellos in the hymn with the continuo ensemble, see App. D, item 33.

¹³⁴ See the discussion of this practice in Rome in Thomas Noel O'Regan, 'Sacred Polychoral Music in Rome 1575–1621' (D. Phil. dissertation, University of Oxford, 1988), i. 85–7.

¹³⁵ Edward Lippman, in a review of the L'Oiseau-Lyre recording of the Vespers (App. D, item 3), noted the flexibility explicit in Monteverdi's title and suggested that 'if one of the Magnificat settings is omitted (as it is in the present recording), the music can be used intact . . . [and] it is equally permissible to look upon the work as a collection of music that could be used only in part' ('Monteverdi: *Vespers of 1610*', *Musical Quarterly*, 41 (1955), 406).

¹³⁶ Some confusion exists on the precise dating of this letter. Davari and De' Paoli give 16 July, while Vogel dates it 26 July. See Stefano Davari, *Notizie biografiche del distinto Maestro di Musica Claudio Monteverdi* (Mantua: G. Mondovi, 1885), 23; Domenico De' Paoli, *Claudio Monteverdi* (Milan: Editore Ulrico Hoepli, 1945), 159; and Emil Vogel, 'Claudio Monteverdi', *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft*, 3 (1887), 430. De' Paoli's more recent biography, *Monteverdi* (Milan: Rusconi, 1979), 250, gives 10 July.

of madrigals for five voices, which will consist of three laments: that of Arianna, still with its usual soprano, the lament of Leandro and Hero by Marini, the third, given him by His Highness, about a shepherd whose nymph has died. The words [are] by the son of Count Lepido Agnelli on the death of the little Roman [the singer Caterina Martinelli].¹³⁷

Casola's description of the Mass and Vespers is neither complete nor accurate in every detail. The eight motifs (*otto fughe*) from the Gombert motet are actually ten in number. In mentioning the *Salmi del Vespero . . . tutte sopra il canto fermo*, Casola has in mind the five vesper psalms and very probably the two Magnificats, but he omits any reference to the response, motets, hymn, and *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*. Whatever inaccuracies and omissions there may be in Casola's remarks, it is nevertheless evident that Monteverdi's compositional work on the collection seems to have been largely if not entirely finished by this date, a circumstance that would certainly have been necessary for the publication to have been dedicated 1 September and available for Monteverdi to take to Rome in the autumn.¹³⁸

The next reference to the Mass and Vespers appears in a letter written on 14 September 1610 by the Gonzaga prince, Francesco, to his brother the cardinal. Francesco remarks that Monteverdi is coming to Rome to have some religious compositions published and to present them to the Pope.¹³⁹ The discrepancy between Francesco's letter and the evidence of Amadino's print, dedicated in Venice on 1 September, is probably the result of a misunderstanding on the prince's part. His letter was posted from Pontestura, west of Casale Monferrato, where Francesco was on holiday, and his knowledge of Monteverdi's intentions and of the publication of the Mass and Vespers by Amadino may have been incomplete and imprecise.¹⁴⁰

The purpose of Monteverdi's trip was twofold, for he was also seeking entrance for one of his sons into the Roman seminary.¹⁴¹ When Monteverdi

¹³⁷ 'Il Monteverdi fa stampare una Messa da Cappella a sei voci di studio et fatica grande, essendosi obligato maneggiar sempre in ogni nota per tutte le vie, sempre più rinforzando le otto fughe che sono nel motetto, *in illo tempore* del *Gomberti* e fa stampare unitamente ancora di Salmi del Vespero della Madonna, con varie et diverse maniere d'inventioni et armonia, et tutte sopra il canto fermo, con pensiero di venirsene a Roma questo Autumno, per dedicarli a Sua Santità. Và ancho preparando una muta di Madrigali a cinque voci, che sarà di tre pianti quello dell'Arianna con il solito canto sempre, il pianto di Leandro et Hero del Marini, il terzo, datoglielo, da S.A.Sma. di Pastore che sia morta la sua Ninfa. Parole del figlio del Sigr. Conte Lepido Agnelli in morte della Signora Romanina.' Text from Vogel, 'Claudio Monteverdi', 430.

¹³⁸ That he did take a copy to Rome for presentation to the Pope is demonstrated by the presence of an Altus part-book with the coat of arms of Pope Paul V on the cover in the Biblioteca Doria Pamphilj in Rome.

¹³⁹ See De' Paoli, *Lettere*, 50; and De' Paoli, *Claudio Monteverdi*, 160.

¹⁴⁰ Casola's letter distinguishes clearly between Monteverdi's intention to have the Mass and Vespers published and his plan to go to Rome to dedicate them to the Pope. It is only Francesco who connects the publication of the collection with the journey to Rome.

¹⁴¹ A letter of Monteverdi's, dated 28 Dec. 1610 and very probably addressed to Cardinal Ferdinando Gonzaga in Rome, describes the composer's hopes for admission and a benefice for his 9-year old son, Francesco. See De' Paoli, *Lettere*, 50–3, and Lax, *Lettere*, 31–3. Eng. trans. in Stevens, *The Letters*, 76–8.

actually departed for the Holy City is unknown, though it must have been after 14 September, since Francesco's letter requests Ferdinando's aid in obtaining a papal audience.¹⁴² When Monteverdi first arrived in Rome, his behaviour was puzzling, as is indicated by a letter discovered by Susan Parisi. In this letter of 7 October 1610 from the Mantuan official Rainero Bissolati to Cardinal Ferdinando Gonzaga, who was away on holiday, Bissolati says 'this morning by chance I ran into Signor Claudio Monteverdi who says he has been in Rome for three days and has been staying in an inn [*Camera locanda*]. He hasn't even let himself be seen or heard of by us so I insisted that this evening he come to your Illustrious Lordship's palace where I will give him hospitality as we did Captain Balciani.'¹⁴³

Since Mantuan court musicians normally stayed in the cardinal's palace or the residences of other nobles or cardinals on visits to Rome,¹⁴⁴ Monteverdi's incognito lodging at a public inn suggests that he wished to conduct some kind of private business away from prying eyes before letting the Gonzagas know he had arrived (the letters from Casola and Francesco quoted above demonstrate that he would have been expected at some point at the cardinal's palace). What this business might have been is unknown, but as will be suggested below, it is probable that Monteverdi was at this time searching for employment outside the Gonzaga court and away from the problems he had suffered there. It is quite probable that Monteverdi was making discreet inquiries at the beginning of his sojourn in Rome.¹⁴⁵ Monteverdi did eventually lodge in Ferdinando's palace, as is indicated in a letter of 30 October from Giulio Gualtieri to the cardinal announcing the arrival of Don Bassano Casola, who would 'lodge with Monteverdi and the master of the house'.¹⁴⁶

The only evidence that Monteverdi may have had an audience with Pope Paul is the surviving Altus part-book with the Pope's coat of arms in the

¹⁴² De' Paoli, *Lettere*, 50.

¹⁴³ 'q.ta mattina a caso ho ritrovato il S.r Claudio Monteverdi, che dice esser tre giorni in Roma, loggiato a Camera locanda, senza mai lasciarsi vedere, ne sentire da noi cosi ho fatto tanto, et con mio gran sforzo, che venghi in q.ta sera nel palazzo di V.S.Ill.ma dove lo trattaro conforme al S.r Cap.o Balciani, credendomi d'incontrare l'intentione sua d'haver fatto bene.' See Susan Parisi, 'Once Fired, Twice Almost Rehired: An Assessment of Monteverdi's Relations with the Gonzagas', paper delivered at Convegno, Claudio Monteverdi: Studi e prospettive, Mantua, 21-4 Oct. 1993 published as 'New Documents concerning Monteverdi's relations with the Gonzagas' in Besutti, Gialdrone, and Baroncini, eds., *Claudio Monteverdi: Studi e prospettive*, 477-511. I am grateful to Prof. Parisi for a copy of this paper, from which the original text and her translation are taken.

¹⁴⁴ Ibid.

¹⁴⁵ Noel O'Regan's studies of sacred music in Rome in this period give some idea of the number of churches and oratorios, aside from the Cappella Sistina and the Cappella Giulia, where Monteverdi might have sought employment. See O'Regan, 'Sacred Polychoral Music'.

¹⁴⁶ Parisi, 'Once Fired': 'Hier sera arrivo D. Ottavio con D. Bassano chi mi dica haver perso V.S.Ill.ma a Poggibonzi con dir che il S.r Chieppio sara qui stasera che lo metterò nelle stanze dove stava il S.r Claudio et proviserò di servirlo in modo che riceva ogni satisfatione et D. Bassano fara vita con il Monteverde et il M'ro di casa.'

Biblioteca Doria Pamphilj.¹⁴⁷ However, it is certain the composer made a favourable impression on the Cardinals Montalto and Borghese (the latter the Pope's nephew), for they wrote to Duke Vincenzo in Mantua on 23 November and 4 December respectively, describing Monteverdi in glowing terms.¹⁴⁸ If Monteverdi was not still in Rome at the time of these letters, he must have returned to Mantua only shortly before. His next extant letter is the one from 28 December mentioned above, posted from Mantua.

Despite his efforts, Monteverdi was unsuccessful in obtaining a benefice and admission for his son into the seminary, and there seem to have been few concrete results from his journey. The evidence of his visit left behind comprises the set of part-books, of which only the Altus, cited above, survives, and a manuscript copy, restored twice, of the *Missa in illo tempore* in the Vatican library (Cappella Sistina MS 107). This version is prefaced by the same dedication to Pope Paul V as Amadino's print, with only slight differences in orthography. Since the Sistine Chapel did not use accompanying instruments of any kind, the Bassus Generalis of Amadino's print is absent from the Vatican manuscript.

Of note in the letter from Don Bassano Casola quoted above is the list of laments in preparation, two of which were published four years later in the Sixth Book of Madrigals.¹⁴⁹ There was often a substantial time-lag between the completion of Monteverdi's compositions and their eventual publication. Some of the madrigals from Book IV (1603) and Book V (1605) were already in circulation by 1600, as proved by the discussion and quotation of excerpts in *L'Artusi, ovvero, Delle imperfezioni della moderna musica*, printed in that year.¹⁵⁰ *L'Orfeo* was premièred in the spring of 1607 but not published in its first edition until 1609. Casola's letter reveals a four-year delay in the appearance of the laments.

These apparently normal time-lags suggest that parts or perhaps even all of the Mass and Vespers may have been completed well before the late summer of 1610. The close connections between portions of the Vespers and *L'Orfeo* also imply an earlier date for some of the pieces, especially *Domine ad adjuvandum*. It is, in fact, quite possible that the compositions in Amadino's very large print of 1610 represent a gradual accumulation of material over the span of several, or even many years. Preparations for the Gonzaga wedding celebration of 1608,

¹⁴⁷ See Claudio Annibaldi, 'L'archivio musicale Doria Pamphilj: Saggio sulla cultura aristocratica a Roma fra 16° e 19° secolo (II)', *Studi musicali*, II (1982), 287, 291. This part-book has handwritten emendations where other copies of the Altus have printed paste-over corrections, indicating that the Pope's copy came from very early in the print run, perhaps as an advance copy specially bound.

¹⁴⁸ Vogel, 'Claudio Monteverdi', 356.

¹⁴⁹ These are the cycles *Lamento d'Arianna* and *Lagime d'amante al sepolcro dell'amata*.

¹⁵⁰ Excerpts in Eng. trans. in Oliver Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1950), 393–404. The polemics between Artusi and Monteverdi, lasting until 1608, are discussed in Claude V. Palisca, 'The Artusi–Monteverdi Controversy', in Denis Arnold and Nigel Fortune, eds., *The Monteverdi Companion* (London: Faber and Faber, 1968), 133–66 and reprinted with very slight changes in their *The New Monteverdi Companion* (London: Faber and Faber, 1985), 127–58.

about which Monteverdi complained bitterly in a letter long after the festivities were over, occupied all his time in the autumn of 1607 and the spring of 1608, leaving him exhausted at the beginning of the summer.¹⁵¹ But work on the Mass and Vespers may have progressed during the summer of 1607 and the summer and autumn of 1608, and throughout much of 1609. It should be recalled that Pope Paul V visited Mantua in 1607, and it is possible that some of the music of the print eventually dedicated to him might have been performed for him during his stay.¹⁵² Some of the pieces in the print, particularly the more conservative psalms *Nisi Dominus* and *Lauda Jerusalem*, could conceivably date from much earlier than 1607. Indeed, both of these compositions have unusually few errors in Amadino's print, suggesting that Monteverdi delivered to the publisher very accurate manuscripts, perhaps resulting from multiple performances and the opportunity to correct errors. On the other hand, the piece that lies between these two in the print, *Audi coelum*, is replete with errors, implying a hastily prepared manuscript that may have resulted from very recent composition and perhaps even no opportunity for performance.

Denis Stevens has suggested that the composition of some of the music for the Vespers reaches much further into the past than the few years before its publication.¹⁵³ According to him, *Dixit Dominus*, in an early version without ritornellos, as well as the Magnificat *a 6*, may stem from Duke Vincenzo's expedition to Hungary in 1595, an expedition on which Monteverdi and other musicians accompanied him and performed a vesper service on the eve of the battle of Vysegrad. A contemporary account indicates that the music for this service might have been composed by Monteverdi (*forse il compositore dello stesso Vespro*).¹⁵⁴ Stevens also suggests that *Laetatus sum*, reflecting gypsy fiddle music in the Lombard rhythms of the passage at *Propter fratres*, may have been written shortly after Monteverdi's return from this expedition. The motets *Nigra sum*, *Pulchra es*, and *Duo Seraphim* could have been written, according to Stevens, in the first few years of the new century. Because of their larger textures, he places *Nisi Dominus*, *Lauda Jerusalem*, and *Audi coelum* at about 1603–5, the time of publication of the Fourth and Fifth Books of Madrigals. The response and the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* he associates with *L'Orfeo* of 1607, and he dates these pieces 'during the aftermath of this work'.¹⁵⁵ The Magnificat *a 7* he considers to

¹⁵¹ Monteverdi's letter is dated 2 Dec. 1608. See De'Paoli, *Lettere*, 33–9, and Lax, *Lettere*, 20–4. Eng. trans. in Stevens, *The Letters*, 55–7 as well as in Arnold and Fortune, eds., *The Monteverdi Companion*, 26–9. Monteverdi's father, Baldassare, also wrote two letters to the Duke and Duchess of Mantua in autumn 1608 seeking his son's release from ducal service. See De'Paoli, *Lettere*, 30, 33. The texts of these letters are in Fabbri, *Monteverdi*, 148–50; Eng. edn., 100–2. The political circumstances surrounding the wedding are documented in Reiner, 'La vag' Angioletta (and Others)'.

¹⁵² See n. 15 above.

¹⁵³ 'Monteverdiana', *Early Music*, 21 (1993), 565–74.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid. 566. This passage was quoted in Fenlon, *Music and Patronage*, i. 194, doc. 63.

¹⁵⁵ Stevens, 'Monteverdiana', 569.

have been completed before 1605. There remains from the 1610 print only the *Missa in illo tempore*, which, on the basis of Casola's letter, Stevens thinks Monteverdi finished in 1609.¹⁵⁶

All of this is highly speculative. Even Casola's letter states no more than that Monteverdi 'is having printed' the works Casola names. Only the madrigals later published in 1614 are mentioned as in progress: 'He is also in the midst of preparing a group of madrigals.' The letter does not preclude the possibility that the *Missa in illo tempore* is several years old.

It is difficult to evaluate such speculations, since there is so little evidence to substantiate most of them. Monteverdi himself spoke vaguely of masses and motets in his first extant letter of 1601,¹⁵⁷ and we have no way of knowing how much sacred music he may have composed in Mantua that was never published and later lost. The most likely of Stevens's suggestions is the composition of the response and the *Sonata* at about the time of *L'Orfeo*. But the very modern vocal style and the virtuoso demands of *Nigra sum*, *Pulchra es*, *Duo Seraphim*, *Audi Coelum*, and the two Magnificats also bear a relationship to *L'Orfeo*, not only in their common requirement for virtuoso singers, especially tenors, but in the instrumental requirements for the Magnificat.

It is just as easy to speculate on other occasions in Mantua that might have given rise to some of the pieces in the 1610 print. For example, on 29 December 1605 the beatification of Luigi Gonzaga was celebrated with a procession from the cathedral of San Pietro to the Jesuit church of the Holy Trinity.¹⁵⁸ Moreover, in the same period, three canvases by the court painter Peter Paul Rubens, including one of Guglielmo Gonzaga and his son Duke Vincenzo I adoring the Trinity, were mounted above the altar of this church.¹⁵⁹ Such occasions could easily have featured the Trinitarian motet *Duo Seraphim*.

Peter Holman has also suggested a diverse origin for at least some of the music of the Vespers, citing 'no consistency in the way particular instruments are allocated to particular partbooks. . . . This suggests that the manuscript material used as printer's copy consisted of a number of separate sets of parts, not a single co-ordinated set of material for the whole "work", as is produced for modern performances—which is another reason for thinking that the individual items had a diverse origin and existence.'¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

¹⁵⁷ De' Paoli, *Lettere*, 17, and Lax, *Lettere*, 13. Eng. trans. in Stevens, *The Letters*, 37. This letter requests an appointment to the position of *maestro di cappella* (at court, not in the ducal church of Santa Barbara) recently vacated by the death of Benedetto Pallavicino.

¹⁵⁸ See Susan Parisi, 'Ducal Patronage of Music in Mantua, 1587–1627: An Archival Study' (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1989), 162.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid. 209 n. 158. These three paintings were Rubens's only major commission from the Gonzagas. See Fenlon, *Music and Patronage*, i. 122–3 and the photograph of the canvas with Guglielmo and Vincenzo on p. 120.

¹⁶⁰ "Col nobilissimo esercizio della vivuola": Monteverdi's String Writing', *Early Music*, 21 (1993), 585.

I concur that the music of Monteverdi's 1610 print was probably composed at various times for various occasions, perhaps in groups of pieces. There is considerable affinity, for example, among the first three psalms, *Dixit Dominus*, *Laudate pueri*, and *Laetatus sum* (see Chapter 6). The other two psalms, *Nisi Dominus* and *Lauda Jerusalem*, also have much in common with one another and are the most accurately notated compositions in the print. The four motets, *Nigra sum*, *Pulchra es*, *Duo Seraphim*, and *Audi coelum*, are likewise quite similar in conception but are wholly unrelated to the *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria*. The latter shares instruments with the Magnificat *a 7*, while the two canticles share a virtuoso vocal style with the last three motets. The hymn stands stylistically alone except for its instrumental ritornellos. It is certainly conceivable that Monteverdi composed groups of these works on different occasions and assembled them into a liturgical whole for purposes of his 1610 publication.

Uncertainties about the origin of the contents of Monteverdi's collection are matched by uncertainties regarding possible liturgical performances of this music in Mantua. While there is no firm evidence of portions of Monteverdi's Vespers being performed in Mantua, it seems likely that many, if not all, of the compositions comprising this print would have served for one or more liturgical celebrations in the city in the few years preceding their publication in 1610. The close relationship between the toccata to *L'Orfeo* and *Domine ad adjuvandum* argues for use of the latter in Mantua some time around or after February of 1607, when *L'Orfeo* was first performed. Likewise, the vocal and instrumental forces required for the Vespers are similar, though not identical, to those assembled for *L'Orfeo*. The close relationship between the chant used in *Ave maris stella* and the unique version of the rite of Santa Barbara suggests that the hymn had been performed in the basilica. The parallel between Monteverdi's *Sonata sopra Sancta Maria* and the Franzoni concerto with the same text mentioned above suggests that this litany with instrumental accompaniment might have been traditional in the ducal church. While *Duo Seraphim*, with or without its second section, was a popular text in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, its recurrence in the Franzoni collection with exactly the same version of the text used by Monteverdi suggests once again a relationship between Monteverdi's setting of this Trinitarian text and the basilica of Santa Barbara. Coupled with the visit to Mantua of Pope Paul V in 1607, these associations imply the possibility of a singular, festive liturgical event during that visit connecting the Pope, the Gonzagas, Mantua, the Virgin Mary, and St Barbara as patrons and protectors of the duchy and the city. However, because there is no direct evidence whatsoever connecting this music to any such liturgical celebration in Mantua, room has been left open for much other speculation among scholars. The proposal of Graham Dixon has already been discussed above; other suggestions will be evaluated here.

Pierre Tagmann has speculated that composition of the Vespers was stimulated by the birth of Duke Vincenzo's granddaughter, Maria, on 29 July 1609, and that portions of the Vespers may have been performed on 15 August 1609, the Feast of the Assumption, or 8 September 1609, the Feast of the Nativity of the Virgin.¹⁶¹ What we know of Monteverdi's whereabouts in this period derives from two letters to Alessandro Striggio, written in Cremona and dated 24 August 1609 and 10 September 1609.¹⁶² In the first Monteverdi acknowledges receipt the day before of a letter from Striggio containing a text from the duke that he wanted Monteverdi to set to music. Monteverdi also makes reference to a conversation with some cornetto and trombone players that seems to have taken place some time in the recent past, in Cremona rather than Mantua, as is clear from the letter of 10 September where he reports a further conversation with these musicians.¹⁶³ It is not impossible that Monteverdi was in Mantua for Assumption Day, but in the interval between 29 July and 15 August he could at most have rehearsed a performance, certainly not composed a large body of music. No record of such a performance survives. From the subsequent letter of 10 September, it is clear that Monteverdi had remained in Mantua between 24 August and 10 September. Thus the dates and the contents of these letters render Tagmann's suggestion impossible.

Iain Fenlon has argued that 'given the system of patronage under which composers worked, it is almost certain that a work of this kind was originally written for a specific occasion, even with particular forces in mind'.¹⁶⁴ Assuming that the Vespers were composed between early 1607 (the period of *L'Orfeo*) and early 1610, Fenlon suggested that the Vespers were first performed on Sunday, 25 May 1608 at 'a special ceremony in Sant'Andrea inaugurating a new order of knighthood in honour of Christ the Redeemer'.¹⁶⁵ This ceremony marked the beginning of the 1608 wedding festival, and featured the installation by Duke Vincenzo of the bridegroom Francesco

as the first member of the new order, investing him and the other new knights with robes and decorations. The knights then kissed the Duke's hand, bowed to Prince Francesco, and took their places for the liturgical part of the ceremony. Now the *Tē Deum* was chanted and then, after an

¹⁶¹ 'The Palace Church of Santa Barbara', 53–60.

¹⁶² De'Paoli, *Lettere*, 40–6, and Lax, *Lettere*, 25–30; Stevens, *The Letters*, 64–5, 68–70. See also Arnold and Fortune, eds., *The Monteverdi Companion*, 30–4; eid., eds., *The New Monteverdi Companion*, 23–5 (10 Sept. letter only).

¹⁶³ Details regarding these musicians may be found in Elia Santoro, *La famiglia e la formazione di Claudio Monteverdi: Note biografiche con documenti inediti* (Cremona: Athenaeum Cremonese, 1967), 80.

¹⁶⁴ 'The Monteverdi Vespers: Suggested Answers to some Fundamental Questions', *Early Music*, 5 (1977), 381.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid. 383. Fenlon's information comes from the court chronicler, Federico Follino, *Compendio delle sontuose feste fatte l'anno M.DC.VIII. nella città di Mantova, per le reali nozze del Serenissimo Principe D. Francesco Gonzaga, con la Serenissima Infante Margherita di Savoia* (Mantua: Aurelio et Lodovico Osanna, 1608), 19–26. The Mantuan ecclesiastical historian Ippolito Donesmondi also describes the ceremony in *Dell'istoria ecclesiastica di Mantova . . . parte seconda*, 419–26.

oration by the Bishop of Mantua, solemn (polyphonic) Vespers were celebrated by the Bishop dressed pontifically. At the end of this service the treasured relic of the Precious Blood was displayed on the high altar and the Duke together with his son, the other new knights, and the members of the nobility who had witnessed the ceremony returned to court.¹⁶⁶

25 May 1608 was Pentecost Sunday, and the singular difficulty with Fenlon's hypothesis is that the vespers in question would not have been a vespers of the Virgin.¹⁶⁷ The feast of Pentecost required the psalms *Dixit Dominus*, *Confitebor tibi*, *Beatus vir*, *Laudate pueri*, and *Laudate Dominum* at first vespers and the same *cursus* with the substitution of *In exitu Israel* as the fifth psalm for second vespers. Therefore, Monteverdi's response, *Dixit Dominus*, *Laudate pueri*, and either of the two Magnificats from the 1610 print could have been used on this occasion, but not the entire Marian service.

Jordi Savall, on the other hand, has suggested that the Vespers were first performed on 25 March 1610, the feast of the Annunciation, in the basilica of Santa Barbara in honour of the daughters of Francesco Gonzaga (note Paola Besutti's association of Monteverdi's version of the *Ave maris stella* chant with the rite of Santa Barbara, discussed above).¹⁶⁸ This hypothesis is plausible, though Savall offers no evidence to support it.

Although speculation regarding the origins and use of the Vespers has ranged widely, the fact is that we actually know no more about the origins of the music of the 1610 print than we did at the time Vogel first published Casola's letter in 1887. On the other hand, there has been much more consensus regarding Monteverdi's motivation in assembling and publishing the *Missa in illo tempore* and the *Vespro della Beata Vergine* in a single large collection. This motivation likely stems from Monteverdi's frequently expressed dissatisfaction with his employment in Mantua. We see this already intimated in his first extant letter of 28 November 1601.¹⁶⁹ Pressures on the composer also came from the attacks of the Bolognese theoretician Giovanni Maria Artusi in a public debate that dragged on from 1600 at least until 1608.¹⁷⁰ From 1604 to 1608 Monteverdi's letters are filled with complaints about difficulties in drawing his salary, poverty, overwork, physical exhaustion, and ill health brought on by the Mantuan climate.

¹⁶⁶ Quoted from Fenlon, 'The Monteverdi Vespers', 383.

¹⁶⁷ Donesmondi confirms that the founding of the order occurred on Pentecost. See *Dell'istoria ecclesiastica di Mantova*, 419–26.

¹⁶⁸ Liner notes to item 28 in App. D.

¹⁶⁹ De' Paoli, *Lettere*, 17–18, and Lax, *Lettere*, 13–14; Eng. trans. in Stevens, *The Letters*, 37–8; and Arnold and Fortune, eds., *The Monteverdi Companion*, 22–3.

¹⁷⁰ See Palisca, 'The Artusi–Monteverdi Controversy', *The Monteverdi Companion*, 133–66 and *The New Monteverdi Companion*, 127–58. See also additional comments on the controversy in Tim Carter, 'Artusi, Monteverdi, and the Poetics of Modern Music', in Nancy Kovaleff Baker and Barbara Russano Hanning, eds., *Musical Humanism and its Legacy: Essays in Honor of Claude V. Palisca* (Stuyvesant, NY: Pendragon Press, 1992), 171–94.

The low point in Monteverdi's life at Mantua came paradoxically at the high point of his professional career there. On 10 September 1607, some seven months after the première of *L'Orfeo*, his wife Claudia Cataneo, a singer, died, leaving him with two motherless sons. But he hardly had any time for grieving. In the autumn of 1607 and spring of 1608 he was wholly occupied with hasty preparations for the wedding celebrations of the coming spring.¹⁷¹ In the midst of these preparations, on 7 March 1608, the 19-year-old singer Caterina Martinelli, who was scheduled to play the leading role in the imminent production of Monteverdi's new opera *Arianna*, died of smallpox.¹⁷² Caterina had been Monteverdi's pupil and lodger ever since she was first brought to Mantua in 1603.¹⁷³ The role had to be assigned to someone else, an actress, and rehearsals became frantic. In addition to composing and rehearsing *Arianna*, Monteverdi composed and rehearsed *Il ballo delle ingrate* for the wedding festivities, which finally took place in late May and early June. Having suffered the death of his wife and his pupil within the space of a few months, the latter in the midst of pressure-filled preparations for the wedding celebrations, Monteverdi was exhausted and sick by the middle of the year. He returned to his father's house in Cremona in early July and remained there for several months. In November his father petitioned first the duke and then the duchess for his son's release from ducal service, but the duke wrote back at the end of the month ordering Monteverdi to return to court.¹⁷⁴ On 2 December Monteverdi wrote to the duke's councillor Annibale Chieppio claiming:

unless I take a rest from toiling away at music for the theatre, my life will indeed be a short one, for as a result of my labours (so recent and of such magnitude) I have had a frightful pain in my head and so terrible and violent an itching around my waist, that neither by cauteries which I have had applied to myself, nor by purges taken orally, nor by blood-letting and other potent remedies has it so far been possible to get even partly better. My father [a physician] attributes the cause of the headache to mental strain, and the itching to Mantua's air (which does not agree with me), and he fears that the air alone could be the death of me before long. Just think then, Your Lordship, what the addition of brainwork would do if I were to come and receive graces and favours from His Highness's kindness and clemency, as he commands.¹⁷⁵

Monteverdi then went on with a long list of complaints, concluding with a request that Chieppio assist him in obtaining an honourable dismissal from the

¹⁷¹ The political circumstances surrounding this wedding are documented in Reiner, 'La vag' Angioletta (and Others)'.

¹⁷² Edmond Strainchamps, 'The Life and Death of Caterina Martinelli: New Light on Monteverdi's "Arianna"', *Early Music History*, 5 (1985), 155–86. Caterina's tomb was inscribed by Duke Vincenzo: 'she died in the eighteenth year of her youth, the ninth of March, 1608.'

¹⁷³ Stevens says she moved to another house on 7 Nov. 1606. See *The Letters*, 53.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid. 56; for Monteverdi's father's letters see n. 86 above. The father's letter to the duke of 9 Nov. 1608 indicated that his son would be willing to serve in the church alone (Giovanni Giacomo Gastoldi, *maestro di cappella* of Santa Barbara, was mortally ill). This request was not fulfilled, however.

¹⁷⁵ Stevens, *The Letters*, 58. For the original Italian, see De' Paoli, *Lettere*, 33–4, and Lax, *Lettere*, 21.

duke's service. These efforts failed, however, and Monteverdi was back at court by mid-January, where Duke Vincenzo attempted to assuage the composer's feelings by raising his salary and establishing an annual pension.¹⁷⁶ The pension became a further sore point, however, for Monteverdi had difficulty in collecting it from the Mantuan treasury, a matter he doggedly pursued for the remainder of his life.

Thus, by 1610 Monteverdi had long been dissatisfied with his employment. But the intrigues and vagaries of Gonzaga court life could hardly have been different in character from those of other Italian courts; therefore, if he were to seek stable employment elsewhere, it would have to be in a major ecclesiastical position. However, Monteverdi was unpublished and unknown outside Mantua as a composer of church music, and his first step would have had to be to publish a major collection with a prominent dedication, demonstrating his capabilities, in the hope of attracting widespread attention. This is precisely what he accomplished in publishing a conservative mass, a contrapuntal *tour de force*, together with a modernistic vespers in the most varied combination of sacred styles yet printed in Italy. If Monteverdi was indeed seeking a new position in Rome, as Redlich, De' Paoli, and Arnold have previously suggested, the Mass would have been an appropriate introduction to the Cappella Sistina, while the Vespers would have been of interest perhaps to the Cappella Giulia (the choir of St Peter's Basilica) and certainly to the many churches, confraternities, and colleges that produced elaborate music involving virtuoso singers and instruments for the feasts of their patron saints and on other important feast-days.¹⁷⁷ Similarly, the combination of elements in this print would have been well suited to Venice and other major centres of the Veneto, such as Verona, Brescia, and Bergamo. In Milan, the *Missa in illo tempore* may have appealed, but the Vespers were very different from typical Milanese sacred music of the time.¹⁷⁸

On Christmas Day in 1611 some psalms of Monteverdi were performed in the cathedral in Modena, but were reportedly received very poorly.¹⁷⁹ The only psalms in common between the feast of Christmas and Marian feasts are *Dixit Dominus* (at both first and second vespers) and *Laudate pueri* (at first vespers). The Magnificat, which was often referred to as a 'psalm' in the sixteenth and

¹⁷⁶ Stevens, *The Letters*, 57; Fabbri, *Monteverdi*, 151; Eng. edn., 104.

¹⁷⁷ See Redlich, 'Monteverdi's Religious Music', 210; De' Paoli, *Lettere*, 50; and Arnold, *Monteverdi* (1975), 24. The variety and character of elaborate sacred music performances in Rome are described in O'Regan, 'Sacred Polychoral Music'. See also the other articles on music in Roman churches by Dixon and O'Regan listed in the Bibliography. The appropriateness of the *Missa in illo tempore* for the Sistine Chapel is underscored by the fact that it is the Mass alone that survives among the Vatican manuscripts, while the surviving Altus part-book with the entire Mass and Vespers in the Biblioteca Doria Pamphilj belonged to the private collection of the Pope.

¹⁷⁸ My thanks to Robert Kendrick for his observations on sacred music in Milan in this period.

¹⁷⁹ The account is quoted in Fabbri, *Monteverdi*, 174: 'Geminiano Capilupi, over Lovetto mastro di capella, a fatto cantare certi salmi del Monteverdo mastro di capella del duca di Mantova, che sono stati a nausea di tutti.' See also Eng. edn., 120.

seventeenth centuries, is, of course, also common to all vespers. Given the reported reaction of the listeners and the liturgical demands of Christmas, it is possible that the psalms performed at Modena were entirely different from those published in 1610. Since the performance was conducted by someone other than Monteverdi and the congregation's reaction was unfavourable, it is unlikely that Monteverdi was using this occasion to audition for a position in Modena.

None of these efforts had a positive outcome, and in the summer of 1612 Monteverdi suffered the indignity of being abruptly dismissed from the duke's service in Mantua.¹⁸⁰ Monteverdi's original patron, Duke Vincenzo I, had died in February of that year, and his son Francesco acceded to the throne encumbered by huge debts piled up by the extravagances of his late father. Francesco determined to cut expenses and reduce the size of his retinue, and after his coronation in June, some of the court's high officials and a quarter of the musicians were released. Francesco's austerities had evidently engendered considerable worry and unhappiness among the musicians, for one had run away to Florence, another was seeking employment in Rome, and the famous singer Adriana Basile complained bitterly of neglect, while a plot to steal her had been rumoured. These events and rumours were embarrassing to Francesco, who also became personally unhappy with the Monteverdi brothers. On 6 July 1612, he wrote to his brother Ferdinando, the cardinal, in Rome:

Your Illustrious Lordship knows how much obligation Monteverdi and his brother have to serve me on account of the honorable stay that they have had in this house for so many years, and because of the great esteem that I have always shown toward both of them; now it appears to me that either to ruin me or for some other reason they have rebelled, and they treat me with every term of disrespect, claiming that other shelter is not lacking to them; and because I would like to take revenge for my reputation I had the idea to dismiss both of them immediately from my service when they least expect it; . . . Your Illustrious Lordship should not be surprised that, since Monteverdi is the subject he is, I should condescend to part with him; for if you knew with what hope of advantage and from what ulterior motives he and his brother are dealing with me you would side with me completely.¹⁸¹

On 29 July 1612, Francesco fulfilled his intention and abruptly dismissed both Claudio and Giulio Cesare Monteverdi. In a letter of 6 November 1615, Monteverdi described his departure from the Gonzaga court thus: '[I] left that Most Serene Court so disgracefully—by God—after being there for twenty-one years I took away no more than twenty-five scudi.'¹⁸² Despite several attempts by the Gonzaga dukes to lure him back to Mantua in subsequent years,

¹⁸⁰ See Susan Parisi, '“Licenza alla Mantovana”: Frescobaldi and the Recruitment of Musicians for Mantua, 1612–1615', in Alexander Silbiger, ed., *Frescobaldi Studies* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1987), 59–62. The following account of Monteverdi's dismissal is taken from this article.

¹⁸¹ Ibid. 60–1.

¹⁸² Quoted from Parisi, 'Licenza alla Mantovana', 64. See De' Paoli, *Lettere*, 77; Lax, *Lettere*, 42–3; Stevens, *The Letters*, 104.

Monteverdi steadfastly refused, citing over and over again the penury, misery, and indignity he had suffered at the court of the Gonzagas.¹⁸³

Early in the autumn of 1612 Monteverdi travelled to Milan, where Aquilino Coppino had published three books of spiritual contrafacta of his madrigals in 1607 (reprinted in 1611), 1608, and 1609.¹⁸⁴ Rumours circulated that Monteverdi was seeking the post of *maestro di cappella* of the cathedral in Milan and had failed miserably at the audition, but the position was not, in fact, vacant, and letters to the Duke of Mantua from a Mantuan singer, Francesco Campagnolo, and Mantua's ambassador in Milan, Alessandro Striggio, squelched these rumours. Striggio indicated instead that 'he [Monteverdi] was most honored by gentlemen [*cavalieri*] and welcomed and cherished as much as possible by the musicians [*dai virtuosi*], and his works were sung here with great praise in the most notable places'.¹⁸⁵ According to Striggio, Monteverdi had not sought the position of *maestro di cappella* at the Duomo, then occupied by Vincenzo Pellegrini; nevertheless, his visit to Milan as an unemployed musician of considerable reputation must have been to seek opportunities of some kind, whether in secular surroundings or in another major church of the city. But like his visit to Rome, this sojourn in Milan produced no tangible results.

Finally, in the following year, Monteverdi found the stable church position he sought, the most visible and prestigious post in northern Italy, as *maestro di cappella* at St Mark's in Venice. The last documentary reference to what might be music from the Mass and Vespers of 1610 comes in connection with Monteverdi's audition (*prova*) for this position in the summer of 1613. The post had become vacant on 10 July of that year through the death of its incumbent, Giulio Cesare Martinengo.¹⁸⁶ In August, Monteverdi underwent a trial performance of his music prior to his appointment as the new *maestro*. A document of 19 August 1613 reads:

The most illustrious Procurators, wanting to elect a *maestro di cappella* of the church of St Mark in place of the Reverend Maestro Giulio Cesare Martinengo, and having written by order of the Procurators [SS. SS. Ill. ^{ma}] to the most illustrious ambassador in Rome, to all of the most illustrious rectors of the *terra firma*, and to the residents of the *Serenissima Signoria* in Milan and Mantua to obtain information about individuals qualified in this profession for the aforementioned service;

¹⁸³ See Parisi, 'Once Fired, Twice Almost Rehired'.

¹⁸⁴ See RISM 1607²⁰ and 1611¹⁵ and François Lesure and Claudio Sartori, eds., *Bibliografia della musica italiana vocale profana pubblicata dal 1500 al 1700* (Pomezia: Staderini spa, 1977), ii, items 1944, 1945, 1946, 1947. The only copy of the 1608 publication was destroyed in World War II, while only three part-books of the 1609 publication survive. See Claudio Sartori, 'Monteverdiana', *Musical Quarterly*, 38 (1952), 403–6. Sartori recounts the history of Monteverdi's relations with Milan and Milanese musicians from 1589 to 1625. See also Margaret Ann Rorke, 'Sacred Contrafacta of Monteverdi Madrigals and Cardinal Borromeo's Milan', *Music & Letters*, 65 (1984), 168–75.

¹⁸⁵ '... è stato onoratissimo da' cavalieri, e dai virtuosi benvenuto et accarezzato al possibile, e le sue opere si cantano qui con gran lode nei più notabili ridotti.' Quoted in Fabbri, *Monteverdi*, 176. For a slightly different translation, see Tim Carter's English edition, 123.

¹⁸⁶ Procuratori di San Marco di Supra, Reg. 140, 1607–1614, a di 1 agosto [1613].

from the responses having learned that the person of the most worthy [D.^{mo}] Claudio Monteverdi, formerly *maestro di cappella* of Duke Vincenzo and Duke Francesco of Mantua, has been recommended as the foremost candidate; of the quality and worth of whom the Procurators [SS. SS. Ill.^{mo}] are greatly confirmed in this opinion, both from his published works and those which in these days the Procurators [SS. SS. Ill.^{mo}] have sought to hear, to their complete satisfaction in the church of St Mark with its musicians. Therefore, by unanimous ballot they have determined that the aforementioned most worthy [D.^{mo}] Claudio Monteverdi should be elected as *maestro di cappella* of the church of St Mark at a salary of three hundred ducats per year and with the usual and customary gifts . . .¹⁸⁷

Monteverdi also received a house in the canonry and 'gift' of fifty ducats (*per donativo*) from the Procurators, to cover his travelling expenses and sojourn in Venice.¹⁸⁸

Account records of the Procurators from 22 August refer to payments for ten extra singers (*cantori extraordinarij*) for performances in St Mark's on the anniversary of the accession of the doge (24 July) and for the entire office for the Ascension of Our Lady (the feast of the Assumption, 15 August).¹⁸⁹ On that day another payment was ordered for carrying two organs back and forth to San Giorgio Maggiore on the island of St George for Monteverdi's rehearsal (*prova*). Earlier entries also refer to these celebrations. One on 24 July had recorded payment to the fifteen regular instrumentalists (*sonatori ordinarij*) for having played on the anniversary of the doge, and one on 19 August had recorded payment to fourteen *sonatori ordinarij* for having played at mass on the feast of the Assumption.¹⁹⁰ This entry may refer to the *Missa in illo tempore*, with fourteen instruments doubling its thick texture, although another mass in more modern style, no longer extant, was also possibly meant. According to the document of 22 August, the payment was to be made by order of the *maestro di cappella*, whereas the one dated 19 August was by order of the *vice maestro di cappella*. Evidently, Monteverdi had not yet been officially named the *maestro* when the payment of 19 August was inscribed, but was already considered the *maestro di cappella* by the scribe on 22 August (after having been officially elected on 19 August, four days after the Procurators had heard the Ascension Day services). The printed music mentioned in the election document of 19 August must have been the Mass and Vespers of 1610, Monteverdi's only printed sacred music since his youthful *Sacrae cantiunculae tribus vocibus* of 1582. The music by Monteverdi heard by the Procurators on the feast of the Assumption very likely comprised either extracts or a complete service from the *Vespro della Beata*

¹⁸⁷ Procuratori di San Marco di Supra, Reg. 140, 1607–1614, a di 19 agosto. See Fabbri, *Monteverdi*, 177–8; Eng. edn., 124. The document was first published by Guido Sommi Picenardi in 'Alcuni documenti concernenti Claudio Monteverde', *Archivio storico lombardo*, 22 (1895), 135–6.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid.

¹⁸⁹ Procuratori di San Marco di Supra, Reg. 7, Cassier Chiesa, 1610–1614.

¹⁹⁰ Ibid. The extra payment may have been required because performing on the doge's anniversary was probably not listed as one of the regular duties for the musicians.

Vergine, although the election document mentions works other than the ones already published (possibly a different mass). Whether Monteverdi's music was performed on 24 July for the anniversary of the doge is unclear.

Pay records from 10 September refer to what was evidently a separate rehearsal in San Giorgio Maggiore and to another performance.¹⁹¹ The first record indicates payment for twenty instrumentalists (*XX. sonatori ordinarij*) for having participated in the rehearsal of a mass by Monteverdi (*del n°. maestro di capella*) as well as playing in St Mark's on the same day as the rehearsal. The second record indicates that six additional musicians were to be paid for having sung in St Mark's on the Feast of the Nativity of the Madonna (8 September). Further confirmation of the performance of a mass on that day is found in another record of 9 September, indicating payment by order of the *maestro di cappella* to fifteen instrumentalists (*15 sonatori ordinarij*) for having played in St Mark's at mass on the Day of the Madonna.¹⁹² The mass for the feast of the Nativity was probably a different work from the mass for the feast of the Assumption, since it is quite unlikely that Monteverdi would have repeated the same work after so short a time. Since most payments seem to have been recorded very shortly after the services for which the musicians were employed, and the pay record of 10 September specifically mentions the feast of the Nativity, it seems that Monteverdi was fully occupied in Venice in late August and early September (and perhaps even from late July) with more than one major celebration. After leaving Venice to return to Mantua, Monteverdi officially took up his duties at St Mark's in early October.¹⁹³ We hear not another word in the seventeenth century of Monteverdi's Mass and Vespers of 1610.

Without further documentary evidence, we may never come to definitive solutions to the many questions raised by Amadino's print of 1610. But another reason why we have experienced such controversy over the Monteverdi Vespers is that we have tended to view this collection in historical isolation. We have been attracted to the Vespers by its obvious aesthetic worth and its dazzling display of modern styles and techniques, but our understanding of the work as historians has been vague at best. Not only do we have no earlier liturgical music by Monteverdi,¹⁹⁴ but until recently we have known nothing about vesper music

¹⁹¹ Procuratori di San Marco di Supra, Reg. 7, Cassier Chiesa, 1610–1614.

¹⁹² Ibid. I am unable to account for the discrepancy between *XX sonatori ordinarij* in the document of 10 Sept. and *15 sonatori ordinarij* in that of 9 Sept.

¹⁹³ Monteverdi wrote to Mantua from Venice on 12 Oct. describing his recent journey, during which he was robbed by highway bandits. From the letter, it appears that he arrived in Venice at midnight on Saturday, 5 Oct. See De' Paoli, *Lettere*, 62–5; Lax, *Lettere*, 37–40; Stevens, *The Letters*, 90–3; Arnold and Fortune, eds., *The Monteverdi Companion*, 36–8; eid., *The New Monteverdi Companion*, 30–2.

¹⁹⁴ Monteverdi's very first publication, at the age of 15, was the set of three-voice Latin motets: *Sacrae Cantuiculae tribus vocibus . . . Liber Primus nuper editus Venetijs Apud Angelum Gardanum*, 1582. The composition of masses and motets is mentioned in his first extant letter of 28 Nov. 1601, and the *Dichiaratione* written by Giulio Cesare Monteverdi and published as the preface to the *Scherzi musicali* of

and motets of his immediate predecessors and contemporaries. Yet information about the liturgical and musical context of Monteverdi's Vespers might not only offer us new perspectives on controversies and performance issues surrounding Monteverdi's music, but also give us a better idea of how this remarkable collection relates to the vesper and other sacred music of his contemporaries. Among the key questions are: How does Monteverdi's publication relate to the publication practices in this repertoire? What aspects of his music reflect contemporary currents in sacred music? Were there other composers whose music influenced Monteverdi? What aspects of his 1610 print are original with Monteverdi and represent unique contributions to the repertoire? What influence might Monteverdi have had on his contemporaries? These are among the questions that the next three chapters will attempt to address.

1607 mentions Claudio's 'responsibility for both church and chamber music' (*il carico de la musica tanto da chiesa quanto da camera che tiene*). The *Dichiaratione* is published in De' Paoli, *Lettere*, 394–404. Eng. trans. in Strunk, *Source Readings in Music History*, 405–12. The 1601 letter is in De' Paoli, *Lettere*, 17–18; Lax, *Lettere*, 13–14; Stevens, *The Letters*, 37–8; Arnold and Fortune, eds., *The Monteverdi Companion*, 22–3.