

Introduction

In 1605 Claudio Monteverdi published his 5th book of madrigals¹ at a time where there were great discussions about the new style, the *seconda pratica*. Only two years later Aquilino Coppini issued the first of his collections from *contrafacta*, "Musica tolta da i madrigali di Claudio Monteverde, e d'altri autori", in which he joins Monteverdi in the strongest possible way: the collection not only contains eleven madrigals by Monteverdi (out of 24), all from the 5th book, but to highlight his position Coppini places the controversial first composition from the 5th book, "Cruda Amarilli", as the first madrigal in his own collection. In the next two years Coppini brings out two more collections, in which he underlines his position as an advocate of Monteverdi's work.²

The other composers represented in this first collection are Ruggiero Giovanelli, Adriano Banchieri, Luca Marenzio, Giovanni Maria Nanino, Andrea Gabrieli, and Oratio Vecchi, and the style of the madrigals composed by them is not particularly modern. Thus, it is an obvious conclusion that Coppini is not generally interested in the most progressive style but first and foremost wants to advocate Monteverdi's compositions.

The collection opens with a lengthy preface, in which Coppini dedicates the collection to the archbishop of Milano, cardinal Federico Borromeo.³ Here Coppini argues for an edition of the originally highly secular madrigals with a new text, so that they can be sung in the church to the glory of God. These texts are made so that in many central places the impassioned Italian words are replaced by Latin words with a parallel meaning. In that way the expression of the music accompanying the new text is often very close to the original expression.⁴ Therefore, many of the Latin versions are nearly as valuable to contemporary use as the original Italian versions, and a choir may have great pleasure in preparing the music for both secular and

¹ See *Claudio Monteverdi: Il Quinto Libro de Madrigali*, A critical edition by Karin Jacobsen and Jens Peter Jacobsen, (Egtved 1985) (subsequently referred to as Jacobsen 1985).

² As far as we know, the second collection does not exist today, and from the 3rd collection only the Basso is preserved. It is my intention to publish this part book and as complete a reconstruction as possible of the collection on my homesite at a later date. The collections will thus not be commented on here.

³ see "Sources", p. 1 f. For a translation into Danish, see my article *Coppini-samlingen* in *Festskrift til Finn Mathiassen*, (Aarhus 1998), also available at my homepage.

⁴ See "The texts", where the Italian and the Latin texts are printed parallel to each other so that the similarities can be directly seen.

churchly use. 20 works are for 5 voices, 17 of them originally *a cappella*, or (in the madrigals by Monteverdi) with *basso continuo a beneplacito* (basso seguente), whereas 3 are with *obbligato basso continuo*. The four last madrigals are for 6 voices, all originally *a cappella*.

A very interesting trait of the collection is that besides containing the part books it contains the Partito, a score. Coppini does not mention why he has added the Partito. One possibility is that it is only meant for study, like the famous print from Rore's madrigals⁵ and like many manuscripts from that period, as stated in Lowinsky's fine article from 1960.⁶ Coppini's Partito has many traits in common with many of the scores commented on: the staff goes on from the *verso* to the *recto*; there are bar lines, which go through all the staves; at the end of a system he uses no bar line; dotted notes that go from one measure to the next are often written as a note in the first measure and a dot in the next, and, very important, the text is only underlayed the Basso. In comparing the original compositions and Coppini's versions we find only a very few differences, and nearly all of them are rhythmical nuances because of alterations in the textual stress or number of syllables. It is interesting to see that these variations are carefully placed in the part books, whereas the Partito (only with words in the basso part) has kept the rhythm from the Italian original. So the Partito must have been written not from the Latin part books but from the original part books or from a handwritten score with an Italian text.

Other traits speak for the Partito also being used for practical reasons: the fact, that two madrigals (no. 3: Monteverdi "Qui pependit"/"Ecco Silvio" and no. 4: Monteverdi "Pulchrae sunt"/"Ferir quel petto") in the Partito (but not in the part books) are transposed a fourth down is very interesting. The explanation must be that the singers were accompanied by an instrument. The two madrigals have a high tessitura, so a transposition is relevant. But there is no explanation for the fact that nos. 9 and 10 from the same madrigal cycle by Monteverdi and with the same tessitura are not transposed in the Partito.

One more thing points to the practical use of the Partito: nos. 17, 18 and 20 by Monteverdi are with *obbligato* basso continuo. The basso in the Partito neither corresponds to the vocal basso nor to Monteverdi's basso continuo: in all places where the vocal basso participates, this is printed in the score. When the vocal basso pauses the score uses the b.c. if it is a *real* basso continuo; but if it is a basso seguente

⁵ *Tutti i madrigali di Cipriano Rore a quattro voci*, 1577

⁶ Edw. E. Lowinsky: *Early Scores in Manuscript*, JAMS XIII, 1960, pp. 126 ff.

(i.e. follows the vocal part with the lowest sound) the score pauses like the vocal basso! The distinction between "vocal polyphonic sections" and "continuo sections" is seen in the polyphonic sections from these three madrigals: where the vocal basso is not the voice with the lowest sound, the basso part in the score follows the basso from the part book (e.g. no. 18, bar 30), contrary to, for example, no. 21, bar 18 and no. 23, bars 39-40.

If the Partito only contained the madrigals without obbligato b.c., it would be possible that the score had been used only for rehearsals. But nos. 17, 18 and 20 cannot be sung without b.c., and the collection does not contain a separate b.c.-part book for these madrigals. So the Partito must have been used by the continuo player; either he has only played at places where the b.c. is necessary, or, more likely, he played (an extract from) the Partito for the rest of the composition.

To confirm the idea that the Partito has been used as a support in all the madrigals, we shall finally consider the last four compositions, which are for six voices. They are not included in the Partito, and the reason is without any doubt that with six parts there is not enough space for two systems on one page. With only one system on each page the madrigals would use too much paper. (This fact might also be the real reason why the madrigals with obbligato b.c. have no separate b.c. part in the Partito.) So the six-voice madrigals only exist in the part books, but contrary to all other works they are provided with an independent b.c. part, printed in a thin part book together with the Sesto. Each of the madrigals are printed with the Sesto on the *verso* and the Basso continuo on the opposite *recto*, so that two persons can look at the composition. None of these madrigals are originally with b.c. and the conclusion must be that all 24 madrigals have been sung with b.c. Thus nos. 17, 18 and 20 must have been performed in the manner outlined, otherwise it would have been natural to print a basso continuo part in the Sesto book together with the b.c. for the last four madrigals.

As mentioned above, Coppini published a second collection in 1608 and a third in 1609; we are not aware of additional new collections from his hand after this time, but in 1611 he republished the first collection. Today we know of only one single Partito from this edition, kept in Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale, Bologna, together with the Canto, Alto, Tenore and Basso from the 1607 edition. As we do not

know more about the edition from 1611, it is possible that only the Partito was republished. One could imagine that from the beginning fewer Partitos than part books were printed. Perhaps many collectors wanted to buy a rare thing like a score, and so a new edition was desired. But of course that will remain guesswork.

At first sight the two Partitos are so alike that one could consider them two copies from the same edition. But a thorough examination reveals many differences, some of which are interesting, because the rest of the Partitos are so alike. Some of the misprints from 1607 are corrected, but not all of them, and rather many new have appeared. In some places a misprint is the result of a note being turned upside down; for example, a tone on the 2nd line is replaced by a tone on the 4th line. Ties are placed more carelessly in the edition from 1611, as are rests. Nevertheless, by and large the edition from 1611 is a sober and correct reprint of the edition from 1607.

The 11 madrigals from **Monteverdi: Il Quinto Libro de Madrigali** are taken from the first edition (1605), which is most clearly seen in no. 17, where two places, bars 20-21 and bars 51-52, were changed from Monteverdi's first edition to his second edition, from 1606.⁷ Monteverdi's collection contained 17 five-part madrigals (besides one for six and one for eight voices), and Coppini uses the rest of them, four in 1608 and two in 1609. He is very faithful to Monteverdi's music, as he is with all the madrigals in his collection. For the present edition all comparison is made to the new edition from 1985.⁸

Two madrigals in Coppini's collection, nos. 2 and 15, are taken from **Ruggiero Giovanelli: Il primo libro de madrigali**, first printed in 1586. For the present edition a copy from 1586 and a copy from 1600 have been used.⁹ The music of the two copies agree with each other in every respect, and Coppini is faithful to the original.

⁷See Jacobsen, pp. IX-X, footnote 1

⁸ See Jacobsen, pp. XXXI-XL

⁹ See Sources pp. 7-8

Coppini has taken four madrigals from **Ruggiero Giovanelli: Il secondo libro de madrigali**, nos. 11, 12, 13 and 16, and so after Monteverdi, Giovanelli is the composer most often represented by Coppini. Giovanelli's second collection was first printed in 1593, and for the present edition a copy from that edition and one from 1607 are used.¹⁰ There are a few differences between the two copies, all mentioned in "Editorial commentary". Coppini is very faithful to the edition from 1593.

Coppini took one madrigal from **Adriano Banchieri: Il Zabaione Musicale**, printed in 1603: no. 7.¹¹ He is faithful to the original in every respect.

One madrigal in Coppini's collection, no. 14, is taken from **Luca Marenzio: Il secondo libro de madrigali**, 1581.¹² Coppini is faithful to the original down to the slightest detail.

Coppini took one madrigal from **Gio. Maria Nanino: Il primo libro de madrigali**, no. 19. From the first edition by Nanino no copy is preserved, and for the present edition a composed copy from 1579 and 1582 is used.¹³ A complete copy from 1605 has also been looked through; it is in every respect like the copy from 1579-82. Coppini is very faithful to the original.

Coppini took two madrigals from **Andrea Gabrieli: Il secondo libro de madrigali a sei voci**, nos. 21 and 23. Gabrieli first had his collection printed in 1580, and a copy from this edition has been used for the present edition.¹⁴ A copy from 1586 has also been looked through. It is in every respect like the first edition. Coppini is very faithful to the original.

¹⁰ See Sources pp. 8-9

¹¹ See Sources p. 10

¹² See Sources p. 10

¹³ See Sources p. 11

¹⁴ See Source p. 12

Finally Coppini used two compositions, nos. 22 and 24, from **Oratio Vecchi: Canzonette a sei voci, primo libro**, 1587.¹⁵ Only very few, insignificant alterations are made by Coppini, all commented on.

In conclusion, we find that in his work Coppini was unusually faithful to the original compositions, and in his own work he made a very serious attempt to make the madrigals useful for religious application. So not only is this an interesting collection for scholars to study, but the compositions can be used with great pleasure by choirs and smaller vocal groups even today.

¹⁵ See Source pp. 12-13