

RODOBALDO TIBALDI

The four-voice motets (Milan 1599) of Giovanni Paolo Cima
and the 'stile osservato' in late-16th-century Milan:
some observations*

In 1622 a *Regola del contraponto e della musical compositione* by the Franciscan friar of Cremonese origin Camillo Angleria was published by the Milanese printer Giorgio Rolla. The work was dedicated "al molto magnifico signor mio osservandiss.mo il signor Giovan Paolo Cima, organista nella Chiesa di Nostra Signora presso a Santo Celso di Milano".¹ As is well known, this work is a short compendium of the main rules of 16th-century counterpoint, though it occasionally includes concessions to the habits of contemporaries, above all on matters concerning the ecclesiastical modes.² Not many composers are cited in the course of the work, but it is interesting to note those that are: Claudio Merulo (of whom the author claims to have been a pupil), Palestrina, Lassus, Giulio Cesare Gabussi, Orfeo Vecchi, Monteverdi and, naturally, Cima. Some are explicitly mentioned merely in connection with individual works or compositional techniques (Monteverdi, for example,

* This article is a revised, updated and expanded version of a paper read at the symposium *Il Concilio di Trento e la musica. Le relazioni tra il mondo germanico e la tradizione cattolica meridionale*, Trento, 27 May 1995.

¹ LA / REGOLA / DEL / CONTRAPONTO, / E DELLA / MUSICAL COMPOSITIONE. / Nella quale si tratta breuemente / DI TUTTE LE CONSONANZE, E DISSONANZE / coi suoi esempi à due, trè, e quattro voci. / DELLA COGNITIONE DE' TONI, / secondo l'uso moderno, e la regola agli Organisti per / suonare trasportato in vari luoghi bisognosi. / *Con due Ricercari l'vno à 4. e l'altro à 5. dell'Autore, & vn / Ricercare, e Canoni à 2.3. e 4. da cantarsi in vari modi / del Signor GIO. PAOLO CIMA, al quale / La presente Opera è dedicata, e nuouamente data in luce / DAL REVER. PADRE / FR. CAMILLO ANGLERIA DA CREMONA, / del Terz'Ordine di S. Francesco, Discepolo di / CLAUDIO MERVLO DA CORREGGIO. / [printer's device] / IN MILANO, Per Giorgio Rolla. M DC XXII. Facsimile reprint: Bologna, Forni, 1983.*

² ANGLERIA, *Regola di Contraponto*, cap. XXII, "Della cognitione de Tuoni, secondo l'uso moderno", pp. 80-85. For Angleria, a Franciscan friar, there continued to be eight ecclesiastical modes ("Alcuni hanno poi voluto inventare, che ci siii altri quattro Toni, cioè, Nono, Decimo, Undecimo, & Duodecimo, la qual cosa non è", p. 82); the other four are incorporated, with the necessary adaptations, above all in Modes 3, 4 and 5. See CLAUDE V. PALISCA, "Die Jahrzehnte um 1600 in Italien", in *Italienische Musiktheorie im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert. Antikenrezeption und Satzlehre*, ed. Frieder Zaminer, Darmstadt, Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1989 (Geschichte der Musiktheorie, 7), pp. 221-306: 264; RENATE GROTH, *Italienische Musiktheorie im 17. Jahrhundert*, in *ibidem*, pp. 307-379: 340, 359-363; PATRIZIO BARBIERI, "Chiavette and modal transposition in Italian practice (c. 1500-1837)", *Recercare*, III, 1991, pp. 5-79: 27, 44.

is cited because he “likes to use double counterpoint at the octave”).³ To Cima, on the other hand, Angleria returns in various parts of the work. On p. 84, after declaring that “he is truly worthy of the fame that is everywhere spread”, he adds the following clarification:

as we can also see from his works issued in print, such as the four-voice a cappella motets, which are concise and good. Ingenious canons for two, three and four parts. Very erudite recercars, again in four parts. Concertini for one, two, three and four voices, which are delightful and pleasant to all types of people.

Giovanni Paolo Cima is a fairly well-known composer. He was born in Milan presumably around 1570, and died there in 1630,⁴ perhaps a victim of the plague. Throughout his professional career he was associated with the sanctuary of Santa Maria presso San Celso. From 1595 until his death he held the post of organist there; and from 1614 was also in charge of the choir, a task he had already previously carried out in the years 1607-1611.⁵ Santa Maria presso San Celso was a celebrated place of devotion in the city.⁶ And

³ ANGLERIA, *Regola di Contraponto*, p. 100.

⁴ On the strength of his will (drawn to our attention by Renato and Rossella Frigerio) and of the payments made by the church of S. Maria in San Celso, we can fix the date of death between 25 June and 30 September 1630; see RENATO and ROSSELLA FRIGERIO, “Giovanni Paolo Cima organista nella Madonna di S. Celso in Milano: documenti inediti dell’Archivio diocesano di Milano”, *Il Flauto Dolce*, XVI, 1987, pp. 32-37. An updated account of the known information on Cima’s life can be read in the entries in the new editions of the New Grove and MGG: JEROME ROCHE/RODOBALDO TIBALDI in *The New Grove’s Dictionary of Music and Musicians*, second edition, ed. Stanley Sadie, London, Macmillan, 2001, vol. 5, p. 848; GUNTHER MORCHE in *Die Musik in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, zweite vollständig neu bearbeitete Ausgabe, hrsg. von Ludwig Finscher, Kassel, Bärenreiter-Metzler, Personenteil, Bd. IV, cols. 1118-1122. Hence the encyclopedia entries predating Frigerio’s article (KARL GUSTAV FELLERER, in MGG, vol. 2, cols. 1439-1442; ALBERTO IESUÈ, in *Dizionario biografico degli italiani* [DBI], Roma, Istituto della Enciclopedia Italiana, 1960-..., vol. 25, pp. 522-523; GABRIELE MORONI, in *Dizionario Enciclopedico Universale della Musica e dei Musicisti* [DEUMM], *Le Biografie*, Torino, UTET, 1985-1990, vol. 3, p. 246) can be considered as superseded.

⁵ As the documents show, from 1607 to 1611 and from 1614 until his death he fulfilled the duties of a maestro di cappella. This actual qualification, however, was never officially recognized, and in the church accounts Cima is simply referred to as “organista” (Frigerio-Frigerio, “Giovanni Paolo Cima”, p. 32).

⁶ The sanctuary was erected following the celebrated Marian apparition of 30 December 1485 at the venerated image of the Madonna and Child (set up by St Ambrose after the discovery of the body of St Celsus, and placed in a niche within the cemetery area of the church of San Celso). It replaced the small church built in 1430 on Filippo Maria Visconti’s orders. The place had in any case already become a place of pilgrimage on account of the many miracles attributed to the sacred image. In that December 1485 an appeal was made to the Madonna asking

during the 16th century it also became a centre of intensive artistic activity, second only to the Duomo itself: among the artists working there were Galeazzo Alessi (responsible for the original project of the splendid facade), Camillo Procaccini, Gaudenzio Ferrari and Antonio Campi, just to mention a few.⁷ Already from 1502 the administration of the church had been entrusted, with papal approval, to the chapter of the *deputati alla Fabbrica*, to which the resident chaplains were also subject. To avoid and discipline any possible conflict between the *fabbricieri* and the resident chaplains, in 1588 the figure of a “prefect” was instituted (again by a rule of a capitular type). From the very start of the prefect’s administration, therefore, the chaplains and *fabbricieri* had been freed of their former (and barely tolerated) dependence on the abbot of the monastery of San Celso.⁸ What is more directly our concern here is that there arose what is without doubt one of the important musical institutions of 16th- and 17th-century Milan. Simone Boyleau had been maestro di cappella there for a certain period; and Cima’s predecessor as organist of the Marian sanctuary was Ottavio Bariolla.⁹

her to put an end to the plague then ravaging the city. The plague ended shortly afterwards and the sanctuary hence became known also as Santa Maria dei Miracoli. See Ferdinando Reggiori, *Il santuario di Santa Maria presso San Celso e i suoi tesori*, Milano, Banca Popolare di Milano, 1968; LICIA CARUBELLI, “Maria dei miracoli presso San Celso, chiesa di S.”, in *Dizionario della Chiesa ambrosiana*, 6 vols., ed. Angelo Majo, Milano, NED, 1987-1994, vol. 3, pp. 1928-1934; MIRELLA FERRARI, “Il Quattrocento. Dai Visconti agli Sforza”, in *Diocesi di Milano*, 2 vols., ed. Adriano Caprioli, Antonio Rimoldi e Luciano Vaccaro, Brescia, La Scuola, 1990 (Storia religiosa della Lombardia, 9-10), vol. 1, pp. 333-349: 347, “Chiese, devozioni, confraternite, ospedali”. On the more general aspects of Marian devotion in Milan, see the classic ENRICO CATTANEO, *Maria Santissima nella storia della spiritualità milanese*, Milano, n.p., 1955 (Archivio Ambrosiano, 8).

⁷ Building was begun in 1493 and the church was largely completely already in 1506, but it was immediately found to be too small, so an enlargement was decided by adding the two side aisles. See EDOARDO ARSLAN, “L’architettura milanese del primo Cinquecento”, in *Storia di Milano*, vol. 8, Milano, Treccani, 1960, pp. 533-563: 548-552; ALESSANDRO ROVETTA, “Aspetti scenografici dell’architettura milanese nell’età barocca: elementi sintattici ed esemplificazioni”, in *La scena della gloria. Drammaturgia e spettacolo a Milano in età spagnola*, ed. Annamira Cascetta and Roberta Carpani, Milano, Vita e Pensiero, 1995, pp. 47-60: 48 and 58.

⁸ See REGGIORI, *Il santuario*, pp. 29-30. The monastery of San Celso, which was established and subsequently endowed by Archbishop Landulf in 997 by testament, was entrusted to the Benedictine monks until 1549, when the few remaining monks (in 1463 there were only four) were combined with the canons regular of the Lateran Congregation of S. Salvatore. See GIORGIO PICASSO, “La chiesa vescovile: dal crollo dell’impero carolingio all’età di Ariberto (882-1045)”, in *Diocesi di Milano*, vol. 1, pp. 143-166: 150, and LAURA AIRAGHI, “Gli ordini religiosi nel sec. XV. L’“osservanza” preludio alla riforma”, in *ibidem*, vol. 1, pp. 351-374: 354.

⁹ On the history of the musical chapel of S. Maria presso S. Celso, at least for the period c.1600-1630, see GIUSEPPE RICCUCCI, “L’attività della cappella musicale di S. Maria presso S. Celso e la condizione dei musicisti a Milano tra il XVI e il XVII secolo”, in *Intorno a Monteverdi*, ed. Maria Caraci Vela and Rodobaldo Tibaldi, Lucca, LIM, 1999 (ConNotazioni, 2), pp. 289-312,

I have just said that Cima is a fairly well-known composer. Well, this is certainly true for his instrumental music (the *Partito de ricercari e canzoni alla francese* of 1606)¹⁰ and for the sacred music in the new concertato style (the *Concerti ecclesiastici a 1.2.3.4.5. e 8. voci* of 1610).¹¹ But I cannot say he is renowned as a composer of sacred music in what we might call the ‘traditional’ style.¹² So Angleria’s mention of a work of this kind, accompanied

to be supplemented with LORENZO GHIELMI, “Contributo per una storia degli organi del Santuario di S. Maria dei Miracoli presso S. Celso”, *L’Organo*, XXII, 1984, pp. 3-22. For the earlier period, see the recent contribution by CHRISTINE GETZ, “Simon Boyleau and the Church of the ‘Madonna of Miracles’: Educating and Cultivating the Aristocratic Audience in Post-Tridentine Milan”, *Journal of the Royal Musical Association*, CXXVI/2, 2001, pp. 145-168. According to CLYDE WILLIAM YOUNG, “Bariolla [Bariola, Bariola, Bariolius], Ottavio”, in *The New Grove*, 2nd ed., vol. 2, p. 730, Bariolla was organist at Santa Maria presso San Celso from at least 1588 to 1595, when he was replaced by Cima. Before that he had been organist at the Duomo from 1570 (and not 1573, as mentioned by Young) until 1576, and at San Marco, as attested by the title-page of his *Ricercari* of 1579 (RICERCARI / DI OTTAVIO BARIOLLA / ORGANISTA IN S. MARCO DI MILANO / Nouamente composti & dati in luce. / LIBRO PRIMO / [printer’s device] / In Venetia Appresso / Angelo Gardano / 1579; see DANIELE SABAINO, “Frammenti di storia musicale vigevanese in alcune stampe cinque-seicentesche recentemente riscoperte nell’Archivio Capitolare della Cattedrale. Catalogo generale e prime osservazioni”, *Vigevanum*, VI, 1986, pp. 82-98: 85 scheda 3, unicum of the alto part only).

¹⁰ PARTITO DE RICERCARI, / & Canzoni alla Francese, / DI GIOVAN PAOLO CIMA / Organista alla gloriosa Madonna presso S. Celso. / *Et in vltimo vna breue regola per imparare à far pratica di suonare in qual si voglia luoco, / ò intervallo dell’Instrumento, con il modo d’acordar il Clauicordo per ogni ordine, / [...]* / IN MILANO, appresso l’herede di Simon Tini, & Filippo Lomazzo. 1606. Modern ed. by Clare G. Rayner, n.p., American Institute of Musicology, 1974 (CEKM, 20).

¹¹ CONCERTI / ECCLESIASTICI / A VNA, DVE, TRE, / QVATTRO VOCI. / CON DOI A CINQVE, ET VNO A OTTO. *Messa, e doi Magnificat, & Falsi Bordoni à 4., & sei so- / nate, Per Instrumenti à due, tre, e quatro.* Di Gio. Paolo Cima, Organista della Glorio- / sa Madonna presso S. Celso di Milano. / NOVAMENTE DATI IN LUCE. / CON LA PARTITURA PER L’ORGANO. / [printer’s device] / IN MILANO, / Per gl’Heredi di Simon Tini, & Filippo Lomazzo. 1610. / Con licenza de’ superiori. Facsimile reprint: ed. Piero Mioli, Firenze, SPES, 1986 (Archivum Musicum. La cantata barocca, 24); Modern ed. by Rudolf Hofstötter and Ingomar Rainer, Wien, Doblinger, 1998 (Wiener Edition Alter Musik, 1).

¹² Equally well-known, though not studied in sufficient detail, is Cima’s penchant for writing canons, even of an ‘enigmatic’ character. As well as the canons published at the end of Angleria’s treatise and those concluding the *Ricercari* of 1606, a volume of *Canzoni, conseguenze & contrapunti doppi a 2.3.4.* was also published in 1609, again in Milan (though it has not survived), and a canon by Cima was included in Romano Micheli’s letter all’*illustri et eccellentissimi signori musici li signori Francesco Soriano [...] et Gironimo Frescobaldi* (Venezia 1619); see GIUSEPPE GERBINO, *Canoni ed enigmi. Pier Francesco Valentini e l’artificio canonico nella prima metà del Seicento*, Roma, Torre d’Orfeo, 1995, pp. 18, 36 and 37, which also mentions that the eight enigmatic canons of Banchieri’s *Cartella musicale* are dedicated to Cima. As well as the more ‘theoretical’ examples, it is also worth remembering that in the six-voice motet *Angelus ad pastores ait*, four voices are engaged in a double canon at the octave: a Cantus-Quintus (2nd tenor) pair and an Altus-Bassus pair; and that the Altus subject is also

even by the observation “*a cappella* motets, which are concise and good”, is striking, especially if we consider not only the kind of counterpoint expounded by the theorist in that context (i.e. counterpoint of an utterly traditional type, with no concessions whatsoever to the new concertato style), but also the historical and geographical context in which both the treatise and Cima’s work were written. But before entering the heart of the discussion, I would just like to say a few words about the title I have given to the paper, because it could sound a little ambitious and might arouse (and disappoint) legitimate expectations.

Unfortunately any discussion of late-16th-century Italian sacred polyphony must inevitably begin with routine excuses about the partiality of the available evidence. We still lack comprehensive studies (often also modern editions) of the principal composers of this period: Pietro Vinci, Pietro Ponzio, and even Giovanni Matteo Asola, Andrea Gabrieli and Costanzo Porta, just to mention a few.¹³ And there is also another aspect to be considered. Remarkable as it may seem, a centre as important as late-16th-century Milan is still largely an unknown quantity, and we know little about either the history of its institutions or the repertory itself. If we except the Duomo (and even then the matter has hardly been satisfactorily resolved),¹⁴ we find that none of the chapels that seem to have played a leading role in the city’s musical life have yet been the object of specific studies aimed at investigating their history and repertory (and here I refer to the

constructed as a tonal answer to the Cantus subject. This highly ingenious work is included, together with another piece in the concertato style, in the anthology MESSE, MOTETTI, ET / VN MAGNIFICAT, / A SEI VOCE. / DI DIVERSI ECCELL. AVTORI, / *Raccolti da Guglielmo Berti Musico nella Ducal Chiesa di / S. MARIA della Scala di Milano.* / Nouamente dati in luce. Col Basso principale per l’Organo. / Al Molto III. Sign. Giulio Aresi Feudatario della Pieue di / Seueso de i sessanta del Consiglio Generale di Mila- / no, & Questore del Magistrato Straordinario / per S. M. Catholica. / [device] / IN MILANO, Appresso gli her. di Agostino Tradate. M.DCX. / *Con licenza de Superiori.*

¹³ Sometimes the only studies are dissertations (for doctorates, degrees or even diplomas). We list the main ones: LEDA SILVANA PUPP, *Le opere sacre di Pietro Vinci*, Tesi di Diploma in Paleografia Musicale, Università degli Studi di Parma, Scuola di Paleografia e Filologia Musicale di Cremona, a.a 1967-68; RUSSEL EUGENE MURRAY, *The voice of the composer. Theory and practice in the works of Pietro Pontio*, PhD. diss., University of North Texas, 1989; DONALD MAHLON FOUSE, *The religious music of Gianmatteo Asola*, PhD. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1960; LILIAN PRUETT, *The Masses and Hymns of Costanzo Porta*, PhD. diss., University of North Carolina, 1960. On Andrea Gabrieli, as well as the volume *Andrea Gabrieli e il suo tempo*, atti del convegno internazionale, ed. Francesco Degrada, Firenze, Olschki, 1987, see also the *Introduzione storico-critica*, vol. 1 in the Edizione Nazionale delle Opere di Andrea Gabrieli, Milano, Ricordi, 1988.

¹⁴ On the most recent study of the subject, *Sei secoli di musica nel Duomo di Milano*, ed. Graziella de Florentiis and Gian Nicola Vessia, Milano, NED, 1986, see the review by Oscar Mischianti in *L’Organo*, XXVII, 1991-92, pp. 178-184.

chapels at Santa Maria della Scala,¹⁵ Santa Maria della Passione, Santa Maria della Pace, Sant' Ambrogio, San Francesco, San Simpliciano,¹⁶ San Sepolcro, San Lorenzo and San Marco, not to mention Santa Maria dei Miracoli itself – just to limit myself to those that can be connected with works published by their respective organists and/or *maestri di cappella* in the period 1590-1630).

In addition, still today there are a number of prejudices regarding the Milanese musical environment after the Council of Trent and the activities of the Borromeos. Admittedly, in the last few decades there has been a change in the way the ecclesiastical rulings on liturgical music are being interpreted by musicologists, and perhaps particularly by those who are also historians of the church and the liturgy.¹⁷ And obviously, there are differences of perspective, represented in some ways by the two very recent contributions by Bonifacio Giacomo Baroffio¹⁸ and Oscar Mischiati.¹⁹ But on the question of Milan we still come across statements reflecting commonplaces that clearly die hard: as, for example, the claim that Claudio Monteverdi would have “com-

¹⁵ See CHRISTINE GETZ, “The Sforza restoration and the founding of the ducal chapels at Santa Maria della Scala in Milan and Sant' Ambrogio in Vigevano”, *Early music history*, XVII, 1998, pp. 109-159; MARINA TOFFETTI, “Nuovi documenti su Orfeo Vecchi”, *Nuova Rivista Musicale Italiana*, XXX/3-4, 1996, pp. 445-465.

¹⁶ On San Simpliciano, see LORENZO GHIELMI, “Organi e organisti a San Simpliciano”, in *San Simpliciano e il nuovo organo Ahrend*, Milano, Silvana Editoriale, 1991, pp. 75-81.

¹⁷ See, for example, PIERO DAMILANO, “Liturgia e musica nell'epoca palestriniana”, in *Atti del Convegno di Studi Palestriniani*, ed. Francesco Luisi, Palestrina, Fondazione “Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina”, 1977, pp. 313-325 (an article of extreme interest both for the basic historical data it provides and for the balanced and by no means routine approach to the conclusions of the Council of Trent; it can still today largely accepted, even after over twenty years, though, as I have already stated elsewhere, has strangely been insufficiently considered); AGOSTINO BORROMEO, “La storia delle cappelle musicali vista nella prospettiva della storia della chiesa”, in *La cappella musicale nell'Italia della Controriforma*, atti del convegno internazionale di studi nel IV centenario di fondazione della cappella musicale di S. Biagio di Cento (Cento, 13-15 ottobre 1989), ed. Oscar Mischiati and Paolo Russo, Firenze, Olschki, 1993 (Quaderni della Rivista Italiana di Musicologia, 27), pp. 229-237: 233-237. Another work by Borromeo worth mentioning is the article, cited by its author in the above work, “Il concilio di Trento e la musica sacra in Italia”, in *Musica e Controriforma: Vincenzo Ruffo*, atti del convegno di studi (Sacile, 5 marzo 1988), in press.

¹⁸ BONIFACIO GIACOMO BAROFFIO, “Il concilio di Trento e la musica”, in *Musica e liturgia nella riforma tridentina*, catalogo della mostra (Trento, Castello del Buonconsiglio, 23 settembre - 26 novembre 1995), ed. Danilo Curti and Marco Gozzi, Trento, Provincia Autonoma di Trento. Servizio Beni Librari e Archivistici, 1995, pp. 9-17.

¹⁹ OSCAR MISCHIATI, “Il concilio di Trento e la polifonia. Una diversa proposta di lettura e di prospettiva bibliografica”, in *Musica e liturgia nella riforma tridentina*, pp. 19-29. An indispensable corollary of this article is Mischiati's “Profilo storico della cappella musicale in Italia nei secoli XV-XVIII”, in *Musica sacra in Sicilia tra rinascimento e barocco*, Palermo, Flacovio, 1988, pp. 23-45.

mited suicide” had he become *maestro di cappella* of Milan’s Duomo.²⁰ Undeniably in the field of musical historiography there is sometimes a tendency to consider the work of the two Borromeo cardinals in more global terms. But this is a point I should like to come back to later.

The present study aims to form part of a wider enquiry I have conducted on the motet repertory directly connected to Milan in the decades bridging the 16th and 17th centuries. Any points and conclusions it makes are (I am well aware) restricted just to Cima’s print and only occasionally introduce connections with other composers. Only subsequently, when we are in a position to outline a general picture, will it be possible to verify their soundness. Having said that, let us now finally tackle Cima’s motet collection.

Published by Agostino Tradate, the *Libro primo delli motetti a quattro voci*²¹ is dedicated “Al molt’ill. et molt rever. sig. mio osservandiss[im]o il sig. Hieronimo Terzago Canonico dignissimo della Scala”. The dedicatee, Gerolamo Terzaghi, who belonged to a very old noble family (in 1388 the Terzaghi already belonged to Milan’s aristocratic *Consiglio dei Novecento*), was a collegiate juriconsult and became canon of Santa Maria della Scala in 1589; shortly after that, he was appointed protonotary apostolic by Cardinal Sfondrati.²² The edition contains the following twenty-one compositions:

1. Fac, Deus, potentiam in brachio tuo
2. Hic accipiet benedictionem a Domino

²⁰ VALENTINO DONELLA, “Le vie della musica sacra dopo il Concilio di Trento”, *Rivista Internazionale di Musica Sacra*, XV/3-4, 1995, pp. 299-309: 306 n. 8.

²¹ LIBRO PRIMO / DELLI MOTETTI / A QVATTRO VOCI, / DI GIO. PAOLO CIMA / ORGANISTA DELLA MADONNA / PRESSO S. CELSO. / VIRTUTI SIC [printer’s device.] CEDIT INVIDIA / IN MILANO / Appresso Agostino Tradato. M.D.XCIX. / *Con licenza de’ superiori*. The only complete copy, consisting of four partbooks (Cantus, Altus, Tenor and Bassus), is preserved in the Biblioteka Gdanska Polskiej Akademii Nauk di Danzica (see RISM A I: C 2227). Considering Milanese publishing habits, we can plausibly conjecture that there was also an organ score, now lost. On the collection of Italian prints in this library, see MARTIN MORELL, “Georg Knoff bibliophile and devotee of Italian music in late sixteenth-century Danzig”, in *Music in the German Renaissance. Sources, styles and contexts*, ed. John Kmetz, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1994, pp. 103-126. I wish to thank the Danzig library, and particularly the director of the music section Prof. Zbiegniew Nowak, for providing a microfilm of the collection.

The only modern edition know to me is one of the motet *Stellam magi viderunt*, transcribed by Giovanni Acciai, *La Cartellina*, no. 93, XVIII, 1994, pp. 101-106.

²² The information is found in GIUSEPPE DE LUCA, “Traiettorie’ ecclesiastiche e strategie socio-economiche nella Milano di fine Cinquecento. Il capitolo di S. Maria della Scala dal 1570 al 1600”, *Nuova Rivista Storica*, LXXVII/3, 1993, pp. 505-569: 525, 552-554, 568-569. I thank my colleague Dr Laura Mauri Vigevani for drawing my attention to this article.

3. Exaltata est sancta Dei genitrix
4. O Doctor optime
5. Domine, non secundum peccata nostra
6. Hodie Christus natus est
7. Stellam Magi viderunt
8. Surrexit Dominus de sepulchro
9. O crux benedicta
10. Laudemus Patrem de coelis
11. Peccata mea, Domine, sicut sagittae
12. Videntes stellam Magi
13. Adiuva nos, Deus, salutaris noster
14. Princeps gloriosissime Michael archangele
15. Deus meus, eripe me de manu peccatoris
16. Domine, non est tibi curae
17. Petrus & Paulus duo sunt luminaria
18. Assumpta est Maria in coelum
19. Gaudete, filiae Sion
20. Benedicite Domino omnia opera eius
21. Deus misereatur nobis, et benedicat nos

Motet no. 16, *Domine, non est tibi cura*, is the work of Benedetto Binaghi (or Binago), a contemporary of Cima's who in those years served as organist at the parish church of Sant' Ambrogio at Settala (which fell within the sixth region of the diocese of Milan, according to the organization introduced by St Charles Borromeo).²³ Later, after a short period at San Gaudenzio in Novara, in 1611 he became *maestro di cappella* at Santa Maria della Scala, thus occupying the position that had been Orfeo Vecchi's just a few years earlier.²⁴ Motet no. 21, on the other hand, carries the annotation "lassando il Basso si può cantare à tre" ("by omitting the bass it can also be sung in three parts").

The context of Cima's book is particularly interesting: both the chronological context and (perhaps above all) the geographical milieu in which the work appeared. Here I will not dwell on things that are well known to everyone. But I do wish to stress that we are now beginning to gain a picture of Milan in the late 16th and early 17th centuries, also from the musical point of view, that is slightly different from the traditional view: i.e. that of a city

²³ See ANTONIO RIMOLDI, "L'età dei Borromeo (1560-1631)", in *Diocesi di Milano*, vol. 2, 389-466: 414.

²⁴ See MARIANGELA DONÀ, "Binaghi [Binago], Benedetto", in *The New Grove*, 2nd ed., vol. 3, pp. 575-576. The information concerning Binaghi's position as organist at Settala is derived from the title-page of his book of five-voice motets of 1598 (see below, n. 94).

wholly given up to applying the recommendations of the Council of Trent and the synods of 1565 and 1576, thanks to the decisive and indefatigable action of St Charles Borromeo (and the consequent invention of a “conciliar” musical style by Vincenzo Ruffo). Now this is naturally true and undeniable, but, as I shall try to show below, it takes place at a different, and perhaps deeper, level, at least in the period of Gasparo Visconti and Federico Borromeo. What is certain is that at the end of the 16th century Milan was an especially active and culturally stimulating centre, also in musical matters. Robert Kendrick’s work, a project that started from his enquiries into the convents²⁵ and is still being pursued, has begun to make scholars reconsider the traditional historiographical view. Here it is perhaps sufficient to consider that perhaps even before the Venetians, the Milanese compositions were among the first to pose the problem of how to combine mixed vocal and instrumental forces, above all at a structural level, giving rise to that particular (and utterly indigenous) form of the *canzone-mottetto* or *concentus duplex*.²⁶

If we examine an external, statistical, factor such as the typologies of publication issued in Milan in the period extending from the end of the Council of Trent and the ensuing Milanese synods until the year 1600, we notice a distinct revival of motet collections during the last two decades. Before then, Ruffo appears not to have published books of this type during his stay in the city. And as for his successors, Ponzio and Gabussi, as well as Gasparo Costa, organist of the Duomo from 1584 to 1590 (and formerly organist at Santa Maria presso San Celso from 1581 to 1584),²⁷ they preferred to make use of the Venetian publishers. Cellavenia, to my knowledge the only composer to publish a set of motets in Milan in the immediate post-conciliar period, worked at the cathedral of Pavia. Then from 1586, what we find is above all reprints of collections by the famous polyphonists and composers active outside Milan (though perhaps working in neighbouring areas like Novara or

²⁵ ROBERT KENDRICK, “The Traditions of Milanese Convent Music and the Sacred Dialogues of Chiara Margarita Cozzolani”, in *The Crannied Wall. Women, Religion and the Arts in Early Modern Europe*, ed. Craig A. Monson, Ann Arbor, The University of Michigan Press, 1992, pp. 211-233; *Genres, Generation and Gender: Nuns’ Music in Early Modern Milan, c. 1550-1706*, PhD. diss., New York University, 1993; *Celestial Sirens: Nuns and their Music in Early Modern Milan*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1996.

²⁶ On the *canzone-mottetto*, see the classic, though in my view not completely convincing, GIUSEPPE VECCHI, “La canzone strumentale e la canzone-mottetto a Milano nella prima metà del Seicento”, in *La musica sacra in Lombardia nella prima metà del Seicento*, Atti del convegno internazionale di studi, ed. Alberto Colzani, Andrea Luppi and Maurizio Padoan, Como, AMIS, 1988, pp. 79-97. My different opinions on this particular form are expressed in RODOBALDO TIBALDI, “Gli inizi dello stile concertante a Milano tra Cinque e Seicento: il Sacrum opus musicum (1598) di Giuseppe Gallo, la canzone-mottetto, ed una Messa di Giovanni Francesco Capello”, in *Intorno a Monteverdi*, pp. 313-349.

²⁷ See MIROSLAW PERZ, “Gasparo Costa”, in *The New Grove*, 2nd ed., vol. 6, p. 522.

Vercelli, but in any case outside the diocese). Among other works located in this preliminary study – which incidentally makes no claim to completeness, but draws on both Mariangela Donà’s bibliography of the Milanese publications²⁸ and the *Lista delli libri degli eredi di Francesco e Simon Tini* of c.1596 (studied and published by Iain Fenlon)²⁹ – we find editions of motets by Claudio Merulo, various books by Palestrina and Lassus, Victoria, Rore and the two books of four- and five-voice works by Andrea Gabrieli. The following therefore is therefore limited to the motet collections (for a fuller picture of the sacred publications, see the Appendix):

- 1565 FRANCESCO CELLAVENIA, *Cantum quinque vocum (quos motecta vocant) liber primus*, Francesco Moscheni.
- 1574 GIOVANNI BATTISTA GIUDICI, *Io. Baptistae Iudicis genuensis et canonici savonensis sacrarum cantionum, quae vulgo motecta nuncupantur, quinque, sex et octo vocum. Liber primus nuper aeditus*, Paolo Gottardo Ponzio.
- 1586 ORLANDO DI LASSO, *Sacrae cantiones (vulgo motecta appellatae) quinque, et sex vocum tum viva voce, tum omnīs generis instrumentis cantatu commodissimae. Liber tertius*, Francesco ed eredi di Simon Tini.
CLAUDIO MERULO, *Il primo libro de motetti a sei voci*, Francesco ed eredi di Simon Tini.
- 1587 ARCANGELO GHERARDINI, *Motecta cum octo vocibus*, Francesco ed eredi di Simon Tini.
GIACOMO ANTONIO PICCIOLI, *Jac. Ant. Piccioli min. conven. musices cathedralis ecclesiae vercellensis moderatoris, Missa, cantica B.M Vir. ac sacrae cantiones cum octo vocibus concinendae*, Francesco ed eredi di Simon Tini.
GIOVANNI PIERLUIGI DA PALESTRINA, *Motetti a quattro. Libro primo*, Francesco ed eredi di Simon Tini.
GIOVANNI PIERLUIGI DA PALESTRINA, *Liber II. motectorum quatuor vocum. Nuper recognitus*, Francesco ed eredi di Simon Tini.
GIOVANNI PIERLUIGI DA PALESTRINA, *Liber III. motectorum quinque vocum. Nuper recognitus*, Francesco ed eredi di Simon Tini.
- 1588 ANDREA ROTA, *Andreae Rotae magistri in choro musico eccl. S. Petronii motectorum liber primus, quae quinque, sex, septem, & octo vocibus concinuntur*, Francesco ed eredi di Simon Tini.
Liber primus musarum cum quatuor vocibus, seu sacrae cantiones, quae vulgo

²⁸ MARIANGELA DONÀ, *La stampa musicale a Milano fino all’anno 1700*, Firenze, Olschki, 1961.

²⁹ IAIN FENLON, “Il foglio volante editoriale dei Tini, circa il 1596”, *Rivista Italiana di Musicologia*, XII, 1977, pp. 231-251. See also OSCAR MISCHIATI, *Indici, cataloghi e avvisi degli editori e librai musicali italiani dal 1591 al 1798*, Firenze, Olschki, 1984, cat. IV, pp. 18, 106-110 and Tab. III (facsimile reprint).

- motecta appellantur, ab Orlando Lasso, Cipriano Rore, & alijs ecclesiasticis authoribus compositae, et ab Antonio Barre collectae, Francesco ed eredi di Simon Tini.*
- 1589 TOMAS LUIS DE VICTORIA, *Motecta quae partim quaternis, partim quinis, alia senis, alia octonis, alia duodenis vocibus concinuntur, Francesco ed eredi di Simon Tini.*
- 1590 ANDREA GABRIELI, *Sacrae cantiones 5 vocum [...] liber primus, Francesco ed eredi di Simon Tini.*
MICHELE VAROTTO, *Sacrae cantiones 5 vocibus, Francesco ed eredi di Simon Tini.*

We must then wait until the final decade (and particularly the last years of that decade) before we find editions published in Milan by composers born or a least active in the city itself.

- 1591 FRANCESCO RAMELLA, *Sacrae cantiones quinis, senis, ac octonis vocibus, una cum Missa & Cantico B.M. Virginis octo vocibus, tum vivae voci, tum omnibus musices instrumentis aptissimae, Francisci Ramellae novar. liber primus, Michele Tini.*
VALERIO BONA, *Missa, et sacrae cantiones (quae vulgo motecta nuncupantur) 8 vocibus concinendae, Michele Tini.*
- 1593 GIOVANNI PIERLUIGI DA PALESTRINA, *Motectorum quinque vocibus liber quartus ex canticis Salomonis, eredi di Francesco e di Simon Tini.*
- 1594 VALERIO BONA, *Missa et motecta ternis vocibus Valerii Bonae in templo vercellensi D. Francesco capellae magistri, eredi di Francesco e di Simon Tini.*
- 1597 ORFEO VECCHI, *Motetti di Orfeo Vecchi [...] e d'altri eccellentissimi auttori a cinque voci. Libro primo, eredi di Francesco e Simon Tini.*
- 1598 AGOSTINO SODERINI, *Sacrarum cantionum octo et novem vocibus liber primus cum tribus aliis canticis vocationum, & instrumentorum alternatim decantandis. Auctore Augustino Soderino mediolanensi, organista Sanctae Mariae Passionis Congregationis Lateranensis, Agostino Tradate.*
ANTONIO MORTARO, *Sacrae cantiones tribus vocibus, Antonii Mortari Brixien-sis in ecclesia divi Francisci Mediolani organistae, eredi di Simon Tini e Gio. Francesco Besozzi.*
GIUSEPPE GALLO, *Totius libri primi sacri operis musici alternis modulis concinendi partitio, seu quam praestantiss. musici partituram vocant. Autore M.R.D. Josepho Gallo mediolanensi, religionis somaschae: studio tamen & labore R.D. Aurelii Ribrochi nobilis derthonensis in gratiam organistarum in lucem edita, eredi di Francesco e di Simon Tini.*
BENEDETTO BINAGO, *Benedicti Binaghi in ecclesiae S. Ambrosii capite plebis septalae organistae. Sacrarum cantionum quinque vocationum liber primus, Agostino Tradate.*

- LUCREZIO QUINZIANI, *Partitura de bassi delle Messe e mottetti a otto voci, libro primo*, eredi di Simon Tini e Gio. Francesco Besozzi.
- ORFEO VECCHI, *Orphei Vecchi mediolanensis in ecclesia Divae Mariae Scalen. reg. duc. musicae, & chori magistri motectorum quinque vocibus liber secundus*, eredi di Simon Tini e Gio. Francesco Besozzi.
- 1599 ANTONIO MORTARO, *Messa, salmi motetti et Magnificat a tre chori*, eredi di Simon Tini e Gio. Francesco Besozzi.
- GIOVANNI PAOLO CIMA, *Libro primo delli motetti a quattro voci, di Gio. Paolo Cima organista della Madonna presso S. Celso*, Agostino Tradate.
- GUGLIELMO ARNONE, *Partitura del secondo libro delli mottetti a cinque & otto voci. Di Guglielmo Arnone milanese organista nella Chiesa Metropolitana di Milano*, eredi di Simon Tini e Gio. Francesco Besozzi.
- SERAFINO CANTONE, *Sacrae cantiones [...] octo vocibus*, Agostino Tradate.

To these we must add a few editions that have not survived, but which can be derived from the Tini catalogue, and which provide particularly eloquent evidence of the diffusion of Lassus's works in the Milanese environment (the numbers refer to both Fenlon's study and Mischiati's book):

- 29-30 ORLANDO DI LASSO, mottetti a 5. voci, libro I e libro III
- 30 ORLANDO DI LASSO, mottetti a 4. voci, libro I
- 31 ORLANDO DI LASSO, mottetti a 3. voci, libro I
- 32 GIUSEPPE CAIMO, mottetti a 5. voci
- 37 ANDREA GABRIELI, mottetti a 4. voci
- 40 DIEGO MENSA, mottetti a 5. voci
- 41 COSTANZO PORTA, mottetti a 6. voci, libro III
- 42 GIOVANNI MATTEO ASOLA, mottetti a 4. voci pari
- 44 ORAZIO COLOMBANO, mottetti a 5. voci
- 45 GIACOMO ANTONIO PICCIOLI, mottetti a 4.5.6.7.8. voci
- 46 MICHELE VAROTTO, mottetti a 6. voci libro I
- 47 Concerti ecclesiastici a 6.8. voci

So we see not only signs of a revival of interest in the motet precisely at the end of the century, but also evidence that it affected both the motet for two or three choirs (a typology in which Lombardy boasted a strong tradition of its own) and the more customary motet for four, five and six voices.

Let us now come to aspects and problems more specifically connected with the collection that concerns us here. Giovanni Paolo Cima found himself working at a very prestigious ecclesiastical institution, and could therefore hardly fail to consider the issue of adherence to the dictates of the Council (and the ensuing synods above all). This is unequivocally confirmed, in one way or another, if we examine the choice of texts he set to music. In this book

we find the following typology:

- 16 texts from the Office (nos. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19);
- 4 texts from the Psalter (nos. 2, 15, 20, 21)
- 1 text from St Luke's Gospel (no. 16)

As is clarified in greater detail in Table 1, many of the sixteen texts from the breviary are taken directly from the Ambrosian rite or are common to both rites. They belong to the following repertoires:

- 4 Ambrosian antiphons (nos. 7, 10, 17, 19):
 Matins antiphons: no. 7
 Lauds antiphons: nos. 10, 17
 antiphons to the *Benedictus*: no. 19
- 4 Roman antiphons (nos. 4, 6, 8, 14)
 antiphons to the *Magnificat*: nos. 4, 6, 14
 Matins antiphons: no. 8
- 3 psallendae (nos. 12, 11, 13)
- 5 common texts (nos. 11, 3, 9, 12, 18)
 no. 11: antiphon to the *Magnificat* (both rites);
 no. 3: antiphon to the *Magnificat* (Ambrosian rite) - Matins antiphons (Roman rite);
 no. 9: psallenda (Ambrosian rite) - Vespers antiphon (Roman rite)
 no. 12: psallenda (Ambrosian rite) - antiphons to the *Magnificat* (Roman rite)
 no. 18: antiphons to the Canticle of Moses (Ambrosian rite) - Vespers antiphon, but without *Alleluia*.

The text of the first motet consists of the antiphon *Fac, Deus, potentiam* (1¹) and the psallenda *Tibi, Domine, derelictus est pauper* (1²). The text of no. 14 is recognized by the Ambrosian rite, but as a psallenda for the feast of the St Raphael the Archangel (24 October), not for that of St Michael. No. 5, *Domine, non secundum peccata nostra*, which is derived from v. 10 of Psalm 102, is drawn from the preces of the Litanies of the Saints, and hence connected with all the different occasions on which they were recited, such as the reconciliation of penitents of Holy Thursday. The character of the text makes it particularly suited to the period of Lent.

- in festo Inventionis S. Crucis (no. 9) 3 May
- in festo S. Michaelis (no. 14) 29 September
- in festo S. Marthae (no. 16) 29 July
- in festo SS. Petri et Pauli (no. 17) 29 June

- in assumptione B.V.M. (nos. 3, 18) 15 August

- Commune apostolorum (= 3)
- pro confessoribus (n. 2)

Varia

- cantus in tonsura clerici (n. 2)

The problem of the multiplication of the feasts connected with the Sanctorale (not to mention the votive Masses) was tackled by the Council immediately after the conclusion of its sessions, when the work of preparing the new liturgical books was initiated. The aim was to remove from these books “the superstructures that had accumulated particularly in the previous five centuries”.³² The first, immediate and positive result was “the elimination of many saint’s feasts that previously filled up every day of the year, suffocating the big cycles of Advent and Lent, and therefore hindering the celebration of the ferial office and often the Sunday office as well”.³³ The same thing naturally occurred in the Ambrosian liturgical calendar as well: for example, the 360 days devoted to the celebration of saints in 1560 were reduced to 196 in 1582.³⁴ As a result, we cannot help noting that in Cima’s collection the Temporale is the principal source of reference and that within it the Advent cycle is given particular emphasis.

As we have observed, there are no texts of other provenance, or centonizations. Only the first motet consists of a combination of antiphon and psallenda. Just two texts belong to Marian feasts, and both are for the Assumption, the sanctuary’s main feast. Completely lacking are motets derived, either directly or indirectly (with liturgical mediation), from the Song of Songs.

There is also another point that emerges from an analysis of the texts. As we have already said, many of them are drawn from the Ambrosian Breviary. Even at first glance this supports the fact that this book is not a generic col-

³² ENRICO CATTANEO, *Il culto cristiano in Occidente. Note storiche*, Roma, CLV-Edizioni Liturgiche, 1992³, p. 317.

³³ CATTANEO, *Il culto cristiano*, p. 317.

³⁴ See ENRICO CATTANEO, “Istituzioni ecclesiastiche milanesi”, in *Storia di Milano*, vol. 9, 1961, pp. 507-720: 553.

lection of sacred music, but a collection of genuinely liturgical music. The use of texts from the Ambrosian liturgy would seem fairly obvious, and in fact it is; but it is nonetheless a field of inquiry worth exploring further. For example, in a preliminary study conducted on a sample of texts set by composers working in Milan before Cima, we note that only a minimal percentage is of Ambrosian derivation. For example, one cannot help noticing that Orfeo Vecchi's collection of four-voice motets, which is specifically designated as "in communi sanctorum",³⁵ presents the succession of the Common according to the Roman Breviary, from which the texts (from responsories, antiphons and even *capitula*) are taken without exception. By proudly drawing attention to what one might call the 'Milanese' ambit, Cima would appear to have made a distinct, indeed almost programmatic, choice. With very few exceptions there would seem to be no concordances with other composers (though clearly the lack of adequate reference works obliges us to be cautious on this point). Naturally we cannot help thinking of the efforts made by St Charles in favour of the Ambrosian rite, and of his tenacious (and fortunately victorious) struggle against the abolition of the privilege accorded by Pius V to the rites that could boast an antiquity of at least two hundred years, a measure suggested to the pope by, among others, the procurator Cesare Speciano Cardinal Giovanni Morone.³⁶ The various examples of the archbishop-saint's pastoral work on this subject are both numerous and well known. They range from the letter to the vicar general Niccolò Ormaneto expressing satisfaction that there was someone capable of teaching the Ambrosian chant to the young boys,³⁷ to the creation of the *Congregazione Diocesana del Rito Ambrosiano* and the revision of the liturgical books. Such actions testify to "how profoundly Charles perceived the dignity of the Ambrosian tradition and how conscious

³⁵ ORPHEI VECHII / MEDIOLANEN. / IN ECCLESIA S. MARIAE SCAL. / MVSICAE, ET CHORI / MAGISTRI. / Motectorum quae in Communi / SANCTORVM / Quatuor Vocibus concinuntur. / LIBER PRIMVS. / VIRTUTI SIC [printer's device] CEDIT INVIDIA / MEDIOLANI, / *Apud Augustinum Tradatum. M.DCIII.* / SVPERIORVM PERMISSV.

³⁶ See PIETRO BORELLA, *Il rito ambrosiano*, Brescia, Morcelliana, 1964, pp. 101-105; ANGELO PAREDI, *Storia del rito ambrosiano*, Milano, Edizioni O.R., 1990, p. 64. Indeed the Milanese archbishop even tried to impose the Ambrosian rite on Monza, Treviglio and Varenna, which had always used the Roman rite (though with a few elements still dating to the patriarchine rite; see CESARE ALZATI, "Aquileia", in *Dizionario di liturgia ambrosiana*, pp. 42-44: 44), though without success; see RIMOLDI, "L'età dei Borromeo", p. 405.

³⁷ "Mi piace molto che abbiate trovato huomo à vostra satisfattione per insegnar' ai nostri putti il canto e le cerimonie Ambrosiane [...]", letter dated Rome, 6 January 1565; quoted in LEWIS LOCKWOOD, "Vincenzo Ruffo and Musical Reform", *The Musical Quarterly*, XLIII/3, 1957, pp. 342-371: 347 n. 18, and in ID., *The Counter-Reformation and the Masses of Vincenzo Ruffo*, Venezia, Fondazione Giorgio Cini-Universal Edition, n.d. [1967] (Studi di Musica Veneta, 2), p. 91.

he was of the respect it deserved”.³⁸ Incidentally, that “someone” who was capable of teaching Ambrosian chant and its rites was Camillo Perego, the man charged by St Charles himself, in 1574, to draw up a *Regola di canto fermo ambrosiano*. As is well known, the work initially remained in manuscript and was not printed until 1622, with various alterations, on the initiative of Federico Borromeo.³⁹

As far as the texts are concerned, the distinct liturgical function of Cima’s collection cannot, I believe, be questioned. Much more complex, naturally, is the relationship established between the motet and its actual use in the liturgy. When tackling this issue, it is always recommended to take an open, unprejudiced attitude, especially when one is trying to establish a direct link between a text and its immediate utilization. Since this subject has become the object of systematic study only in the last few years, we are still at what we could call a ‘pioneering stage’. Yet this mere fact, which was often stressed by Jerome Roche,⁴⁰ is often misinterpreted precisely by those who take as their starting point the late English scholar’s thorough investigations.⁴¹ In

³⁸ CESARE ALZATI, “Carlo Borromeo e la tradizione liturgica milanese”, in ID., *Ambrosiana ecclesia. Studi su la chiesa milanese e l’ecumene cristiana fra tarda antichità e medioevo*, Milano, NED, 1993 (Archivio Ambrosiano, 65), pp. 307-321: 313.

³⁹ See MARCO ROSSI, “Perego, Camillo”, in *Dizionario di liturgia ambrosiana*, pp. 388-389.

⁴⁰ “The motet is not a liturgical entity like the psalm, hymn or Mass Proper, though its text may be drawn from all or part of any of these; it is best described as a ‘para-liturgical’ form with widely adaptable uses, as Anthony Cummings has argued in a recent article. Thus we may narrow down the term “liturgical motet” to mean one whose textual source occurs in the liturgy – which is not, of course, to say that it was performed at that point in a service”: JEROME ROCHE, “Liturgical Aspects of the Motets of Andrea Gabrieli Published in 1565 and 1576”, in *Andrea Gabrieli*, pp. 215-229: 216. The article by Cummings cited is the following: ANTHONY M. CUMMINGS, “Toward an Interpretation of the Sixteenth-Century Motet”, *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, XXIV/1, 1981, pp. 43-59.

⁴¹ I will here limit myself to one example of this way of approaching Roche’s considerations on the subject of motet texts, either too casually or (conversely) prejudicially. In the proceedings of the conference dedicated to Andrea Gabrieli (cited in the previous note) we note Denis Arnold’s comment on the motet *Heu mihi, Domine*: “a text which Dr Roche has tracked down to the office of the Dead; though I doubt whether this was its main use either here or elsewhere; it seems more likely to have acquired a para-liturgical function” (DENIS ARNOLD, “Gabrieli and the new Motet Style”, in *Andrea Gabrieli e il suo tempo*, pp. 193-213: 198). That the source of the motet is the corresponding responsory of the office of the Dead (with the omission of the *versus*) is not in doubt, that the use of the motet could have been prevalently devotional instead of used during the burial service is surely not in contrast with what Roche himself says (“Andrea’s pieces would have been no more likely than Lassus’s to grace an actual *Officium defunctorum*, for they are not properly liturgical, omitting the *versus* of the responsories and thereby vitiating the ritual form; but they could certainly have been heard at funerals, or at any time during November, the month of the Holy Souls, or perhaps even during a penitential season like Lent”: see ROCHE, “Liturgical Aspects”, p. 218); ultimately, the point does not seem worth labouring.

other words, if motet no. 13 *Adiuva nos, Deus salutaris noster*, was specifically designated “in Festo SS. nominis Jesu” (2 January), it is very unlikely to have been performed as a polyphonic version of the corresponding vespers psallenda, but it could have been used at any moment of the office or even at the Mass for the feast of the Sacred Name of Jesus or even, given that the source of the psallenda is a psalm, on other occasions as well. Even for the chapel of Santa Maria dei Miracoli the main moments for performing polyphony were still almost exclusively the Mass and (as far as the Office was concerned) Vespers. From Riccucci’s careful research we learn that the Mass on the most solemn of occasions, the *Messa Grande*, required the services of the polyphonic chapel for the “l’Ingresso, la Gloria, il Credo, il Santus, et responderere al Sacerdote, che cantarà la Messa sino al fine”. One could also perform “qualche concerto in più nell’organo, come saria all’Offertorio, et al Santus”. Two annotations of particular interest, because they explicitly mention the motet, concern the Office: first, “subbito dopo l’intonatione del Quoniam, cantaranno l’Hinnno corrente, il Responso in Choro, et li salmi à vicenda con il Choro, et il Motetto dopo il Magnificat”; and second, “nelli giorni, che si congregano li Signori Deputati per far Capitolo”, in addition to the normal service, “almeno due Motetti, uno avanti, et l’altro dopo il Magnificat” are required, as on solemn feasts.⁴²

The concrete possibility of using Cima’s motets within a strictly liturgical context cannot and must not exclude devotional practices of a para- or extra-liturgical, oratorical or even private character. At least in one case, motet no. 9, *O crux benedicta*, which is specifically designated “in festo inventionis Sanctae Crucis”, the devotional option is easily demonstrated, given that the reasons for the non-liturgical use of a motet based on this text lie in the very history of the Marian sanctuary. At the start of October 1576, when the earliest symptoms of what would later be called the “plague of St Charles” became visible, the archbishop of Milan organized a series of four special processions of intercession. Of these, the third, which took place on Saturday 6 October, went from the Duomo to the sanctuary of S. Maria dei Miracoli and carried in procession the Sacred Nail⁴³ mounted on a wooden cross, specially made for the occasion.⁴⁴ Today, in the church itself there is still a 15th-century

⁴² RICCUCCI, “L’attività della cappella musicale”, with the references in the documents preserved in the Archivio Storico Diocesano. Riccucci also tells us that every Saturday evening the finest singers of the chapel, perhaps also reinforced by singers from outside, were used for performances of the *Salve Regina*.

⁴³ See FAUSTO RUGGERI, “Santo Chiodo”, in *Dizionario di liturgia ambrosiana*, pp. 489-494.

⁴⁴ See LEONIDA BESOZZI, *Le magistrature cittadine milanesi e la peste del 1576-1577*, Bologna, Cappelli, 1988 (Biblioteca dell’Archivio Storico Lombardo, 2), p. 52; ANGELO MAJO, *Storia della Chiesa ambrosiana dalle origini ai nostri tempi*, Milano, NED, 1995, p. 348. Today, after being passed from parish to parish in the diocese of Milan, the cross is venerated in the church of SS. Gervasio e Protasio at Trezzo sull’Adda, in the chapel on the left side of the altar.

wooden crucifix that was apparently carried in procession by St Charles himself, again to appeal for the intercession of the Madonna against the plague, and then placed above the altar of the third side-chapel on the right, exactly where it still stands today for the memory and devotion of future generations.⁴⁵ This procession was certainly not the same one, as we can see in a painting of the procession of 6 October 1576 by Fiammenghino (real name Giovanni Battista Della Rovere) in 1602, in which one clearly identifies the cross (and not a crucifix) on which the Sacred Nail is mounted;⁴⁶ perhaps it was the same heavy crucifix that was carried round the neck with a thick rope at the two previous processions, those of 3 and 5 October, respectively towards Sant’Ambrogio and San Lorenzo.⁴⁷ Evidently, since at present we have no substantial reason for questioning the truth of this tradition, we are dealing with a different moment in the religious history of the Marian sanctuary.⁴⁸ Whatever the case, it is clear that the cross assumed a profound significance, as a direct testimony or memory of that particular moment, which could evidently be re-evoked at any moment of the year, yet particularly in the month of October, with fitting rituals and the performance of suitable motets – which would therefore also include our *O crux benedicta*.⁴⁹

⁴⁵ REGGIORI, *Il santuario*, p. 35-36; CARUBELLI, “Maria dei miracoli...”, p. 1933. The same information is given in the guide distributed in the sanctuary itself.

The remains of the body of St Celsus were located under this altar, in an urn of gilded bronze, as recently as 1935, when the then cardinal Schuster removed them from the sarcophagus that is still preserved in the left transept, where they had been laid by St Ambrose. This sarcophagus, originally located in the church of San Celso, was moved to Santa Maria dei Miracoli when, after the suppression of the monastery in 1738, it was decided in 1818 to demolish part of the church to make way for the Marian sanctuary. So today we are directly concerned with two important moments of Milanese religious history, in turn connected with the two figures of St Ambrose and St Charles.

⁴⁶ This fine picture is one of the so-called “quadroni di San Carlo”, a cycle of paintings (still exhibited annually in the Duomo) commissioned by Federico Borromeo and showing episodes and miracles from the saint’s life; see ERNESTO BRIVIO, *Vita e miracoli di S. Carlo Borromeo. Itinerario pittorico nel Duomo di Milano*, Milano, NED - Veneranda Fabbrica del Duomo di Milano, 1995 (the painting by Fiammenghino is illustrated as no. 15).

⁴⁷ See MARIO BENDISCIOLI, “Politica, amministrazione e religione nell’età di Borromeo - Vita sociale e culturale”, in *Storia di Milano*, vol. 10, 1957, pp. 3-495: 243-244.

⁴⁸ REGGIORI (*Il santuario*, p. 35) refers to just one procession, in which the archbishop of Milan fixed the Sacred Nail onto the wooden crucifix, and concludes by saying that later the crucifix was placed on an altar and “there it remained for ever, particularly and universally adored, for centuries, every Friday in the month of March”. Unfortunately he fails to cite the archival and bibliographical sources, so it would appear that he was muddling things up, given that during the plague of 1576-1577 the Holy Nail was carried in procession three times in all, and only once to Santa Maria presso San Celso, in the month of October, not March.

⁴⁹ The motet is transcribed complete in my contribution to the previous issue of the journal, which anticipates some of the themes of the present article: “Lo stile ‘osservato’ nella Milano

The choice of texts immediately plunges us into the original spirit of the Tridentine recommendations and rulings, and, above all, of the provisions on the subject in the synodal decrees. The next stage consists in examining the choices made by the composer in matters of style and musical idiom: an unavoidable passage considering the time and place in which Cima's motets were composed and published.

When we speak of Milan after the Council of Trent, one's thoughts automatically focus on St Charles Borromeo and on Vincenzo Ruffo, whom the cardinal encouraged first to do some experimenting with some motets,⁵⁰ then to compose "a Mass that was as clear as it could be".⁵¹ The direct result was Ruffo's invention of what is variously termed the "intelligible", "conciliar" or even "Tridentine" style: something that must have assumed a strongly experimental character for a composer by then around sixty years old. As far as musical substance is concerned, failure in this venture was unavoidable, owing to Ruffo's decision to resort to constant homorhythmic declamation in the two longest and most taxing texts, the *Gloria* and the *Credo*, made perhaps also because he was unable (or unwilling) to look to the similar solutions found by certain composers of secular music (principally among whom the "divine" Cipriano) in the field of the so-called "recitativo corale" (with which, as a composer of madrigals, he would have certainly been familiar).⁵² One can certainly not deny Ruffo's Masses a certain "ideological" success (as Lockwood's puts it), which consisted above all in prompting certain composers (like Asola) to strive for a greater simplification of the polyphonic structures, at least in the longest and textually more significant parts of the Mass, through an extensive, though rhythmically varied, use of homorhythm. It is worth recalling that the most fertile field of development for such tendencies (at least as a rule) lay principally in the Mass, and only to a lesser extent in the works intended for the Office (psalms, canticles, hymns).

di fine '500: alcune osservazioni preliminari", *Polifonie. Storia e teoria della coralità – History and theory of choral music*, V/2, 2001, pp. 251-279: 258-262.

The sanctuary of Santa Maria dei Miracoli also has another famous cross, of the 11th-12th century, the so-called "Chiaravalle Cross", formerly donated to the abbey of that name by Ottone Visconti in 1296; but, as the connoisseurs of art and Milanese history well know, it reached the chapter of San Celso only in 1799, following the Napoleonic suppression of the abbey. Today it is housed in the Tesoro del Duomo.

⁵⁰ Letter to the vicar Ormaneto of 20 January 1565; see LOCKWOOD, "Vincenzo Ruffo", p. 348 n. 20; ID., *The Counter-Reformation*, p. 92.

⁵¹ Letter to the vicar Ormaneto of 10 March 1565; see LOCKWOOD, "Vincenzo Ruffo", p. 349 n. 22; ID., *The Counter-Reformation*, p. 93.

⁵² See STEFANO LA VIA, "Origini del "recitativo corale" monteverdiano: gli ultimi madrigali di Cipriano de Rore", in *Monteverdi. Recitativo in monodia e polifonia*, Giornata lincea dedicata a Claudio Monteverdi (Roma, 9 marzo 1995), Roma, Accademia nazionale dei lincei, 1996 (Atti dei convegni lincei, 124), pp. 23-58.

The chronological context and cultural environment in which Cima began to compose was that of Archbishop Federico Borromeo, who, it is well known, began his career under the vigilant and constant guidance of his formidable cousin.⁵³ And yet, Federico's cultural and intellectual training, as well as temperament, were somewhat different from those of St Charles, and these differences could not help but influence his attitude towards sacred art in general. As regards the figurative arts and architecture, as pointed out in a recent stimulating article by Barbara Agosti,⁵⁴ Federico's ideas on the recovery of the local Gothic tradition, "within certain limits" (Agostini significantly adds), tended to re-establish certain traditions that had been broken by the "Roman" policies of St Charles, even within the cathedral itself. So it is incorrect to speak of continuity between the two Milanese archbishops in musical matters. The only exception concerns perhaps (again this is a field totalling needing research) the revival of Ambrosian plainchant, given that (as I mentioned earlier) it was under Federico that Perego's revised handbook was actually published.⁵⁵

If again we take the chapel of the Duomo as a significant model, we see that the *maestro di cappella* in 1599 was Giulio Cesare Gabussi. Gabussi had succeeded Pietro Ponzio in 1583, and it is known that his appointment was made on the distinct recommendation of Costanzo Porta, who in turn had been personally approached for the same post,⁵⁶ in spite of the fact that the Cremonese composer's typically elegant style had never renounced the complex contrapuntal and imitative approach.⁵⁷ Now, Gabussi is one of the innumerable musicians that are less often studied than cited, and then generally either for his liturgical works expressly written for the Ambrosian rite (later published by his successor Vincenzo Pellegrini) or above all for his motet *Defecit gaudium*, written for eight voices divided into two choirs "in obitu

⁵³ See PAOLO PRODI, "Borromeo Federico", in DBI, vol. 13, pp. 33-42.

⁵⁴ BARBARA AGOSTI, *Collezionismo e archeologia cristiana nel Seicento. Federico Borromeo e il Meioevo artistico tra Roma e Milano*, Milano, Jaca Book, 1996, in particular pp. 119-136.

⁵⁵ Again we owe the first attempt to make a concise, yet lucidly clear, distinction between the different positions and, above all, different actions taken on musical issues of the two Borromeos to Robert Kendrick, in a paper written in 1991: "Music and spirituality in Federico Borromeo's Milan", a paper read in Chicago in that year at the annual meeting of the American Musicological Society; the results of this study partially found their way into the above-cited volume *Celestial Sirens*. I owe the opportunity of examining the text of that paper to the courtesy of the author and the kindness of Laura Mauri Vigevani, whom I again thank.

⁵⁶ LOCKWOOD, *The Counter-Reformation*, pp. 112-113.

⁵⁷ LOCKWOOD, *The Counter-Reformation*, pp. 134-135. See also MISCHIATI, "Il concilio di Trento", p. 21; also cited here is the dedictaion of the *Missarum liber primus* (Venezia, Angelo Gardano, 1576) to Cardinal Giulio Feltrio della Rovere, in which the composer declares his loyalty to the "veteres praeclarissimi authores", in spite of the fact that the cardinal himself had urged him to compose music in which "verba [...] facillime perciperentur".

Caroli Cardinalis Borromaei” (it is included in the book of *Magnificat* of 1589).⁵⁸ The only assessment of Gabussi’s work of any breadth (though it is specifically addressed to *Defecit gaudium*) is still that written by Mompellio back in 1962:

His a cappella writing flows without intricacy, pure and at the same time lively and appealing in his best works, such as the motet for the death of St Charles. The musical texture is here mainly conducted in choral recitative, as a tribute to the fervent supporter of a sacred polyphony that is word and sound at the same time: it is an almost bare declamation where one detects not the fruit of observance, but a nobly pathetic threnody [...] However, with Gabussi the a cappella writing of the masters of the Duomo released the anchor from the obligation of homorhythm and went back to moving freely.⁵⁹

It is worth dwelling for a moment on this reference to an “obligation”, even though it has often been cited or paraphrased in the studies concerning the Milanese music of this period.⁶⁰ In the works published posthumously in the Ambrosian *Pontificalia*⁶¹ and *Letanie*,⁶² hence in the pieces written expressly

⁵⁸ IVLII CAESARIS / GABVTII / In Metropolitana Mediol. Musices praefecti, / MAGNIFICAT X. / Quorum novem quinis, & vnum senis vocibus concinuntur, quibus in obitu Caroli Cardinalis Borromaei / Motectum octonis. & Te deum laudamus quaternis / vocibus alternatim decantandum adijciuntur. / [printer’s device] / MEDIOLANI, / Apud Franciscum, & Haeredes Simonis Tini. / M. D. LXXXIX. Moden edition of the motet, ed. Giuseppe Vecchi, Bologna, AMIS, 1964 (Monumenta Lombarda Excerpta, 1).

⁵⁹ FEDERICO MOMPELLIO, “La Cappella del Duomo dal 1573 ai primi decenni del ‘900”, in *Storia di Milano*, vol. 16 (1962), pp. 507-588: 515 (author’s italics), and 535-539 (complete transcription of the motet *Defecit gaudium*).

⁶⁰ See, for example, UMBERTO SCARPETTA, “La musica composta per il Duomo dall’Ars nova al movimento ceciliano”, in *Sei secoli*, pp. 225-250: 236: “La produzione del Gabussi, quantitativamente non molto ricca, si iniziò con mottetti, salmi, inni in rito ambrosiano e *Magnificat*, tutti scritti in uno scorrevole stile a cappella. Il discorso procede in modo liberamente imitativo: da Gabussi in poi la prescrizione di San Carlo riguardo l’omoritmia non fu più osservata”.

⁶¹ [device of the *Veneranda Fabbrica del Duomo*] / ILLVSTRISSIMO / REVERENDISSIMOQVE / D. D. FEDERICO BORROMAEO / SANCTAE ROMANAE ECCLESIAE / PRESBYTERO CARDINALI, / & Sanct[a]e Mediolanensis Ecclesi[a]e Archiepiscopo vigilantissimo. / PONTIFICALIA / AMBROSIANAE ECCLESIAE AD VESPERAS / Musicali concentui accomodata. / LIBRI QVATVOR. / PRAEFECTORVM VENERDAE FABRICAE ECCLESIAE METROPOLITANAE / IVSSV IMPRESSI. / PARS HYEMALIS [PARS AESTIVA] / [device of the cardinale] / MEDIOLANI / IN AEDIBVS CAMPI SANCTI. / EXCVDEBAT GEORGIVS ROLLA. / Anno Domini M.DC.XIX.

⁶² [device of the *Veneranda Fabbrica del Duomo*] / IULII CAESARIS GABVTII, ET / VINCENTII PELLEGRINI, / DIVERSORVMQVE AVCTORVM / LITANIAE AMBROSIANAE, ET ROMANAE / Cum Octo, ac etiam Quatuor voc. / Hymni, & alia prout in calce huius Libri /

for the Duomo, the composer tends to adopt a plain and simple manner of a chordal type, in which liturgical functionality tends to prevail over musical interest, often very distinctly. In his 1589 *Magnificat* works, which are all set continuously without any kind of break between the verses (hence following the practice of psalmody by whole verses), he uses a moderately imitative style, for the most part resorting to individual juxtaposed points (often derived from the psalm tone itself), and a varied (though over-compulsive) use of homorhythm.⁶³

The motets of 1586, which were published in Venice but dedicated to St Charles's successor, Archbishop Gaspare Visconti, and hence evidently linked to the Milanese environment, are another matter.⁶⁴ Certainly, the writing for the individual voices is prevalently syllabic, and the ornamentation (in semi-minim values) is, all things considered, somewhat scant and generally introduced to emphasize individual words or specific details of form. But the overall conception reveals an expert hand at imitative writing (an evident legacy of his great teacher, whose mark is sometimes also visible in certain constructional features of the individual melodic lines),⁶⁵ a feature he does not wish to renounce, even though his attention would appear to be focused more on the individual detail than the global design.⁶⁶ In this respect it would appear (though once again caution is vital) that Gabussi's motets belong to the North-Italian tradition that grew up and matured on the styles of the ultramontane composers such as Lassus and Monte: in which a certain density of the musi-

AB EODEM VINCENTIO PELLEGRINO CANONICO PISAVRENSI, / & in Ecclesia Metrop. Mediol. Musico Praefecto, nuper in lucem editae, / EIUSDEMQUE ECCLESIAE VEN. FABRICAE RECT. ET PRAEFECTIS / DICATAE. / MEDIOLANI, Ex Typographia Georgij Rollae. MDCXXXIII.

⁶³ Five-voices polyphonic settings of complete, and not particularly elaborate, *Magnificats* do not seem to very common. To my knowledge there are only two other *Magnificats* by Pietro Ponzio (Gabussi's immediate predecessor) that present similar formal features (including the five-voice format) in *Magnificat D. Petri Pontii parmensis Divae Virginis Parmae magistri modulationum. Liber primus*, Venezia, erede di Girolamo Scotto, 1584. See MARCO RUGGERI, *I Magnificat di Pietro Ponzio. Edizione critica*, 2 vols., Tesi di Laurea in Musicologia, Università degli Studi di Pavia, Scuola di Paleografia e Filologia Musicale, a.a. 1994-95, vol. 1, pp. 197-199.

⁶⁴ IVLII CAESARIS GABVTII / BONONIENSIS, ECCLESIAE / MAIORIS MEDIOLANI / Magistri Musices, / MOTECTORVM LIBER PRIMVS, / Quae partim Quinque, partimque Senis / Vocibus concinuntur. / [printer's device] / Venetijs Apud Angelum Gardanum / M. D. LXXXVI.

⁶⁵ See LILIAN PIBERNIK PRUETT, "The Motets of Costanzo Porta (1529-1601)", paper read at Chapel Hill (27 February 1957) at the "Meeting of the Southeastern Chapter", and published as an abstract in the *Journal of the American Musicological Society*, X/2, 1957, pp. 137-138.

⁶⁶ See for example the motet *Sperent in te omnes*, transcribed in TIBALDI, "Lo stile 'osservato'", pp. 254-257.

cal fabric is mitigated by the clarity of the contrapuntal textures, often achieved by a more or less pronounced simplification of the individual melodic lines, a reduction of the formal dimensions and a certain euphonic expression. At times the expression is elegantly sober, as in these motets by Gabussi, or certain examples by Asola⁶⁷ or Pietro Vinci (which in some respects are more traditional, particularly the five-voice works).⁶⁸ Elsewhere, it is excessively ‘neutral’, abstract and even verging on the unassuming and impassive, as in certain collections by a composer of unquestioned importance (and hence special significance) like Ingegneri,⁶⁹ not to mention other less skilled practitioners. But – and this is no minor point – the use of homorhythm is absolutely marginal and restricted to individual moments of importance, to underline details of the text or the piece’s structure. We are talking, therefore, about a type of motet that was somewhat distant from the Palestrina model, a model splendidly and illustriously represented by the two collections of Andrea Gabrieli (1565 and 1576), which also show how the declamatory treatment of the text remains anchored within an essentially imitative-contrapuntal style.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ See GIAMMATTEO ASOLA, *Sixteen Liturgical Works*, ed. Donald M. Fouse, New Haven, A-R Editions, 1964 (Recent Researches in the Music of the Renaissance, 1).

⁶⁸ See above all *Il secondo libro de motetti à cinque voci. Nuovamente posti in luce*, Venezia, Girolamo Scotto, 1572.

⁶⁹ In this regard, see some of the five-voice motets (*Sacrarum cantionum cum quinque vocibus [...] Liber primus*, Venezia, Angelo Gardano, 1576) and almost all the four-voice motets (*Sacrarum cantionum cum quatuor vocibus [...] Liber primus*, Venezia, Angelo Gardano, 1586). In these cases, the excessively syllabic character of the jagged vocal lines, though again incorporated in an essentially polyphonic context, and the continual insistence on single rhythmic-melodic points (sometimes, moreover, of scant significance) give the works a generally flat, uniform tone, almost as if the composer had written them exclusively out of duty. A transcription of the two four- and five-voice collections is given in DANIELE SABAINO, *Edizione critica delle Sacrae cantiones cum quinque e cum quatuor vocibus e prolegomeni ad uno studio complessivo dell’opera mottettistica di Marc’Antonio Ingegneri*, Tesi di Dottorato in Filologia Musicale, Università degli Studi di Pavia, Scuola di Paleografia e Filologia Musicale di Cremona, a.a. 1993-94.

Ingegneri’s skill and imagination as a motet composer is better appreciated in the six-voice pieces (*Sacrae cantiones, senis vocibus decantandae. Liber primus*, Venezia, Angelo Gardano, 1591; modern edition ed. Daniele Sabaino, LIM, Lucca, 1994 [Opera omnia, serie I, 5]), and above all in the famous polychoral collection of 1589 (*Liber sacrarum cantionum. Quae ad septem, octo, novem, decem, duodecim, sexdecim voces choris et coniunctis et separatis comode etiam cum variis musicis instrumentis concini possunt*, Venezia, Angelo Gardano).

⁷⁰ ANDREAE GABRIELIS. / SACRAE CANTIONES (vulgo / Motecta Appellatae) Quinque Vocum, tum viva Voce, tum omnis generis Instru- / mentis cantatu commodissimae. / LIBER PRIMVS / [printer’s device] / Venetijs Apud Antonium Gardanum MDLV; ANDREAE GABRIELIS / SERENISS. REIP. VENETIARUM / IN TEMPLO D. MARCI ORGANISTAE / Ecclesiasticarum Cantionum Quatuor Vocum, Omnibus Sanctorum Solemnitatum deseruientium. / LIBER [printer’s device] PRIMVS / Venetijs Apud Angelum Gardanum. / 1576. See ARNOLD, “Gabrieli”.

The object of Federico Borromeo's measures, however, were not exclusively the Duomo. Quite the reverse, he fully espoused the needs expressed by the Council and devoted much of his pastoral work to the parishes and various religious orders. Thus, in the musical field it is no accident that he was among the first to support and encourage Orfeo Vecchi, whom, as would appear from a passage in a letter of 12 December 1591,⁷¹ he helped to gain the post of maestro di cappella at Santa Maria della Scala, the most important collegiate church after the Duomo and Sant'Ambrogio, since it was the royal church (and later imperial church, until its suppression). Nor is it a surprise that he was the dedicatee of Aquilino Coppini's spiritual contrafacta (first book, 1607), works associated, like the other similar collections (by Coppini, Vecchi, Girolamo Cavaglieri, etc.), above all with the Milanese monasteries and convents.⁷² Nor finally, is it remarkable to find there is evidence that he corresponded with composers such as Luzzasco Luzzaschi, Carlo Gesualdo (to whom he was also related), Giovanni Ghizzolo, Bartolomeo Re and Adriano Banchieri. It is possible (the hypothesis is Kendrick's) that certain problems relating to the running of the Duomo's chapel, which became evident later on during the period of Vincenzo Pellegrini, and the 'conservatism' of its repertoire prompted the archbishop to turn his attention elsewhere.

With Vecchi we have a monumental corpus (unfortunately not surviving complete) associated with a 'minor', though important, ecclesiastical institution. It can therefore be viewed as a possible model for the churches equipped with chapels that were not especially numerous. Though, all things considered, our knowledge of Vecchi's works is still somewhat slight, we can nonetheless point to certain basic features, at least in the field of the motet. They show us

the variety and abundance of the musical procedures used: alongside strictly vocal contrapuntal sections [...], in strict or free imitation, in pairs and contemporaneously within the pair itself, we find almost dance-like triple-time rhythms [...], homorhythmic and falso bordone passages, opening motifs opening with repeated notes clearly derived from the canzona francese, sometimes a typically concertante approach to part writing [...].⁷³

⁷¹ Quoted in KENDRICK, "Music and spirituality".

⁷² See MARGARET ANN RORKE, "Sacred Contrafacta of Monteverdi Madrigals and Cardinal Borromeo's Milan", *Music and Letters*, LXV/2, 1984, pp. 168-175; ANTONIO DELFINO, "Geronimo Cavaglieri e alcuni contrafacta di madrigali marenziani", in *Luca Marenzio musicista europeo*, atti della giornata di studi marenziani (Brescia, 6 marzo 1988), ed. Maria Teresa Rosa Barezani e Mariella Sala, Brescia, Fondazione Civiltà Bresciana, 1990, pp. 165-216;

⁷³ See LAURA MAURI VIGEVANI, "Orfeo Vecchi, maestro di cappella di S. Maria della Scala", *Rivista internazionale di musica sacra*, VII/4, 1986, pp. 347-369: 360-361. See also the musical appendix on pp. 399-448, which offers a modern edition of five motets from the second

Other prominent procedures are a tendency towards elaboration or a simple juxtaposition of individual points, and a structure generally tending to be formed by clearly defined sections. We also find frequent recourse to chromaticism for expressive ends and passages of a declamatory character, sometimes independent (i.e. in homorhythmic passages), sometimes within a polyphonic context (still the musician's most frequent style of writing).⁷⁴ We can conclude, it would appear, that Vecchi's style combines different elements: some borrowed from the northern tradition, other closer to the influence of other environments or musical forms.

Vecchi's work might very plausibly have constituted a model (indeed one of high quality) of sacred music: one that displayed a solid and 'traditional' contrapuntal approach – a style that evidently aroused no scandal (or even discussion), at least in the motet – and was directly destined to the collegiate churches and parishes (or any other musical chapel of reduced forces) in the diocese of Milan. Admittedly, the publication of his motet collections began only in 1597, just two years before Cima's first book. But it is also true, as far as we know, that it was only at that date that we find a resumption of motet publications on the part of composers definitely linked to ecclesiastical institutions.

Cima's choices, however, point in other directions. The overall approach and compositional choices displayed in the twenty-one motets of the set (including the Binaghi piece) are fairly consistent. In a preliminary fashion, they could be summarized as follows:

- an overall structure of generally reduced dimensions, ranging from a minimum of 41 breve bars to a maximum of 66 (the "conciseness" mentioned by Angleria), and a use of the ecclesiastical modes that is generally shifted upwards, hence requiring the so-called high "chiavette" (see Table 2);
- openings that are uniformly imitative, with statements of the subject in all four voices, and with common recourse to *rovesciar la fuga* (reversing the imitation) by *variar la corda* (varying the note) and/or *variar d'ordine*

book for five voices. A transcription of all Vecchi's motet books (except for the six-voice works) is given in LAURA MAURI VIGEVANI, *Motetti di Orfeo Vecchi maestro di cappella di Santa Maria della Scala in Milano*, Tesi di Diploma in Paleografia Musicale, Università degli Studi di Pavia, Scuola di Paleografia e Filologia Musicale di Cremona, a.a. 1982-83.

⁷⁴ This does not apply, for example, to the four-voice motets of 1597, recently published (see ORFEO VECCHI, *Missarum quatuor vocibus liber primus*, ed. Ottavio Beretta, Lucca, Libreria Musicale Italiana, 1991 [Quaderni di San Maurizio, 2]), owing to the clear prevalence of a plain, chordal idiom, at least in the Gloria and Credo movements. But we must remember that these are Masses, so evidently the comparison with Ruffo's 'model' and the greater simplification required by the text somehow made themselves felt.

- (varying the order),⁷⁵ often in all voices. This results in a somewhat extended first part that occupies by itself much of the work, sometimes as much as half (Example 1);
- a distinct preference for imitative counterpoint also in the following sections; for though some sections do present homorhythmic textures (either strictly chordal or moderately polyphonic), they are not all that frequent and in any case restricted to just a few bars (Example 2);
 - (as a result) an articulation of the individual sections that is somewhat varied and not always clearly defined in the polyphonic movement; in this regard it is interesting to observe how a homorhythmic section is joined to the ensuing polyphonic section (Examples 3a, 3b e 3c);
 - a melodic structure that is invariably wide, distinct, and non-syllabic, with a use of extended semiminim figurations, variously combined in accordance with the possibilities already experimented by Palestrina,⁷⁶ and sometimes divided into two elements separated by a rest (Examples 4a, 4b and 4c);
 - a total absence of chromaticism.

We also add a very careful and controlled use of the various dissonant procedures. At this point there should be no difficulty in identifying Cima's model of reference for the 1599 collection: it was Palestrina, and more precisely the Palestrina of the two books of four-voice motets (particularly the first). It is incidentally worth noting that Milanese editions of both these books appeared in 1587, published by Francesco and heirs of Simon

⁷⁵ GIOVANNI BATTISTA MARTINI, *Esemplare o sia Saggio fondamentale di contrappunto sopra il canto fermo [...] Parte prima*, Bologna, Lelio Dalla Volpe, 1774, pp. 144-148, concerning the analysis of Palestrina's four-voice motet *Veni sponsa Christi*: "Nel primo Soggetto sopra le parole *Veni sponsa Christi* la varia disposizione, condotta, e rivolti di esso soggetto, che consistono in mutare l'ordine delle Risposte, facendo che le prime divengono seconde [...], ciò chiamasi da' Maestri Rovesciar la Fuga. Tal Rovesciamento in due modi vien praticato, o col variar la Corda, o variar d'ordine. Per il variar la Corda deve intendersi allorchÈ una Parte, avendo formata la Proposta, o Risposta nella corda fondamentale di Tuono, o sua Ottava, nel ripigliar il Soggetto, lo ripigli nella Quinta, o nella Quarta del Tuono, e cosÌ al contrario. Ma siccome accade molte volte, che tale è la natura del Soggetto, che mutando la Corda, verrebbero le parti ad uscire dal numero delle Corde in cui devono stare ristrette, sia verso il grave, che verso l'acuto, perciò non potendo variar la Corda, variasi l'ordine, e quella Proposta, o Risposta, che era anteriore diviene posteriore, e questo è il secondo modo di Rovesciamento insegnatoci, e praticato da' Maestri dell'Arte". See ETIENNE DARBELLAY, "L'Esemplare du Padre Martini. Una exégèse musicologique moderne du *stile osservato*?", in *Padre Martini. Musica e cultura nel Settecento Europeo*, ed. Angelo Pompilio, Firenze, Olschki, 1987 (Quaderni della Rivista italiana di musicologia, 12), pp. 137-171.

⁷⁶ See the classic KNUD JEPPESEN, *The Style of Palestrina and the Dissonance*, Oxford, Oxford Univeristy Press, 1946² (facsimile reprint: New York, Dover, 1970), pp. 61-62.

Tini.⁷⁷ It is also not accidental that Cima referred to the Palestrina book that most conspicuously reveals the debt to the Flemish masters, and Josquin in particular, as Ambros has already acutely observed.⁷⁸ However, we also detect the influence of the other great master of 16th-century polyphony, Lassus. It is evident for example in the overall structuring of the compositions, which are devised in such a way that the contrapuntal development should not suffer in the slightest from the overall reduction in the work's dimensions. This, I believe, is the key to understanding Angleria's assessment of the "concise and good".⁷⁹

What we don't find in Cima, and I would say this was programmatic, are any of the distinctively different solutions typical of the "Counter-Reformation motet",⁸⁰ as experimented in certain important and successful collections of the late 16th century. In 1585 the only sacred collection issued by Luca Marenzio during his lifetime was published: the four-voice *Motecta festorum totius anni*,⁸¹ a work that played an important role in the composer's artistic

⁷⁷ See FENLON, "Il foglio volante", p. 244 nos. 35-36; on the surviving copies see RISM A I: P 694 and P 733. See also JEROME ROCHE, "'The praise of it endureth for ever': the posthumous publication of Palestrina's music", *Early Music*, XXII/4, 1994, pp. 631-639. Modern edition ed. Franz Xaver Haberl, *Johannis Petraloysii Praenestini Opera Omnia*, vol. 5, Leipzig, Breitkopf & Härtel, 1875, and ed. Raffaele Casimiri, *Opere complete di Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina*, vols. 3 and 11, Roma, Scalera, 1940 and 1942.

⁷⁸ AUGUST WILHELM AMBROS, *Geschichte der Musik*, Bd. 4, dritte verbesserte Auflage durchgesehen und erwidert von Hugo Leichtentritt, Leipzig, Leuckart, 1909, pp. 48-50. On the characteristics of the two Palestrina books, see also KARL GUSTAV FELLERER, *Palestrina-Studien*, Baden-Baden, Koerner, 1982, pp. 104-108, 122-129, 151-156.

⁷⁹ Concision in the polyphonic discourse is unquestionably one of the composer's individual traits, regardless of the idiom adopted. In this regard, we can profitably compare these motets with the five-voice *Pater noster* in the *Pontificalia* (pars aestivalis), which makes use of a somewhat different counterpoint from that used in the collection of 1599; see TIBALDI, "Lo stile 'osservato'", pp. 268-271.

⁸⁰ A undoubtedly appealing definition, coined by Michèle Fromson, is perhaps a little too restrictive, at least in the light of our present knowledge, and does not completely match the genuine variety shown by the composers in their various environments (see MICHÈLE YVONNE FROMSON, "A Conjunction of Rhetoric and Music: Structural Modelling in the Italian Counter-Reformation Motet", *Journal of the Royal Music Association*, CXVII/2, 1992, pp. 208-244: 210; by the same author, see also *Imitation and Innovation in the North-Italian Motet, 1560-1605*, 2 vols., PhD. diss., The University of Pennsylvania, 1988).

⁸¹ MOTECTA / FESTORVM / TOTIVS ANNI / CVM COMMVNI SANCTORVM / QVATERNIS VOCIBVS / A Luca Marentio nunc denuo / in lucem aedita. / LIBER PRIMVS. / [printer's device with specification of the part] / ROMAE / Apud Alexandrum Gardanum. / .M.D.LXXXV. For a bibliography of the set, see OSCAR MISCHIATI, *Bibliografia delle opere dei musicisti bresciani pubblicate a stampa dal 1497 al 1740. Opere di singoli autori*, 2 vols., ed. Mariella Sala ed Ernesto Meli, Firenze, Olschki, 1992, nos. 198-202. Modern edition ed. Roland Jackson, n.p., American Institute of Musicology, 1976 (*Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae* 72, 2).

development⁸² and was deservedly successful. Cima's motets, however, seem to display none of the characteristic features of Marenzio's sacred music that so clearly distinguish him from Palestrina (admittedly partly derived from the experience of Andrea Gabrieli, even though the Venetian's counterpoint is distinctly more syllabic): and above all, the paired-voice movement, the double motifs, the effects created by the changes of tessitura among the voices,⁸³ and also the strong contrasts between homorhythmic declamation and abundant ornamental figurations.⁸⁴

Also lacking is recourse to textual declamation within the polyphonic context. On the one hand, this excludes the solutions indicated just a few years earlier by Andrea Gabrieli in the two above-cited books of motets for four and five voices: the "new style" of the motet, to quote Denis Arnold (incidentally there were Milanese editions of both sets, though copies of the five-voice works only have survived). On the other, it ruled out the approaches of certain other great polyphonists from various environments, though here I particularly refer to the Victoria of the four-voice motets (again reprinted in Milan).⁸⁵ The point is eloquently made by comparing even just the opening of Cima's *Videntes stellam Magi* with the corresponding motet by Gabrieli, in which we observe the use of the double theme, the imitative structure that immediately involves all four voices, and the different approach towards the syntax of the text (Examples 5a and 5b).

The Palestrina model, however, is never followed slavishly or mechanically. In just one case, for example, in motet no. 8, an aBcB pattern is used, on account of the recurrence of the "Alleluia", within the text as well as at the end.

Just one motet, the Christmas *Hodie Christus natus est*, constitutes an exception to what is the composer's favoured stylistic manner by making

⁸² See, for example, the assessment in GIOVANNI ACCIAI, "'Lucae Marentii Motecta festorum totius anni... quaternis vocibus' e 'Madrigali a quatro voci' (1585)", in *Luca Marenzio musicista europeo*, atti della giornata di studi marenziani (Brescia, 6 marzo 1988), ed. Maria Teresa Rosa Barezzi and Mariella Sala, Brescia, Fondazione Civiltà Bresciana, 1990, pp. 237-255.

⁸³ See ROLAND JACKSON, "I primi mottetti di Marenzio (trattamento del testo e mutamento di stile)", in *Luca Marenzio: poetica, stile e tecnica dell'opera profana e sacra*, atti e documentazioni del X convegno europeo sul canto corale promosso e organizzato dalla Corale Goriziana "C.A. Seghizzi", Gorizia, n.p., 1979, pp. 23-49: 29.

⁸⁴ JACKSON, "I primi mottetti di Marenzio", p. 30: "L'ingegnosità contrappuntistica di Marenzio è diretta verso i dettagli, quella di Palestrina più alla struttura globale. L'impulso di Marenzio sembra essere condizionato dalla parola, quello di Palestrina da elementi strutturali più ampi."

⁸⁵ FENLON, "Il foglio volante", p. 245 no. 26.

extensive use of homorhythmic writing, even though it is introduced after the customary opening with its imitative exposition of the subject. The reason for adopting this style, however, would seem to be very clear. The text is one that had been set by various composers,⁸⁶ not infrequently in a format that required the use of two choirs. It is therefore fairly usual to find it among the work of musicians from the Venetian environment. Examples include Claudio Merulo (for ten voices; from the *Sacrorum concentum octonis, den: duoden: et sexdenis vocibus modulandorum liber primus*, Venezia 1584),⁸⁷ Giovanni Gabrieli (for ten voices, with “alleluia” interpolations; from the *Sacrae Symphoniae*, Venezia 1597),⁸⁸ Baldassarre Donato (for eight voices, with “noe noe” interpolations; from *Il primo libro de motetti a cinque, sei et otto voci. Nuovamente composti, & dati in luce*, Venezia 1599)⁸⁹ and also Palestrina himself (for eight voices, with “noe noe” interpolations; from *Motetorum quae partim quinque partim senis partim octonis vocibus concinuntur, liber tertius*, Venezia 1576).⁹⁰ So clearly we here have an allusion to the Venetian polychoral style, and with a very definite aim: to offer a reconstruction, and give the clear sensation of not just the contrasts of the antiphonal semi-choir (an effect sometimes used also by Palestrina), but also of the presence of two different cori battenti, all within a four-voice context. A concise outline of the motet’s structure should clarify this point:⁹¹

⁸⁶ Here we mention a few: Costanzo Porta, for four voices *Liber primus motectorum quatuor vocum*, Venezia, 1559); Giovanni Contino, for five voices (*Modulationum quinque vocum liber primus*, Venezia 1560); Vincenzo Ruffo, for five voices (*Sacrae modulationes liber secundus*, Venezia 1583); Luca Marenzio, for four voices with interpolation of “noe noe” (*Motecta festorum totius anni*, Roma 1585); Andrea Gabrieli, for seven voices (*Concerti*, Venezia 1587); Cipriano de Rore, for six voices (*Sacrae cantiones*, Venezia 1595).

⁸⁷ Modern edition ed. James Bastian, Neunhausen-Stuttgart, American Institute of Musicology-Hänssler Verlag, 1984 (*Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae* 51, 6), pp. 47-60.

⁸⁸ Modern edition ed. Denis Arnold, Rome, American Institute of Musicology, 1959 (*Corpus Mensurabilis Musicae* 12, 2), pp. 102-110.

⁸⁹ Modern edition ed. Richard Sherr, New York-London, Garland, 1994, pp. 281-293.

⁹⁰ Modern edition ed. Franz Xaver Haberl, *Johannis Petraloyssii Praenestini Opera Omnia*, vol. 3, Leipzig, Breitkopf & Härtel, 1875, pp. 155-159, and ed. Raffaele Casimiri, *Opere complete di Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina*, vol. 8, Roma, Scalera, 1940, pp. 202-207.

⁹¹ The piece is transcribed complete in TIBALDI, “Lo stile ‘osservato’”, pp. 263-267.

1-9	Hodie Christus natus est, hodie Salvator apparuit	Imitative structure for the first phrase with successive entries A.-C.-T.-B. with the A. dovetailing the second phrase (bb. 5-7); homorhythmic declamation on “hodie Salvator apparuit” in all four voices with cadence on D.
9-11	hodie Salvator apparuit	Homorhythmic declamation for equal voices as before, but with cadence on G
11-13	hodie in terra	A.T.B.
13-15	hodie in terra	for four voices
15-17	canunt angeli	C.A.B.
17-18	canunt angeli	C.T.B.
18-19	laetantur, laetantur,	C.A.T.
19-22	laetantur, laetantur archangeli	for four voices
22-25	hodie exultant iusti dicentes	A.T.B.
25-27	hodie exultant iusti dicentes	for four voices with cadence on C
27-29	hodie exultant iusti dicentes	for four voices with cadence on G
30-34	gloria, gloria in excelsis Deo	for four voices in triple metre, absolute homorhythm, cadence on C
35-39	gloria, gloria in excelsis Deo.	for four voices in triple metre, absolute homorhythm, cadence on Bb
40-44	gloria, gloria in excelsis Deo.	for four voices in triple metre, absolute homorhythm, cadence on G
44-54	Alleluia	Final episode of a concertante character, with a pair of voices answered by a single voice.

Quite clearly the piece is based on a continual contrast between three- and four-voice structures. This could suggest merely a normal antiphonal alternation, but that is only apparent. In fact, what we have is a continual succession of statements and answers typical of the polychoral style with *cori battenti*.⁹² The point is made even more clearly when similar rhythmic structures are repeated three times with full forces (“hodie exultant iusti dicentes” and “gloria in excelsis Deo”), immediately reminding one of the following type of succession:

⁹² Even though the corresponding motet by Merulo does not seem to be Cima’s model (because of the different mode used and, above all, different basic melodic material), it nonetheless resorts to echo responses in an extended fashion between the two choirs also on individual words, such as “laetentur”.

hodie exultant iusti dicentes	Choir I
hodie exultant iusti dicentes	Choir II
hodie exultant iusti dicentes	Choirs I+II

As for the final “alleluia”, by proposing an alternating structure again of bi-choral derivation (though in the manner of Giovanni Gabrieli), it shows itself to be a genuine four-voice concertato in the 17th-century mould. In this regard, it is worth remembering that in 1598 a significant collection that anticipated the 17th-century tendencies in the field of the early 17th-century “small-scale concertato” was published in Milan: this was the three-voice *Sacrae cantiones* by Antonio Mortaro, a Brescian composer at the time working as organist at San Francesco.⁹³ His influence is perhaps noticeable in the last motet, which carries the annotation: “lassando il Basso si può cantare à tre”. In fact it is a work originally conceived for three voices, with the Bassus subsequently added: this is confirmed in the two cases where the Tenor closes with a *clausula basizans* together with the Bassus, which uses the same cadence type in contrary motion, so that an octave resolves on a unison (Example 6). Similarly, we find echoes of the concertato style in the “Alleluia” of motet no. 10, though this time in a different context (Example 7). Moreover, in just a few cases there are procedures that most distinctly recall an instrumental type of polyphony, such as that of the recercars, because of how they are organized in the vocal discourse. The clearest example is in the motet *Deus meus, eripe me* (Example 8).

As for the Binaghi motet included in Cima’s collection, from the compositional point of view, by and large it also shares the same type of structure and style as the other pieces. If anything we notice that the melodic lines are treated more syllabically and that less importance is given to ornamentation, which is still present yet used to emphasize individual details (Example 9). In

⁹³ ANT. MORTARII / BRIXIENSIS / In Ecclesia Diui Francisci Mediolani Organistae / SACRAE CANTIONES / Tribus vocibus concinendae; / *Quibus adiungitur altera Cantio, cum Sanctorum / Laetanijs, quae senis vocibus modulantur*; / Cum sua Partitione Instrumentis etiam accomodatae. / Nunc denuò in lucem editae. / [printer’s device] / MEDIOLANI, / Apud haeredem Simonis Tini, & Io. Franciscum Bisutum. / M. D. XCVIII. For a bibliography of this collection, see MISCHIATI, *Bibliografia delle opere dei musicisti bresciani*, nos. 354-356. In this set, the required foci in most of the works consist of two voices of equal register and a bass in “a style that is as close to concertato as one can get without basso continuo” (JEROME ROCHE, “Mortaro, Antonio”, in *The New Grove*, 1st ed., vol. 12, p. 593 [in the second edition, vol. 17, pp. 151-152, Tim Carter’s revision cuts the author’s fundamental comments on this collection]; ID., *North Italian Church Music in the Age of Monteverdi*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1984, p. 51).

his publication of the previous year, a five-voice set,⁹⁴ Binaghi sometimes displays a somewhat elaborate style, which clearly shows different influences and signs of various stylistic components, prevalently borrowed from Lassus, but the suggestion of the Palestrina model nonetheless remains undeniably present.⁹⁵

It is not possible, therefore, to identify in Cima's motets any trace of a Tridentine style, or even "Tridentinism" – if by that we mean the radical solution advanced by Ruffo with his Masses of 1570 and followed, though less slavishly, in certain collections described as "conformi al Decreto e del Sacrosanto Concilio di Trento". In actual fact, the reassessment of the issue that has (fortunately) occurred in the last few years concerns precisely this point. We have to consider various levels, not least that of the different typologies of repertoire and compositional 'genre', which cannot be yoked together and placed on the same level. In other words, leaving aside a few elements shared at a more general level, the musical setting of a *Credo* neither poses the same problems nor requires the same solutions as a motet text. When interpreting the Tridentine and (above all) synodal norms, what is needed is a wider perspective: one that considers not just the letter, but above all the authentic spirit, of the Council.⁹⁶ While the condemnation of polyphony was avoided, as we learn from Pallavicino, we can by no means take it for granted that this was achieved through the birth of a new and simpler style. Or to put it another way: though we can appreciate Ruffo's attempt – an effort that had aims that were probably somewhat experimental – we now realize better that it was precisely that: one attempt and (luckily) a somewhat isolated one. If the problem was that of understanding the text, that could also be tackled within a normal, traditional, polyphonic structure, as had already been stressed by Vicentino in the 16th century:

with four voices one can comfortably compose and make the words intelligible in such a way that that they move together and still introduce points, but with five, six or more voices there will be a lot of inconvenience for one cannot make the words intelligible and have all the voices moving

⁹⁴ BENEDICTI BINAGHI / IN ECCLESIAE S. AMBROSII / CAPITE PLEBIS / SEPTALAE ORGANISTAE. / SACRARVM CANTIONVM / QVINQVE VOCVM / LIBER PRIMVS. / VIR-TUTI SIC [stemma tip.] CEDIT INVIDIA / MEDIOLANI / Apud Augustinum Tradatum. M.D.IIC. / SVPERIORVM PERMISSV. Again I would like to thank the Biblioteka Gdanska Polskiej Akademii Nauk of Danzig for providing me with the microfilm of this collection.

⁹⁵ The collection offers various reasons for interest. As an example, see in TIBALDI, "Lo stile 'osservato'", pp. 272-275, one of the most significant motets, no. 3, *Tres sunt qui testimonium dant*.

⁹⁶ BAROFFIO, "Il concilio di Trento", pp. 14-16.

together, because one will have to either introduce rests continually in some parts or hide voices.⁹⁷

and, as Palestrina succeeded in doing in his famous Mass, even in a six-voice format, thereby becoming the “saviour” of sacred polyphony.

The recovery of counterpoint, of Palestrinian counterpoint in this case, evidently means something different. Not necessarily need one interpret it, at least in Cima’s case, as a mark of ‘conservatism’. After all, just a few years later Cima went on to publish one of the most important collections of concertato motets in the North Italian environment. Nor is it necessarily a characteristic of the musical institution he belonged to. Just two years later Orazio Nantermi, the *maestro di cappella* at Santa Maria presso San Celso, was to issue a set of five-voice motets,⁹⁸ in which the influence of the instrumental canzona is very strongly present and even conditions the counterpoint itself and rhythmic movement. Moreover, the same approach was also shared by other Milanese musicians, such as Guglielmo Arnone, organist at the Duomo, in his second book of motets.⁹⁹ Here we offer two examples from these two collections: Nantermi’s motet *Gaudeamus omnes in Domino* (Example 10) and Arnone’s motet *Fulcite me floribus* (Example 11), reproduced from the original scores.¹⁰⁰ Though extensive use was made of this type of writing in other contemporary Milanese publications, particularly in those for two choirs, Cima seems to have remained indifferent, at least here.¹⁰¹ Perhaps (but

⁹⁷ NICOLA VICENTINO, *L’antica musica ridotta alla moderna prattica*, Roma, Antonio Barré, 1555 (Faksimile-Neudruck hrsg. von Edward E. Lowinsky, Kassel-Basel-London-New York, Bärenreiter, 1959), libro IV, cap. XXVII “Modi di comporre a più di quattro voci”, fols. 79v [recte 84v]-85r.

⁹⁸ PARTITO / DEL PRIMO LIBRO / DELLI MOTETTI A CINQUE VOCI / DI HORATIO NANTERMI, / Nuouamente ristampato / AL MOLTO MAG. ET REV. S.D. GASPARO / Maspero Theologo, / mio Sig. osservandiss. / [the dedication follows, dated Milan, 3 January 1601] / VIRTUTI SIC [printer’s device] CEDIT INVIDIA, / IN MILANO, Appresso Agostino Tradate. 1606. Only the score has survived, in the Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale of Bologna.

⁹⁹ PARTITVRA / DEL SECONDO LIBRO / DELLI MOTETTI / à cinque, & otto voci, / DI GVGLIELMO ARNONE MILANESE / Organista nella Chiesa Metropol. di Milano. / AL M.TO ILL.TRE SIG. LVICIO CASTELNOVATE / Signore & Padrone colendissimo. / [the dedication follows, dated Milan 10 February 1599] / [printer’s device] / IN MILANO, / Appresso l’herede di Simon Tini, & Gio. Francesco Besozzi. / M. D. XCIX. Again only the score has survived, again in the Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale of Bologna.

¹⁰⁰ I here thank the director of the Bologna library, Dr Mario Armellini, for authorizing the publication of the two examples in facsimile.

¹⁰¹ That this was a possibility Cima was familiar with is clearly shown in the four-voice Mass published in the *Concerti ecclesiastici* of 1610. Here the prevalently (though not schematic) homorhythmic movement, justified by the ‘Mass’ genre, is animated by strong rhythmic characterization, mainly derived from the canzona.

this is a hypothesis that totally needs verifying) the use of a type of historically attested counterpoint, such as that of the Josquin tradition as transmitted by Palestrina in the four-voice motets, could be seen to correspond to a recovery of the authentic musical tradition of the Roman Catholic Church; a recovery that was also ideological and only apparently conservative in character. As for the end-of-century monodic experiments in the sacred field, they were often dictated by contingent needs (as we learn from the preface to Viadana's *Cento concerti ecclesiastici*) and in any case applied to polyphonic pieces, whereas, apart from Ruffo, the composers did not always have such clearly defined attitudes towards contrapuntal writing. Indeed the use of authentically liturgical texts, combined with the adoption of the most perfect and refined compositional technique then existing as a model of musical style (viewed as something utterly modern and relevant and by no means 'didactic') and recourse to the classic, balanced vocal forces of four full voices, were seen as a fitting response to a conception (an intimately Counter-Reformational conception) that viewed art as a means of lavishly glorifying the Catholic Church. Only in the 17th century did this vision find its truly authentic accomplishment in the grandiose Roman polychoral style and in the fully-developed concertato style.