

AGNIESZKA BUDZIŃSKA-BENNETT

Schola Cantorum Basiliensis

Musica fatta spirituale. Aquilino Coppini's contrafacta of Monteverdi's Fifth Book of Madrigals

ABSTRACT: This article focuses on Aquilino Coppini's contrafacta of Monteverdi madrigals from the Fifth Book, *Musica tolta da i Madrigali di Claudio Monteverde, e d'altri autori [...] e fatta spirituale*, published in Milan in 1607. Coppini (d. 1629), a Milanese priest, professor of rhetoric at the University of Pavia and man of letters, was Monteverdi's personal friend and admirer. He was associated with the circle of Cardinal Federico Borromeo (1564–1631), Archbishop of Milan and a great connoisseur of the arts, and his cousin, Cardinal Carlo [Charles] Borromeo (1538–1584), principally responsible for the Tridentine reform of church music, to whom Coppini dedicated the first of his three collections of contrafacta discussed here. Coppini's efforts in re-texting Monteverdi's compositions and transforming them into *madrigali spirituali* were very much welcomed by the mighty Borromeo family, as they allowed the newest stylistic achievements of the *seconda prattica* to be transferred to church music. Coppini's contrafacta are of interest for their concentration on madrigals by Monteverdi, as Coppini chose to work on eleven madrigals from Monteverdi's controversial Fifth Book. His treatment of the poetic text is quite elaborate. First, his Latin contrafacta are creative re-textings in which he reproduces the metric structure and the sound quality of Guarini's original Italian texts through the careful placement of phonemes, vowels and consonants. Second, he transforms them into *madrigali spirituali*, always following their original *affetti*, creating strong associations and often profound intertextual relationships among the original and the new texts, in which he elevates the profane situations from Guarini's texts to the spiritual level of the Gospel teachings. In this respect, Coppini's work remains a fascinating contribution to the enduring discussion on the thin line between the sacred and the profane.

KEYWORDS: contrafactum, *madrigale spirituale*, re-texting, *affetti*, sacred – profane

*Non esiste il sacro, se non incarnato.*¹

Adriano Banchieri, in one of his letters to the Milanese priest Aquilino Coppini (d. 1629), a professor of rhetoric at the University of Pavia, writes:

Parts of this study were developed during my MAS course in Advanced Vocal Ensemble Studies at the Schola Cantorum Basiliensis. Various aspects benefited from suggestions made by Anthony Rooley, Evelyn Tubb, Jeremy Llewellyn, Gerald D. Bennett, Lucas Bennett and Yvonne Eddy, to whom I am very grateful. Translations, unless cited, are my own. The following abbreviations are used:

CC *Canticum Canticorum*

GEN Genesis

NIV New International Version of the Bible

¹ The opening words of Antonio Egidio Caporello (1986–2007), Bishop of Mantua, at the international conference 'Claudio Monteverdi, Studi e prospettive', Mantua, 21–24 October 1993.

I don't know who merits greater praise, the composers of those Madrigals, the Poets and Musicians; or you, who so skilfully transformed them from the secular into the sacred style, from the vernacular into the Latin language, and did it so masterfully that the music, through your marvellous art, transfers from one sense to the other, profane to sacred, vernacular to Latin.²

He is referring to the first book of Coppini's contrafacta, *Musica tolta*, containing madrigals by Claudio Monteverdi and several other composers.³ Coppini's collection is dedicated to *il S. Cardinale Borromeo, Archivescovo di Milano*. The member of the mighty Milanese Borromeo family referred to here is Cardinal Federico (1564–1631), an archbishop of Milan and great connoisseur of the arts. The dedication, however, also points indirectly to his cousin, Cardinal Carlo [Charles] Borromeo (1538–1584), the person principally responsible for the Tridentine reform of church music. One of the most important decisions of the Council of Trent regarding music was the banning from the Church of all elements that one could describe as *lascivum et impurum*.⁴ An important issue was the greatest possible clarity of the text. Polyphonic music was not to include any profane elements, and only masses, *hymni* and *divinae laudes* were allowed.⁵ However, Federico's apparent need to keep pace with the newest musical achievements and with new styles in the visual arts made him seek compromises.⁶ One of these compromises was to support the production and dissemination of *madrigali spirituali*, a genre with sacred text but set to modern and complex music. Several compilations of such pieces were written and published already by the end of the Tridentine Council.⁷ Many of these sacred madrigals, like Coppini's works, were contrafacta of secular pieces. His efforts in re-texting Monteverdi's compositions and transforming them

² 'Non só chi merita lode maggiore, ò i compositori di essi Madrigali Poeti, e Musici; od ella, che così industremente gl'a hà trasportati dal profano al sacro stile; e dall'Idioma volgare, alla latina locutione: e così proportionatamente, che l'armonia con mirabile artificio applica all'uno, ed all'altro senso, profano in sacro, e di volgare in senso latino.' Adriano Banchieri, *Lettere armoniche* [Bibliotheca Musica Bononiensis V/21] (Bologna, 1968), 120.

³ *Musica tolta da i madrigali di Claudio Monteverdi, e d'altri, a cinque, et a sei voci, e fatta spirituale da Aquilino Coppini* (Milan: Agostino Tradate, 1607). See an unpublished edition of this book of madrigals edited by Jens Peter Jacobsen available by request online at www.archive-dk.com/jpj.dk (accessed February 2012).

⁴ Council's decree of 17 September 1562. Franz Körndle, 'Die Motette vom 15. bis zum 17. Jahrhundert', in Horst Leuchtman and Siegfried Mauser (eds), *Messe und Motette* [Handbuch der musikalischen Gattungen, 9] (Laaber, 1998), 106.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 106.

⁶ Margaret Ann Rorke, 'Sacred Contrafacta of Monteverdi Madrigals and Cardinal Borromeo's Milan', *Music & Letters*, 65/2 (1984), 174.

⁷ Sabine Ehrmann-Herfort, "'Ad Religionem ergo referatur Musica": Monteverdi-Kontrafakturen bei Aquilino Coppini', in Silke Leopold and Joachim Steinheuer (eds), *Claudio Monteverdi und die Folgen, Bericht über das Internationale Symposium Detmold 1993* (Kassel and Basel, 1998), 327.

into *madrigali spirituali* were thus more than welcomed by Federico Borromeo, as they allowed the stylistic achievements of the *seconda prattica* to be transferred to church music. This is particularly clear in the case of Coppini's *Musica tolta*. As a personal friend and admirer of Monteverdi, Coppini chose to work on eleven madrigals (out of twenty-four) from the former's controversial Fifth Book, even placing a re-texted 'Cruda Amarilli' (the piece that aroused Artusi's scorn) as the first composition in his collection. It is Coppini's interest in Monteverdi's masterfully realised *affetti* that led him to his 'arduous labours' on this compilation, following 'the force of the music in every part' with his new texts.⁸ In this respect, Coppini's work remains also a fascinating contribution to the enduring discussion on the thin line between the sacred and the profane.⁹

The main goal of this paper will be to understand and to present Coppini's mastery, as mentioned in Banchieri's letter, in transforming Monteverdi's madrigals into Latin religious works. Not much has been written on this subject. Margaret Ann Rorke's concern is the influence of the cultural and spiritual environment on the production of such repertoires in Borromeo's Milan; her interest in Coppini's method is very modest, pointing only to the obvious key-words and the general topic-transfer in the contrafacta. Sabine Ehrmann-Herfort also concentrates on the circumstances rather than giving a deeper analysis, presenting three short examples from Coppini's later contrafacta of Monteverdi's Fourth Book of madrigals – again, limited to indicating key-words and the transfer of topics.¹⁰ Of limited relevance to our considerations is Kristin Sponheim's analysis of Ambrosius Profe's method for making contrafacta of Monteverdi's madrigals in Germany.¹¹ Finally, Jens Peter Jacobsen's introductory notes to his edition of Coppini's *Musica tolta* have only editorial value and make two very general statements as to Coppini's skilful re-texting of the original pieces.¹²

I will present my remarks about Coppini's thoughtful way of transforming Monteverdi's madrigals into sacred works in his *Musica tolta* in three parts. This division depends heavily on Monteverdi's choice of the texts for the Fifth Book: they all come from Giambattista Guarini's *Il pastor fido* or his collection of *Rime*. Since I decided to adhere to the dramatic order of the pieces found

⁸ Rorke, 'Sacred Contrafacta', 171

⁹ On this aspect of the early Baroque contrafactum, see particularly Margaret Murata, "Quia Amore Languet", or Interpreting "Affetti Sacri e Spirituali", in Paola Besutti, Teresa M. Gialdroni and Rodolfo Baroncini (eds), *Claudio Monteverdi. Studi e prospettive, Atti del Convegno, Mantova, 21–24 ottobre 1993* (Florence, 1998), 79–96.

¹⁰ Ehrmann-Herfort, "Ad Religionem ergo referatur Musica", 325–338

¹¹ Kristin Sponheim, 'Ambrosius Profe's Sacred Contrafacta of Monteverdi's Madrigals', in Leopold and Steinheuer (eds.), *Claudio Monteverdi und die Folgen*, 339–358.

¹² 'These texts [Coppini's] are made so that in many central places the impassioned [*sic*] 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'. Jacobsen, '*Musica tolta*', Introduction, 1.

in both Guarini's poem and Monteverdi's oeuvre, the first part has Mirtillo's soliloquies as its main topic, and the third part focuses on the moving dialogue between Silvio and the dying Dorinda – all characters from *Il pastor fido*. The short second part presents a dramatic interlude – a madrigal from Guarini's *Rime*, 'Era l'anima mia', inserted between the *Il pastor fido* settings. The focus of the last part of this paper is Monteverdi's continuo madrigals set to individual poems from Guarini's *Rime*. As already mentioned, the only existing edition of Coppini's contrafacta is the one published online by Jens Peter Jacobsen, which has the additional important feature of presenting the two texts – the Guarini and the Coppini – in the same score. The same technique is employed in the music examples given below.

I. *Il pastor fido* – Coppini's contrafacta of Mirtillo's soliloquies

'Felle amaro / Cruda Amarilli'

Il pastor fido (I:2, lines 1–8)

1 Cruda Amarilli, che col nome ancora	Felle amaro me potavit populus
2 d'amar, ahi lasso, amaramente insegni;	Et aceto, non illi dedi amaras aquas
3 Amarilli, del candido ligustro	In deserto, sed latices suaves.
4 più candida e più bella,	sed latices suaves.
5 ma de l'aspido sordo	Viri, aspide surda
6 e più sorda e più fera e più fugace,	Surdiores et saeviores,
7 poi che col dir t'offendo	Quid a me vultis adhuc?
8 i' mi morrò tacendo.	Iam moriar pro vobis.

This masterful contrafactum opens Coppini's collection. The famous Italian text comes from the first act of Guarini's *Il pastor fido*. The starting point for Coppini is the name Amarilli, containing two contrary associations: *amare* (to love) and *amaro* (bitter). This is the experience Mirtillo expresses in the opening lines: the beautiful but cruel Amarilli teaches him the bitter side of loving by not requiting his feelings and being deaf to his desperate pleas. Coppini decides to set the new text using those key-words, both phonetically and semantically. Phonetically, for example, he places the word *amaro* parallel to Amarilli's name in the original text, although slightly delayed in the musical setting (bars 2–4 and 6–8 in Example 1). Coppini also adopts the dominant vowel *a*, visible in his contrafactum mainly in a series of alliterations: *amaro*, *aceto*, *amaras*, *aquas*. He reinforces this device (present also in Guarini's use of the consonant *c/ch* in the first line) in the expression *potavit populus*. It is worth mentioning that both poems make considerable use of the vowel *o* (bars 9–10). The following bars have a strong *a* presence – Coppini

must have thought of the expressive *ahi!* *lasso* on the fast-moving and expressive figure appearing for the first time in bars 11–13 and used it to set the word *aceto*.

Semantically, he chooses bitterness as the main topic of his Latin poem and transforms the original text into a poem on the Crucifixion. Already the title, 'Felle amaro' [The bitter gall], as well the use of the word *populus*, brings us immediately to the middle of the Good Friday liturgy, richly quoting the Improperia, also known as the Reproaches, expressing the remonstrance of Christ with His people: *Popule meus, quid feci tibi?* Strangely enough, these striking quotations were not recognised by M. A. Rorke in her article on Monteverdi's sacred contrafacta.

Canto
Fel - le a - ma - ro, fel - le a - ma - ro
Cru - da A - ma - ril - li, cru - da A - ma - ril - li

Alto
Fel - le a - ma - ro, fel - le a - ma - ro
Cru - da A - ma - ril - li, cru - da A - ma - ril - li

Quinto
Fel - le a - ma - ro, fel - le a - ma - ro
Cru - da A - ma - ril - li, cru - da A - ma - ril - li

Tenore
Fel - le a - ma - ro, fel - le a - ma - ro
Cru - da A - ma - ril - li, cru - da A - ma - ril - li

Basso
Fel - le a - ma - ro, fel - le a - ma - ro
Cru - da A - ma - ril - li, cru - da A - ma - ril - li

10

me po - ta - vit po - pu - lus et a - ce - to
ch col no - me an - co - ra d'a - mar ahi! las - sol

me po - ta - vit po - pu - lus et a - ce - to
che col no - me an - co - ra d'a - mar ahi! las - sol

me po - ta - vit po - pu - lus et a - ce - to
che col no - me an - co - ra d'a - mar ahi! las - sol

me po - ta - vit po - pu - lus et a - ce - to
che col no - me an - co - ra d'a - mar ahi! las - sol

ma po - ta - vit po - pu - lus et a - ce - to
che col no - me an - co - ra d'a - mar ahi! lass - sol

Example 1.

Firstly, she translates *felle amaro me potavit populus* as ‘the multitude filled me with bitter anger’. Secondly, she wrongly interprets Coppini’s text as a dialogue, assuming that ‘lines 1–4 express the grief of a sympathetic observer, lines 5–8 thoughts of Christ’.¹³

In the *Improperia*, the topic of water and fluids is quite dominant and is always expressed in contradictory pairs:

– planting the sweet vineyard and receiving but sour grapes (*Ego quidem plantavi te vineam meam speciosissimam et tu facta es mihi nimis amara*)

– opening the sea to cross the water and opening Christ’s side with a spear (*Ego ante te aperui mare et tu aperuisti lancea latus meum*)

– giving saving water in the desert and receiving vinegar and gall to drink in return (*Ego te potavi aqua salutis de petra et tu me potasti felle et aceto*)

Coppini was fully aware of all these associations, and his listeners certainly were too. His word-games include equating twice the Italian word *candida/candido* (white, pure) with the Latin *latices*, meaning in general ‘liquid, fluid’, but specifically ‘a milky sap of several trees’, which goes wonderfully with the white colour mentioned in the Italian poem. Probably for this reason, Coppini repeats the section *sed latices suaves* (lines 3–4). At the same time, the sound of this word brings another Latin word to our mind, namely *latus* (side), which could be an allusion to the wounded side of the crucified Lord.

Coppini adopts also the idea of the deaf asp to which Mirtillo compares Amarilli. In the Latin poem, it is the human race that is even crueller and deaf to the words of the Saviour. Both poems use the strong presence of the sibilant *s*, onomatopoeically depicting the snake with a hissing sound. The two poems finish with analogous phrases. Since Amarilli is deaf to his pleas, Mirtillo is going to die silently. Christ announces his sacrificial death for mankind (*iam moriar pro vobis*), though he does speak to his people. Moreover, in the refrain of the *Improperia* (*Popule meus, quid feci tibi? Aut in quo contrastavi te? Responde mihi!*), which any educated person must have noted in Coppini’s poem, Christ insistently demands an answer from his people (‘My people, my people what have I done to you? How have I offended you? Answer me!’), thus elevating Guarini’s poem to a high spiritual plane.

The next two madrigals, from Act III of *Il pastor fido* (III:3), are part of Mirtillo’s lament for the cruel Amarilli.

‘Sancta Maria/ Deh, bella e cara’
Il pastor fido (I:2, lines 143–157)

1 Deh, bella e cara e sì soave un tempo
2 cagion del viver mio, mentr’al ciel piacque,

Sancta Maria, quae Christum peperisti
Virginei sine labe pudoris,

¹³ Rorke, ‘Sacred Contrafacta’, 169.

3 volgi una volta e volgi	Volve serenos, volve
4 quelle stelle amorose,	oculos illos tuos
5 come le vidi mai, così tranquille	Misericordiae et pietatis
6 e piene di pietà, prima ch'io moia;	In homines, qui tibi sunt devoti,
7 ché 'l morir mi fia dolce.	Dulcis virgo Maria
8 E dritt'è ben che, se mi furo un tempo	Tu maris tumidi refulgens Stella,
9 dolci segni di vita, or sien di morte	Tu decus Paradisi, tu rosa vernans
10 quei belli occhi amorosi;	Pudicissima Virgo
11 e quel soave sguardo	Et lilium suave,
12 che mi scorse ad amare,	Bonum est te amare,
13 mi scorga anco a morire;	Quae non sinis perire.
14 e chi fu l'alba mia	O virgo benedicta,
15 del mio cadente di l'espero or sia.	Duc nos ad gloriam Regni coelestis.

Here, Coppini still uses some of the framework of Guarini's poem, such as the rhetorical device in line 3, which works very well for both languages, and employs related words very close to each other (like *pietà/pietatis* in lines 5–6, *dolce/dulcis* in line 7 and *soave/suave* in line 11). But an interesting innovation is the use of the Italian rhyme structure of lines 12–14 in the Latin poem: *amare*, taken intact, then the endings *-ire* and *-a* (lines 13–14). The name *Maria* and the word *Virgo* are carefully placed, mostly in the fragments employing powerful adjectives in the Italian version: *bella e cara* (line 1), *dolce* (line 7), *amorosi* (line 10).

Both poems use the image of the eyes. In Guarini's lines, Mirtillo asks Amarilli to turn her calm, amorous eyes on him with mercy, before his love for her kills him. The same look can give him life or bring him death; as Guarini puts it even more poetically in the last lines, 'and that sweet glance, which saw me love, should now see me die; and she who has been my dawn, now be the evening of my ebbing day'. The imagery of the eyes (*stelle amorose*, *occhi amorosi*, *sguardo*) led Coppini to introduce the figure of the Virgin Mary, watching over humanity with her merciful gaze. 'Oh turn, turn your serene eyes of mercy and pity on mankind', writes the Italian priest, making a bold analogy between Amarilli and Maria (note that the two names are phonetically closely related!). By replacing *volgi una volta e volgi quelle stelle amorose* with the Latin *volve serenos, volve oculos illos tuos*, the poet also makes rich use of the soundscape of the Italian poem. We find a rare example of a change to Monteverdi's text in bars 13–16 of the cantus (Example 2): Coppini apparently wanted to use an expressive figure for the word *volve* (to turn) instead of having there the final syllable of the word *se-re-nos*. He got into the bargain an additional apt rhetorical device.

Coppini divides the common Italian metaphor of eyes as stars into the vision of Mary's loving eyes and the image of her as the Evening Star or the Morning Star. Thus, she is the *stella refulgens*, a bright star and ornament of Paradise (*decus Paradisi*), leading the lost to a safe haven. This makes another link to Guarini's

vol - ve se - re nos, vol - ve se - re - nos,
 5 vol - gi u - na, vol - ta, vol - gi u - na vol - ta e...
 vol - ve gi

Example 2.

poem: in the last line, Mirtillo mentions the dawn and the ‘evening hour’, which are the moments when the Evening Star or Morning Star appears.¹⁴ Coppini, however, interprets the Italian passage in his Latin contrafactum in the theological sense: Mirtillo’s time-span from morning until evening represents in the poem the life of a human being, finally led by Mary to the glory of the heavenly King (lines 14–15). The ‘evening hour’ of Guarini’s poem leads Coppini to another device, namely using some near quotations of *Salve regina*, a Marian antiphon sung during the evening services of the Office, Vespers or Compline, in lines 4–5 and 7.¹⁵ This antiphon was often sung in funerals, and so Coppini might have been making a humorous allusion to Mirtillo’s desire to die for love.

Spēnit Deus cor durum/ Ma tu, più che mai dura’
Il pastor fido (I:2, lines 158–166)

1 Ma tu, più che mai dura,	Spēnit Deus cor durum,
2 favilla di pietà non senti ancora;	Quod nulla pietate moveatur,
3 anzi t’inaspri più, quanto più prego.	Quod in duritie sua laetetur.
4 Così senza parlar, dunque, m’ascolti?	Visne frui pio eius amore
5 A chi parlo, infelice, a un muto sasso?	Gloriosasque sedes possidere?
6 S’altro non mi vòl dir, dimm’almen: mori!	Frangē duritiem pectoris tui
7 E morir mi vedrai.	Pietatemque cole.
8 Quest’è ben, empio Amor, miseria estrema:	Quod si persistere vis in peccato,
9 che s’è rigida ninfa	Fiet rigida tibi
10 non mi risponda e l’armi d’una sola	Maiestas illa et condemnabit animam
11 sdegnosa e cruda voce	Tuam inquinatam,
12 sdegni di proferire al mio morire.	Tuque subibis miser ignem aeternum.

Also here Coppini uses the greater part of the structure of Guarini’s poem. The first three lines make a full sentence; line 5 ends with a question mark in both po-

¹⁴ That both of them represent the planet Venus in the sky and the goddess of love in mythology could be an additional subtext intended by Coppini.

¹⁵ Those lines paraphrase the line ‘illos tuos misericordes oculos’ from the Marian antiphon and quote its ending, ‘o dulcis Virgo Maria’.

ems. Line 8 is a turning point in both poems, using respectively the words *questa* and *quod*. The words retained from Guarini's poem are plain to see in lines 1, 2 and 9, presenting at the same time the main topic of both poems: rejection, stubbornness and a lack of pity. In Guarini's poem, Mirtillo continues to speak to his *cruda* Amarilli, who does not even bother to respond, still rejecting his ardent love. She is harsh and unbending (*dura, rigida*) and not even merciful enough to tell him to die; thus Mirtillo compares her to *muto sasso* – a silent rock. Here, the sound of Coppini's poem is very similar to that of the Italian. The use of the sibilant *s* in line 5 is obviously Coppini's conscious choice – the strong and semantically crucial word *sasso* is echoed in the whole Latin passage *gloriosasque sedes possidere*. The idea of having a heart of stone and being unmoved was taken up by Coppini. In his poem, it is God who rejects (*spernit*) the harsh heart (*cor durum*), the heart incapable of being moved by pity (*quod nulla pietate moveatur*) and rejoicing in its own harshness (*quod in duritie sua laetetur*). The same motif – breaking the harshness of one's heart through mercy – appears in lines 6–7. In line 3, Coppini cleverly replaces the Italian verb *inasprire*, meaning 'to embitter, to become harsher', with the related noun *duritia*, 'hardness, stubbornness, harshness'.

Coppini's theological equation of Mirtillo's *miseria estrema* with the idea of sin (*peccato*) in line 8 is a very interesting device, and the scornful, cruel voice of Amarilli (if she only spoke!) would equate to an iniquitous soul (*anima inquinata*, lines 10–11) – the music underlines this in a series of resolutions and dissonances in bars 52–58 (Example 3).

Canto
et con - dem - na - bit a - ni - mam tu - am in - qui - na - tam
e l'ar - mi d'u - na so - la sde - gno - sa e cru - da vo - ce

Quinto
et con - dem - na - bit a - ni - mam tu - am in - qui - na - tam
e l'ar - mi d'u - na so - la sde - gno - sa e cru - da vo - ce

Alto
et con - dem - na - bit a - ni - mam tu - am in - qui - na - tam
e l'ar - mi d'u - na so - la sde - gno - sa e cru - da vo - ce

Tenore
et con - dem - na - bit a - ni - mam tu - am in - qui - na - tam
e l'ar - mi d'u - na so - la sde - gno - sa e cru - da vo - ce

Basso
et con - dem - na - bit a - ni - mam tu - am in - qui - na - tam
e l'ar - mi d'u - na so - la sde - gno - sa e cru - da vo - ce

Example 3.

At the end of the poem, Coppini associates Mirtillo's *amorous morire* with hell's eternal flame (*ignem eternum*), placing this part of the text on long sustained chords, thus clearly interpreting it as real death befalling those who disregard and disobey the Lord.

II. 'Era l'anima mia' – a dramatic interlude

'Stabat virgo Maria/ Era l'anima mia'

Rime, no. 65

1 Era l'anima mia	Stabat virgo Maria
2 già presso a l'ultim'ore,	mestissimo dolore
3 e languia come langue alma che more,	languens ad crucem et flebat amare.
4 quand'anima più bella e più gradita	Et edidit ex ore tales voces:
5 volse lo sguard'in sì pietoso giro	"Quis te confixit in hoc diro ligno,
6 che mi mantenn'in vita.	quis mihi rapit vitam?
7 Parean dir quei bei lumi:	Fili mi, Iesu Christe,
8 "deh, perché ti consumi?	en liquefacta languet
9 Non m'è sì car' il cor ond'io respiro	et solvitur in lachrymas amoris
10 come se' tu, cor mio.	anima mea, dolens,
11 Se mori, ohimè, non mori tu, mor'io. "	en languet, en morior dolore! "

'Era l'anima mia' is a poem from Guarini's *Rime* that Monteverdi inserted between his large dialogue cycles in the Fifth Book of madrigals. Massimo Ossi proposed the following translation:

My soul was already near its final hour, and languished as do dying souls, when a soul more beautiful and more welcome turned its gaze with such a merciful turn that kept me alive. Those lovely eyes seemed to say: "Come, why do you languish? The heart that keeps me breathing is not so dear to me, as you are, my heart; if you die, alas, it is not you, but me who dies."¹⁶

Guarini's madrigal, with its subtitle 'Morte soccorsa', suggested to Aquilino Coppini a clear choice: instead of two lovers looking at each other within the poetic moment of amorous dying, he uses for his contrafactum the scene between the Virgin Mary at the Cross and her dying Son. He adapts the main motifs of Guarini's poem – a dying soul, suffering and supreme empathy – and transposes them onto a higher spiritual plane. The 'last hour' in the Italian poem (line 2)

¹⁶ Massimo Ossi, *Divining the oracle: Monteverdi's 'Seconda Prattica'* (London, 2003), 62–63.

has a clear response in the Crucifixion itself: the figure of Christ replaces the suffering of the dying soul. Coppini could not have found a better theme than the Virgin under the Cross. He equates the great empathy of the woman ready to die symbolically for her lover in Guarini's poem with the real feelings of the suffering mother, ready to sacrifice herself for her son. Knowing Coppini's contrafactum, one can easily see Guarini's verse in a new light and even re-read it as a *madrigale spirituale*.

In making his contrafactum, Coppini seems to have paid particular attention to the overall structure of the original poem. First, he keeps the rhymes, or at least the vowel-endings, of the first couple of lines (the rhymes *-ia*, *- ore*, *more/amare* and the vowel *o* in the fifth line). Then he keeps Guarini's vocabulary in the groups of words *mi – mihi* and *vita – vitam* (line 6), *mio – meo* (line 10) and *mori – morior* (line 11). He re-uses the group *langui/languē – languens* from line 3 in lines 8 and 11. Similarly, he places Guarini's initial important noun *anima* in the penultimate line of the Latin text. And, most importantly, he takes up the idea of direct speech, introducing it even earlier than Guarini (line 5).

When we consider the music, we find a remarkable connection with Coppini's crucifixion tableau (Example 4). Steady, repeated pitches in three lower voices depict perfectly the new text, *Stabat virgo Maria* (bars 1–6). The false relations and frequent dissonance in this opening section enhance the dark and serious mood.¹⁷

Our example also makes clear to what degree Coppini adopts the vowel distribution of Monteverdi's madrigal: many *a* vowels are placed just the same, and there is also the syllable *ma* in *l'a-ni-ma* and *Ma-ri-a*. Common consonants also play an important role: a double *s* in *mestissimo – presso* (bar 4), a series of alliterations employing *l* in bars 6–7 and 9–10 (*languens – languia/languē*, also *l* in *flebat*) and the pair *crucem – come* (bars 7 and 10). The clever design of Coppini's text is evident also in bar 9, where the bass voice finishes only the second line of the text, but fits perfectly with the tenor and quintus singing the end of line 3. The next passage (lines 5–6) presents a new section introducing the dominant vowel *i*.

This remains the principle of the next passage, where the upper voices continue with line 7 of the Latin text, even if the tenor imitates the bass line sung before with the previous text fragment. Coppini cleverly places the alliteration *liquefacta languet* on the long, sustained tones of Monteverdi's madrigal (Example 5).

The same applies to the last few bars of the piece: the long *languēo* uses long pedal notes (e.g. the bass line in Example 6) to depict Mary's languishing at the Cross, and the whole piece ends in a big *morendo* of all the voices.

¹⁷ Rorke, 'Sacred Contrafacta', 170.

Canto

Alto

Quinto

Tenore

Basso

Sta - bat vir go Ma ri - a me - stis - si - mo do - lo - re languens ad crucem et fle -
 E - ra l'a ni ma mi - a già presso a l'ul - ti - m' ho - re. E lan - gua co - me lan - gue al

Sta - bat vir go Ma - ri - a me - stis - si - mo do - lo - re languens ad crucem et fle -
 E - ra l'a ni ma mi a già presso a l'ul - ti - m' ho - re. E lan - gua co - me lan - gue al

Sta - bat vir go Ma - ri - a me - stis - si - mo do - lo - re languens ad crucem et fle -
 E - ra l'a ni ma mi a già presso a l'ul - ti - m' ho - re. E lan - gua co - me lan - gue al

10

- bat a - ma - re, lan - guens ad cru - cem et fle - bat a - ma - re
 ma che mo - re, e lan - gua co - me lan - gue al - ma che mo - re

- bat a - ma - re, lan - guens ad cru - cem et fle - bat a - ma - re
 - ma che mo - re, e lan - gua co - me lan - gue al - ma che mo - re

re
 re

Example 4.

Canto
Chri - ste
lu - mi

Alto
Chri - ste
lu - mi

Quinto
en Deh! li - que - fac - ta lan - guet,
per - ché ti con - su - mi,

Tenore
en Deh! li - que - fac - ta lan - guet,
per - ché ti con - su - mi,

Basso
Chri - ste en li - que - fac - ta lan - guet,
lu - mi Deh! per - ché ti con - su - mi,

en Deh! li - que - fac - ta lan - guet
per - ché ti con - su - mi

en Deh! li - que - fac - ta lan - guet
per - ché ti con - su - mi

guet, en li - que - fac - ta lan - guet
mi, deh! per - ché ti con - su - mi

guet, en li - que - fac - ta lan - guet
mi, deh! per - ché ti con - su - mi

en li - que - fac - ta lan - guet
deh! per - ché ti con - su - mi

Example 5.

10 en lan - gue - o, se mo - ri ohi - mē! en lan - gue - o, se mo - ri ohi - mē!

17 en mo - ri - or do - lo - re! non mo - ri tu, mor' i - a.

Example 6.

III. *Il pastor fido*: dialogue of Dorinda and Silvio

All four Monteverdi madrigals and their Latin contrafacta presented in this group come from Guarini's *Il pastor fido* (IV:9). They form a sequence of four fragments comprising a dramatic dialogue between Silvio and the dying Dorinda. Dorinda is passionately in love with Silvio, but he is interested only in hunting and despises her. Dorinda disguises herself as a wolf, in order to be as near to him as possible. Sensing something move, Silvio throws his dart and wounds her. Discovering her wounded, Silvio is suddenly overcome by passion – his heart melts and he declares his love. He reproaches himself for his past behaviour and prays for Dorinda's recovery, offering to marry her.

'Qui pendit in cruce/ Ecco, Silvio, colei che in odio hai tanto'
Il pastor fido (IV:9, lines 100–113)

[Dorinda:]

- 1 Ecco, Silvio, colei che in odio hai tanto;
- 2 eccola in quella guisa
- 3 che la volevi a ponto.
- 4 Bramastila ferir, ferita l'hai;
- 5 bramastila tua preda, eccola preda;
- 6 bramastila al fin morta, eccola a morte.
- 7 Che vuoi tu più da lei? Che ti può dare
- 8 più di questo Dorinda? Ah, garzon crudo!
- 9 Ah, cor senza pietà! Tu non credesti
- 10 la piaga che per te mi fece Amore:

Qui pendit in cruce, Deus meus,
 liberat me potenter
 de persequentibus me,
 ne quando rapiatur coelum mihi.
 O miram charitatem et ardorem!
 Qui nesciebat mortem, subiit mortem,
 ut me deduceret ad regna sua,
 regna coeli excelsi. O clavos atroces
 sine pietate! Vulnere tua
 sunt mihi medicina salutaris,

11 puoi quest'hor tu negar de la tua mano?	non ego fundam lachrymas amaras,
12 Non hai creduto il sangue	non ingemiscam, Deus,
13 ch'ei versava per gli occhi;	Deus meus, qui sceleribus
14 crederai questo che'l mio fianco versa?	meis effecti plagas tuas?

Coppini skilfully adapts a series of motifs from Guarini's poem in another piece on the Crucifixion. Silvio's scorn for Dorinda is represented in the blind hatred of Christ's enemies nailing him to the Cross. Dorinda's 'Ah! garzon crudo, ah! cor senza pieta' ('Oh, cruel youth! Oh, pitiless heart!') in line 8 becomes 'O clavos atroces sine pietate' ('O cruel nails with no mercy') in the Latin poem: her *piaga* becomes Christ's wounds (*vulnera*) in lines 9–10. The idea of following is also present: Dorinda is pursuing her beloved hunter; Christ is followed and persecuted by the Jews. In Coppini's poem, the praying *je parlant* is also being persecuted and prays to the crucified Christ to liberate him from his persecutors (lines 2–3). It is interesting that Coppini uses only the word *Deus*, normally reserved for the heavenly Father and Creator. One explanation for this could be the fact that, by analogy to Silvio's not recognising Dorinda in disguise and thus wounding her, the people did not recognise the Son of God himself, appearing as a man, and sentenced him to a cruel death.

The idea of 'translating' Guarini's text on the wounded Dorinda into a contemplation on Christ's wounds must have occurred to Coppini for musical reasons as well. The repeated and sustained *g* in the alto part, taken up in a similar manner by other voices at the very beginning of the piece, depicts the heavy burden of Christ's body hanging on the Cross (Example 7).

The image shows a musical score for five voices: Canto, Quinto, Alto, Tenore, and Basso. The lyrics are "Qui pe-pen-dit in cru-ce". The Alto part has a sustained note on the letter 'g' in "pen-g", which is highlighted by the text as depicting the heavy burden of Christ's body hanging on the Cross. The other voices also sing the same lyrics, with the Tenore part being mostly silent in this excerpt.

Example 7.

The *saltus duriusculus* in imitation in the two upper voices is used by Coppini as the expression of the plea for liberation from the persecutors (Example 8, bars 11–15).

Example 8 shows two vocal parts: Canto and Quinto. The Canto part has the lyrics: *li - be-rat me po - ten - ter* / *Ec - co-la in quel-la gui - sa*. The Quinto part has the lyrics: *li - be-rat me po - ten - ter, li - be-rat me po - ten - ter* / *Ec - co-la in quel-la gui - sa, ec - co-la in quel-la gui - sa*. The music features a *saltus duriusculus* in imitation between the two parts.

Example 8.

In line 6, he uses the syntax and the sound of the Italian verse (the variants of the word *mors/morte*, caesura in the same place) – this place is particularly striking in the score (bars 25–27, Example 9).

Example 9 shows five vocal parts: Canto, Quinto, Alto, Tenore, and Basso. All parts have the same lyrics: *Qui ne - sci - e - bat mor - tem, sub - i - it mor - tem* / *bra - ma - sti - laal fin mor - ta, ec - co - la a mor - te*. The music features a caesura in the same place across all parts, which is particularly striking.

Example 9.

Lines 4–6 in both poems are also dominated by the presence of the *r* sound – both poets use here strong-sounding words like *bramare*, *ferire*, *preda* and *morte* (Guarini), *rapio*, *mira charitate et ardor* and *mors* (Coppini). The talented priest also has the vowel sound of the Italian poem in his verse in line 11:

Non e- go fun-dam la-chry-mas a-ma-ras
 Puoi quest' hor tu ne- gar de la tu-a ma-no

A further analogy between the two poems appears in line 14, where we find *plagas* and *fianco*. Dorinda's wounded side is an obvious allusion to the wounded side of Christ. Moreover, it brings to mind the Biblical passage with the Apostle Thomas not believing the resurrection of the Lord until he was invited to put his hands into Jesus' wounded side.¹⁸ In fact, a lack of faith is another important motif in both poems. Silvio never took Dorinda's feelings seriously; neither did the Jews believe that Christ was the long-awaited Messiah – only dramatic circumstances (dying Dorinda, dying Christ) led to a change of opinion. Finally, the blood flowing out of Dorinda's wound in Guarini's verse has its counterpoint in other fluids in Coppini's poem. However, just like Dorinda, who faces her fate calmly, the desperate *je parlant* does not groan or weep bitterly (*non ego fundam lachrymas amaras, non ingemiscam*), and as her wounds can heal love, so the bleeding *vulnera Christi are medicina salutaris*. Thus Dorinda's love wound (in both the physical and the spiritual sense) is paralleled with the power of the healing of salvation in line 10.

'Maria, quid ploras/ Dorinda, ah, dirò mia, se mia non sei'
Il pastor fido (IV:9, lines 123–130)

[Silvio:]

1 Dorinda, ah, dirò mia, se mia non sei	"Maria, quid ploras ad monumentum?
2 se non quando ti perdo	Quaenam fruire tibi causae doloris?"
3 e quando morte da me ricevi,	"Crucifixerunt amorem meum,
4 e mia non fosti allora	Et occiderunt eum,
5 che ti potei dar vita?	que mihi dedit vitam."
6 (Pur mia dirò, ché mia sarai)	„Exultet cor tuum gaudio,
7 Pur mia dirò, ché mia sarai	absterge cadentes lachrymas,
8 malgrado di mia dura sorte;	inuitis perfidas Iudaeis,
9 e, se mia non sarai con la tua vita,	ille vivit, et vivet in aeternum,
10 sarai con la mia morte.	et possidebit eum."

The main framework of Coppini's verse is the idea of dialogue. Although this madrigal is set to Silvio's monologue, the dialogue with Dorinda takes place many times before (as in *Ecco, Silvio*) and continues afterwards (in the two following

¹⁸ NIV, John 20:24–29.

madrigals from the Fifth Book of Monteverdi, 'Ecco piegando le genocchie' and 'Ferir quel petto, Silvio?'). There was no better opportunity to show the dialogue idea than to use the scene between Mary Magdalene and the angel by the tomb on Easter Day. Life, death and resurrection are thus consistently the main themes of both poems. In the Italian verse, Silvio is desperate, having mortally wounded Dorinda instead of giving her life by loving her. Hence he decides to die with her and so reunite with her after their deaths. Mary Magdalene at the tomb laments the cruel death of her beloved master who gave her life in the spiritual sense through Christian faith (*que mihi dedit vitam*) and now is dead. The angel announces the resurrection of the Lord and eternal life now belongs to the whole community of believers.

Coppini's verbal associations led him to several decisions in the process of adapting the Italian text. The first was the simple but effective use of the name of *Maria* instead of *Dorinda* as the invocation at the beginning of the Latin verse – the two names are phonetically related, employing three syllables of similar vowel-consonant constellations. The word *ploras* fits perfectly the expressive figure on *ah* in the cantus in bar 6 (Example 10).

The image shows a musical score for five voices: Canto, Quinto, Alto, Tenore, and Basso. Each voice part has a line of musical notation with lyrics underneath. The lyrics are in Latin and Italian. The Latin text is: Ma-ri-a, Ma-ri-a, quid plo-ras, quid plo-ras. The Italian text is: Do-rin-da, Do-rin-da ah! di-rò mia ah! di-rò mia. The score includes musical notation with notes, rests, and slurs.

Example 10.

As usual, Coppini tries to keep similar any fragments of the Italian text that also work in Latin, as is the case in line 5, but also, less directly, in line 9. This last passage, *ille vivit et vivet in aeternum*, elegantly justifies the sudden fast movement in all the voices. In the Italian poem, this expresses Silvio's newly found passion for

Dorinda (*e, se mia non sarai con la tua vita, sarai con la mia morte*). The expression *perfidus Iudaeis* is carefully placed where Guarini had equally strong words with negative connotations, like *malgrado* or *dura sorte* (line 8). A particularly interesting passage can be found in bars 23–28 (Example 11).

Canto
ab - ster - ge ca - den - tes la - chry - mas
Pur mia di - rò che mi - a sa - rai

Quinto
ab - ster - ge ca - den - tes la - chry - mas
Pur mia di - rò che mi - a sa - rai

Alto
ab - ster - ge ca - den - tes la - chry - mas
Pur mia di - rò che mi - a sa - rai

Tenore

Basso
Ex - ul - tet cor tu - um gau - di - o
Pur mia di - rò che mi - a sa - rai

Example 11.

The text of line 6, *exultet cor tuum gaudio*, is present only in the bass voice and corresponds to the Italian line *pur mia dirò, ché mia sarai*. All the other voices, however, have another Latin text – *absterge cadentes lachrymas*. I suspect that Coppini has left a hidden message here: in case we have forgotten what story he is referring to, he places a reminder here that in St John's Gospel, which he is quoting, Mary Magdalene finds not one, but two angels in white.¹⁹ This might then be the two of them speaking simultaneously to the astonished woman, announcing the joy of the risen Lord.

¹⁹ 'Then the disciples went back to their homes, but Mary stood outside the tomb crying. As she wept, she bent over to look into the tomb and saw two angels in white, seated where Jesus' body had been, one at the head and the other at the foot. They asked her, "Woman, why are you crying?" "They have taken my Lord away," she said, "and I don't know where they have put him".' (NIV, *John 20:10–13*)

‘Te, Iesu Christe, liberator meus/ Ecco piegando le genocchie a terra’
Il pastor fido (IV:9, lines 138–148)

[Silvio:]

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Ecco piegando le genocchie a terra | Te, Iesu Christe, liberator meus, |
| 2. riverente t’adoro | reverenter adoro |
| 3. e ti chieggio perdon, ma non già vita. | Vulneratus es, mihi ut des vitam, |
| 4. Ecco li strali e l’arco; | clavi tibi foderunt pedes, |
| 5. ma non ferir già tu gli occhi o le mani, | manus amabiles, diro colore |
| 6. (non ferir già tu gli occhi o le mani), | feriere te cuspide saeva |
| 7. colpevoli ministri | teterrimi ministri, |
| 8. d’innocente voler; ferisci il petto, | impie ausi sunt ferire pectus. |
| 9. ferisci questo mostro | Sic mira pietate |
| 10. di pietad’e d’amor aspro nemico; | redemisti me, Christe, tua morte. |
| 11. ferisci questo cor che ti fu crudo! | Te vero vulnera cor meum durum |
| 12. Eccoti il petto ignudo. | telo amoris tui. |

This is one of the best examples of Coppini’s use of the overall design of the Italian poem. Most striking are lines 2 and 8, showing the close relationship between the languages. Also the end of the third line uses the word *vita*, identical in both languages. We find the same phenomenon in lines 7 (*ministri*) and 11 (*cor*). The words *pietate* – *pietade* in lines 9–10 are very close to one another, though not exactly in the same place.

In Guarini’s poem, Silvio is asking the dying Dorinda to kill him with arrows thrust directly into his breast. She should wound the heart that had no pity on her love and devotion and that was so cruel to her. Coppini transforms this picture into an ardent prayer to Christ on the Cross. At the beginning of Guarini’s poem, Silvio is on his knees (*Ecco piegando le genocchie a terra*). We can presume that the veneration in the Latin work occurs in the same position, as an echo of the unheard but familiar text of the original piece. Silvio begs Dorinda to pardon him but not to leave him among the living (*e ti chieggio perdon, ma non già vita*). In the corresponding passage in Coppini’s poem, the wounds and the death of Christ are the source of new life (*vulneratus es, mihi ut des vitam*). Coppini anticipates the wound topos, speaking about it immediately in line 3 (*vulneratus es*), while in Guarini, it only starts in line 5 with the word *ferir*.

Coppini also transforms Silvio’s armour (*li strali e l’arco*) into piercing nails (*clavi*), quoting Psalm 22 (21).²⁰ He continues with terms like *cuspis* (line 6: ‘spear, sting’) and *telum* (line 12: ‘spear, arrow, throwing weapon’). The passage about the pierced hands (line 5) naturally uses the word for hand, which is very similar in both languages. Coppini decides not to place *manus* in the same position as *mani* in the Italian poem, but uses the original placement of the word

²⁰ Psalm 22 (21), 17: ‘foderunt manus meas et pedes meos’.

manus in the beginning of line 5, placing there the Latin *ma non*, thus employing another phonetic quality of Guarini's poem. Line 5 of the Italian poem also mentions the eyes. In the same line, Coppini uses the expression *diro colore*, directing our attention to the visual aspect of the dreadful colour of Christ's blood-covered body.

Lines 9–10, in which Silvio calls himself a monster and love's enemy (*mostro di pietad'e d'amor aspro nemico* – bars 46–48), show in the Latin poem Christ's mercy and redeeming love. In line 11, Coppini not only uses the *u-* and *r-*sound quality of Guarini's verse *ferisci questo cor che ti fu crudo* in his *tu vero vulnerasti cor meum durum* (using Monteverdi's strong and expressive cadence to place the word *durum*, originally used for *crudo*), but also uses an echo on *cor* and plays with alliteration in *vero vulnerasti*. At the end of Guarini's text, Silvio dramatically offers his naked chest to be wounded (*eccoti il petto ignudo*), but the real wound in fact appears only in Coppini's *contrafactum* in Christ's body on the Cross, metaphorically caused through the harshness of the unworthy venerator's heart (*te vero vulnera cor meum durum*).

'Pulchrae sunt genae tuae/ Ferir quel petto, Silvio?'

Il pastor fido (IV:9, lines 149–168)

[Dorinda:]

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Ferir quel petto, Silvio? | Pulchrae sunt genae tuae, |
| 2. Non bisognava a gli occhi miei scovrirlo, | amica mea, soror mea sponsa, |
| 3. s'avevi pur desio ch'io te 'l ferissi. | oculi tui sicut columbarum. |
| 4. O bellissimo scoglio, | O pulcherrima Virgo, |
| 5. già da l'onde e dal vento | vulnerasti cor meum, |
| 6. de le lagrime mie, de' miei sospiri | vulnerasti cor meum, sponsa mea, |
| 7. sì spesso in van percosso, | in uno crine tuo, |
| 8. è pur ver che tu spiri | vulnerasti cor meum, |
| 9. e che senti pietate? O pur m'inganno? | vulnerasti cor meum, columba mea. |
| 10. Ma sii tu pur o petto molle o marmo, | Übera tua sicut botri Cypri |
| 11. già non vo' che m'inganni | et ut hinnuli duo |
| 12. d'un candido alabastro il bel sembiante, | gemelli capreae, qui pascunt flores. |
| 13. come quel d'una fera | (et ut hinnuli duo |
| 14. oggi ha ingannato il tuo signor e mio. | gemelli capreae, qui pascunt flores) |
| 15. Ferir io te? Te pur ferisca Amore, | Quam pulchra es et speciosa, Virgo! |
| 16. ché vendetta maggiore | Coronabere. Veni |
| 17. non so bramar che di vederti amante. | de Libano, amica mea, veni: |
| 18. Sia benedetto il dì che da prim'arsi! | Veni de Libano, formosa mea; |
| 19. Benedette le lagrime e i martiri! | Tui dentes ut oves de lavacro, |
| 20. Di voi lodar, non vendicar, mi voglio. | et labia stillantia unguentum |

From this scene in *Il pastro fido*, Coppini decides to adopt three motifs that he can use in his spiritual version of this madrigal:

1. the eyes/gaze: *gli occhi, oculi, genae*²¹
2. the chest/ breast/heart: *petto, cor, ubera*
3. the wound – the verbs *ferire/vulnerare*

At the beginning of Guarini's poem, Dorinda, asked by Silvio to kill him, answers: 'Wound that breast, Silvio? You should not have bared it to my gaze if you wanted me to wound it' (lines 1–3). Coppini immediately associates this with the Song of Songs and offers a paraphrase of its various fragments. First, he expresses the beauty of the Bride's eyes (lines 1 and 3), then of her breasts, compared to clusters of Cyprian grapes and to two fawns, twins of a gazelle, that browse among flowers (lines 10–14). In line 4, Coppini transforms the beautiful rock – *o bellissimo scoglio* – into *o pulcherrima Virgo*, thus clearly directing our attention to his allegorical, Marian reading of the Song of Songs. He also masterfully uses the wound topos as found in the *Canticum canticorum*: *vulnerasti cor meum*. This phrase appears many times both in the original Biblical text and in Coppini's paraphrase (lines 5–6, 8–9). Interestingly, Coppini omits the mention of the eyes in the phrase *vulnerasti cor meum in uno oculorum tuorum*,²² using only its continuation *in uno crine tuo*.²³ The hair of the beloved is discreetly depicted in musical motifs of the cantus and quintus in bars 24–25 (Example 12).

The re-texting of the following fragment (line 8) shows how carefully Coppini arranges his lines: the phrases *è pur ver che tu spiri* and *vulnerasti cor meum* have a strong assonantal quality in the use of vowels and consonants. The three-part texture used in this fragment (only cantus, quintus and tenor employed) expresses the fragility of both main protagonists: Dorinda is shyly asking the question 'is it true that you breathe?', while the Latin text emphasises the vulnerability of the Bridegroom's love.

Canto

in u - no cri - ne tu - o
si spes-so in van - per-cos - so

Quinto

in u - no cri - ne tu - o
si spes-so in van - per-cos - so

Example 12.

²¹ *Genae* means in Latin both 'cheeks' and (more rarely) 'eyes'.

²² CC 4:9

²³ CC 4:9: 'in uno crine colli tui'

It is striking that the new passage opens with the same idea: Silvio's *petto* and the Bride's *ubera* (line 10). We encounter here a particular situation in which Coppini decides to react to two different lines of Guarini's poem using the same sentence twice: *et ut hinnuli duo gemelli capreae qui pascunt flores*. This is an ingenious response to Dorinda's two passages: the first in which she claims she should not be deceived by the resemblance of Silvio's chest to white alabaster (lines 10–12), the second as Silvio should not have been deceived by her resemblance to a wild beast (lines 13–14). On one hand, Coppini uses the idea of equating white alabaster with two gazelle fawns, to which he compares the breasts of the Bride;²⁴ on the other, he plays on the disguised Dorinda's similarity to a wild animal. The general idea of this Guarini passage is the comparison which is predominant also in the Song of Songs, paraphrased by Coppini.

Further analogies can be found in the sound disposition of both texts in line 19 in the assonance group *tui dentes – benedette* and in the alliteration *lagrime – lavacro*. At the end of the Latin poem, Coppini again uses an idea taken from Guarini's poem. Dorinda wants to praise Silvio (*lodare*), not to be avenged of him. The spiritual work uses the related image of the Bride whose lips (*labia*) drip with perfume.

IV. Guarini's *Rime* and Coppini's spiritual contrafacta

This group of works is based on continuo madrigals from Monteverdi's Fifth Book which Coppini turned into spiritual pieces *con l'organo*, as the *tavola* states; that is, with organ accompaniment.

'Gloria tua manet in aeternum/ T'amo, mia vita'

Rime, no. 70

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. 'T'amo, mia vita!' La mia cara vita | Gloria tua manet in aeternum, |
| 2. dolcemente mi dice [x], e in questa sola | potentissime Deus [x]. Fecisti coelum |
| 3. sì soave parola | conglobastique terram, |
| 4. par che trasformi lietamente il core, | formasti nos ad imaginem tuam, |
| 5. per farmene signore [x]. | ut te perfrueremur [x]. |
| 6. O voce [x] di dolcezza e di diletto! | Aeterna [x] tibi laus, honor et potestas, |
| 7. Prendila tosto, Amore; | Domine Deus noster, |
| 8. stampala nel mio petto. | (Domine Deus noster), |
| 9. Spiri solo per lei l'anima mia: | qui perducis ad te animas nostras. |
| 10. 'T'amo mia vita!' la mia vita sia. | Gloria tua manet in aeternum. |

²⁴ In the Vulgata text, the fawns browse among lilies, which underlines the idea of the colour white even more (CC 4:5).

In this *contrafactum*, Coppini had to make particular decisions due to Monteverdi's setting of Guarini's verse. Monteverdi decides to repeat the poem's opening words, *t'amo mia vita*, making it a kind of a motto for the whole piece. So does Coppini, choosing *gloria tua* to dominate his version. *T'amo mia vita* functions as a refrain, and Monteverdi uses it to personify 'the remembered voice of the beloved, obsessively recalled by the narrator'.²⁵ Interestingly, a very similar text is to be found in Adriano Banchieri's *Terzo libro di novi pensieri ecclesiastici*, as a monodic *motetto*:

*Gloria tua manet in aeternum, amantissime Deus. Facisti nos ad imaginem tuam ut te perfrueremur. Gloria tua mantet in aeternum, clementissime Deus. Tu perducis ad te animas nostras. Gloria tua manet in aeternum, potentissime Deus.*²⁶

It seems likely that Banchieri is using a version of Coppini's text, not only because of the almost identical vocabulary, but, more importantly, because he appears to be adapting the repeated section *gloria tua mantet in aeternum*. Banchieri knew *Musica tolta* and appreciated the fact that one of his own pieces, 'Aprestateci fede', was included there, turned by Coppini into 'Confitemini'.²⁷ Therefore, it is likely that he kept Coppini's *Gloria tua* in mind: this text appears in Coppini's piece four times in the cantus alone, in the three lower voices, leaving the quintus unemployed for over half of the piece.²⁸ The similarities between the narrative and commentary functions of those voices and those in the famous 'Lamento della ninfa' have long been recognised.²⁹ Coppini uses this daring textural device, placing the words *gloria tua* in the disembodied cantus and the praise of God's creation in other voices, thus proposing almost a responsorial structure between an imaginary priest and his congregation.³⁰ The strong shift from the realm of *mia/mio* first-person singular (lines 1, 8, 9 and 10, including the verb *farmene* in line 5) to the first-person plural (*nos/noster/nostras*, including the verb *perfrueremur*) seems to support this idea, emphasising the togetherness of a responding religious community in polyphony. The sense of congregation first flourishes in the last third of the piece, where all the voices (including the quintus, which begins only here) sing *gloria tua*, imitating the opening motif of the cantus.

²⁵ Massimo Ossi, 'The Mantuan madrigals and the Scherzi musicali', in John Whenham and Richard Wistreich (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Monteverdi* (Cambridge, 2007), 104. I have marked the recurring passage in both texts with [x].

²⁶ Adriano Banchieri, *Terzo libro di novi pensieri ecclesiastici*, Op. 35 (Bologna, 1613).

²⁷ 'Trà l'illustre schiera, che V.S. hà raccolta di Madrigali à cinque voci on Claudio Monteverde, & altri moderni compositori de' nostri tempi [...] s'è compiaciuta V. S. registrarne un mio'. Banchieri, *Lettere armoniche*, 120.

²⁸ I have marked the recurring passage in both texts with [x].

²⁹ Massimo Ossi, *Divining the oracle*, 75n.6.

³⁰ It is worth noting that both opening lines, *t'amo mia vita* and *gloria tua manet*, have a strong assonantal relationship (*t'amo* – *manet*)

As usual, Coppini keeps some fragments of the Italian poem intact. Line 9 has the words *animas/l'anima* in the same position. Similarly, he sets the word *formasti* almost in the place of *trasformi* (line 4) and the verb *perfrueremur* (line 5), meaning 'to enjoy to the full', approximately at the original position of *lietamente*, 'joyfully' (line 4). He also puts the name of his poem's protagonist, God-Creator, next to the original one (*Domine Deus versus Amore* in bars 31–32). The activity of creating is also of some importance, mirrored in the verbs *fare* (line 5) and, anticipated by Coppini, *facere* (line 2). The idea of setting this madrigal to a text on the Creation might have had its source in Guarini's passage about the 'sweetest word' (*si soave parola*) transforming the heart of the lover. Coppini's text suggests connections to the beginning of St John's Gospel (particularly in the sense of the vital role of the Word),³¹ as well as to the Book of Genesis, which he even quotes,³² thus transforming Guarini's amorous lines into a poem about the creative power of divine love.

'Ure me, Domine/ Troppo ben può questo tiranno Amore'
Rime, no. 108

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Troppo ben può questo tiranno Amore! | Ure me, Domine, amore tuo, |
| 2. Poi che non val fuggire | quem fecit amor mori, |
| 3. a chi no 'l può soffrire. | incede me hoc igne, |
| 4. Quand'io penso talor com'arde e punge, | subice cordi meo facem tuam. |
| 5. io dico: ah, core stolto, | O Iesu, amore tuo |
| 6. non l'aspettar, che fai? [x] | liquescere me velis, [x] |
| (non l'aspettar, che fai? [x]) | (liquescere me velis, [x]) |
| 7. Fuggilo, sì che non ti prenda mai. | fugiat omnis amor mei a me, |
| 8. Ma, non so, com'il lusinghier mi giunge | lasciviant mihi propter te medullae. |
| 9. ch'io dico: ah, core sciolto, | O Iesu, amore tuo |
| 10. perché fuggito l'hai? [x] | anima mea languet; [x] |
| (perché fuggito l'hai? [x]) | (anima mea languet; [x]) |
| 11. Prendilo, sì che non ti fugga mai. | Iam rapior amore tuo dulci. |

Guarini's *Troppo ben* introduces *Amore* as a cruel tyrant from whom there is no way of hiding, but since it is useless to flee, it is better to catch it and thus keep it safe forever. Coppini's verse takes up this final motif and presents a spiritual desire to merge into Christ and remain forever within the flame of his love. In his contrafactum, Coppini uses Guarini's double-refrain *Ah, core stolto/Ah, core sciolto* in order to repeat one single phrase – *O Iesu, amore tuo*. The Latin poem

³¹ NIV, John 1:1–4: 'In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was with God in the beginning. Through him all things were made; without him nothing was made that has been made. In him was life, and that life was the light of all mankind'.

³² Especially Gen. 1:27: 'et creavit Deus hominem ad imaginem suam'.



Example 15.

Similarly, he keeps the vowel *e* on long melismas in the words *prenda/mei* and the vowel *u* on *fugga/tuo* in all the voices, thus preserving most of the euphonic qualities of the original poem.

'Vives in corde meo/ Ahi, come a un vago sol cortese giro'

Rime, no. 110

- | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|
| 1. Ahi, come a un vago sol cortese giro | Vives in corde meo, Deus meus, |
| 2. de' duo belli occhi, ond'io | nec te dimmitam: Tu tui |
| 3. soffersi il primo dolce stral d'Amore, | me vulnerabis pharetra amoris. |
| 4. pien d'un novo desio, | Deus meus, |
| 5. sì pront'a sospirar torna 'l mio core. | te quaeso, contine in meo corde, |
| 6. (Ah, che piaga d'Amor non sana mai!) | fruar, bone Iesu, amore tuo. |
| 7. Lasso, non val ascondersi, ch'omai | Lava, quae macularunt animam, incede |
| 8. conosco i segni che 'l mio cor addita | frigiditatem meam flamma tua, |
| 9. de l'antica ferita. | ut te diligam semper, |
| 10. (Ah, che piaga d'Amor non sana mai!) | fruar, bone Iesu, amore tuo, |
| 11. Ed è gran tempo pur che la saldai. | et super omnia, quae sunt amanda, |
| 12. Ah, che piaga d'Amor non sana mai! | fruar, bone Iesu, amore tua. |

The main motifs that the two poems share are the following: love (*Amore/amor, amanda*), heart (*core/cor*), wound and suffering (*soffrire, piaga, ferita, vulnerare*). Guarini's poem shows 'an amorous infatuation', caused by the glance of a woman's beautiful eyes – a new desire, forcing the speaker (remembering, however, his old love's wound) to give in to this new feeling. Coppini's devotional text is an ardent prayer to Christ, asking him to light the fire of faith and wash the unclean soul. Guarini's speaker is torn between his desire to love and his fear of being hurt again, just as the wishes for fire and water in the Latin poem contradict each other (lines 7–8).

Presumably because of the presence of a continuo instrument, as already shown in *T'amo mia vita*, with its soloistically treated cantus, Monteverdi decided to contrast different vocal textures for *Ahi come a un vago sol cortese giro*. In fact, it is a tenor duet, with the quintus functioning as tenor. The other voices enter only on the last line of the original poem: *ah che piaga d'Amor non sana mai*. Monteverdi, however, anticipates the end of Guarini's madrigal, placing the refrain twice before the actual end of the piece (lines 6 and 10). Massimo Ossi senses in the repetition

‘an air of inevitability’ and assumes that ‘the urgency of its repeated “misplacement” underscores the pained resignation of the speaker’.³³ Hartmut Schick compares it to the commenting role of the choir in ancient Greek theatre.³⁴ Coppini uses this fragment in a different way: for him, the repetition is a chance to depict the zealous ardour of his speaker in the words *fruar, bone Iesu, amore tuo*. It is important to note that Coppini deliberately replaces *Amore* in the refrain of the piece with the name *Iesu*, placing the Latin phrase *amore tuo*, as a reminder of Guarini’s verse, just next to it.³⁵ This refrain is set to music five times: twice as a trio, once as a tenor duet and twice as a full five-voice ensemble.³⁶ The soloistic tenor parts are highly ornamented, but they demonstrate Monteverdi’s care over the choice of words (*giro, stral[e], core, lasso*). Coppini responds to these madrigalisms. The first melisma in the quintus and the tenor in bars 3–5, on the Italian *giro* (‘turn’), introduces the invocation *Deus meus* (Example 16).

The image shows a musical score for two voices: Quinto (Soprano) and Tenore (Tenor). Both parts are in a single system. The Quinto part is written on a treble clef staff, and the Tenore part is written on a bass clef staff. The lyrics are written below the notes. The Quinto part has two lines of lyrics: "Vi Ahil! ves in cor-de me-o, De-us me us" and "co me a un va-go sol cor-te-se gi ro". The Tenore part also has two lines of lyrics: "Vi Ahil! ves in cor-de me-o, De-us me us" and "co me a un va-go sol cor-te-se gi ro". The music consists of a series of notes, with some ornamentation in the Tenore part.

Example 16.

The second melisma in the same voices was placed originally in Italian on the word *stral[e]* – ‘arrow’. Coppini responds to it both semantically and euphonicly, choosing the rather rare word *pharetra*, meaning ‘quiver’ (bars 9–12, Example 17). The euphony of having the same melisma in the Latin piece on *pha-re-tra* as it was on *stral* in the Italian piece seems to have been of great importance to Coppini: in re-texting this madrigal, he might have used many other words, like *sagitta* (‘arrow’), but he deliberately chooses this strong sonorous similarity.

³³ Massimo Ossi, “‘Ahi, come a un vago sol cortese giro’ (1605)”, *Intermedio II*, in Whenham and Wistreich (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Monteverdi*, 113.

³⁴ ‘Die refrainartig eingesetzte Zeile wirkt wie ein chorischer Kommentar nach Art der griechischen Tragödie’, Hartmut Schick, *Musikalische Einheit im Madrigal von Rore bis Monteverdi. Phänomene, Formen und Entwicklungslinien* [Tübinger Beiträge zur Musikwissenschaft, Bd. 18] (Tutzing, 1998), 371.

³⁵ It seems to belong to Coppini’s contrafactum language: in two pieces from *Il terzo libro della musica di Claudio Monteverdi [...] fatta spirituale da Aquilino Coppini* (1609), he reacts identically to the original text, replacing *cor mio* in two different madrigals with the name *Jesu*, *cor mio mentre vi miro/Jesu dum te* and *Cor mio non mori/Jesu tu obis*. The same strategy appears again in *Longe a te mi Jesu/Longe da te cor mio* from the same compilation.

³⁶ Massimo Ossi recognises only four passages of the refrain, considering the tenor duet in bars 56–61 to be the opening of the third such passage. Ossi, “‘Ahi, come a un vago sol’”, 113.

Quinto
 Tu tu - i me vul - ne - ra - bis pha - re - tra a - mo - ris
 ond' i - o sof - fer - sù il pri mo dol - ce stral d'A - mo - re

Tenore
 Tu tu - i me vul - ne - ra - bis pha - re - tra a - mo - ris
 ond' i - o sof - fer - si il pri - mo dol - ce stral d'A - mo - re

Example 17.

The third melisma employs a word that is almost the same in both languages – *core/cor* – ‘heart’ (Example 18).

Quinto
 in me - o cor - de, in me - o cor
 tor - na il mio co - re, tor - na il mio co

Tenore
 in me - o cor
 tor - na il mio co

de
 re
 de
 re

Example 18.

In the fourth short melisma (bars 33–35), Coppini uses the same opening syllable *la* on *lava*, as in the Italian *lasso* (Example 19).

Quinto
 La - - - - - va
 Las - - - - - so

Tenore
 La - - - - - va
 Las - - - - - so

Example 19.

In a similar way, the fifth melisma recalls the *i*-vowel sound of Monteverdi's original (*antica/diligam*). Finally, in the last melisma, the vowel sound shifts again to the *a*-vowel sound in the assonant pair *saldai/amanda*.

Conclusions

The foregoing discussion of Coppini's adaptation of Monteverdi's secular madrigals from the Fifth Book shows how carefully and thoughtfully he made his choices in the process of composing his contrafacta. In his poems, he tries to largely retain the euphonic qualities of the original texts: the Italian vowels, consonants, phonemes and syllables. He often uses words sharing the same root in both languages. In this way, he can keep both their similar sounds and their related meanings. Coppini's interest in retaining as much as possible of the original text can plainly be seen in many incipits and opening lines. In this way, the informed listener is immediately reminded of the original text. There are many examples of words etymologically connected, but sounding differently in Italian and Latin – again, for the sake of keeping as much of the original material as possible. As far as form is concerned, Coppini clearly adopts similar poetic structures and overall syntax. We have even shown the occasional adaptation of rhyme structure in Coppini's otherwise prose lines.

More important, however, is Coppini's response to the general character of the texts. Monteverdi's decision to use two main couples from *Il pastor fido* (Amarilli/Mirtillo and Dorinda/Silvio) must have appealed to Coppini for at least two reasons: the comic aspects of the play (characters like Corisca or Satiro) could be avoided and the psychological states of the principal characters emphasised.³⁷ Monteverdi's musical depiction of Mirtillo's passion and obsession must have seemed more than suitable for being transformed into a poem on the Crucifixion (*Felle amaro*) or a poem on the harsh, pitiless heart of a sinner (*Spernit Deus cor durum*). Dorinda's mad love and irrational passion as depicted in Monteverdi's music were wonderful material for Coppini to change into a piece on Christ's Passion (*Qui pependit in cruce*). Dorinda's masochistic lyricism finds its way into Coppini's *Pulchrae sunt genae tuae*. Silvio's guilt at having shot her, on the other hand, causes him to realise his love for her and experience a moment of epiphany. Coppini uses Monteverdi's inspired music to set two scenes of spiritual enlightenment: the healing wound of Christ in *Te Iesu Christe liberator meus* and Mary Magdalene being told the good tidings of his Resurrection in *Maria quid ploras*. Both Coppini's texts illustrate the discovery of some deeper truth – just as in Guarini's verses, where Silvio experiences the transformation of his feelings for Dorinda, thus celebrating the victory of devoted love.

Yet another feature makes Coppini's contrafacta a real masterpiece. Coppini responds to Monteverdi's choice of theatrical texts in the *a cappella* pieces discussed above by composing dramatic texts. At the same time, he reacts specifically to Monteverdi's settings of continuo madrigals from Guarini's *Rime*. Those three madrigals – 'Gloria tua manet in aeternum', 'Ure me Domine' and 'Vives in corde

³⁷ Ossi, *Divining the oracle*, 84.

meo' – all set lyrical texts. Coppini transforms them into spiritual texts in a non-dramatic, meditative way. In fact, all three of them are simple prayers. Coppini's reaction to the text 'Era l'anima mia' from *Rime*, re-texted by him as 'Stabat virgo Maria', only confirms his thoughtful and respectful way of treating Monteverdi's concept of the Fifth Book. This *a cappella* madrigal is placed between the two main dialogues of the above-mentioned characters from *Il pastor fido*. On one hand, it continues indirectly the motifs of the encounter between Amarilli and Mirtillo, but above all it anticipates the dialogue between Dorinda and Silvio. In this respect, it belongs to the theatrical part of the cycle, and as such Coppini transforms it into a dramatic scene under the Cross in his masterful contrafactum.

