

ELISABETTA PASQUINI

*Padre Martini, iudex et arbiter.  
On a “concorso” in Bologna in 1760\**

Even during his life, Padre Giambattista Martini was accorded the sobriquet “Gran musagete italiano”. Among those who described him in such terms was Stefano Arteaga:<sup>1</sup> an erudite Spaniard who resided at Bologna for just over a decade from 1773, attending lectures in philosophy, mathematics and medicine at the university, and who was well-acquainted with the Franciscan and his extensive library. Martini’s fame, earning him this high-sounding epithet of the ‘guide of the Muses’, had developed over time through his activities as a music scholar, a teacher and a composer, all of which he exercised with noted precision and abnegation. His published works, both musical and non-musical, brought him recognition and appreciation beyond the walls of the convent of San Francesco, consolidating his relationship with princes, prelates and the cultural élite throughout Europe. The most subtle nuances of his theoretical texts, often too technical for *dilettanti* or amateurs, were perhaps lost on non-musicians. But all could appreciate their solid conceptual framework: the unanimous admiration it aroused is still evident in the many letters in which his correspondents

---

\* I owe thanks to Francesco Luisi for allowing me to publish here the paper presented to the Seventh Colloquium of Musicology of *Il Saggiatore musicale* (23 November 2003); the text read at the Arezzo conference entitled “Padre Martini in giudizio da Apollo” will see the light elsewhere. I am grateful to Annarita Colturato, Erminio Lora, Francesco Lora and Piero Mioli for their valuable suggestions, of which I was able to make use in the definitive edition of this text, and to Andrea Gualandi for having indicated to me the documents cited here in note 37; a grateful thought goes finally to the memory of Oscar Mischiati, who brought the topic discussed here to my attention some years ago. These pages owe much to some of my earlier writings: in particular, *L’“Esemplare, o sia Saggio fondamentale pratico di contrappunto”*. *Padre Martini teorico e didatta della musica*, Firenze, Olschki, 2004; and *Giambattista Martini*, Palermo, L’Epos, 2007. The following RISM abbreviations are used: I-Bc = Bologna, Museo internazionale e Biblioteca della Musica; I-Bca = Bologna, Biblioteca Comunale dell’Archiginnasio; I-Bsf = Bologna, Biblioteca di S. Francesco, Convento dei Minori francescani; I-Bsp = Bologna, Archivio musicale della Basilica di S. Petronio.

<sup>1</sup> As in the review in vol. III of *Storia della musica*, which appeared in *Memorie enciclopediche*, n. 10, 1782, pp. 73-77: 74. Beginning from 1783 with Martini’s encouragement, Arteaga published *Le rivoluzioni del teatro musicale italiano dalla sua origine fino al presente*, 3 vols., Bologna, Trenti, 1783-1788, in which he defended Metastasian opera as the perfect model of *dramma per musica*. This epithet had appeared earlier also in the *Efemeridi letterarie di Roma*, n. XLI, 14 ottobre 1775, pp. 321-324: 321, in a review dedicated to the *Dubbio di d. Antonio Eximeno sopra il “Saggio fondamentale pratico di contrappunto” del reverendissimo padre maestro Giambattista Martini*, Roma, Barbiellini, 1775, which referred in polemical fashion to the Martinian text. Even his adversaries were therefore very conscious of Martini’s influence (see PASQUINI, *L’“Esemplare, o sia Saggio fondamentale pratico di contrappunto”*, doc. 99, pp. 245-248: 246).

frequently praised the comprehensive scholarship of the learned Bolognese.<sup>2</sup> Equally, the name of Padre Martini also reverberated courtesy of those who turned to him in order to acquire the rudiments of, or to perfect their studies in, counterpoint or composition. His many pupils – thought to be more than a hundred – were supervised with his habitual goodness and generosity of character, and proudly dubbed themselves his ‘disciples’.<sup>3</sup>

However, the great authority enjoyed by Padre Martini was not revealed only in these terms. He was also *definitore perpetuo* in the Accademia Filarmonica of Bologna, an institution created in 1666 and which nominated the *maestri di cappella* in the Bologna diocese.<sup>4</sup> In 1758, the Franciscan was admitted to the

<sup>2</sup> The correspondence comprises more than six thousand letters sent by almost a thousand correspondents (colleagues and pupils of Padre Martini, including Agricola, Gerbert, Locatelli, Marpurg, Quantz, Rameau, Soler, and Tartini, or eminent political and cultural personalities of the day, such as Frederick II of Prussia, Charles Theodor of Baviera, Ferdinand of Bourbon duke of Parma, Metastasio, Ludovico Antonio Muratori and Girolamo Tiraboschi; around six hundred draft responses were annotated by the Bolognese friar in the blank pages of the letters to which they refer), and covers a temporal arc from 1730 to 1784. The first known letter came from Ferrara, regarding some books that later entered Padre Martini’s library (I-Bc, I.7.103; letter of 10 October 1730), while the last, written by Martini three days before his death and addressed to Luigi Antonio Sabbatini, concerned the admission of two young men to the Congregazione dei musici di santa Cecilia (I-Bc, I.29.11a; letter of 31 July 1784). As is evident from the contents of these two letters, the correspondence encompassed the most disparate themes, from the acquisition of books to matters of a personal nature. The correspondence has been catalogued by ANNE SCHNOEBELEN, *Padre Martini’s Collection of Letters in the Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale in Bologna: An Annotated Index*, New York, Pendragon, 1979; a small number of letters (136 in total, written by Martini and others) has been published in the *Carteggio inedito del p. Giambattista Martini coi più celebri musicisti del suo tempo*, a cura di Federico Parisini, Bologna, Zanichelli, 1888. Scholarship on the correspondence, however, is scattered across tens of diverse contributions, from editions of letters relative to the personalities with whom he was in contact, to essays of a different nature in which the letters document some aspects of the character and interests of the Franciscan (see PASQUINI, *Giambattista Martini*, chapt. “La fama”, pp. 31-59: 33-37, which contains a specific bibliography).

<sup>3</sup> “A caring and loving genius”, who loved to sacrifice himself “solely for the good of others, and with incredible disinterest”: these are the words with which a distinguished student, Paolo Morellato, recalled him. Martini’s teaching activity took place entirely in the Bolognese convent. He began in 1735, at the age of 29 years, and with every probability continued – flanked by Stanislao Mattei, who in San Francesco had assumed the role of both his spiritual and material heir – until a little before his death, almost half a century later. Alongside the most noted names of Johann Christian Bach, Wolfgang Amadé Mozart and Niccolò Jommelli, among Martini’s pupils were also much less celebrated musicians, destined to remain almost wholly unknown. The disciples arrived at Bologna from across Europe (Spain, France, Belgium, Austria, Germany, Denmark and Russia) in order to learn step by step all the secrets of counterpoint or even merely in order to practise for some weeks for admission into the Accademia Filarmonica, as will be mentioned later (see PASQUINI, *L’“Esemplare, o sia Saggio fondamentale pratico di contrappunto”*, pp. 82-87, and EAD., *Giambattista Martini*, chapt. “Il didatta”, pp. 145-161).

<sup>4</sup> Originating from Benedetto XIV in 1749, the papal brief *Demissas preces* had decreed that the favourable judgement of the Accademia Filarmonica was the necessary requisite in order to undertake the profession of *maestro di cappella* under the Two Tower. Such a privilege, which in fact placed the Bolognese institution on the same footing as the Roman Congregazione

class of composers "with universal acclamation and applause" (although not without dispute, given his clerical status), and three years later he became "the arbiter of musical issues".<sup>5</sup> On various occasions he found himself settling controversies and pronouncing on the ability of certain musicians. The most noted case concerned Jean-Philippe Rameau, who in 1759 was hoping for his own admission to the Accademia dell'Istituto delle Scienze of Bologna, and on whose theoretical writings Martini formulated a severe opinion.<sup>6</sup> At times,

---

dei musici di santa Cecilia, was expressed by a form of hegemony over civic musical activities. On this subject, see NESTORE MORINI, *La R. Accademia Filarmonica di Bologna*, Bologna, Cappelli, 1930; LAURA CALLEGARI HILL, *L'Accademia Filarmonica di Bologna, 1666-1800: statuti, indici degli aggregati e catalogo degli esperimenti d'esame nell'archivio, con un'introduzione storica*, Bologna, AMIS, 1991; OSVALDO GAMBASSI, *L'Accademia Filarmonica di Bologna. Fondazione, statuti e aggregazioni*, Firenze, Olschki, 1992. The text of the papal brief appears in PASQUINI, *L'"Esemplare, o sia Saggio fondamentale pratico di contrappunto"*, pp. 168-171, doc. 3.

<sup>5</sup> The minutes record how "the academy's members, lit by a lively and just desire to see someone of such notable merit enrolled among their gathering, notwithstanding any contrary statute or sanction excluding regulars" decided to depart from their usual practices "on this one occasion only, and on condition that it did not constitute a precedent for the future". Martini's admission in fact contravened an unwritten rule that excluded access to practising members of religious orders, and therefore also to the Franciscans. Instituted in 1719 in response to the "virtuous queries" submitted by Francesco Antonio Pistocchi, the role of "*definitore perpetuo*" was conferred on prominent composers in order to settle musical controversies; Giacomo Antonio Perti and Giuseppe Righi were the first to undertake this responsibility. Martini's stormy association with the Accademia Filarmonica ended in 1781, when he officially resigned: the events are narrated by CALLEGARI HILL, *L'Accademia Filarmonica di Bologna*, pp. 35-48; but see also NATALE GALLINI, "Le dimissioni di padre Martini", *La Scala*, XVI, 1953, pp. 11-15; GIUSEPPE VECCHI, "Padre G. B. Martini e le Accademie", in *La musica come arte e come scienza. Ricordando padre Martini*, 2 vols., Bologna, AMIS, 1985, II, pp. 153-187.

<sup>6</sup> Martini was commissioned by the Istituto delle Scienze (to which he had been admitted the preceding December with the dissertation "De usu progressionis geometricae in musica") to report on the text that Rameau had submitted for the Accademia's judgement, the *Nouvelles réflexions sur le principe sonore* – then revised and published as an appendix to the *Code de musique pratique* (1760) –, which followed the *Démonstration du principe de l'harmonie*, on which Pompeo Pellegrini should have given his opinion nine years earlier. In his report, not presented before April 1761, Padre Martini severely criticised the French theorist's proposed system. We do not know if the text of the report was read publicly at the Accademia: it is almost certain, however, that Rameau could not scrutinize it, as was the usual practice, and he did not receive any response to his requests made to Martini to make a public declaration. The first explicit judgements on Rameau's theories occur in the first volume of the *Esemplare, o sia Saggio fondamentale pratico di contrappunto*, I: *Sopra il canto fermo*; II: *Fugato*, Bologna, Dalla Volpe, 1774-76 (anast. repr. Ridgewood, Gregg, 1965), where ten years after the death of his colleague Martini underlines how "he knew how to reduce his system to such a degree that little or nothing remained of it that could not be demonstrated or verified" (p. 93). On the difficult relationship between Martini and Rameau, see FRANCESCO VATELLI, "Lettere di musicisti brevemente illustrate", *La Cronaca musicale*, XX, 1916, pp. 199-224, and XXI, 1917, pp. 10-36; ERWIN R. JACOBI, "Rameau and Padre Martini: New Letters and Documents", *Musical Quarterly*, L, 1964, pp. 452-475; and above all PATRIZIO BARBIERI, "Martini e gli armonisti 'fisico-matematici': Tartini, Rameau, Riccati, Vallotti," in *Padre Martini. Musica e cultura nel Settecento europeo*, a cura di Angelo Pompilio, Firenze, Olschki, 1987, pp. 173-209: 189-196.

Martini also participated in the judging panels for the posts of *maestro di cappella* in Italian churches and musical institutions. Such work began in 1745, when he supported the much loved and by then elderly third *maestro* of counterpoint, Giacomo Antonio Perti, in the “concorso” for the Royal Chapel of Naples, necessitated by the death of Leonardo Leo,<sup>7</sup> and continued until 1779 when he was among those who appointed Giuseppe Sarti for the Cathedral of Milan.<sup>8</sup> In 1762 Melchiorre Chiesa was chosen for Santa Maria della Scala, notwithstanding the Franciscan in the second round had expressed a favourable

<sup>7</sup> Giuseppe De Maio triumphed over Francesco Durante, towards whom Perti was inclined; the other candidates were Antonio Auletta, Carlo Cotumacci, Giuseppe Marchitti, Saverio Nanucci, Nicola Sala, Michelangelo Valentini and Francesco Vallutti. The originals of the proceedings and the tasks and Martini’s copies relative to this and other competitions in which the Franciscan appeared as a judge are conserved in I-Bsf, mss. 50-54, and in I-Bc, EE.122-124 e 126 (*Concorsi a cappella*).

<sup>8</sup> The first of the Milanese competitions on which Martini delivered judgement took place in 1747, when his support enabled Gianandrea Fioroni to obtain the post of *maestro di cappella* in the Cathedral, competing with Carlo Borroni, Michelangelo Caselli, Francesco Messi and Giuseppe Palladino. A year after Fioroni’s death in ’78, and after new examinations, Giuseppe Sarti was appointed, notwithstanding that the judging panel proposed Lorenzo Mariani and, in second place, Gabriele Vignali (preferred by Martini); other participants in the competition were Pietro Annetti, Francesco Bianchi, Raimondo Mei, Carlo Monza and Agostino Quaglia. Apart from Martini, the two judging panels comprised respectively Gaetano Carpani, Girolamo Chiti and Carlo Foschi (1747; in this case Martini’s opinion was supported by Perti and Giuseppe Maria Carretti), and Pasquale Cafaro, Giambattista Casali, Gioacchino Cocchi, Nicola Sala and Francesco Antonio Vallotti (1779). The proceedings of both events have been published in *Sei secoli di musica nel Duomo di Milano*, a cura di Graziella De Florentiis and Gian Nicola Vessia, Milano, NED, 1986, pp. 96-125; on the second competition, see also LUIGI TORRI, “Una lettera inedita del padre Giambattista Martini”, *Rivista musicale italiana*, II, 1895, pp. 262-286; LEONIDA BUSI, *Il padre G. B. Martini, musicista-letterato del secolo XVIII*, Bologna, Zanichelli, 1891, pp. 323-333; GIOVANNI TEBALDINI, *L’archivio musicale della Cappella Antoniana in Padova. Illustrazione storico-critica*, Padova, Tipografia Antoniana, 1895, pp. 47-50. In truth, Padre Martini had already evaluated the ability of Pietro Paolo Valle in 1743; Valle had previously been a candidate for the successor to and then for the assistant to the Cathedral’s *maestro di cappella*, Carlo Baliani. The opinions of the external “experts” had been negative – beyond the Bolognese theorist, the panel included Andrea Basili, Pietro Paolo Bencini, Giuseppe Gonella, Leonardo Leo, Niccolò Porpora and Pietro Pulli, plus three other judges who preferred to remain anonymous; the internal commissioners comprised Michelangelo Caselli, Giovanni Corbelli, Francesco Messa and Giambattista Sammartini –, and the candidate was rejected. On this matter, see *Sei secoli di musica nel Duomo di Milano*, p. 129; MARINA TOFFETTI, “Sammartini in commissione d’esame presso il Duomo di Milano (1733-1773)” in *Giovanni Battista Sammartini and His Musical Environment*, a cura di Anna Cattoretti, Turnhout, Brepols, 2004, pp. 417-474: 433-437; EAD., “Prassi contrappuntistica e sensibilità musicale a metà Settecento. L’esperimento di Pietro Paolo Valle presso il Duomo di Milano”, in *Barocco padano 4*, Atti del XII convegno internazionale sulla musica italiana nei secoli XVII-XVIII (Brescia, 14-16 luglio 2003), a cura di Alberto Colzani, Andrea Luppi, Maurizio Padoan, Como, AMIS, 2006, pp. 475-530. Moreover, on the request of the candidate Gaetano Piazza, Padre Martini in 1773 participated with Giuseppe Carcani and Francesco Antonio Vallotti on the panel for the competition for the post of first organist in the Cathedral of Milan, attributed instead to Quaglia (see TOFFETTI, “Sammartini in commissione d’esame”, pp. 437-449).

opinion about another candidate, Carlo Monza.<sup>9</sup> (On at least one occasion, Padre Martini determined the outcome of a contest without figuring officially among the designated judges: thanks to his suggestions, in 1779 his former pupil Bernardino Ottani took service in the Cathedral of Turin despite not having participated in the trials the preceding year.<sup>10</sup>) At Bologna in 1760, the position of assistant (with future promotion) to the *maestro di cappella* in San Petronio was advertised, owing to the fact that Giuseppe Maria Carretti, “because of his advanced age, and his known indispositions”, could not “always participate in all the chapel’s functions”.<sup>11</sup> As will be related here, Martini was judge and undisputed arbiter of the competition, from the moment when the preliminary criteria were compiled up to the proclamation of the winner, which took place after some difficult vicissitudes and almost a year after the start of the work of the commission.

As the published notification of the competition on 28 February 1769 demonstrates, there were two qualifications for admission (possibly suggested, but certainly agreed and reviewed by Padre Martini) imposed by the Fabbriceria of San Petronio. The candidates had to be approved by the Accademia Filarmonica (the licence issued by the Accademia had to be exhibited when the applications were presented to the secretary Giuseppe Gaetano Cuppi) and to be citizens either of Bologna or its state. Moreover, they had to declare themselves ready to undertake “whatever trial” might be asked of them.<sup>12</sup> The final list of participants included

<sup>9</sup> Beyond Chiesa and Monza, Valle also undertook the examination. Johann Christian Bach turned to Martini for an opinion regarding the formal protests submitted by two of the three candidates, who asserted that the assigned *cantus firmus* was too long. Giambattista Sammartini, an influential internal commissioner, intervened to clarify why the composer supported by the Franciscan theorist had not been appointed: it was Martini himself who responded that the judgements of the commissioners were consultative, not elective. See CLAUDIO SARTORI, “A Milano J. C. Bach in disaccordo con il tesoriere”, *La Scala*, 15 novembre 1950, pp. 29-31; HOWARD BROFSKY, “J. C. Bach, G. B. Sammartini, and padre Martini: A “concorso” in Milan in 1762”, in *A Musical Offering: Essays in Honor of Martin Bernstein*, a cura di Edward H. Clinkscale and Claire Brook, New York, Pendragon, 1977, pp. 63-68; TOFFETTI, *Prassi contrappuntistica e sensibilità musicale*, pp. 480-482.

<sup>10</sup> The candidates Paliuzi and Gian Domenico Perotti were rejected also thanks to Padre Martini’s negative opinion, officiously sought by the Chapter of the Cathedral; the Franciscan made the suggestion to elect a candidate outside the competition (see ROSY MOFFA, “Bernardino Ottani”, in BERNARDINO OTTANI, “*Te Deum*” in *Re maggiore per soli, coro e orchestra*, a cura di Maurizio Benedetti, Lucca, LIM, 2001, pp. VII-XIII: VIII).

<sup>11</sup> As in the deliberations of the Fabbriceria of S. Petronio, conserved together with the formal documents pertaining to the competition in I-Bsp, ms. 28 (*Decreta Congregationis incipiens a die 21 aprilis 1746 usque ad diem 4 ianuarii 1773*), p. 79. Carretti (1690-1774) was a cantor and composer, and prince and examiner of the Accademia Filarmonica. In 1740 he had been nominated as the assistant to the *maestro di cappella*, Perti; sixteen years later he succeeded in acquiring the post itself.

<sup>12</sup> The originals and Martini’s copies of the documents relative to the competition are conserved in I-Bsp, ms. 56 (*Filza corrispondente agli atti della R. Fabbrica di S. Petronio dall’anno 1731 al 1773*); in I-Bsf, ms. 52 (on p. 3 the draft of the notification, edited by Martini); in I-Bc, EE.124, cc. 242r-261r, the copies of the single trials can be found, with Martini’s comments. The selectivity of the admission requirements of the competition demonstrate the role exercised by the Accademia Filarmonica in regulating the musical life of the city in almost corporatist fashion.

Lorenzo Gibelli, Giovanni Calisto Andrea Zanotti, Petronio Lanzi, Antonio Maria Mazzoni and Domenico Barbieri.<sup>13</sup> At least one, but perhaps two (Zanotti and Gibelli) were former pupils of Padre Martini; Mazzoni and Gibelli, both aged more than forty, were composers of merit;<sup>14</sup> the youngest competitors were Barbieri, Lanzi and Zanotti – the latter was little more than twenty years of age.<sup>15</sup>

The examinations took place the following June.<sup>16</sup> On the second day, the candidates, furnished with “*cartella* and ink-pot”,<sup>17</sup> convened at the residence of the president of the Fabbricieri, Francesco Albergati Capacelli, and in the presence also of Paolo Bolognini (both men were the “deputised” senators of Fabbriceria of San Petronio). The candidates were set the task of composing a counterpoint for four voices on a *cantus firmus* assigned by the commission and drawn from the book of introits opened at random. In this instance, the choice fell on «In medio Ecclesiae», in the sixth mode (see

<sup>13</sup> The originals of the licences for Gibelli, Zanotti and Mazzoni are conserved among the documents in I-Bsp, ms. 56.

<sup>14</sup> In 1743, Antonio Maria Mazzoni (1717-1785) was approved for admission into the Accademia Filarmonica’s class of composers, of which he was then prince *pro tempore* in ’57, ’61, ’71, ’73, ’84. At the time of the Bologna competition he was *maestro di cappella* in the basilica of San Giovanni in Monte; his operas were performed in Italy and abroad, arousing notable success. Lorenzo Gibelli (1718-1812) was a singer and composer (known also as “Gibellone dalle belle fughe”): a member of the Accademia Filarmonica from 1743, he was prince of the association in ’53, ’63, ’68, ’72 and in 1810. He taught singing at Bologna’s Liceo Filarmonico from its foundation (1804), where his pupils included also Gioachino Rossini. From 1744 he was *maestro di cappella* in the church of Santissimo Salvatore.

<sup>15</sup> Domenico Barbieri, approved in 1755 by the Filarmonica as an organist, was *maestro di cappella* of the Servites. Petronio Lanzi, born in 1729, studied counterpoint with Giacomo Cesare Predieri; admitted into the Accademia Filarmonica in 1751, he became its prince in 1762, ’70, ’75 and ’79. In 1760 he was employed as a tenor in the chapel of S. Petronio, a position he held from 1752 to ’64 (see OSVALDO GAMBASSI, *La cappella musicale di S. Petronio. Maestri, organisti, cantori e strumentisti dal 1436 al 1920*, Firenze, Olschki, 1987). As written later by GIAMBATTISTA MARTINI, “Serie cronologica de’ principi dell’Accademia de’ Filarmonici di Bologna, e degli uomini in essa fioriti per nobiltà, dignità, e per le opere date alle stampe”, *Diario bolognese*, 1776, pp. 35-36: 36, he moreover taught “singing and counterpoint”. From 1779 he was *maestro di cappella* in the basilica of S. Giovanni in Monte. Giovanni Calisto Andrea Zanotti (1738-1817) had followed his musical studies under the guide of Martini – see the notebook today in I-Bc, KK.320 (*Studi di contrapunto*) –, who in the *Serie cronologica de’ principi*, pp. 36-37: 36, describes him as of the “notably learned Zanotti family”; in 1759 he had been admitted to the class of composers of the Accademia Filarmonica. From 1804 he was the teacher of pianoforte at the Liceo Filarmonico.

<sup>16</sup> In the draft of the press notification of the competition, Padre Martini corrected the terms for the presentation of the applications (not within “the next month of March beginning from the first day up to the 31st of that same month”, rather within “eight days from the publication of the present notice”, which he foresaw as taking place on 21 February), and suggested the dates for the trials (originally three, as will be discussed): 8, 11 and 15 March 1760 (I-Bsf, ms. 52, pp. 5 e 25). The Fabbriceria of S. Petronio instead preferred to impose more convenient dates for the trials.

<sup>17</sup> As in the letter notifying the meeting sent on 29 May (I-Bsp, ms. 56).

music example 1).<sup>18</sup>

The second test, which took place at the same location two days later, consisted of a five-part fugue of not less than 30 bars, on a subject drawn by lots among those suggested by Carretti, four or six in total (see music example 2).

At the top of both tasks, the candidates were asked to annotate the tone of the piece, and if authentic or plagal, perfect or imperfect; and in the case of the fugue, to indicate moreover each answer and countersubject, to demonstrate the devices introduced “in order to give examples... of merit”, and finally, “to condense the subject, forming of it, as is vulgarly termed, the *stricco* [stretto]”.<sup>19</sup> Once the tests were finished, the papers were copied on to new paper, anonymised, and assigned an alphabetical letter (from *A* to *E* for the introit, from *F* to *L* for the fugue; cfr. musical examples 3-12),<sup>20</sup> and were then again recopied in order to be sent to the members of the judging panel, presumably designated by Padre Martini. Those who agreed to evaluate the Bolognese candidates included Giacomo Antonio Arrighi (Cathedral of Cremona), Andrea Basili (Santa Casa of Loreto), Giambattista Casali (San Giovanni in Laterano at Rome), Gianandrea Fioroni (Cathedral of Milan), Quirino Gasparini (Cathedral of Turin), Niccolò Porpora (Conservatory of Santa Maria di Loreto at Naples) and Francesco Antonio Vallotti (Basilica del Santo at Padua).<sup>21</sup> Those who instead

<sup>18</sup> Introit of the mass for the Feast of St. John, apostle and evangelist (27 December): “The Lord opened his mouth in the assembly, and filled him with the spirit of wisdom and understanding, and clothed him in a robe of glory” (from the *Ecclesiastius* XV, 5-6). The version set by the candidates – unanimously apart from Lanzi, who anticipates by three notes the syllable *-lec-* of *intellectus*, and by one note the syllables *-lam glo-* of *stolam gloriae* – presents minimal variations with respect to the *Liber usualis missae et officii pro dominicis et festis cum cantu gregoriano*, Paris-Tournai-Roma, Desclée, 1954, p. 1190: F-F (rather than F-G) on the syllable *-pe-* of *aperuit*, and E-F-G-A-G-A-F-F-C (rather than F-G-A-A-G-A-G-F-D-C) on *intellectus*.

<sup>19</sup> The passage is drawn from the *Leggi ed avvertenze prescritte ne' due sperimenti ai concorrenti al posto di sostituto all'odierno maestro di cappella della perinsigne collegiata di S. Petronio* (I-Bsp, ms. 56), which will be referred to later in this essay.

<sup>20</sup> The edition reproduces faithfully the text of the trials, including the errors.

<sup>21</sup> Clearly, almost all the external judges were extremely close to Padre Martini. Giacomo Antonio Arrighi (1706-1797) turned to the Franciscan to silence the criticisms of some of his enemies who were contesting his responsibilities in the principal church of Cremona because of his slowness in composing, in their view caused by a lack of ideas. In response, the Bolognese theorist published the *Attestati in difesa del signor d. Jacopo Antonio Arrighi* (Bologna, Dalla Volpe, 1746), a brief apologetic tract – the first among the theoretical writings of Padre Martini – that bore a declaration signed not only by the author but also by his illustrious colleagues Giacomo Antonio Perti, Giuseppe Mavia Carretti, Angelo Antonio Caroli and Giuseppe Matteo Alberti (cfr. PASQUINI, *Giambattista Martini*, pp. 122-124). Thanks also to the favourable opinion of Martini, Gianandrea Fioroni (1715/6-1778) had obtained the position of *maestro di cappella* in the chapel of the Cathedral of Milan in the competition of 1747; for his part, Fioroni redeemed his debt by providing Martini with news and books on Ambrosian chant (Charles Burney turned to him for the same reason, after his journey to Italy in which he met the Franciscan and gathered documents for his

refused were Giacomo Saratelli, *maestro di cappella* of San Marco at Venice, and Johann Adolf Hasse, who because of his imminent departure for Vienna declared that he did not have “sufficient time in order to make a mature reflection on the compositions”, as can be read in the autograph letter conserved in San Petronio.<sup>22</sup>

The members of the commission were requested to make a “reasoned judgement on [the candidate’s] greater or lesser ability... in the art of composing ecclesiastical music”.<sup>23</sup> In the introits, the first position was awarded by unanimous agreement to the letter C (corresponding to Petronio Lanzi), for the “graceful” impression made by the “fugues, imitations, in the middle a touch [*un tocco*] of canon in unison, and at the end a kind of *stricco* drawn from the same *cantus firmus*: all with excellent distribution of parts, adorned with natural, firm and artless *cantilene*”: in short, in full respect of the rules of the art.<sup>24</sup> With regard

---

*General History of Music*); see RICCARDO ALLORTO, “Il canto ambrosiano nelle lettere di G. B. Martini e di Charles Burney”, *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft*, XXV, 1962 (*Festschrift für Erich Schenk*, a cura di Otto Wessely), pp. 1-4. Others who completed their studies in counterpoint under Martini’s guidance included Quirino Gasparini (1721-1778), and Giambattista Casali (1715-1792), who then opposed him in a diatribe concerning the admission to the Congregazione di santa Cecilia of two pupils of his fellow student Sabbatini (the events are described in CALLEGARI HILL, *L’Accademia Filarmonica di Bologna*, pp. 53-61). Among the most confirmed admirers of Padre Martini were Andrea Basili (1705-1777) and Francesco Antonio Vallotti (1697-1780), with whom he maintained a long epistolary relationship (on their correspondence, see VITTORE ZACCARIA, “Il carteggio tra Francescantonio Vallotti e Giambattista Martini”, in *Francescantonio Vallotti nel II centenario dalla morte (1780-1980). Biografia, catalogo tematico delle opere e contributi critici*, a cura di Giulio Cattin, Padova, Edizioni del Messaggero, 1981, pp. 433-439). Padre Martini would even have edited the posthumous edition of volumes I and II of Vallotti’s *Scienza teorica e pratica della moderna musica*: however, he limited himself to transcribing the musical examples indicated in the text, and to supplying each volume with a note to the reader and an index of the chapters (see PASQUINI, *Giambattista Martini*, p. 49 sg.).

<sup>22</sup> I-Bsp, ms. 56; letter of 28 June 1760.

<sup>23</sup> As in the letter of invitation to the external *maestri di cappella*, drawn up by the Secretary of the Fabbrica on 16 June 1760 (*ibid.*). Among the Martinian documents in I-Bsf, ms. 52, p. 23, there is an *Esemplare della lettera, che potrà scriversi dal Segretario della Fabrica ad ognuno de’ maestri di cappella esteri, nello spedire ad essi le copie delle composizioni fatte dai concorrenti, e le leggi ed avvertenze ad essi prescritte nelli sperimenti*, which follows faithfully the letter then sent by Cuppi.

<sup>24</sup> As in Fioroni’s judgement. The other judges were of similar mind, appreciating the “greater variety of the cantilena” and the “modulation of the composition”, such as the “various well-proportioned imitations, which ingeniously and clearly bring it to a conclusion” (Arrighi); the “counterpoint imitated by the other parts according to the need of the mode”, the “new thoughts elegantly imitated” in the middle of the composition, and the “clear, natural movements, elegant slurs, and the harmonic triad a little more expected; united harmony, and the parts all held on the 5 lines” (Basili); the respect of the “number”, in the “possibile imitation of the most celebrated Pietro Luiggi Prenestina”, and of the “weight”, through which the author “does not confuse the *cantus firmus* by making the parts breath always in the appropriate place, so that the entrances have novelty and force, so that beyond the intrinsic diversity that makes the harmony beautiful, it also brings beauty to the extrinsic factors and good order of the composition” (Gasparini); the “well-observed and correct” antiphon (Porpora); the introduction “with a form of subject, or imitation, by following always with others successively to the end”, “the written words, extremely well-disposed and arranged”, “not one error in counterpoint...; and a very much more abundant, full and perfect harmony”,



to the fugues, all imitative, the judgement was uncertain. As Vallotti affirmed, the selected candidate (whoever that might be) would have “to apply himself not a little, and train himself in the composition of the fugues, in order to construct them properly”. The examinations of Gibelli, Lanzi and Zanotti were all in all judged sufficient: Gibelli, for having “sustained [the fugue] with virtue from beginning to end” and for the “modulation wholly appropriate to the nature of the tone” (Fioroni);<sup>25</sup> Lanzi for the “greater clarity of the harmony” and the “better way of *ben cantare*” (Arrighi);<sup>26</sup> Zanotti because «the parts proceed pleasingly by degrees and with an elegant contrary movement”, “according to the schools of the old masters” (Gasparini).<sup>27</sup>

It was up to the Petronian experts to pronounce the final word on the opinions formulated by the external professors. Carretti and Martini were supported by another two judges, “each having wished then to listen to the view of a companion”:<sup>28</sup> respectively, Angelo Antonio Caroli, *maestro di cappella* in the Cathedral and prince *pro tempore* of the Accademia Filarmonica, and Gianangelo Antonio Santelli, first censor in this last institution and organist in the Bolognese civic church. After having met during the months of November and December in 1760, the commission declared the winner to be Calisto Zanotti (composer of the tasks bearing the letters *D* and *I*), awarded first place in the fugue, the “most difficult composition, and the most necessary to whoever wants to prove his competency for the position”.<sup>29</sup> That the second of the two tests was really regarded more significant in the aims of the overall judgement, above all for Padre Martini, has yet to be confirmed.<sup>30</sup> In any case, it seems unlikely that the

---

the respect of the “disposition and... nature of *cantus firmus*” (Vallotti); Casali, who did not dispute the motives of the choice, was instead much more laconic. As has been said, the autographs of the external judges are conserved in I-Bsp, ms. 56, cited here; in I-Bsf, ms. 52, pp. 50-108, there are the copies compiled by Martini, and including his observations and comments.

<sup>25</sup> According to Vallotti, Gibelli’s fugue was the “most tolerable... The response given to the proposed subject is good, and the harmony which supports it is better than all the others”.

<sup>26</sup> Fioroni maintained that it was “very praiseworthy, woven together well, and carefully handled with good slurs and ingenious imitations”.

<sup>27</sup> For Basili, Zanotti “has responded well”, and the fugue “is without many errors; good counterpoint, elegant imitations; a final stretta well-considered in part.”

<sup>28</sup> I-Bc, ms. 56.

<sup>29</sup> The minute of the judgement of the external commissioners is from 26 November 1760; the final declaration from the following 7 December; both are conserved in I-Bsp, ms. 56.

<sup>30</sup> Some years later, in 1772, on the occasion of the controversial admission to the society of one of Carretti’s pupils, Ignazio Fontana (a topic to which I’ll refer later), Martini strengthened the practice of subjecting the candidates to setting an antiphon of *cantus firmus* in four voices, writing that it was “the principal and most secure means to discover the merit of the candidate”, notwithstanding such composition was not “universally practised” both for the “difficulty that uniting counterpoint with *cantus firmus* brings, certainly not an insignificant factor”, and for the “almost total mutation of the current style introduced in ecclesiastical music” (as in the *Voto e parere* compiled as support to the negative judgement formulated by the academy’s commission; see PASQUINI, *L’Esemplare, o sia Saggio fondamentale pratico di contrappunto*”, pp. 2-8: 3, and doc. 1, pp. 158-167: 159f.).

assessment of the tests took place in ignorance of the names of the candidates, and that the best compositions only in a second moment appeared to be the work of a single musician, described as “one person alone, not known to us” and judged the most deserving also in the opinions of the external referees (with every evidence here of “modification”).<sup>31</sup> The strain is clear – an «extorted» election in favour of Zanotti would even be mentioned – and for “just and relevant motives” the Assunteria of San Petronio “agreed not to think further about providing an assistant for signor Caretti”.<sup>32</sup> Among other things, the letters of the external judges, opened *in absentia* of one of the Fabbricieri deputies, were hidden, and the consultative vote of the two most important Bolognese experts directly involved in the business – one having requested the appointment of an assistant, the other having presented two former pupils among the candidates – became decisive. Such suspicions are given further proof by a fact that the Assunteria could not have realised: the autograph of the second test compiled by the candidate later proclaimed the winner contains an error of counterpoint that does not appear in Martini’s copy. The external judges, otherwise very careful to indicate the defects present in the tasks sent to them, did not refer at all to the parallel octaves between Canto I and II – so discovered – in the fugue marked by the letter *I* (musical example 13*a-b*: Re<sup>4</sup>-Sol<sup>3</sup>). Did Padre Martini (or someone on his behalf) therefore correct the text before it was copied in order not to

<sup>31</sup> In the minute of 26 November, the Bolognese experts had determined that “in the first session, on the examination of the antiphon or introit, ... the letter *C* has first place, the letter *D* second place, and the letter *E* third place. In the second session, on the examination of the subject or fugue, it was agreed ... that the letter *I* had first place, the letter *G* second place” (that is, in order Lanzi, Zanotti and Mazzoni in the antiphon, and Zanotti and Gibelli in the fugue). This order is overturned in the final declaration: compiled about ten days later, it confirms that, taking account of the findings of the external judges, “the most decisive trial in terms of merit” was that of Zanotti (I-Bsp, ms. 56).

<sup>32</sup> *Esposizione di fatto* (I-Bsp, ms. 56); the nomination of Zanotti, “a young man of promise, and for his tender years well-versed in doctrinal music” would have done “manifest wrong to signor Gibelli and Mazzoni – men no longer of promise but of fundamental experience of music *di cappella*.” That Martini was well aware of what ought to be the natural outcome of the competition is evident from a letter written to him by Vallotti, who on 5 July 1760 regrets not having received “the esteemed paper of Your Excellency that I would like to reach me in time to be able to obey you”. In reaffirming his preference for the “introit marked *C* and the fugue marked *G*” (that is, Lanzi and Gibelli), Vallotti declares to have written “my sentiment freely and with all sincerity, according to the tenor of my character” (I-Bc, I.8.35).

<sup>33</sup> Further to other small retouchings, introduced also in the first test. Moreover, if it was so it did not concern merely a single case. It is enough to consider what happened exactly ten years later, on occasion of the examination of the “celebrated little German”, Wolfgang Amadé Mozart (as defined by Burney, who met him in 1770 during the annual celebrations dedicated to St. Anthony, patron of the Bologna musical institution: CHARLES BURNEY, *Viaggio musicale in Italia*, Torino, EDT, 1979, p. 181). The event is well known, and has acquired a somewhat legendary status: on that occasion Padre Martini had the task recopied by the promising composer after having rewritten it himself in an “observed” style that might pass the scrutiny of the judges (perhaps by suggesting the examination, or by earlier stitching together with the young Mozart a more “orthodox” version to then use as the submission). See LUIGI FERDINANDO TAGLIAVINI, “Accademico filarmonico”, in *Mozart in Italia*, a cura di Guglielmo Barblan e Andrea Della Corte, Milano, Ricordi, 1956, pp. 108-122; and

compromise the hoped-for outcome?<sup>33</sup> (see music example 13).

Only the intervention of the lawyer Lorenzo Casanova recalled the parties to the contract stipulated at the publication of the competition. On 15 January 1761, Zanotti was allowed to take up service in the Bolognese basilica, where he worked until 1816.<sup>34</sup>

But the candidature of the young musician for the post of assistant to the *maestro di cappella* at San Petronio was perhaps supported not only by Padre Martini (like every true teacher, careful to advertise the values of his school), but first and foremost by Francesco Albergati Capacelli. As is evident in a letter addressed by Eustachio Zanotti to Martini in 1756, in the discussions about the successor to Carretti the President was primarily in favour of Calisto Zanotti, although he considered him as yet too young: to the point that it did not seem suitable to appoint him “as assistant, and it is not credible that the other Fabbricieri would be of this opinion”.<sup>35</sup> The outcome of the competition four years later had therefore to satisfy not only the most authoritative member of the judging panel, but also the influential representative of the governing body, ready to expend himself in person and in broad anticipation of the timing of the contest in supporting his preferred competitor. In short, it was not really a “rigorous examination of competence”, as the Franciscan was to write fifteen years later, and not simply owing to the faults of procedure indicated by the lawyer:<sup>36</sup> even before its advertisement, the competition had a candidate *in pectore* who was then assisted through every phase of the proceedings.<sup>37</sup>

---

LUIGI VERDI, “Mozart a Bologna. Tra Villa Pallavicini e Accademia Filarmonica”, in his *La musica a Bologna. Accademia Filarmonica. Vicende e personaggi*, Bologna, AMIS, 2001, pp. 109-138.

<sup>34</sup> From 8 July 1774 as titular *maestro di cappella*. Afflicted in his last years by blindness, Zanotti would be succeeded by his colleague Stanislao Mattei, the favourite student of Padre Martini, who taught counterpoint at the Liceo (see GAMBASSI, *La cappella musicale di S. Petronio*).

<sup>35</sup> Letter of 18 April 1756 (I-Bc, I.10.158). Eustachio Zanotti refers here to the news from Count Casati, son of the churchwarden of San Petronio, who had been contacted by the canon Matteo Amorini in order to plead Mazzoni’s candidature; in the event that Mazzoni might be chosen as Carretti’s assistant, he would cede to Calisto the “churches that he currently serves”. Albergati Capacelli, writer, playwright and politician of notable reputation beyond the city of Bologna, had completed his own studies under the guide of Eustachio and Francesco Maria Zanotti, uncles of our musician.

<sup>36</sup> MARTINI, *Serie cronologica de’ principi*, p. 36.

<sup>37</sup> This was probably not the only occasion on which Zanotti made use of the support of influential persons who expended their efforts in his favour. Some years later the correspondence of Eustachio with his sister Angela Zanotti, mother of the composer, offers a further testimony. Other responsibilities in Bologna are discussed: “In this *ordinario* I am without your letters. I have received one from Gioannino, which tells me about the misfortune of Caroti [*sic!* does he mean Caroli?], and adds that I might recommend him for the post of assistant in the Bastardine in order to then obtain (in case of death of Caroti) a honorary and lucrative post. It’s new to me that such a job can be lucrative, and much more, that it might be honorary. However, I would not know what I might do here in Rome. He says that the choice of deputy depends principally on the vote of senator Caprara and signor Fabrizio Fontana. I am not in the confidence of either, and am unable to write to them. I marvel that my nephew speaks only of the Bastardine, when I would have expected that he would have desired either Santa Lucia, or the Madonna di Galliera. Are these churches

Beyond offering a vivid cross-section of the competitive practices in the mid-1700s – particularly in comparison with those that take place nowadays – such colourful events stimulate reflection upon the qualifications of the *maestro di cappella* and on the teaching of counterpoint as seen by Padre Martini: not only because his presence was decisive in determining the proceeding of the competition, but also because the hoped-for outcome had to be favourable to one of his disciples. The criteria of evaluation to which the commissioners adhered (at times explicated in their assessments and punctiliously annotated by the Franciscan in his meticulous notes) were significant in this regard. To Vallotti, who endorsed the superiority of Lanzi’s antiphon also for the presence of the text positioned under all the voices (as he said, “very important, and more than some people believe”,<sup>38</sup> Martini replied in these terms: “One cannot deny to this judge that even the words, apart from the difficulty that they bring, serve to reveal the worth of the composer”. But, he continued, the “qualities required in a perfect *maestro di cappella*” are above all knowing how “to use and arrange the consonances and dissonances”, to be “faithful to the nature of the tone”, to understand “the nature of the various species of fugue”, “to maintain the animation of the subject united to variety”, and to pursue “the unity of the composition”.<sup>39</sup> Basili was similarly explicit: “Any composition judged good” must respond to the “true rules of art”, that is, of musical grammar, of style and genre, of elegance and inherent beauty, which “consist of unity, variety and proportion”.<sup>40</sup> (Looking closely, on the sole grounds of these criteria of

---

perhaps occupied already?” (I-Bca, ms. B.205; letter of 9 November 1765); “This evening the General of the Jesuits writes to one of these Fathers in Santa Lucia recommending that Gioannino be elected as *maestro di cappella*. And because I know the style of the Fathers is always to choose the best for the position, I have told him that I am screwing up the courage to recommend him, given he had been chosen as *maestro di cappella* of San Petronio” (*ibid.*; letter of 23 November 1765); “I have received a letter from Gioannino... He says nothing of the chapel of Santa Lucia, from which I gather that the letter of the General might not have had the swift effect desired... The Jesuits are mysterious, and before making a decision they like to think well about things, and then they act on their own judgement without taking account of recommendations” (*ibid.*; letter of 20 December 1765).

<sup>38</sup> I-Bsp, ms. 56.

<sup>39</sup> I-Bsf, ms. 52, pp. 58-68: 58.

<sup>40</sup> These are the words in the final judgement (I-Bsp, ms. 56). In responding to Basili’s letter of 23 June 1760 and discouraged by the qualities evident in the results of the trials he had just received (“If I had to resolve things myself, I would declare the competition a draw. I would make these *virtuosi* understand that they should deign to study Palestrina”; I-Bsf, ms. 52, pp. 199-201: 199), Martini advanced his favourite themes: “I am persuaded of the sentiment of Your Illustrious Lordship concerning the competitors for the chapel of San Petronio; because until they have fully grasped what is true counterpoint, they will never be capable of serving a church that is among the most notable in Italy, which requires solid counterpoint, not merely the habits of modern taste guided more by chance than art and knowledge. That notwithstanding, I think that these Signori Senatori will be content to elect the least bad competitor: for example, whoever has made not only the fewest number of errors of counterpoint but who has prepared and resolved the dissonances according to the rules; who has maintained the substance of true harmony, placing all the consonances in

judgement, it is difficult to affirm the superiority of Zanotti over Lanzi, whose compositions impress more from almost every point of view. As underlined by one of the external judges, Vallotti, Lanzi’s use of B flat to the key in his fugue was deplorable, whereas “the accidentals to the key are appropriate to transposed tones”; but all told nothing comparable to the “forced...cantilenas” and to the “monster of harmony” manufactured by the winning candidate.<sup>41</sup>) In examining the competition tests according to this perspective, the judges could do no less than wholeheartedly underline how such precepts, even the most elementary ones, often no longer played a part in the cultural baggage of young musicians. For Porpora, music was “in a state of decadence, and virtually with little hope of resurgence, owing to the lack of patrons and the shortcomings of the young generation, who have neither known how or wanted to improve”.<sup>42</sup>

What might have been the remedy for overcoming the impasse, in order to “reestablish honour to all Italy” (again the words of Porpora), is stated in the aforementioned *Leggi ed avvertenze* prescribed to the competitors, and presented by the president Albergati Capacelli in San Petronio as “the method ... of maestro Padre Martini”.<sup>43</sup> Called upon to determine the contents of the candidates’ tests, the Franciscan announced the necessary competencies required of whoever would assume the appointment at San Petronio. The Fabbrica wished to hold on to the practices in use at the most important Italian churches (as the notice of the meeting sent to the competitors stated, “a trial in the method of other ecclesiastical universities”), which until then had been administered through the examination of counterpoint *a cappella* and *concertati*, for five and eight voices.<sup>44</sup> For his part, Padre Martini could not do less than propose a more severe procedure that would assure a qualitatively elevated level. In a provisory draft of the *Leggi ed avvertenze*, he hoped in fact to be able to introduce at least

---

the proper places, who has escaped those false leaps never practised by good composers, and who has produced good imitations and responses, and avoided false relations” (draft of 2 July following; *ibid.*, p. 187).

<sup>41</sup> Vallotti, extremely critical about Lanzi’s test (which moreover also contained “two large, blundering fifths”: at bars 47<sup>+</sup>-48<sup>+</sup>, between A and B), is instead concise with regard to Zanotti: “in my judgement, he is not capable of the intended position” (I-Bsp, ms. 56).

<sup>42</sup> As in the judgement formulated by the Neapolitan *maestro di cappella* on 29 July 1760 (I-Bsp, ms. 56).

<sup>43</sup> *Esposizione di fatto*.

<sup>44</sup> In the margins of the documents conserved in I-Bsp, ms. 56, this annotation can be read: “In the competition for the chapel of Milan in 1684, the test included a subject for 8 voices, and another for 5 voices, both *a cappella*, with a psalm in part *concertato* and in part *a cappella* for 8 voices without instruments. For the same chapel in 1747 the test included the Ambrosian *cantus firmus* of the hymn “Misterium” with counterpoint for 8 *a cappella*, and a psalm in part *concertato* and in part *a cappella* for 8 voices without instruments. For the competition of the church of the Anima at Rome in 1721, the *cantus firmus* of the antiphon “Te unum in substantia” with counterpoint for 8 voices *a cappella* was given. For the competition of the Royal Chapel of Naples in 1746 the *cantus firmus* of the introit “Pratixisti me Deus” with counterpoint for 5 *a cappella* and a psalm *concertato* for 5 voices were given” (I-Bsp, ms. 56).

one other competitive trial: the composition of a canon in three voices of at least thirty bars, drawn by lots from four or six kinds specified by the commission.<sup>45</sup> And perhaps the Franciscan had in mind also a trial dedicated to the *versetto* for solo voice: in contesting the usefulness of the canon, the Fabbricieri were obliged to specify that the *versetto* was also ambiguous, because it «does not depend on fixed rules, but on the idea and the taste different in various countries», and in consequence was pernicious «to the rectitude of the judgement».<sup>46</sup>

Elsewhere, Martini insisted on the usefulness that derived from a more testing examination, which the candidates could only tackle after having seriously applied themselves to the study of counterpoint. Little more than a decade later, he had the new *Leggi* for admission into the class of the composers of the Accademia Filarmonica approved. In establishing the trials in which the candidates had to compete, the Franciscan delineated the ideal formative course for the *maestro di cappella*, insisting on that which he had not succeeded in imposing at San Petronio.<sup>47</sup> In order to be approved by the Bolognese association, the candidates had to «demonstrate their merit in various tests», and “compose correctly every kind of *musica pratica*, both old and modern, both a *cappella* and

<sup>45</sup> See I-Bsf, ms. 52, pp. 13-14: 14. The canon had been adopted in the competition for the Roman church of S. Maria dell’Anima (1721), won by Girolamo Chiti who defeated Giovanni Biordi, Pietro Califfi, Carlo Monza, Niccolò Porpora and Giovanni Rossi. It was not by chance that Martini knew so well the tests by which other competitors would have had to be measured, particularly those who were aiming for the post of *maestro di cappella* in the national church of the Germans at Rome. Copies of the tasks on the antiphon on *cantus firmus* administered on that occasion can be found among the Martinian papers (I-Bc, EE.125, *Concorsi a capelle*). Martini maintained a very intense correspondence with Girolamo Chiti (1679-1759), evidenced today by more than four hundred letters documenting an incessant exchange of books, catalogues from publishers and libraries, and music. Having become *maestro di cappella* at San Giovanni in Laterano, Chiti had access to the heritage conserved in the Capitoline libraries, and in many cases was the means by which Padre Martini acquired historical-bibliographical information relative to the composers of the Roman school. Moreover, Chiti donated numerous items from his personal library to his Bolognese friend, convinced that he would best know how to value their worth. Among the most important were the incomplete “set” of the first book of the *Motetti de la corona* (rist. 1526; I-Bc, Q.74), which arrived at the beginning of 1746 together with the first books of madrigals for six voices by Orazio Tigrini (1582; U.241) and the *Moduli motecta vulgo nuncupata* by Gioseffo Zarlino (1549; V.25), not to mention the *Theoricum opus musicae disciplinae* by Franchino Gaffurio (1480; A.70). See VINCENT DUCKLES, “The Revival of Early Music in 18th-Century Italy: Observations on the Correspondence between Girolamo Chiti and padre Giambattista Martini”, *Revue belge de Musicologie*, XXVI/XXVII, 1972/73, pp. 14-24; GIANCARLO ROSTIROLLA, “La corrispondenza fra Martini e Girolamo Chiti: una fonte preziosa per la conoscenza del Settecento musicale italiano”, in *Padre Martini. Musica e cultura nel Settecento europeo*, (here, note 6), pp. 211-275.

<sup>46</sup> I-Bsp, ms. 56.

<sup>47</sup> See the *Leggi presentate dall’Accademia de’ filarmonici all’eminentissimo sig. cardinale Vincenzo Malvezzi, arcivescovo di Bologna e protettore della medesima, e da lui confermate, per l’approvazione e aggregazione de’ compositori e maestri di musica*, Bologna, Dalla Volpe, 1773.

*concertata*, both vocal and instrumental”, subjecting themselves to three separate tasks:<sup>48</sup> a counterpoint in four or five voices on an antiphon of *cantus firmus* proposed by the commission, a fugue of four or five voices on a given subject, a polyphonic *pieno* or *grave* in four or five voices and a *versetto* for solo voce with instrumental accompaniment.

It is not my purpose here to underline the victory of the extremist position expressed by Padre Martini, who at the Accademia Filarmonica succeeded in imposing what the Fabbricieri had previously excluded, that is, a test on the *versetto*;<sup>49</sup> rather, it is to reflect on the motives for such choices that formalised a decidedly contrary position to prevailing tendencies. The programmatic rehabilitation, at least in didactic guise, of “observed” counterpoint – the competitive tests dedicated to antiphons on *cantus firmus* and to the fugue – was not dictated by archaic obsession, as Martini’s detractors would have it.<sup>50</sup> It was

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 3-5. Approved in the Accademia’s sitting of 12 December 1772 (Martini appeared together with the officials who signed the act in the presence of the notary, but it is not difficult to attribute the drafting of the greater part of the instructions to him), the *Leggi* included among others the directives contained in the breve *Demissas preces*, mentioned previously, owing to which it was opportune to reorganise the class of the association’s composers, safeguarding the rights of the older *maestri* in service. From 1773 they were subdivided in three categories: those of the “numeraries”, in service in Bolognese churches; “supernumeraries”, who in order of the length of their admission would be appointed to vacant posts; and ‘honoraries’, “notable for birth and nobility” – to these were added the composers “*alla forastiera*”, that is, those “destined to serve some chapels outside Bologna and its diocese” (*ibid.*, p. 6 sg.).

<sup>49</sup> The canon was not however reinstated. Martini underlined its usefulness in more effectively educational circumstances: in particular, in the pages of the *Esemplare*, where he affirmed “if the young composer may be brought to practise such artful compositions, he will acquire a full possession of the art of counterpoint” (vol. II, pp. xx-xxviii: xxviii).

<sup>50</sup> Above all, Ange Goudar, who in describing the aberrations of the cisalpine music in 1777 wrote that “all Italian counterpoint is today enclosed in the head of a Franciscan father. It is necessary that the *maestri* go to him to kiss his feet in order to have some of the music, as one goes to kiss the pope’s mule in order to obtain indulgences” (ANGE GOUDAR, *Le brigandage de la musique italienne*, s.l., s.n., 1777, p. 99; but see also GIORGIO MANGINI, “Sviluppi di una polemica; Ange Goudar e il “Brigantaggio della musica italiana” (1777)”, in *La musica come arte e come scienza*, cit. here note 5, II, pp. 47-72); Prince Aleksandr Mihailovič Beloselskij, who described Martini as “a wise hermit charmed by the tiresome jargon of the antithesis and the awkward mania of turning everything into conflicting sounds”, who oppressed his pupils with the “pedantic weight of musical precepts and axioms” (ALEKSANDR MIHAILOVIČ BELOSELSKIJ, *De la musique en Italie*, La Haye, s.e., 1778, p. 21); and of Antonio Eximeno, who in the satirical novel *Don Lazarillo Vizcardi* sketched the figure of one such Padre Diego Quiñones. Organist of San Francesco and owner of an extensive library, Quiñones is concerned with preserving counterpoint on *cantus firmus* and is respectful of the authority of the old masters to the point of not being capable of infringing the rules of which he grasped all the limits (see ANTONIO EXIMENO, *Don Lazarillo Vizcardi. Sus investigaciones músicas con ocasión del concurso á un magisterio de capilla vacante*, a cura di Francisco Asenjo Barbieri, Madrid, Sociedad de Bibliófilos españoles, 1872-73; also LAURA CALLEGARI HILL, “Visitando la biblioteca di padre Diego: ancora sulla controversia Martini/Eximeno alla luce del romanzo *Don Lazarillo Vizcardi*”, *Quadrivium*, n.s., I, n. 2, 1990, pp. 85-99; and CARMEN RODRÍGUEZ SUSO, “Las ‘Investigaciones músicas de don Lazarillo Vizcardi’. Una propuesta sincrética para una música en busca de su identidad”, *Musica e Storia*, III, 1995, pp. 121-156).

not to be preferred at all costs to the *stile pieno e concertato*, to which the composers were inevitably more accustomed, but it had to be kept in due account as an indispensable technical and cultural resource of which the musicians should be able to make use. (Such is the sense of the Petronian and academic tests, designed to ascertain the familiarity of the candidates with a language and a style judged essential but regarded outdated by most.) In the *Esemplare*, conceived as a kind of catalogue of competences of the “reformed” composer, Martini affirmed: “The desire to restrict all the art of the composer to contemporary musical style impoverishes and narrows this profession, which, rich as it is in various styles, similarly requires a great mastery of the art, in order to be able to perform appropriately each to perfection”.<sup>51</sup>

Far from wanting to demonstrate anachronistically that in the eighteenth century rigorous counterpoint was the best of all possible musics, the only one that wise composers should practise in order to confront the decadence of modern music, Martini taught his pupils that extensive study of the compositions of earlier times furnished “the means to be able to compose easily and effectively in every kind of music, both ancient and modern, and in whatever style”.<sup>52</sup> In

<sup>51</sup> MARTINI, *Esemplare*, vol. I, p. XIII. The work was written at the behest of cardinal Vincenzo Malvezzi, patron of the Accademia – by the author’s admission, his “weak effort” was “embarked upon, and guided to the end” on his “authoritative... order”. In short, the work was “decreed” by the cardinal, and Martini dedicated the first volume to him (*ibid.*, p. IV). *L’Esemplare* is Martini’s response to the debate that had emerged in the Accademia after the disputed defeat of Fontana, and from the subsequent approval of the *Leggi*. As noted by MARIO BARONI, *Rigori e licenze dell’Accademia Filarmonica di Bologna negli anni di padre Martini*, in *Studi in onore di Giuseppe Vecchi*, a cura di Ivano Cavallini, Modena, Mucchi, 1989, pp. 67-76: 68, *l’Esemplare* reflects Martini’s teaching in preparation for the entry examination of the Accademia (it is not by chance that the two volumes are dedicated to the antiphon on *cantus firmus* and to the fugue, the foundation of Martinian teaching *tout court*). The publication of the treatise does not however seem to have had concrete effects on the qualitative level of the compositions delivered by the candidates in the 1770s and 1780s, increasingly more distant from the “observed” style promoted by the Franciscan. KARL GUSTAV FELLNER, *Der Palestrinastil und seine Bedeutung in der vokalen Kirchenmusik des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts*, Augsburg, Filser, 1929, pp. 242-268, has already examined many entry examinations, noting – perhaps a little simplistically – a relaxation of the judging criteria and a renunciation of the old severity after the 1750s. With this treatise, which more than any other synthesised Martini’s aesthetic and musical horizon, the Franciscan wished to direct an official address to the Accademia, the most faithful to his own principals. In total, a hundred complete musical examples are discussed, drawn from works by composers of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (from Costanzo Porta and Adriano Willaert to Alessandro Scarlatti and Giacomo Antonio Perti), and commented by means of the undisputed theoretical *auctoritates* of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries (above all, Gioseffo Zarlino and Angelo Berardi). *L’Esemplare* is a faithful reflection of Martini’s teaching, characterised by example rather than rule, from judgement more than precept.

<sup>52</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. I, p. XXXI. It was not by chance that Padre Martini chose the *iter per exempla* for his treatise on counterpoint, putting analysis and discussion of the works of the most influential composers of the past before the theoretical and speculative framework, here circumscribed by the initial pages of each volume, dedicated respectively to a *Breve compendio degli elementi, e delle regole di contrappunto* and to the *Regole per comporre la fuga*.



short, they constituted a technical and musical heritage, on which to draw on any occasion.<sup>53</sup> Nonetheless, in reaffirming the value of a teaching based on the example of the ancients, the Franciscan – in this respect, historian and bibliographer more than teacher and composer – renewed and consolidated the fabric of an illustrious musical tradition (recognising its defects along with its virtues), which from all other accounts had run its course by the middle of the 1700s. The models discussed in the *Esemplare*, and on which Martini drew when preparing the trials for San Petronio,<sup>54</sup> represented an irreplaceable cultural heritage in danger of extinction. Furthermore, they outlined the coordinates of a hermeneutic horizon in which the alterity of the music of yesterday was the most effective mental therapy for the narcissistic homologation to the present: a present whose allurements were wholly insufficient to reap to the full the profound sense of music, born in order to sing the praises of God. Rather than inhibiting development, like the mirror of Narcissus, the models measured maturity and self-knowledge by the practice of alterity. Their value derived from being, as the word suggests, ‘evidence’: distant things could be apprehended by being placed under the eyes and in the voice of the beholder. The critical examination of the past, which permits the projection of itself into the future, thus postulates the idea of ‘music as history’, of the ‘canon’ as the dynamic of exemplarity and posterity – the experience of a period in which the present is not the exclusive property of the living but also of the dead. The legacy of the great *maestri* echoed therefore in the young musicians who under the guide of their mentors perpetuated, from generation to generation, the values and ideas of the

<sup>53</sup> The testimony of Niccolò Jommelli is typical. He studied counterpoint with Martini for some weeks, perhaps even months (coinciding with the production of his *Ezio*, staged at Bologna on 29 April 1741; from the following 8 June he was admitted to the Accademia Filarmonica.). He confessed “to have learnt much from this eminent maestro – in particular, the art of escaping whatever narrow straits or aridity to which one had been reduced” in order «to find oneself in a new spacious field to resume the path» (SAVERIO MATTEI, “Elogio del Jommelli, o sia Il progresso della poesia e musica teatrale”, in his *Metastasio e Jommelli*, In Colle, Martini, 1785, pp. 59-136: 76).

<sup>54</sup> In truth, in the planning and evaluation of the competitive trials. As has been said, in recopying among his own papers the judgements of the external commissioners – the originals evidently had to be kept among the documents in San Petronio – Padre Martini intervened by making notes in the margins. Needless to say, his comments rest on examples furnished by the most influential composers of the past: above all, Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina, the most represented composer in the *Esemplare* (with a good 25 items out of a total of 105), of whom some passages are cited in detail. Moreover, there is no doubt that the multiplicity of Padre Martini’s erudite mind is epitomized in such a method. As I have underlined elsewhere, the same approach is evident also in the brief text that clearly can be considered a kind of *frühstadium* of the *Esemplare*, that is, the *Voto e parere*, mentioned earlier. Here the examples (fifteen in total, in particular drawn from Palestrina’s music) were moreover included “so that every *maestro* and academic composer can have before his eyes what has been reasonably established by earlier and most excellent *maestri* in the art of *cantus firmus* and counterpoint” (PASQUINI, *L’“Esemplare, o sia Saggio fondamentale pratico di contrappunto”*, pp. 6 e 158).

common artistic direction by which they were formed. Such is the heritage that Padre Martini consigned to us today. His reflections allow us to follow again that red thread that runs uninterruptedly from him to the great polyphonists of the Roman school and, by making use of his critical spirit and experience (in a word, by looking through the “spectacles” of his own erudition),<sup>55</sup> to judge all music “with its immense train of diverse and unusual manifestations”. At least in this, it is beyond doubt that the Franciscan fulfilled his mission as teacher.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> This very effective metaphor originates from Burney. In his travel diary in which he describes repeated visits to the Bolognese convent, the English music historian does not hide his desire to make use not only of the erudition of the Franciscan, with whom he immediately established a rapport of affectionate friendship, but also of the documents collected by Martini. It is not by chance that we owe the most striking and detailed description of Martini’s library to Burney (see BURNEY, *Viaggio musicale in Italia*, pp. 165-167, *et passim*).

<sup>56</sup> GIAMBATTISTA MARTINI, *Storia della musica*, I, Bologna, Dalla Volpe, 1757, p. 3; anast. repr. Graz, Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1967. These observations draw on some comments in my paper “La teoria musicale nel «concavo della luna»? Padre Martini e il concetto di ‘scuola’”, presented at the international conference, *Giovanni Maria Nanino e la Scuola romana* (Arezzo, Fondazione Guido d’Arezzo, 24 agosto 2007), to be published shortly.