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ABSTRACTS

SATURDAY, SESSION 1

8:45-9:30 Giuseppe Gerbino
“Galilei’s Search for the Motions of the Mind”

What is the concetto dell’animo? This is the term that Vincenzo Galilei uses in his critique of the polyphonic madrigal to designate the proper object of musical imitation. In what sense the concetto dell’animo relates to language, and consequently to the content, meaning, and message of a text set to music polyphonically, is not self-apparent. The term precedes Galilei’s theory of musical representation. It already appears, for example, in Leonardo da Vinci’s writings on visual representation. This paper explores the sixteenth-century notion of pre-linguistic mental activity in order to clarify the conceptual categories that informed Galilei’s perception of the musical practices of his own time.

9:30-10:15 Sherri Bishop
“Con alcuni altri: A Hybrid Approach to Multi-Composer Madrigal Prints”

Studies of the early printed madrigal book have long acknowledged several types of multi-composer collections. Although the term anthology is frequently used as a blanket term for these prints, scholars have also grappled with ways to delineate and define multi-composer collections in which only a single composer is named on the title page. One variant of such collections makes use of titles in which the featured composer’s name is accompanied by a phrase indicating the presence of music by other composers, such as “con alcuni altri” or “et altrì eccellentissimi autori.” This approach to titling collections was particularly common in the collections issued by Antonio Gardano and Giralamo Scotto in the earliest years of their dominance of the Venetian music printing industry.

In this paper, I examine trends in the production of con alcuni altri prints between 1538 and 1560, with a focus on variants in the construction of titles and title page design, a comparison of the prints issued by Gardano and Scotto, a summary of frequently appearing composers’ names (including the “others” to whom individual works are attributed), and an overview of how these collections compare to other types of multi-composer prints from this period. Taken in sum, I argue that this hybrid approach to the use of names on title pages represents a distinct marketing strategy that would have allowed publishers to take advantage of the popularity of a single (often well-known) composer while simultaneously relying on the broader marketability of a print advertised as a multi-composer collection. As such, these collections must be treated as distinct from other multi-composer prints and recognized for their specific contributions to the development of the printed madrigal book.
German-language contrafacta of Italian madrigals usually form part of a story about Italian musical taste in central Europe or Italian-style spiritual madrigals in Protestant devotion. But a set of contrafacta on Marco Scacchi’s *Madrigali a cinque voci* (Venice, 1634) reveals how Breslau musicians in the circle of Ambrosius Profe used madrigals for additional purposes. First, Profe and his Lutheran colleagues turned these madrigals into polemics directed at their religious and political opponents. While the polemical tone of Profe’s published contrafacta is usually muted, the manuscript contrafacta vividly evoke key religious issues plaguing Silesia during the Counter-Reformation. At the time when they were copied—likely in the 1640s—the security of Breslau’s Protestants was still under threat from Vienna and from the recatholicization efforts of the local bishop. The retexted madrigals bring to mind this turmoil: several call on God to protect the Church, one quotes Psalm 83, which Lutherans often interpreted polemically, and many lament the misery of war.

Secondly, this set also likely served as an intermediate stage between Scacchi’s original print and four madrigal contrafacta reprinted in Profe’s famous anthologies. The German texts in the manuscript are different from but closely related to Profe’s printed texts. Consequently, the manuscript set reveals another stage in the transformation from Italian secular to German spiritual madrigals. In addition, the manuscript is now vital, because it is now the only complete source, from which Scacchi’s originals must be reconstructed.

Thirdly, the set shows how central German musicians responded to the recent controversy between Scacchi and Paul Siefert. They evidently copied the madrigals shortly after Scacchi’s *Cribrum musicum* (1643), most likely to judge the Italian composer’s writings against his own music. At a time when other central German musicians, including Heinrich Schütz, had difficulty obtaining Scacchi’s music, Profe evidently obtained them relatively quickly.

Margarita Restrepo

“The madrigal in Spain”

The madrigal arrived in Spain in the 1530s and soon enjoyed widespread appeal, illustrated by the numerous examples of the genre in printed collections of instrumental and vocal music. Madrigals first appeared in instrumental publications by vihuelists who had ties with courts, pointing to the decisive role of the aristocracy in the adoption of the genre into the country. Following these, madrigals are found in printed collections of vocal music by composers working for the church, indicating its presence in ecclesiastical circles, and in the publications of city-dwellers, signaling its vitality in urban centers.

This paper focuses on how Spanish composers not only fully embraced the Italian genre, but also adjusted it to their own needs and culture. Well-aware that the madrigal was text-generated, Spanish composers chose fine poetry and allowed it
to dictate the structure and content of each piece. While in Italy the response to
the nuances of the text intensified with every subsequent generation of com-
oposers, utilizing more extreme musical devices, in Spain it remained constant and
never achieved the unprecedented intensity it reached in Italy. Spanish composers
did not choose modes with expressive purposes in mind, avoided unexpected
sonorities and inflections, and did not sectionalize phrases. In order to express
the meaning of the text, they consistently utilized small vocal forces, moderate
length, textual repetition, melismas, large melodic skips, chordal texture and word
painting. And it is precisely this more moderate response to the text that charac-
terizes the Spanish madrigal and differentiates it from its Italian counterpart.

SATURDAY, SESSION 2

2:00–2:45  Tim Carter
“Who sang Monteverdi’s (Mantuan) Madrigals?”

We are accustomed to reading Monteverdi’s Third (1592), Fourth (1603), and
Fifth (1605) books of madrigals as reflecting the composer’s responses to the new
music he encountered on his move to Mantua (e.g., by Benedetto Pallavicino and
Giaches de Wert, among others), and also to his developing thoughts on the sec-
onda pratica in the context of his controversy with the theorist Giovanni Maria
Artusi. However, they also need placing in the specific performance contexts new-
ly available to the composer at the Gonzaga court in terms of location (regular
Friday evening concerts in the Hall of Mirrors) and of the singers and instrumen-
talists under his supervision as maestro della musica del duca (from 1601). The point
has already been made in connection with the Fifth Book’s “Questi vaghi concen-
ti” and its potential links with the performers of Monteverdi’s first opera, Orfeo
(1607). But can we discover similar voices in other of these madrigals, and if so,
what does that offer for how we might read them?

The issue extends to Monteverdi’s other “Mantuan” madrigal book, the Seventh
of 1619 (by virtue of its dedication to Caterina de’ Medici, the new duchess of
Mantua). This book is carefully structured as an epithalamium—although the or-
der was partly disrupted in the printing (for reasons that can be explained)—and it
also seems clear that the most unusual setting in it, “Con che soavità, labbra odo-
rate” (for solo soprano and “nine” instruments), was intended to give some kind
of voice to Caterina herself: it represents the “Concerti di Muse Concertati dallo
stesso Apollo” that Monteverdi says in his dedication bring the duchess such de-
light even as he hopes she might still appreciate some rough sound from his hum-
ble pipe. So who might have ventriloquized the duchess, and why?

2:45–3:30  Zoey Cochran and Peter Schubert
“Poetic Tension and Counterpoint in Monteverdi’s Madrigals”

Monteverdi is justly celebrated for his expressive text setting, but much less so for
his skills as a contrapuntist. In the madrigals of Book IV Monteverdi uses a spe-
cific technique consistently in response to precise elements in the poem. It is
what Gary Tomlinson has called “multiple subject points,” in which different text

phrases, set to distinct motives, are simultaneously declaimed in a contrapuntal texture. Monteverdi must fashion anywhere from two to ten soggetti that can be sounded against one another. We have found that he systematically uses this technique in response to tension in what literary scholars call the rhythm of the poem. Poetic meter and syntax create the rhythm of poem, and when syntactic and metrical accentuation do not coincide, tension emerges between these two forces. In the case of enjambment, for example, two words that have a strong logical and syntactic connection are separated by a line break: poetic meter calls for a strong accent (a pause) at the end of the line, while the syntax pushes the reader forward for the accent to arrive at the end of the syntactic unit, creating tension between the need to stop and the drive forward. Throughout Book IV, Monteverdi responds to these moments with surprising consistency: we have identified six types of tension in the rhythm of the poem that can account for all of Monteverdi’s settings of multiple subject points. Monteverdi’s choice of this specific contrapuntal technique therefore does not respond to the poem at the level of semantics, but rather at that of the rhythm of the poem, more specifically in moments in which the impulse to stop and the drive forward seem to collide. Counterpoint represents this collision of forces musically.

3:30–4:15 Seth Coluzzi
“Licks, Polemics, and the Viola bastarda: Unity and Defiance in Monteverdi’s Fifth Book”

“Ahí, lasso!” cry the five voices in Monteverdi’s Cruda Amarilli (1605). The exclamation has long been a central focus of madrigal scholars’ work on Monteverdi’s Fifth Book and the debate with Artusi on account of the soprano’s celebrated yet improper dissonances and the controversy they provoked. Little has been said, however, of the unusual bass runs that precede and follow these dissonances and what they (and their divergences from the basso continuo part) might intimate about the larger role of the bass in the madrigal book as a whole. Similar questions surround many less conspicuous gestures that contribute to the book’s overarching strategies and sense of unity, but that have eluded scholarly attention.

This paper peers between the cracks in the extensive literature on Monteverdi’s compositional language and the Fifth Book by exploring the collection from three perspectives: the harmonic and melodic treatment of the bass voice and basso continuo, the integrated network of textual–musical motives, and the ordering of book’s contents and the potential relationship of this ordering to the Artusi–Monteverdi debate. Through this analysis, the Fifth Book becomes a snapshot of Monteverdi’s activities at the Mantuan court around 1600 not only as a composer, but also as an instrumentalist—as a performer of the “viola bastarda.” These findings, in turn, shed new light on notions of large-scale unity (and potentially meaningful ordering) in the Fifth Book, on the driving forces behind Artusi’s targeted attack on the book’s contents, and on Monteverdi’s response to Artusi through his music.
**Sunday, Session 3**

**9:00-9:45**  
Dan Donnelly  
“One Foot in Front of the Other: Building with the Poet’s Toolbox in Willaert’s Musica nova”

Building on Cerone’s metaphor of the vertical interval as a letter, I have previously proposed a system for interpreting various contrapuntal structures as analogous to a number of poetic devices used in sixteenth-century verse. Key elements of this system include contrapuntal repetition, which works in a manner analogous to repeated vocabulary or refrain, and modular manipulation, which produces the same-but-different quality of rhyme. I have furthermore posited that these kinds of poetic analogues exist at two levels: a more general structural level (e.g. rhyme schemes or dispositions of cadences), and a local lexical level consisting of specific words or contrapuntal combinations. In this presentation I show this system in action, mapping the musical structures of the 4vv madrigals in Willaert’s *Musica nova* with particular emphasis on the relationship between metrical feet and cohesive polyphonic “chunks” that are strung together into larger sections. These comparisons—made in light of contemporary understandings of poetic style—may help to further our understanding of the complex relationship between style and genre in Italian Renaissance polyphony, especially with respect to differences in the use of imitation, modules, and other forms of repetition among sixteenth-century madrigals, motets, and mass movements.

**9:45-10:30**  
Cathy Ann Elias  
“The Musical Soundscape of the Cantos of Orlando Furioso Set to Music by Don Salvadore di Cataldo”

*Orlando furioso* was an instant classic in the musical world; the plot was intriguing and *ottava rima* was easy to sing. In the 16th and 17th centuries vocal performances based on these cantos were pervasive, with staged musical works both public and private—improvisatory songs of *cantastorie*, *in the streets*, and performances by *amateurs and professionals in courtly palaces and gardens*. The madrigal cycles of Don Salvadore di Cataldo (1559) and Jachet Berchem (1561), in particular, make extensive use of *Orlando furioso*. I will discuss, very briefly, musical elements of Berchem’s cycle, followed by a close reading of di Cataldo’s setting of the first stanza of all 46 cantos. These madrigals by di Cataldo, while not unknown, have not received the attention they deserve. I have transcribed all of them with my former student Jianghai Ho, and we are currently preparing them for an edition. In my presentation, I will address editing problems and concerns, and provide video recordings of several madrigals of this collection, performed by DePaul graduate students.

**10:30-11:15**  
Mark Rodgers  
“Aria and the Madrigal: Wert’s Four-Voice Settings of Ariosto”

In her edition of Giaches de Wert’s *Il primo libro de madrigali a quattro voci* (1561), Carol MacClintock asserted that five of the book’s items, all settings of stanzas from Ludovico Ariosto’s *Orlando furioso*, “are really polyphonic versions
of arie per cantar ottave.” Though MacClintock did not further substantiate her claim, subsequent work by James Haar, Gary Tomlinson, Howard Mayer Brown, and others has repeatedly affirmed the debt these madrigals owed to the longstanding tradition of declaiming poetry—including Ariosto’s epic—with the arie of extemporized song. But beyond a basic level of agreement among those writers, together their accounts yield confusion about the nature of the relationship between Wert’s madrigals and the arie to which they seem so clearly to have alluded. Partly to blame for the confusion, my paper contends, has been a reductive interpretation of aria as it was conceived at mid-century. Based on my rereading of key evidence, namely the arie of Petrucci’s frottola anthologies, I argue, too, that MacClintock’s original characterization of Wert’s madrigals, still foundational to the discourse, merits reconsideration. A narrow focus on melody has come at the expense of investigating other types of information, relating especially to harmony and the disposition of cadences, which were salient to the ways in which arie were taught and put to use. Recent research on extemporized four-voice counterpoint, and my own work on cadences, gives cause to doubt the premise that arie were not often already polyphonic. Instead of considering these madrigals to be “versions” of arie, I offer a functional distinction between the two types of song that newly illuminates Wert’s allusion to the declamatory tradition. Finally, I propose that the nuanced conception of aria that emerges here militates for a broader reinterpretation of its relation to the mid-century madrigal.

11:15-12:-00 Emiliano Ricciardi
“Topic Theory and the Late Italian Madrigal”

The last few decades have seen the flourishing of a substantial amount of scholarship on topic theory and its musical ramifications. This scholarship, some of which has stirred a heated, yet productive debate, has for the most part centered on late eighteenth-century music, a repertoire that has proven particularly suitable to this approach. In this paper, I propose that with some caveats topic theory may provide useful tools for the study of the late Italian madrigal, not only because the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries witnessed a dramatic increase in the quest for musical representation, but also because the poetic repertoire on which late madrigal composers drew was itself built around topoi and often systematized accordingly in literary sources and treatises. More specifically, in this paper I seek to provide a theoretical framework for the topical study of the late Italian madrigal, with special emphasis on the distinction between and interaction of poetic and musical topoi. Furthermore, by examining select case studies, I show how a topical approach may help us to understand certain aspects of the composition, dissemination, and reception of the late madrigal repertoire. These include: the formation of a precise musical vocabulary associated with certain affects and natural phenomena, similar in spirit and practice to the visual vocabulary developed in contemporaneous iconographies; the assembling of madrigal books, which are often arranged by topos, clearly reflecting the topical forma mentis of composers, publishers, and audiences; and the copious production and consumption of madrigals, which I argue was possible thanks also to the recognizability and cultural resonance of the poetic and musical topoi employed by composers. In so doing, I seek to open a new research avenue, one that may complement and enrich other approaches to such a rich and varied repertoire as the late Italian madrigal.
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