

**ISTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY ★ GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MADRIGALS OF CARLO
GESUALDO AND CLAUDIO MONTEVERDI**



M.A. THESIS

Mert SOYKAN

Department of Music

Master Program in Music

DECEMBER 2017

**ISTANBUL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY ★ GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES**

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MADRIGALS OF CARLO
GESUALDO AND CLAUDIO MONTEVERDI**

M.A. THESIS

**Mert SOYKAN
(409131026)**

Department of Music

Master Program in Music

**Thesis Co-Advisors:
Dr. Paul WHITEHEAD
Assoc.Prof.Dr. Jerfi AJİ**

DECEMBER 2017

İSTANBUL TEKNİK ÜNİVERSİTESİ ★ SOSYAL BİLİMLER ENSTİTÜSÜ

**CLAUDIO MONTEVERDI VE CARLO GESUALDO'NUN
MADRİGALLERİNİN KARŞILAŞTIRMALI ANALİZİ**

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZİ

**Mert SOYKAN
(409131026)**

**Müzik Anabilim Dalı
Müzik Yüksek Lisans Programı**

**Tez Eş-Danışmanları:
Dr. Paul WHITEHEAD
Doç. Dr. Jerfi AJİ**

ARALIK 2017

Mert Soykan, a M.A student of ITU Graduate School of Arts and Social Sciences student ID 409131026, successfully defended the thesis entitled “A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MADRIGALS OF CARLO GESUALDO AND CLAUDIO MONTEVERDI”, which he prepared after fulfilling the requirements specified in the associated legislations, before the jury whose signatures are below.

Thesis Advisor : **Dr. Paul WHITEHEAD**
Istanbul Technical University

Co-advisor : **Assoc.Prof.Dr. Jerfi AJİ**
Istanbul Technical University

Jury Members : **Assoc.Prof. Dr. Tolga Zafer ÖZDEMİR**
Istanbul Bilgi University

Assoc.Prof. Dr. İlke BORAN
Istanbul University

Assoc.Prof. Dr. Ozan BAYSAL
Istanbul Technical University

Date of Submission : 17 November 2017

Date of Defense : 11 December 2017





To everyone who participated directly or indirectly to the writing of this thesis, may they know or not.



FOREWORD

I would like to express my deep appreciation for my advisor Dr. Paul Whitehead for leading me through this work.

I would also want to thank my colleagues Dogucan Temizel and Engin Mehmetli of whom the thesis would not have been complete without their support.

November 2017

Mert SOYKAN
Center for Advanced Studies in
Music (ITU-MIAM)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
FOREWORD	ix
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
ABBREVIATIONS	xiii
SUMMARY	xv
ÖZET	xvii
1. INTRODUCTION – A HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	1
1.1 Purpose of Thesis	1
1.2 The Madrigal.....	2
1.3 The Crisis of Ars Perfecta and Galilei	4
1.4 Monteverdi and Gesualdo	6
1.4.1 The musical styles of Monteverdi and Gesualdo	7
1.5 Text and Music Relationship.....	10
1.6 The Texts.....	12
1.6.1 <i>Baci soavi e cari</i>	12
1.6.2 <i>Luci serene e chiare</i>	13
1.6.3 <i>T'amo mia vita</i>	13
1.7 Harmonic Analysis.....	15
2. ANALYSIS OF THE MADRIGALS	17
2.1 <i>Baci Soavi e Cari</i>	17
2.1.1 Monteverdi's setting.....	17
2.1.2 Gesualdo's setting	22
2.1.3 Summary.....	28
2.2 <i>Luci Serene e Chiare</i>	29
2.2.1 Monteverdi's setting.....	29
2.2.2 Gesualdo's setting.....	34
2.2.3 Summary.....	38
2.3 <i>T'amo Mia Vita</i>	39
2.3.1 Monteverdi's setting.....	39
2.3.2 Gesualdo's setting.....	43
2.3.3 Summary.....	47
3. CONCLUSION	49
REFERENCES	53
APPENDICES	55
CURRICULUM VITAE	89



ABBREVIATIONS

m.	: Measure
mm.	: Measures
v.	: Verse
vv.	: Verses





A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE MADRIGALS OF CARLO GESUALDO AND CLAUDIO MONTEVERDI

SUMMARY

This thesis compares and contrasts the madrigals of two central figures of late Renaissance music; Carlo Gesualdo and Claudio Monteverdi. The framework for the works in the discussion is limited to the shared texts that they both composed in their madrigal collections between 1587 and 1611. With references from different sources, this framework functions as a template where the discussions in hand take place.

In the first chapter of the thesis, the material in hand and the historical framework for this material is presented. The first chapter introduces the musical form of the madrigal. The influence of the northern polyphony and the native songs on the madrigal is discussed. The second part of the introduction discusses the musical styles and influences of Carlo Gesualdo and Claudio Monteverdi. Finally, the texts subject to the thesis are introduced.

The second chapter is the analytical body of the study. It presents the analysis in light of the musical styles of the composers. Text and music relationship, form, structure, influences of the composers and the musical devices in the compositions are discussed.

The harmonic language of the composers is also analyzed in the second chapter. Hexachordal system of Chafe (1992) is the main reference for the harmonic analysis. The harmonic movements in the compositions and how they function as expressive devices on the text is discussed. The use of modality versus tonality is reviewed.

The range of the musical analyses in the thesis is limited to the first five books of madrigals of both composers, featuring works from first, fourth and fifth books. The logic behind choosing this set of madrigals is twofold; first of all, it encompasses a precise chronology of works without exceeding the limits that the thesis has set for itself. Furthermore, these madrigals provide us with a clear template to carry out our investigation.



CLAUDIO MONTEVERDI VE CARLO GESUALDO'NUN MADRIGALLERİNİN KARŞILAŞTIRMALI ANALİZİ

ÖZET

Giriş bölümünde tezin konusunu oluşturan madrigal formu ele alınır ve döneme ait tarihsel arkaplan açıklanır. İtalya'ya ait bir form olan madrigalin diğer hangi formlarla etkileşim içinde olduğu ve hangi koşullarda ortaya çıkıp geliştiği gösterilir. Kuzeyli bestecilerin ağırlıklı olarak etkilediği bu form zaman içinde birçok değişiklik geçirmiştir. Yerel italyan şarkı biçimleri ile kuzeyin sanat müzik gelenekleri arasında yer alan madrigal, bu iki eksenin birlikte ve eşit ölçülerde etkisini taşıyan bir nevi sentez form olarak İtalya'da 17.yy'a kadar gelişimine devam etmiştir.

Giriş bölümünün devamında teze konu olan besteciler Carlo Gesualdo ve Claudio Monteverdi incelenir. Bestecilerin müzikal tarzları tartışılır ve madrigal formuna yaklaşımları gösterilir. Monteverdi'nin ilk döneminde ağırlıklı olarak yerel şarkı biçimlerinden etkilenmesine karşılık Gesualdo'nun ağırlıklı olarak kuzey etkisi altındaki gelişimi ve bu etkilerin devamında bestecilerin müzikal gelişimleri tartışılır. Sözü geçen etkilerin teze konu olan bestecilerin madrigallerini hangi yönde ve ölçüde etkilediği anlatılır.

Giriş bölümü son olarak aslen bir şiir biçimi olan madrigalin yazınsal özelliklerini ve bunların müzikal formu nasıl etkilediğini açıklar. Epigram gibi farklı şiir türlerinin madrigal üstündeki etkileri teze konu olan biçimleriyle tartışılır. Teze konu olan üç şiir, biçimsel ve karakteristik özellikleri ile anlatılarak giriş bölümü tamamlanır.

İkinci bölüm dokuz başlıktan oluşur ve analiz başlığını taşır. Bu bölümde teze konu olan üç şiir, ve bunların Gesualdo ve Monteverdi tarafından ayrı ayrı bestelenmiş olması sebebiyle de altı beste yer alır. İkinci bölümün başlıkları sözü geçen üç şiir altında bölümlenmiştir ve her bölümün altında ise ek olarak üç başlık daha bulunur. Bu alt bölümlerde ilk olarak Monteverdi'nin ilintili bestesi, ardından Gesualdo'nun ilintili bestesi ve son olarak iki besteyi karşılaştıran bir özet bölümü yer alır.

Analiz bölümünde bestelerin şiirle olan karşılıklı ilişkisi, giriş bölümünde tanıtılan kuzeyli ve yerel etkiler, melodik ve figüratif yapı, form ve müzikal stiller incelenir. Bestecilerin farklılıkları ortaya konur. Özet bölümü bu farklılıkları ve önemli noktaları derleyerek analizi toparlar.

Bestecilerin armonik dili analiz bölümünün içinde incelenir. Armonik analizin referans kaynağı Chafe (1992)'nin kitabıdır. Yazarın heksakord sistemi teze konu olan kompozisyonlara uygulanır. Bestecilerin armonik dilinin madrigal formu içinde nasıl bir anlatım diline dönüştüğü ve bu dilin şiir ile olan organik bağı gösterilir. Latif ve kaba armonik öğelerin bir arada bulunduğu ve bu şekilde zaman zaman şiirin anlatım dilini bile aşan bir armonik dilin varlığından söz edilir. Heksakord sistemindeki aşağı ve yukarı hareketlerin ras gelelik içermediği ve şiirin belirli tonlarına denk geldiği tekrar bu bölümde gösterilmektedir.

Modalite ve tonalite ikiliği yine bu analizde yer alır. Monteverdi'nin armonik dilinin zaman içinde artan tonal özellikler göstermesine karşılık Gesualdo'nun

bestelerindeki yođun modal karakter karřılıklı olarak incelenir. Bu farklılıđa sebep olarak giriş bölümünde bahsi geçen yerel ve kuzeyli etkiler gösterilir.

Sonuç bölümü tezin genel bir özeti niteliğindedir. Giriş bölümünde ele alındığı ve orta bölümde geliştirildiđi biçimleriyle bestecilerin müzikal stilleri ve şiiire yaklaşımları tekrar karşılaştırılır. Kuzeyli ve yerel etkiler, ve bunların doğurduđu sonuçlar toparlanarak giriş bölümünde bahsi geçen şemaya uygunlukları gösterilir.



1. INTRODUCTION – A HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The motivation for the author of this thesis in considering Carlo Gesualdo and Claudio Monteverdi as critical figures to be musically contrasted resides in the fact that they achieved musical greatness via different routes.

Claudio Monteverdi was systematic in his development as a composer, he gradually developed the traditional musical devices and used them in different contexts, opening new spaces and forming new idioms. He pushed the limits of the musical context of his time, laying out the technical groundwork required for the change from Renaissance music to Baroque.

Carlo Gesualdo the Prince of Venosa, being free from the considerations of patronage, exploited the musical narrative of his period in an authentic way. His musical style, marked by the delicate balance of chaos and order, uses an intense chromatic language. As opposed to the formal grandeur in Monteverdi's music influenced by traditional forms, Gesualdo exploited the idioms of the northern counterpoint for affective ends, inspired by the mannerism in the Ferraran court.

Both composers contributed to the technical and stylistic development of music in different ways as well as creating a corpus of timeless works that has profound depth. Although their motivations are different regarding their musical styles, they are tied together as great composers of the late Renaissance.

1.1 Purpose of Thesis

The purpose of this thesis is to show the contrasting elements in the madrigals of Carlo Gesualdo and Claudio Monteverdi through a stylistic analysis of their compositions. To this end, the differences in the motivations and influences of the composers are discussed and traced in their compositions over shared texts. Gesualdo and Monteverdi embody two different approaches to the madrigal of the late Renaissance. A comparison of their musical styles with a background reading of the

period sheds light on the music of the Renaissance and the following musical periods.

1.2 The Madrigal

Initially being a poetic form, the musical form of the madrigal is one of the most fruitful forms in Western music history, spanning a range of a hundred years from the first half of the 16th century to the 17th century. Similar to the baroque suite and the classical sonata, it served as the body where the musical innovations of the time happened, and the musical science was developed, eventually paving the way for the tonal music of the Baroque. As Einstein (1924) emphasizes, “The madrigal became the universal form in which all progress in the field of music was incorporated” (p. 475).

Monteverdi is educated under the dominant Netherlandish tradition. He uses the madrigal form to fight his musical past and form his innovative musical programme. Monteverdi uses the devices of the native musical forms in the madrigal and by doing so, he raises the madrigal to a profound level by gradually eliminating the artificiality inherent in the form.

Carlo Gesualdo on the other hand, uses the madrigal form to create his affective compositions marked by the delicate balance between order and chaos. Mannerism influences the use of chromaticism and non-linear dissonances in his compositions. Contrary to Monteverdi, Gesualdo focuses on the free-form of the madrigal. Taking the above-mentioned idioms to their extremes, he exploits the Mannerist style of the madrigal. Maniates (1979) underlines the rapid changes and sharp contrasts inherent in Mannerism which best suits the compositions of Carlo Gesualdo.

How did the madrigal appear and develop? To answer this question, we have to be acquainted with the artistic background of the period. Renaissance, being invented in Italy, has a large corpus of artworks which embodies the humanistic ideals of the period. Michelangelo’s David in sculpture or Da Vinci’s Mona Lisa in the painting are only two examples. The madrigal succeeded the northern motets of the early Renaissance and became the leading musical form in Italy. Initially developed by the northern composers, with the contributions of Italian composers the madrigal became one of the most popular forms in Italy. Through its emphasis on text expression,

madrigal replaced the sacred spirit of the motet and became a banner of humanistic ideals in the late Renaissance.

Before the establishment of the Italian Madrigal, the field of music in the Renaissance was dominated by the Flemish tradition, whose principal composers were of Netherlandish origin. Schrade (1969) points out to the published anthologies of music in Italy before and after 1550 and arouses a stimulating discussion on the popularity of northern composers.¹

Composers of the Burgundian tradition like Dufay and Binchois elaborated on the late medieval tradition of music, Guillaume de Machaud being the summit of it, and helped the development of *ars nova*, the style in which the medieval tradition of music was succeeded. Ockeghem founded his school over this tradition and the Netherlandish school dominated Europe until the end of 16th century. As described by Schrade (1969) “any Netherlandish musician could always hear his musical language spoken in no matter what European country he chose as the scene of his activity” (p.19).

Ockeghem was succeeded by following generations of great Netherlandish musicians like Josquin de Prez, Cipriano de Rore and Orlando de Lassus, furnishing and perfecting the style, which eventually gets named *ars perfecta* by Heinrich Glarean in the generation of Josquin. The northern school who established the high art in the secular tradition of music mastered the counterpoint to the degree of perfection, setting the idioms for vocal polyphony for the upcoming centuries.

History of the madrigal, on the other hand, is rooted in the Italian native song tradition, its predecessors being the villanelle and the frottola. These forms show typical song-like attributes with their simple texts and fragmented and sectional character. Due to their simple form and spirit, these song-like forms were not able to saturate the complicated mechanics that the Netherlandish school of counterpoint has perfected. As discussed by Watkins (1991) in a romanticised way, “the *Oltremontani* responded to the need of Italians to create a specifically Italianate art, and helped their southern colleagues to fashion not a secular frivolous music, but one worthy of

¹ See Schrade (1969) pp.61-74 for a discussion on the popularity of northern composers in published anthologies in Italy before 1550. The rise in the published secular works after 1550 introduces Italian composers along with the Netherlandish in the anthologies. After 1580 Italian composers are widely printed outside of Italy due to the enormous output of madrigals during the 1550s.

the skill and craft of their northern heritage” (p. 97). The madrigals of the ultramontane opened up new horizons for the young Italian composers and it heralded the possibility of a different music, rid of the rigid rules of the northern counterpoint and the simple structures of the native songs. This tradition created musical giants like Monteverdi and Gesualdo who developed their styles in the form of the madrigal.

It was common for the northern composers to travel to south at that time, especially to the high courts of the noble families. Starting from the early 16th century these composers were in contact with the native Italian forms. The fourth and fifth generation of the Netherlandish school of composers, especially Jacques Arcadelt, Cipriano di Rore and Orlando di Lasso, composed their madrigals which infused the high-art of the ultramontane into a native Italian form, which directly influenced and determined the madrigal tradition in Italy.

1.3 The Crisis of Ars Perfecta and Galilei

The term *ars perfecta* reveals a paradox which is vital for us to understand the development of a native Italian musical renaissance, a delayed one compared to painting and sculpture. The music of High Renaissance, especially of Josquin in the North and Palestrina in Italy is described as perfect, regarding its strict contrapuntal design wherein strongly weaved compositions nothing could be added or subtracted, every note is crucial in the overall design as in a house of cards. Famous music theoreticians of the Renaissance, Heinrich Glarean and Tinctoris in the north and Zarlino in Italy all hailed the Northern tradition of music as perfect.

Theoreticians of the period were on the side of the values of the classical antiquity as they understood it. They were ready to reject any music that did not fit with the aesthetics of the Flemish school, which they believe was the summit of the science of music, and the natural successor of the Greek antiquity. It is valuable to mention here that Vincenzo Galilei, a music theorist of the period, the founder of the famous Florentine Camerata and the father of Galileo, advocated the values of Greek Antiquity and their heritage in music against this school of theoreticians. Galilei wrote, "To some intelligent men they did not appear to have truly restored music to

its ancient state, and this could be verified by innumerable passages of ancient histories of both poets and philosophers" (as cited in Schrade, 1969). It is precisely this point of dispute which eventually leads to a series of developments in the 16th and 17th centuries.

As it is common in history, the breakpoints which end up with changes always happen via the intervention of a different field of thought. An idea gets carried to its limits, and when it reaches perfection where there is nothing more to say about it within itself, the intervention has to come from a different perspective. For Galilei, the intervention was the restoration of the Greek pathos of human expression, and through it the unity of the text and music. The northern counterpoint was not perfect because it failed to transmit ideas in their pure form but rather drowned them under its massive body.

Galilei was looking for a pure form of musical transmission, restoring the unity of the text and music. To that end, he advocated the use of monody in compositions. Ancient Greeks were great because they had the unification of poetry and music.

According to Galilei, sublimating consonance and dissonance to the expression of the text could recuperate the music back to its essential status. On the ideas of Galilei, Palisca (1994) states "Modelling his precepts on the practices of the generation led by Cipriano de Rore, he sought not simply to control dissonance and to mitigate its crudeness but to exploit both consonance and dissonance to serve the expression of the affections of a text. The text for him was the soul of music, the notes the body; the soul must animate the body" (p. 13).

Galilei's above mentioned stance on music overlapped the ideas of the second practice.²

The second practice differed from the first in that the text reigned over the other elements, whereas in the first it was the harmony that was sovereign. The second practice is based on a different usage of consonances and dissonances from that practiced by Adrian Willaert and

² See Walter Hill (2005), especially pp.44-48, and Palisca (1994), chapter 2, for an insightful discussion on the relation between Galilei and the second practice.

taught by Zarlino; the practice of Monteverdi was that begun by Cipriano de Rore and continued by Marenzio, Wert, Luzzaschi, Peri and Caccini. (Palisca, 1994, p.23)

Throughout the analysis, musical influences of Wert and Marenzio on Monteverdi and Luzzaschi on Gesualdo is shown through the forms of the canzonetta-madrigal and the Netherlandish polyphony.

1.4 Monteverdi and Gesualdo

As it was the standard practice, Monteverdi and Gesualdo were both educated under the Netherlandish counterpoint school, and there is no doubt that they knew this style in their early ages. Their madrigals carry the fruits and burdens of this style.

Monteverdi and Gesualdo are influenced by Netherlandish composers like Willaert, Wert, and Rore. They both followed in the footsteps of these composers until they established their course. What proves to be a fair point of contrast, is how they did break through the crisis mentioned above, related to *ars perfecta*, and developed their musical styles.

Monteverdi is very systematic from the start. He applied the devices of the native musical forms, as opposed to the northern idioms, in his early compositions. He continually developed these principles and idioms in his later compositions. As discussed in the analysis, his composition *T'amo mia vita* from *the fifth book of madrigals* brings back the simple song-like structures from *Baci soavi e cari* from *the first book of madrigals* and applies them in a diverse context, creating a genial dramatic structure.

Gesualdo on the other hand, breaks the traditional rules of counterpoint, by relentlessly subordinating these rules to the affections of the text in his compositions. He exercises traditional northern devices such as imitation and motivic development and pushes them beyond their limits.

Monteverdi and Gesualdo lived and learned in a period of the crisis of *ars perfecta* as mentioned in the previous part. They both reacted differently to the situation in their music. Their different approaches to the described crisis is one of the leading points of comparison in this essay.

Monteverdi has a broader range of influences, contrasting styles, and techniques in his corpus. His developing musical style is analyzed from the first book of madrigals to the fifth book of madrigals in the thesis. He was systematic in his development as a composer. As Schrade (1969) points out, "he was never an abrupt revolutionary, who broke with the past suddenly and completely but always proceeded slowly and systematically" (p. 104).

Monteverdi's growing use of harmonic bass, the principle of text imitation as the primary source of rhythm, a creative reflection of the dramatic pathos, the use of tonal regions and the song-like melodies helped to develop harmonic and structural idioms in his compositions. As a composer trained under the Netherlandish school, he was conscious in rebelling against the subordination of Italian music to Netherlandish principles.

Gesualdo's musical journey, on the other hand, is speculatively determined by his troubled psyche to a certain extent. His chromatic musical style makes him a more intense figure in comparison to Monteverdi. Gesualdo's musical style did not evolve in the same direction with Monteverdi, and he was not extensively referenced in the 18th century. Only with Stravinsky he got recognized again as a major composer in the 20th century. Gesualdo's mesmerizing compositions have a delicate balance of harshness and order, and they are relevant today more than ever, as highly dramatic compositions of vocal music.

1.4.1 The musical styles of Monteverdi and Gesualdo

The musical styles of the composers will be traced over the course of the analysis, revealing the systematic use of various musical devices and breaks with the older ways. The madrigals of Carlo Gesualdo and Claudio Monteverdi subject to this thesis are under the influence of song-like forms like the canzone on the one hand and the northern polyphony on the other. Palisca (1985) describes the qualities inherent in the canzone in these words; "The entire art of the canzone consists in three things; the partition of the song, the proportionate disposition of parts and the number of lines and syllables" (p. 370).

Northern polyphony, on the other hand, rises above these strict idioms of form and subordinates the simple structures embedded in the native forms to contrapuntal

virtuosity. It is possible to track the qualities of the canzone in Monteverdi's compositions in the first five books of madrigals, as opposed to Gesualdo, who leans to the northern style with his accent on contrapuntal virtuosity.

Tomlinson (1990) describes Monteverdi's first book of madrigals as "a crossroads between the simple and emotionally neutral canzonetta-madrigals of Marenzio and the affective text-expressive rationale in Luzzaschi's compositions" (p.33). Tomlinson elaborates on this contrast with the terms Ferraran Style and Mantuan Style.³ The former connotes the intense contrapuntal style of Luzzano Luzzaschi, who was the most influential composer in the Ferraran court. The latter stands for the precise style of Luca Marenzio and Giaches de Wert. The Ferraran style is characterized by intense imitative passages and disruptive musical devices, like the play around musical motives and the rapid entrances of short imitative figures. The Mantuan style, on the other hand, is mostly a homophonic language with text inspired declamatory rhythms.

According to Schrade (1969) "The canzonetta affected the madrigal in two ways; in individual elements, such as the organization of melody, phrasing, diction; and in the over-all aspects of structure" (p. 127). Monteverdi's musical style unfolds over this scheme of the canzone.

The first book of madrigals of Monteverdi shows a significant amount of canzonetta influence, mainly that of the canzonetta-madrigals of Luca Marenzio. Marenzio's madrigals raised the style of the canzonetta-madrigal to its peak and prepared the scene for the Italian composers to exploit the form in the madrigal. Einstein (1949) points out this fact, stating that the first book of madrigals of Monteverdi has the "impression that it is a collection of canzonetta"(p.719).

The echoes of the political struggle between the reformists and counter-reformists find its expression in Monteverdi through his struggle against the Northern tradition of music. The supporters of the northern aesthetics in music were mostly the supporters of counter-reformation. Native forms like the villanelle and the canzonetta, on the other hand, satirized the political institutions with their witty lyrics. Leo Schrade describes this schism that Monteverdi felt at its height as such;

³ Tomlinson's terminology is also used by Newcomb (1980).

For thirty years Monteverdi lived among the bearers of this perfect music and felt the power of this art at its height. But this music was not to be his. He was to eliminate its style and do away with the myth of its perfection, to become its greatest antagonist, to mark the beginning of a new age and become its herald. (Schrade, 1969, p. 18)

In this respect, the influence of the canzonetta is essential to understand Monteverdi's first book of madrigals as well as the following books which continuously show influences of song-like forms.

Monteverdi's canzonetta influence is traced through the use of song-like structures in his madrigals. Melodic, structural and harmonic aspects of this tradition contrast with the Netherlandish school of counterpoint .

As Schrade (1969) points out, song-like melodies of native forms are determined by “the firm melodic outline, clarity in phrasing, a balanced relation between the constituent sections, logical correspondence of antecedent and consequent and precise groups of rhythmic accents” (p. 96). Furthermore, the imitation of the syllabic structure of the text determines the rhythm in this style. Melismata and ornamentation are avoided.

Traditional northern melody, on the other hand, is melismatic. It has an ample range and proceeds with an uninterrupted flow. The marginal tones of the tetrachord usually limit the range, melodic leaps are common and the melody seems endless and unorganized. The imitative figures are short and designed for multiple entrances. In short, northern melody is designed for polyphonic weaving where song-like melody is designed to stand out alone. Melodic approach of Gesualdo and Monteverdi is contrasted under this scheme in the thesis.

Other song-like devices influenced by the canzonetta are three-voice sections, fauxbourdon progressions, the grouping of upper parts against a harmonic bass, and the separation of the verses through cadential treatment. Northern devices, on the other hand, include imitation, motivic fragmentation, the division of the verse into smaller parts, free-flowing passages, and homogeneity of the voices.

The division between the harmonic bass against the melodic upper parts has entered the madrigal form through the canzonetta madrigals of Marenzio. The use of

harmonic bass eventually formed idiomatic harmonic patterns, commonly used by Monteverdi as the analysis will highlight.

The above mentioned northern and song-like devices are tracked throughout the analysis. They provide stylistic contrast between the musical styles of Monteverdi and Gesualdo. Monteverdi gradually develops the use of song-like structures to new forms. Gesualdo, on the other hand, exploits the northern devices to emphasize text expression, under the influence of Luzzano Luzzaschi. Monteverdi's emphasis on the traditional Italian forms raises the formal structures in the madrigal to a deep-felt level. The Mannerist character in Gesualdo's work, on the other hand, emphasizes a free form and exploits the use of shocking musical contrasts. The contrasting elements between the composers will be elaborated throughout the analysis.

1.5 Text and Music Relationship

The subordination of the music to word is an essential feature of the madrigal. The idea of human expression, the emphasis on human feelings in respect to a human-centered world against the God-centered world of the middle ages is the idea behind this style. The text is revered as the inventor and creator of human feelings.

Eric Chafe explains the relationship between the madrigal text and the artful contrapuntal surface of the madrigal as follows;

The categorization of musical figures, affections, and styles accompanied the conjoining of music with rhetoric to create a musical surface whose countless patterned subdivisions were often explained through the thoroughgoing sense of analogy to verbal discourse. (Chafe, 1992, p. 6)

Text-music relation is of crucial importance in the analysis of madrigals. As it will unfold in the analysis, Monteverdi and Gesualdo set their music to the text, carefully planning each step in reflecting formal, syntactic, and rhetoric attributes of the text to music.

This thesis is subject to three madrigal texts by two poets, Giambattista Guarini and Ridolfo Arlotti. The former is one of the most popular poets in Italy. His poems that are subject to the thesis are marked by the epigrammatic style. The latter is a local Ferraran poet, whose poems are mostly in the traditional native forms.

Sharp contrasts between sections, syntactic and semantic precision and the division of the text into two separate narrative and analytical elements are the main attributes of the epigrammatic style. The primary outcome of this style is that it creates an opportunity for the composer to use an extensive set of contrasting devices to express the text.

Furthermore, this style is highly influential in the late 16th-century Italian art. The poet uses different sections of the text to create dualities, which emphasizes the various forces acting on the lover or even expresses itself in the form of a critical approach to nobility. Guarini's critique of the aristocracy, via the contrast between appearance and reality is a good example;

In appearance, the nobility speak politely; in reality their acts of politeness are rare. In appearance, they seem gentle and affable; in reality they are haughty and fierce...They cheat, lie, steal and enrich themselves at the expense of others. (Schrade, 1969, p. 180)

The epigrammatic style is an integral part of Monteverdi's madrigals. He sets nine texts from Guarini in his third book, and nineteen more in fourth and fifth books. *Baci soavi e cari* and *T'amo mia vita* of Guarini are characteristic of this style and subject to the thesis, as it will be discussed in the second chapter.

The epigrammatic style of text is also favoured by Ferreran composers. Escobar points out the relevance of the this style to the Ferreran composers, underlining the stylistic differences between the Mantuan and Ferraran styles,

The poetic choices of the Ferrerese composers differed from those of other distinguished exponents of the late madrigal. The Mantuan Giaches Wert, for instance, who was similarly concerned with the depiction of intense human passions, preferred long texts, in the traditional forms of Italian literature, and drawn from the traditional body of Italian poetry, rather than the modern epigrammatic madrigal favored by Luzzaschi, Gesualdo and Fontanelli. (Escobar, 2004, p. 3)

Ridolfo Arlotti is the second poet who is subject to the thesis. His poem *Luci serene e chiare* is in a strophic form. It exhibits an arsenal of contrasting poetic devices, which will be further discussed in the second chapter.

The preferred texts of the composers reflect their musical agendas. The change in the preferred texts in each madrigal book relates to a certain shift in the musical paradigm of the composers. The poetic texts in the essay will be approached from this perspective for a more comprehensive analysis.

1.6 The Texts

There are six pieces and three texts that get analyzed in the thesis. The texts are *Baci soavi e cari* and *T'amo, mia vita* by Giambattista Guarini and *Luci serene e chiare* by Ridolfo Arlotti. *Baci soavi e cari* of Guarini appears in the first book of madrigals of Claudio Monteverdi, published in 1587 and in the first book of madrigals of Carlo Gesualdo published in 1594. Ridolfo Arlotti's poem is seen in the fourth book of madrigals of Carlo Gesualdo, published in 1596 in Ferrera and in the fourth book of madrigals of Claudio Monteverdi, published in 1603. *T'amo, mia vita* of Guarini appears in the fifth book of madrigals of Monteverdi published in 1605 and in the fifth book of madrigals of Gesualdo published in 1611.

1.6.1 *Baci soavi e cari*

Baci soavi e cari of Giambattista Guarini appears in the first book of madrigals of Monteverdi and Gesualdo. The text is in the canzone form. The first part consists of six verses, grouped as 3+3. These groups share the same rhyme and metric structure. They both have abC/abC rhyme structure along with two heptasyllabic lines and a hendecasyllable line. The second section has the rhyme scheme of c dee Dff.

Guarini's poem has epigrammatic features and references to love, life, and death, which lead the composers to mirror the style in their compositions through abrupt shifts in tempo and mood. The canzone form on the other hand, is simplistic and connotes an emotionally neutral context. Bringing these elements together, Guarini's text leads the composers in translating this duality into music. Gesualdo's setting seems profoundly influenced by the Ferraran style with its emphasis on the play around musical motives and mesmerizing imitative passages. Monteverdi's setting, on the other hand, is largely influenced by the Mantuan idioms with its use of homophonic structures throughout the composition.

Monteverdi reflects the formal 3+3 scheme of the text with a parallel musical structure by using an antecedent/consequent pair. He sets the musical phrases on vv. 1-2 as partial transpositions of the music for vv. 4-5, and ends the syntactic group with a long musical peroration on v.6. In the middle part of the poem, however, he fails to follow the form of the text and creates an ambiguous structure. It is also

notable that Monteverdi reiterates the idea of the antecedent/consequent pair by using it between other syntactic groups.

Gesualdo only composes the first part of the poem. He utilizes the similar 3+3 grouping. His composition though appears with a marvelous motivic unification and interchange between parts, that shows a mastery of the Ferraran idioms.

1.6.2 *Luci serene e chiare*

Luci serene e chiare of Ridolfo Arlotti appears in the fourth book of madrigals of Monteverdi and Gesualdo. The form of the text resembles canzone, and it is organized in three tercets with the rhyme scheme of aBB/aCC/bDD . The parts have syllabic symmetry.

Gesualdo uses AA'BB' form for the setting of the piece. He sets the first two tercets to the same music with minor variations in rhythm and texture. The third tercet is composed as the B section. He uses suspension chains, dissonant harmonies, and intricate rhythmic activity.

Monteverdi borrows Gesualdo's AA'BB' form for the composition. He uses trio like sections, fauxbourdon progressions and harmonic bass. Upper parts are contrasted with the lower parts in many parts of the composition. Text declamation is frequently used and the rhythm is mostly determined by the text.

1.6.3 *T'amo mia vita*

T'amo mia vita of Guarini appears in the fifth book of madrigals of both composers. It is in the epigrammatic style and has a ballata like structure. Guarini's text incorporates formal elements from the ballata by bringing back the refrain of the opening line in the volta. Monteverdi and Gesualdo respond to this form in their own styles.

Monteverdi assigns the refrain to the canto solo, which comes back three more times in between syntactic groups of the text. Gesualdo sets the refrain as a declamation, which comes back before the final cadence. Monteverdi's emphasis on form is influenced by his early teacher Ingegneri, who is defined by Newcomb (2010) as a member of the school of composers who specialize in the formal aspect of setting a text to music, "Schick isolates what he sees as a school of composers leading from

Cipriano de Rore in the 1550s and early 1560s through Marc'Antonio Ingegneri and Giaches Wert and eventually to Monteverdi – a school specializing in such techniques” (p. 442).

Although Newcomb includes Luzzano Luzzaschi into this school of composers, the analysis will reveal that Carlo Gesualdo is not mastering the form in his compositions as a student of Luzzaschi. As opposed to it, he is contributing to the dissolution of it all together. As mentioned before, Gesualdo prefers the free form as opposed to the abundance of formal structures in Monteverdi’s madrigals. Einstein (1924) describes the evolution of the formal structures in the madrigal with these words; “the evolution proceeds to extremest freedom, almost to the dissolution of the general formal construction, with Marenzio and Gesualdo” (p. 481).

Monteverdi’s fifth book of madrigal is marked by his maturity in composition, use of vertical harmonies, mastery of the harmonic bass, the use of basso continuo and most importantly his expressive use of dramatic devices via the contrasting of the upper voices against the lower voices. Although set apart by its epigrammatic text, Monteverdi's *T'amo mia vita* shows all the typical aspects of book five and stands as a fulfillment of his musical ideas through the perfection of the dramatic pathos.

Gesualdo’s setting emphasizes the principles of rhythmic declamation of the text, cadential organization of the verse and the introduction of a chromatic language.

Gesualdo introduces cross-relations, unprepared dissonances, non-functional harmony, suspension chains, chromatic figures and the use of the semi-verse.

Watkins’ (1991) description of Gesualdo’s musical style fits to his setting of *T'amo mia vita*; “His unerring instinct alone permits the succesful juxtaposition of these several ingredients in a highly delicate balance which seems always to suggest the possibility, nay probability, of an architectural collapse” (p. 169).

1.7 Harmonic Analysis

I will use the hexachordal system of Chafe (1992) in the analysis of the harmonic content of the works. The benefit of the system is that it provides a clear template to discuss the harmonic range of a composition via its four hexachord framework.

Two flat hexachord: Eb Bb F - c/C - g/G - d/D

One flat hexachord: Bb F - C - g/G - d/D - a/A

Natural hexachord: F - C - G - d/D - a/A - e/E

Sharp hexachord: C - G - D - a/A - e/E - b/B

The model shows the modes that belong in the range of a particular hexachord. The range of the cantus mollis system holds two flat, one flat and natural hexachords, and the range of the cantus durus system contains one flat, natural and sharp hexachords. With the use of this system, the harmonic content of the compositions is discussed as expressive tools.



2. ANALYSIS OF THE MADRIGALS

2.1 *Baci Soavi e Cari*

2.1.1 Monteverdi's setting

Monteverdi's *Baci soavi e cari* is in the cantus mollis g mode, typical of his first book of madrigals. The tonic-dominant movement of the first measure and the dominant-tonic movement in m.5 establish the mode in the opening phrase of the piece. The opening phrase over vv.1-2 outlines the chordal content of the two flat hexachord. The phrase over line three cadences on Bb harmony with a dominant-tonic movement, ending the first tercet on the third degree of the principal chord. The emphasis on the dominant of Bb creates the flattest region in the piece. This is in accordance with the words "sweet" and "dear" of the first line of the text. As Chafe (1991) points out, Monteverdi contrasts the use of the flat and sharp regions to illustrate the love/death antithesis.

Baci soavi e cari of Monteverdi does not have the intense motivic variety in Gesualdo's setting. Instead, Monteverdi's setting is mostly homophonic and has short imitative sections built on three-part passages. Gesualdo's motivic approach, with its long and elaborative imitations, is influenced by Luzzaschi's style, as opposed to Monteverdi's influence over Marenzio's canzonetta-madrigals.

The abundance of homophonic passages in the composition goes parallel with the idea of clear text expression. Perkins (2000) points out to Biagio Rossetti's observation on this topic "He observes that the relationship between the declamation and the syntax of the text and its setting was much tighter in syllabic chants than in melismatic ones, and he distinguishes among melismas that come at the beginning of a chant, those found towards the middle, and those that come in the end" (p. 315). Monteverdi's preference for homophonic passages under the influence of the canzonetta-madrigal is directly related to the idea of clear text expression against the complex counterpoint structure of the Netherlandish polyphony, that we often see in Gesualdo's works under Luzzaschi influence.

The piece opens with a four-voice declamation. First two verses of the text is connected with an antecedent/consequent pair. The tonic-dominant motion in m.3 is answered with the dominant-tonic motion in m.5.

Rhythm is determined by the text, typical of the madrigal. Monotonal declamation on “cibi della mia” contributes to the pathos of clear text declamation. The counter-motion between outer parts in m.3 compliments Monteverdi's musical style. Second verse ends with an authentic cadence on G.

The phrase on v.3 starts with the d^{''}-g^{''} leap in m. 5 in the soprano. The conjunct melodic figure descends to d^{''} in m.6. The following melodic figure in m.7 compliments the previous melodic movement by restating it a tone lower. This melodic configuration is typical of song-like melodies, showing the influence of song-like structures from the beginning. Opposed to the short and disjunct figures of the northern melody, Monteverdi is using a song-like melody in imitation.

The above mentioned melodic motion connects the musical phrase of the third verse with the opening declamation, by referring to the melodic movement of canto in m.2 and m.4, stressing the pitches g^{''} and f^{''} respectively. The use of the melisma in m.7 functions as a melodic reference to the monodic declamation on f in m.4 as mentioned above. The subordination of an ornamental Netherlandish device to a melodic function is typical of Monteverdi's musical style of the first book.

The stepwise melodic figure between g and e in m.6 is imitated at the fifth in the alto. The same figure is imitated by the quintus and tenor, rhythmically slowed and doubled at the third. Doubled lower parts are set against the imitative upper parts in a three-part form, revealing Monteverdi's influence of the canzonetta-madrigal.

The melisma in the quinto in m.8 functions as a 4-3 suspension. The use of ornamentations as such is a rare phenomenon in Monteverdi's madrigals subject to the thesis. The musical phrase over v.3 ends with an authentic cadence on B^b in m.9.

The opening period of the text between vv. 1-6 is formed by an antecedent clause (vv.1-3) and a consequent clause (vv.4-6) as discussed in the previous chapter. Monteverdi projects it in his musical setting by composing vv.4-5 as a partial transposition of vv.1-2 and using a long peroration on vv.6 to end the syntactic unit.

The consequent phrase commences in the latter half of m.9 accompanied by a shift in the choral range. As opposed to the setting of vv.1-3, v.4 starts with the lower four

parts in m.9, omitting the soprano and enabling the bass. By doing so, Monteverdi creates a contrast between the formal groups of the text and shows an early interest in the formal structures under the Mantuan influence.

This range shift is accompanied by the move of the harmonies in the sharper regions. Monteverdi gradually moves the music towards the sharper regions; the introduction of the Eb in the opening phrase is now followed by the move into the one flat hexachord via the introduction of the authentic cadence on D in m.14. The second line of the text ends with an authentic cadence on G in m.5, so the authentic cadence on D in m.14 over v.4 (which is structurally parallel to the second line thinking of the antecedent/consequent pairing of the first two tercets) affirms the chordal shift and prepares the peroration on v.6 which starts in the mode g of the natural hexachord.

Syntactic completion of the first part happens in the long peroration over v.6 starting in m.15. The rhythm is slower and a five part texture is used, signaling the end of the syntactic group. 4-3 and 7-6 suspensions in mm. 17, 19, 20 and the cross relation between the bass and the soprano in mm.23-24 create a dramatic musical surface, expressing the words pain and death.

The following peroration on the sixth line of the poem emphasizes the move in the sharper direction, in mm.15-26. The five-part texture is used for the first time, marking the end of the syntactical unit of vv.1-6. The suspension laden passage brings back the eb pitch in an internal Phrygian cadence in mm.19-20, referencing to the opening phrase.

The text of line six has erotic references, such as “feels no pain of dying and yet dies.” Monteverdi's shift to the sharper region on this line, with the move to the natural hexachord is an analogy to the erotic death. The second tercet ends with a dominant-tonic cadence on D in m.26. To summarize, the contrast between the sweetness of the first tercet and the harshness of the second is imitated via the transition between flat/sharp regions.

To continue with, the use of pedal bass in mm.17-18 and mm.24-26 foreshadows the stylistic harmonic bass of Monteverdi's later madrigals, which develops into the use of tonal regions in the later books. As mentioned in the introduction, the extensive use of harmonic bass is one of the significant differences separating his style from that of Gesualdo.

Monteverdi's setting for the remaining verses is not precise in syntax. Guarini's middle period (vv.7-10) is divided by the authentic cadence on v.8 in m.32 and by the long exclamation on v.9 in m.33. Furthermore, Monteverdi brings back the antecedent-consequent pair of the opening phrase and applies it between vv.7-8 and vv.9-10, in m.26-32 and in m.33-37 respectively. The musical setting contradicts the syntax of the text.

The musical phrase for v.7 is a four-voice declamation. The rhythm is determined by the text. When compared to the declamations on vv.8-10, starting in m.29, 34 and 35 respectively, various rhythmic groupings can be observed, resulting from the different syllabic structures of the verses. Rhythmic grouping as such is an influence of the canzonetta-madrigal and dance forms, whose sections are separated by different rhythms. The rhythmic alternation between the musical phrases is a device widely used by Monteverdi in the first book of madrigals.

To continue with, the declamation on v.7 "all that is sweet in love" moves the music back to the two flat hexachord via the re-introduction of the c minor harmony in m.28. The use of the upper choral range accompanies this shift. The following passage on v.8 further establishes this shift by using the c minor harmony in a cadential progression, in what we would call the subdominant harmony in modern terms in m.31, via the IV-V-I progression. Following the harsher text of the second tercet, this middle period with its words of love is harmonically reflected by bringing back the flatter chordal content of the first tercet.

The musical phrase over v.8 commences in m.29. Motivic unity with the preceding passages is established with the use of the stepwise descending figure in the soprano. The setting resembles the trio-like (three-part) passages of the canzonetta. Quinto and tenor are doubled at thirds and move under the duet of the canto and alto in mm.29-31. The passage ends with an authentic cadence in m.32. The powerful closure on v.8 and the long exclamation on v.9 in m.33 divides Guarini's middle period (vv.7-10) and suggests a syntactical error by Monteverdi.

The homophonic setting extends for the setting of v.9 in m.33, further separating the syntactically bound lines. Monteverdi uses an antecedent/consequent structure once more between vv.9-10, creating syntactic ambiguity in mm.33-37.

Lover's exclamation is highlighted in m.33, with the authentic F chord. The following declamation mutates back to the one-flat hexachord once more, via the authentic cadence on D in m.37, ending the middle period.

The phrase on v.11 starts in m.37, with a textural reduction to four parts. The strong authentic cadence on Bb in m.41 ends the phrase and provides further contrast between phrases which are syntactically related.

The above-mentioned authentic cadence on Bb in m.41 delineates the lower limit of the hexachord, softening the harmonies and illustrating the text "sweet kisses" with a move to the third degree of the principal chord of g. For the following phrase on "la mia vita finire", Monteverdi shifts to a three-voice declamation, reducing the number of voices and highlighting the dramatic line. The plagal cadence in m.45 affirms the setting. The final line of the text is in four parts and cadences in the fifth degree of the principal chord in m.50. Its restatement cadences in the tonic in m.54, reaffirming the mode g by emphasizing the dominant-tonic relation.

The setting of v.12 is reduced to three voices, setting the soprano over the doubled alto and quinto in mm.42-45. Monteverdi shifts back to a homophonic setting in m.46. The ordering of imitative and homophonic passages is a Ferraran influence, which is commonly used by Luzzaschi. As we will see, Gesualdo strictly follows this scheme in most of his compositions. Monteverdi, on the other hand, prefers a variety of structural devices in his later books, influenced by his interest in the native forms.

The reduction of voices, the suspensions, the use of chromaticism in m.44, and the Phrygian cadence in m.45 all reflect the text of v.12, that of "end my life".

The phrase for the final verse commences in m.45. The five-voice homophonic declamation creates a strong emphasis on the text "oh what a sweet death". The descending figure from the preceding passages is assigned to soprano, forming a double suspension over the word "morire" and a diminished fourth in m.52. Monteverdi's setting masterfully creates an affective musical surface over the final verse of the text. Monteverdi restates the closing section of the text in m.54-70 before the final cadence.

Throughout the composition, Monteverdi's cadences delineate the principal degrees of the mode g, cadencing either on Bb or D. His harmonic language is limited in the first book and does not go astray to remote regions. Monteverdi's cantus mollis

setting shifts between the two-flat and one-flat hexachords as an analogy to the life/death antithesis of the text.

Furthermore, *Baci soavi e cari* clearly demonstrates the early canzonetta-madrigal influence of Monteverdi via the extended use of homophonic passages and the adaptation of song-like devices.

2.1.2 Gesualdo's setting

Gesualdo's composition is in the cantus mollis system. The fast harmonic progression in the opening phrase delineates the chordal content of the two-flat hexachord minus B \flat and D, traversing the harmonies of g, F, B \flat , C.

Baci soave e cari starts with a five-voice declamation on the first verse. Declamation on the opening verse is typical of the madrigal form. Rhythm is determined by the syllabic structure of the text, another common determinant of the form, often used by both composers. The octave leap in the bass in m.2 is characteristic of many cadences in Gesualdo's madrigals. The authentic cadence in m.3 closes the opening phrase.

Gesualdo immediately shifts to an imitative setting for the second verse in m.3. Gesualdo's five-voice imitation contrasts with Monteverdi's preference for the three-part form, highlighting the difference of their musical styles as mentioned in the introduction chapter. Gesualdo's extensive Luzzaschian approach, as opposed to Monteverdi's canzonetta influence, will be highlighted throughout the piece.

Another contrast between the composers reveal itself in the melodic figures of the imitative sections. Gesualdo's imitative figure in m.4 is a typical Netherlandish figure designed for imitative treatment. It is short and treated rather freely as opposed to the longer melodies in Monteverdi's setting, coming in antecedent/consequent pairs in *Baci soave e cari*. Gesualdo's melody is disjunct and has an ample range. In short, Gesualdo's imitative figure is typical of the northern style, designed for polyphonic weaving as opposed to Monteverdi's song-like melodies.

The imitative passage on v. 2 is short and marked by rapid entrances of voices, typical of Gesualdo's imitative style influenced by Luzzaschi. Although Gesualdo's first book does not exploit his chromatic style yet, the imitative passage is generous in the use of cross relations and suspension chains that sweep through the passage,

forming an affective surface. Newcomb (2010) traces the use of *stile aulico* by Luzzaschi. According to him, the style is marked by “the sweeping entries of imitative subjects from high to low or low to high registers” (p.483) revealing the influence of Luzzaschi over Gesualdo's characteristic imitations marked by rapid entrances. The Phrygian cadence in m.8 ends the phrase on D with a 4-3 suspension.

The entry points of the above-mentioned imitation are ordered as c^{''}, a' and f^{''}, highlighting the principal pitches of the F chord from the preceding cadence. Gesualdo juxtaposes the pitches of eb and e in mm.5-7, resulting in cross-relations between the tenor, alto and bass. The use of successive cross-relations create ambiguity and tension within the imitation, creating a contrast with the text “sustenance of my life”. The introduction of eb and the Phrygian cadence in m.8 further emphasizes the two- flat hexachord and prepares the following imitation on g by cadencing on D.

The musical setting for the third verse rapidly succeeds the preceding cadence, starting a new imitation with a different musical figure in m.8. The treatment of each verse with a corresponding musical figure and the play around these figures through unification and disintegration is one of the stylistic approaches of Gesualdo that is tracked in the madrigals subject to the thesis. Gesualdo divides the third verse into two parts and assigns contrasting imitative figures for both.

The short figure on “c'hor m'involate” contrasts with the ascending figure of “hor mi rendete il core”. Gesualdo inverts and transposes these musical motives, playing around with their shape and size to fit them into the imitation. The rapid entrances of the voices reveal his influence from the Ferraran idioms. The condensed imitation has the feeling of rushing to the cadence. The phrase ends with a strong authentic cadence in m.15. The cadence is separated by a rest from the following phrase on v.4, emphasizing the grouping of vv.1-3 against vv.4-6 in the text as we have seen in Monteverdi's setting.

The entrances of the above-mentioned imitation delineate the principal pitches of g. Eb is brought back for the internal Phrygian cadence on D in m.12. The long imitation ends in m.15 on G. Besides the authentic cadence on F in m.3, Gesualdo uses Phrygian cadences on D until the end of the first tercet. By doing so, he avoids the use of the c# of the dominant A, limiting the boundaries of the music to the

chordal range of the two flat hexachord. Gesualdo's emphasis on the flat region via the use of the two flat hexachord corresponds to the erotic imagery of the text, functioning as an expressive device as we have also seen in Monteverdi's harmonic setting.

Gesualdo's setting for the fourth line of the text highlights the region of F via the dominant-tonic relationship in mm.16-18, similar to the formal structure in Monteverdi's opening period. The declamatory setting and the authentic cadence on F reference to the opening period, connecting the first and fourth lines of the text, which are structurally complimentary due to the strophic form.

“Per voi” from v.4 in m.16 is separated by a rest and composed as a declamation, similar to Monteverdi's setting. The general form, textural and rhythmic details and the peroration on v.6 seem to suggest a mutual influence between the composers.

The phrase on v.5 starts in m.19 following the authentic cadence on F from the preceding passage. Gesualdo sets the musical figure on v.5 in double imitation against the figure on v.6, bringing back the musical figures from the previous passages, inverting them here and there in variations. The sweeping entrances of the five-part imitation appear and vanish in quick succession. The use of melodic interchange between parts in the passage is another intricate contrapuntal device and a Ferraran idiom.

The falling figure on the word “morte” comes in m.22, 25, 33 and illustrates the text. The passage further contrasts Gesualdo's musical style with Monteverdi's; the contrapuntal approach of the former through the use of the Northern idioms under Luzzaschian influence as opposed to the dramatic pathos and the invocation of the native idioms in the latter.

To continue with, the introduction of c# for the first time in m.22 signals a move to the one flat hexachord. The move into the sharper region coincides with Monteverdi's setting and prepares a similar harmonic approach for the forthcoming erotic imagery of v.6.

Gesualdo divides the verse once more for the setting of v.6. The above-mentioned imitation cadences in m.33, through a plagal cadence on Bb. The cadence comes on the word “morte”, separating the latter half of v.6 from the former, which gets treated separately in the following peroration. This division of the verse into two parts also

functions as a rhetorical device here, enabling the composer to emphasize “e pur si more” in a separate affective passage.

The latter half of v.6 is treated in imitation. The imitative passage has an intricate figurative treatment, bringing musical material from the previous passages. The musical phrase on “E pur si more” starts with a descending figure in the bass, followed by the ascending figure in alto in m.34. The counter-motion between outer parts is a systematically developed feature in Monteverdi's music, a part of his musical style, influenced by the native forms. Here we see Gesualdo using it to create an affective passage. The quinto brings back the figure from m.24 on “come un'alma rapita”, followed by its inversion in the tenor in m.35. The three figures are interchanged between parts in a slow rhythm, eventually reaching the authentic cadence on C in m.41. This virtuosic motivic play is stressed by Watkins (1991), “It discloses Gesualdo's remarkable capacity, even at this early stage, for motivic unification and development” (p. 142).

The suspension-laden passage is marked by the eb/e juxtapositions and the prolonged rhythm, functioning to illustrate the word “more” in an affective passage. M.37 introduces the authentic cadence on Bb. The restatement of the line proceeds with an emphasis on the eb pitch, ending with the above-mentioned authentic cadence on C in m.41, introduced for the first time in the composition. The downward harmonic motion achieved via the use of the eb pitch for v.6 is contrasting with Monteverdi's upwards motion over the same verse.

The above mentioned double imitation on vv. 5-6, in m.23-33, has an abundance of melodic exchange as mentioned. This double imitation setting is defined as metalepsis by Burmeister (1993), referring to the cause and effect relation between the words “stolen heart” and “dies”. The strong authentic cadence in m.41 ends the phrase, before the restatement of vv.4-6.

The following setting of the restatement of vv.4-6 is similar with the original setting. Although there is no repetition of the text in the poem, Gesualdo sets the music on vv.4-6 twice.

The second part of Gesualdo's *Baci soavi e cari* is composed under the name *Quanto hà di dolce amore*, being the second composition in his first book of madrigals. It starts with a stepwise descending melody in the alto. The tenor and the bass

accompanies the melody doubled at the third, creating a three-part structure that we often see in the madrigals of Monteverdi subject to the thesis. The conjunct melody and the three-part opening for the second part suggests a Mantuan influence and creates a contrast with the first part of the composition.

The opening passage starts with the g minor harmony and rapidly falls a fifth to D in m.3 via the use of a Phrygian cadence. Similar to the opening passage of the first part, the introduction of the Phrygian cadence hints the use of the two flat hexachord, supporting the erotic imagery of v.7.

The following phrase on v.8 starts in m.4, elaborating on the descending figure from the opening passage. Typical of Gesualdo's ordering of imitation and homophonic parts between the different lines of the text, the melodic figure is treated in a rapid five-part imitation following the three-part passage. The imitation is an inverted variant of the figure in m.29 from the first part. By bringing back musical materials from the first part, Gesualdo creates a motivic unity with the former part of the text.

The imitation highlights the harmonies of F and Bb and moves the music to the flatter region. The authentic cadence in m.7 on Bb concludes the passage and prepares the following declamation on v.9.

The musical passage on v.9 starts with a 5-part declamation on "O" in m.7. The use of Eb, the flattest harmony in the system, for the full texture declamation is analogous to the joyful declamation of the lover, illustrating his cry to the beloved. Gesualdo uses a homophonic texture for the setting of the verse, almost identical to Monteverdi's setting of the same line of the text.

The following phrase brings back the three-part structure from the opening phrase. The sudden change in texture contrasts the syntactically related lines of the text as opposed to Monteverdi's setting which keeps the five-part homophonic structure intact in the musical setting on vv.9-10.

The above-mentioned three-part setting comes in variation this time. Gesualdo uses the middle range of the choir and assigns the solo to the tenor under the doubled alto and quinto. The middle section of the text ends with a three-part cadence on g in m.10. The return to g after traversing the flat region of the two flat hexachord is in accordance with the end of the middle section of the text on v.10, concluding the passage on the harmonic centre of the composition.

As opposed to Monteverdi who only restates the final part of the text, Gesualdo recomposes the middle part in variation in mm.11-24. The opening passage is given to the upper three voices this time in m.11 and the following imitation commences starting from the lower three voices. The harmonic structure is conserved besides the setting of v.10, which cadences on c instead of the former g.

The setting for the final tercet of the text starts in m.25 with a five-part declamation on F. The move to F from the Eb of the previous declamation on v.9 suggests a motion to the sharper end of the hexachord in accordance with the erotic imagery of the last tercet. Gesualdo sets v.11 as a homophonic declamation, suggesting further Mantuan influence. As opposed to Monteverdi's setting which is dominantly homophonic under the canzonetta influence, Gesualdo shifts between homophonic passages and imitations effected by his influence on Luzzaschi. The passage ends with a strong authentic cadence on C, further moving the harmonies to the sharper end of the two-flat hexachord.

Gesualdo sets v.12 as a 3-part imitation. The imitation is in a slower rhythm compared to the preceding passages. Following the cadence on g in m.31, Gesualdo restates the line, using the lower three voices this time. He shifts to a trio-like texture once again for the restatement and creates textual integrity with the previous passages. Structural formal devices and long homophonic passages is not a common aspect of Gesualdo's madrigals subject to the thesis. The motivic unity from the first part of the composition is replaced by the structural devices as such, which recur. The use of these along with the above-mentioned setting of v.9 suggests a Monteverdi influence on Gesualdo's setting for the second part of *Baci soavi e cari*.

The restatement of v.12 cadences on D in m.32 with an authentic cadence. Gesualdo's shifts to the sharper end of the one flat hexachord for the setting of vv.12-13, illustrating the erotic imagery of the text with sharper harmonies. As we have shown, he already hinted the move towards the sharper regions in the previous passage. Via the authentic cadence on D, Gesualdo completes this motion and prepares the music for the final line of the text.

The imitation on the final line elides with the cadence on v.12 in m.32. Soprano and quinto are doubled at the third against the alto and tenor. The doubled voices move in a trio-like setting over the harmonic bass. The bass joins the setting in m.33, and it supports the upper parts with its harmonic function, simultaneously being another imitation entrance. The double counterpoint against the harmonic bass creates an abstract form of a trio-like passage that we often see in Monteverdi's compositions. This passage further reveals Mantuan and Monteverdi influence on Gesualdo. The final authentic cadence on g in m.40 concludes the composition.

The second part of Gesualdo's *Baci soave e cari* contrasts with the previous section in terms of texture. The use of homophonic and trio-like passages as opposed to the rapid imitations of the first part suggests a Monteverdi influence on Gesualdo's composition.

2.1.3 Summary

Both composers structure the form of their compositions considering the antecedent-consequent structure of the first section of the poem. The setting for the middle and final periods of the text shows a lack of syntactic understanding on Monteverdi's part.

Monteverdi's setting shows song-like structures such as the setting of the upper parts against the lower parts, use of harmonic bass, three-part passages and song-like melodies. The abundance of homophonic parts in Monteverdi's setting further reveals his influence from the canzonetta-madrigal. Monteverdi's composition is mostly in the Mantuan style. The use of the above mentioned song-like devices and the use of harmonic bass systematically becomes a part of his authentic musical style, as will be shown in the forthcoming analyses.

Monteverdi is influenced by the canzonetta-madrigal which is rid of the rigid northern counterpoint and snobbish polyphonic weaving. His use of song-like forms underlines his belief in the affective power of the native songs. Monteverdi's setting for this text can be seen as an attempt to reconcile song-like forms with the Netherlandish counterpoint, searching for the potential power of affections in the former.

Gesualdo, on the other hand, is deeply influenced by the Luzzaschian idioms and an overall Ferraran style of the madrigal. The abundance of complex imitative sections,

the motivic interchange between parts, the integration and disintegration of the musical motives, the strict ordering of the consequent sections as declamations and imitations are some of his Luzzaschian influences. Gesualdo's preference over the Netherlandish melody as opposed to Monteverdi's use of song-like melodies provides us with further contrast.

Gesualdo's use of motivic virtuosity is worth mentioning. He shows a mastery of Northern idioms as early as his first book of madrigals. His musical style develops in the direction of exploiting these idioms to extreme limits, where he finds his mesmerizing style. On the other hand, Gesualdo's use of chromaticism and vertical dissonance is not in a mature form in this composition from the first book of madrigals.

The second part of Gesualdo's setting shows his diversity as a composer. As opposed to the contrapuntal surface of the first section, Gesualdo uses homophonic settings in the latter, revealing his awareness of the Mantuan idioms and the canzonetta-madrigal.

Both composers have responded to the text with a similar tempo and structure. There are multiple passages suggesting a mutual influence as mentioned. The overall harmonic motion in both of the compositions is parallel in illustrating the erotic imagery of the text by moving back and forth between the flat and sharp regions of the cantus mollis system.

2.2 Luci Serene e Chiare

2.2.1 Monteverdi's setting

Monteverdi's *Luci serene e chiare* is in the cantus durus d mode. The phrase on the first line of the text between mm.1-7 establishes the g region with the dominant-tonic motion, emphasizing the middle range of the one flat hexachord. The use of the flattest hexachord in the cantus durus system for the opening phrase reflects the impression of the poet in the first line of the poem. The juxtaposition of Bb into the g chord and the contrasting motion of the outer parts in m.3 emphasize this impression with a dramatic declamation for the opening phrase.

Monteverdi's AA'BB' form is influenced by Gesualdo, as well as some rhythmic and textural details. The first two strophes of the text are composed complimentary to

each other, by a transposition up a step in the latter, reflecting the narrative portion of the epigrammatic text. The third strophe contrasts with the first two as the descriptive portion of the text, highlighting the death/love analogy. Monteverdi's harmonic language also reflects this structure as will be mentioned.

The first line of the text is composed as a declamation in five parts and it ends with a perfect authentic cadence in m.7. Rhythm of the passage is determined by the text, typical of Monteverdi's madrigals. The a'-d'' leap in the canto and the complementary d-G fall in the bass in m.3 widen the musical range of the declamation, creating a profane sound for the opening phrase. The melodic descent in the canto between m.4 and m.7 has a song-like characteristic with its stepwise descent of a fifth.

Contrary motion between the outer parts – a systematically used musical device that we already observed in *Baci soavi e cari* – is tracked in m.4 and m.7 via the stepwise descent of d-g in the canto as opposed to the ascending harmonic bass. The abundance of the homophonic passages from the first book is preserved in the setting of *Luci serene e chiare*.

The following phrase starts in m.7 and shows the progress of Monteverdi's musical style through the expressive use of song-like structures such as the setting of the lower parts against the upper parts. Following the declamation on “voi”, the upper parts are set against the lower parts in m.9. The bass and tenor move together against the soprano and quinto, harmonically supporting the rhythmic declamation of the upper voices in a trio-like setting.

The rhythmic declamation of the upper parts is determined by the text. Monteverdi's declamation on the word “m'incedete” is short in range, sharply profiling the text. Gesualdo also uses a similar setting for this verse, suggesting a mutual influence.

The verse is restated following the authentic cadence in m.10. The repetition raises the tessitura by a tone, restating the verse in the tonal region of g. The 4-3 suspension between the quinto and bass in m.12 is worth mentioning. This suspension figure comes back as a melisma in m.18 and as an imitative figure in the second part starting in m.53, revealing Monteverdi's subtle use of motivic unity. The subtle use of motivic repetition, as opposed to Gesualdo's fabrication of the device, further highlights the different styles and influences of the composers.

The phrase over v.2 establishes the F region with the dominant-tonic motion between mm.8-10. The restatement of the same phrase in m.11 shifts to the natural hexachord via the introduction of the b natural pitch. This hexachordal shift takes place by an upward transposition from F to G in mm.8-12. This tonal duality that is established over the same line of the text reflects the dual nature of the “inflaming” of the lover, referencing to the love/death contrast in the poem. The following declamation ends in m.16 with a half cadence on G, preparing the region of C that is established over the text “non dolore” in the following phrase.

Monteverdi's merging of vv.2-3 between mm.13-15 shows his break from the singular verse-phrase unit from *Baci soave e cari*, interrupting the usual phrase-by-phrase treatment of verses in his madrigals. The phrase over “non-dolore” starting in m.16 slows in rhythmic activity, emphasizing the word “pain”. The five-voice texture augments the passage, signaling the end of the first tercet.

The use of the harmonic bass supports the cadential progression of I-IV-V-I in mm. 17-19 and reveals the development of Monteverdi's use of the device. Compared to the setting of *Baci soave e cari*, Monteverdi's harmonic progressions and the use of the harmonic bass is more structured in *Luci serene e chiare*.

Monteverdi tonally contrasts the lines of the text by assigning them different harmonic regions in *Luci serene e chiare*. The cadence degrees of the first strophe are on G-F-G-C, respectively. The use of the cadences on G and F until the introduction of the final C in m.19, suggests a strophic unity. By using the upper and lower fifth degrees of C for the cadences of the first strophe, Monteverdi suggests a completion of the syntactic group by finally introducing a strong cadence on C in m.19. The formal relation of the cadence degrees to the text is an authentic feature of Monteverdi's harmonic language.

For the setting of the second tercet, Monteverdi transposes the music up a step, reflecting the unity of the first two strophes of the poem. Monteverdi's raising of the tessitura creates an affective setting for the second strophe, emphasizing the similar rhyme and metric structure of the first two strophes of the text with an upwards harmonic motion.

For the setting of the third tercet, Monteverdi assigns a declamation to the narrative v.7, and composes the descriptive vv.8-9 in imitation, emphasizing the contrast

between the narrative and descriptive parts of the epigrammatic poem. The syntactic grouping of the text from *Baci soavi e cari* is replaced by structural groupings in *Luci serene e chiare*.

The third tercet starts with the setting of v.7 in m.39. Monteverdi uses a wide choral range for the declamation on “O”. The g” in the soprano is the upper limit of the piece, creating a strong affection for the lover's declamation. The stepwise descent in canto from g” to b’ brings back the melodic motive from the canto in the opening passage. The counter-motion between outer parts and the use of harmonic bass is worth attention. The perfect authentic cadence comes on the first syllable of “more”, eliding with the entrance of v.12 in m.41.

The following imitation for the setting of vv.8-9 shows Monteverdi's mastery of musical expression. Monteverdi is using a virtuosic Netherlandish idiom like the double counterpoint, by subordinating it to the affections of the text in mm.41-60. The musical motive for v.8 in m.42 is a typical melismatic figure from the northern motets. Here Monteverdi is treating it as a syllabic imitative figure, in a trio-like passage over the harmonic bass. By doing so, he is reconciling a traditional northern idiom with the madrigal form. The figure of imitation is similar to Gesualdo's figure on v.8, suggesting another mutual influence. On the other hand, Monteverdi treats vv.8-9 as a single unit where Gesualdo divides vv.8 into two parts and treats the former part in imitation and the latter in declamation.

“Sangue” of v.8 is slower in rhythm and treated freely as opposed to the former part of imitation, as seen in m.43. The ingenious function of this rhythmic alteration of the word is twofold; first it creates a textural contrast with the following imitation points and liberates the music from the potential confusion created by the overload of imitation entrances - as we have seen in Gesualdo's setting of *Baci soavi e cari* - serving the pathos of clear text declamation in accordance with his musical style. Furthermore, when he assigns the imitative figure to bass in mm.42-47, he further prolongs the musical figure and makes it function as a harmonic bass supporting the imitation.

The chromatic neighbour figure from m.12 and m.18 comes back in this passage as the musical figure for the text “si strugge”, treated in double imitation against the musical figure over v.8. This recurring of the same motive under different functions

creates a subtle motivic unity that binds different parts together. The subtle motivic unity is one of the stylistic approaches of Monteverdi in *Luci serene e chiare* and it contrasts with Gesualdo's overemphasized motivic weaving influenced by the Ferraran idioms. Furthermore, the chromatic neighbour motion creates a dramatic effect, illustrating the words “destroys” and “grieves”.

Monteverdi treats the musical figure on v.9 in a single musical phrase and avoids the division of the verse that we see in Gesualdo's setting. He only divides the verse-phrase unit to make it function as harmonic bass in mm.48-50 and in mm.52-55.

Another subtle motivic device is seen in mm.53-60, in the duet of the soprano and quinto. A variation of the melismatic figure from m.42 is augmented in rhythmic value and treated as a song-like melody, descending from e'' to d' in the soprano. It gets harmonized with a circle of fifths progression in mm.52-57, followed by a cadential progression in mm.57-60.

The third tercet concludes in m.60 with a perfect authentic cadence on D. The restatement of the third tercet starts in m.61. It brings back the same music with various textural variations. The final cadential progression between mm.84-89 pushes down the range of the parts to their lower limits, creating a solemn ending for the dramatic final line. This device is described as hypobole by Burmeister (1993). Being an antonym for hyperbole, this rhetorical technique conceals the clarity of the words and disperses the music in the final progression.

The music of the third strophe is marked by descending fifths sequences, forming a musical allegory to the “erotic death”. The harmonic progression of E-a/A-d/D-g/G-C/a in mm.44-52 and mm.66-74 is restated a fourth lower between mm.74-82, as A-d/D-g/G-C/F. Furthermore, these sequences traverse the chordal range of the natural hexachord and present the varied cadence degrees of the first two sections. The final cadential progression between mm.86-89 ends the piece with an authentic cadence on the modal center d.

Monteverdi's harmonic language in *Luci serene e chiare* introduces the use of tonal relations. The cadence degrees of F and G in mm.1-19 anticipate the final cadence on C in m.19 by functioning as the upper and lower fifth degrees (subdominant and dominant). The structural function of this device is to create a unity within the first

tercet. Furthermore, the analogy to the life/death antithesis via the shifts between the flat and sharp harmonic regions from *Baci soavi e cari* is further elaborated by the downward fifth sequences in *Luci serene e chiare*.

The three-part structures that we encountered in Monteverdi's setting for *Baci soavi e cari* comes back in *Luci serene e chiare* in abstract forms, suggesting continuity of his musical style from the first book. An example is the pedal doubling of bass, tenor and soprano in mm.46-47, which serves as a harmonic foundation for the duet of the quintus and alto. There are similar passages between mm.50-51 and mm.68-70, coming in different textures.

Luci serene e chiare shows how Monteverdi masters the use of the Netherlandish musical devices by subordinating them to the affections of the text. His use of song-like structures create a unity with his earlier musical style from the first book. The analysis reveals his development as a composer, from the simple homophonic setting of *Baci soavi e cari* to the elaborate setting of *Luci serene e chiare*.

2.2.2 Gesualdo's setting

Gesualdo's *Luci serene e chiare* is in AA'BB' form, reflecting the strophic structure of the text. Both composers use a similar structural grouping by treating the text in three tercets. As opposed to Monteverdi, Gesualdo sets the first two tercets to the same music, missing the affective raising of the tessitura in Monteverdi's composition.

The declamation of the opening passage is in a texture what Watkins (1991) calls "the homophonic adagio" (p. 255). The monotonal introduction of the composition emphasizes the opening verse. Monotonal declamation is a device commonly used by both composers, serving the pathos of clear text expression. The counter-motion between outer voices and the widening of the choral range in m.4 seems to influence Monteverdi, as the opening sections of both composers sound alike.

The opening declamation highlights the Bb region with the dominant-tonic motion in mm.1-5, providing the phrase with a harmonic precision that supports the clarity of the passage.

The musical phrase on v.2 starts in m.6. The imitation delineates the chordal content of the two flat hexachord before the plagal cadence in m.10 on d. The declamation on the first half of v.3 emphasizes the two-flat hexachord by highlighting the eb pitch in m.11. The following phrase on “non dolore” suddenly shifts to the one flat hexachord and harmonically moves upwards in the sharper direction via the introduction of the pitches c# and f#. This abrupt contrast between two phrases creates a tonal allegory for the word “pain”. The slow rhythm of the passage, the abundance of suspensions and the imitative setting work together to create an affective setting, further underlining the word “pain”.

Gesualdo treats v.2 in an elaborate imitation in mm.6-10, as opposed to the homophonic setting in Monteverdi’s composition. Separated by a rest from the preceding passage, the following phrase in m.11 is a five-voice monotonal declamation over the former part of v.3. The declamation emphasizes the text. The verse is divided into two parts. For the setting of the latter part of the verse, Gesualdo shifts to an imitative setting in m.13.

The abundance of the semi-verse in Gesualdo's madrigals is referred to his Mannerist influences by Watkins;

“Gesualdo's treatment of the semi-verse, especially in his later volumes where each half of the verse is frequently set with strongly contrasting textures, shows his Mannerist capacity for swift and unexpected change, for juxtaposition of irreconcilable elements even within the context of the verse/phrase”. (Watkins, 1991, p. 118)

Gesualdo brings back the motive from “voi m'incedetete” in variation for the passage starting in m.13. The entrances of the imitation move slowly in suspensions, reaching the evaporated cadence in m.18. The use of an evaporated cadence on the word “pain” illustrates the word, as the five-voice setting diminishes to a three-voice declamation. Furthermore, Gesualdo omits the third degree of the final harmony, creating an ambiguous effect for the cadence. The cadence in m.18 ends the first tercet and declares the end of the first syntactic group with the following rest.

Gesualdo's setting for the second tercet restates the same musical material with textural variations, without the upwards transposition that we saw in Monteverdi's setting. Cadential degrees delineate the principal tones of Bb, emphasizing the pitches bb, d and f. The final cadence of the second tercet comes in m.37, on F. Gesualdo transposes the cadence up a third from the final cadence of the first tercet on d, foreshadowing the abundance of third relations in the setting of the third tercet.

Compared to Monteverdi's raising of the tessitura, Gesualdo's decision to bring back the same musical material for the second tercet reveals that he is not as interested in the large-scale expressive devices. Instead, Gesualdo is fond of expressive musical devices like chromaticism and vertical dissonance.⁴

Third tercet commences with the declamation on v.7 in m.38. The five-voice setting and the rhythmic declamation is similar to Monteverdi's setting of the text. Furthermore, the musical figure on "alma che tutta foco" in m.40 reminds the melisma-like figure of Monteverdi, suggesting further influence. The introduction of eb in the plagal cadence in m.39 brings back the two flat hexachord, emphasizing the lover's declamation by moving back to the flatter region. The following imitation is in the one flat hexachord and juxtaposes back to the e natural. The cadential root movement by thirds in m.45 ends the imitation and prepares the following declamation on "e tutta sangue".

The musical setting for v.8 in mm.40-57 is divided into two parts. For the former part, Gesualdo uses a long imitation with rapid voice entrances as opposed to the latter part which is composed as a homophonic adagio.

The relentless entries of imitation in mm.40-45 create a mesmerizing passage, typical of Gesualdo's style. The setting of the latter part of v.8 starts in m.46. Following the imitation, Gesualdo composes the latter half of the verse as a declamation. Gesualdo's harmonic treatment for this declamation creates an allegory of the line "all blood" by introducing a downward fifths harmonic motion in mm.46-48. The progression traverses the harmonies C, F, B and Eb delineating the chordal content of the two flat hexachord minus g and d. The downward motion stops at the flattest harmony of the two flat hexachord (Eb) in m.48, where it is followed by the

⁴ See Chafe (1992), especially the first chapter, for further discussion on vertical and horizontal dissonances.

sharpest harmony of the one flat hexachord (A), via the double chromatic inflection. This sudden shift unites the sharpest and flattest harmonies of the composition in a single measure, creating an affective harmonic progression, illustrating the text and the word “blood”. This setting is an example of Gesualdo's chromatic language. He bends the rules of the northern counterpoint and goes extreme lengths in subordinating the musical language to the affections of the text. As opposed to the abundance of structural relations in Monteverdi's music, Gesualdo is fond of local chromatic relations in his harmonic language.

Gesualdo's setting for the final line of the text starts in m.48, eliding with the declamation on “e tutta sangue”. The slow rhythm, abundance of suspensions and the use of tied notes create an affective imitation of the line. Gesualdo extends the use of the pitch c# from the preceding harmony, sharpest pitch of the one flat hexachord, emphasizing the words “torture”, “pain” and “dies”. The passage ends with the cadence in m.57 on the harmony A. The root movement by a third over the pedal bass in the cadence brilliantly illustrates the word “languishes”.

The restatement of the last tercet starts in m.59, following a full measure rest, and it reveals Gesualdo's expansion of his chromatic language. The trio setting in mm.74-76 introduces unresolved suspensions creating an ambiguous harmonic motion. The final cadential progression in mm.82-86 has a sequence of root movement by thirds, traversing the harmonies of cm, Ab and F. The introduction of the Ab harmony goes beyond the range of the two flat hexachord, conserving the flattest harmony in the composition for the final cadence and forming a tonal allegory to the text. The introduction of Ab and the following chromatic inflection in the final measure creates a brilliant illustration of the word “languishes.” Gesualdo's dazzling harmonic language appears in its purest form, destroying the established rules of counterpoint to evoke the dramatic text.

The root movement of thirds in the final progression of the piece in mm.82-86 is worth a further mention. The pedal bass over the Ab⁶ harmony is followed by the f minor in the root form, which then turns into an F major in the final measure through a cross-relation. The use of a root movement by thirds in the final cadence of the piece is another example of Gesualdo's creative harmonic language. Furthermore, Davis (2000) points out to the use of cross-relations in Gesualdo's cadences; “The

change from the major to minor triad on the same pitch is even more striking when it is effected by a cross relation” (p. 171).

2.2.3 Summary

It is safe to assume that Monteverdi borrowed the general form of AA'BB' as well as many rhythmic and textural details from Gesualdo. The similar syntactic groupings suggest further influence.

The use of the Netherlandish devices such as double counterpoint and five-part imitation were already used by Gesualdo in his setting of *Baci soavi e cari*. Monteverdi also exploits these devices in his setting for *Luci serene e chiare*.

Monteverdi's imitative figures are derived from the song-like melodies as opposed to Gesualdo's Netherlandish imitations. Monteverdi's imitative passages are structurally influenced by the trio-like sections of the native forms where Gesualdo prefers rapid imitative entrances in the style of Luzzaschi. This difference further reveals the direction of Monteverdi's musical style, in which he continuously merges Netherlandish devices with song-like forms to produce affective musical passages. Gesualdo, on the other hand, exploits the Netherlandish forms by drifting away from the traditional rules of voice leading and harmonic progressions to create expressive passages.

In the summary of *Baci soavi e cari*, we have seen the motivic virtuosity of Gesualdo as opposed to the homophonic setting in Monteverdi's composition. In *Luci serene e chiare*, we see a similar motivic virtuosity from Monteverdi, especially in his setting for v.9 in mm.53-60. He brings back the melismatic figure from m.42 and augments the rhythmic value, treating it in a sequence. He subordinates the augmented melody to a sequence of fifths leading up the cadential progression that ends the second tercet. As opposed to the motivic figuration of Gesualdo which is influenced by the Northern idioms, Monteverdi's melodic variation and its harmonization are influenced by the song-like melodies.

Gesualdo drifts away from the established idioms of counterpoint and harmony, developing his musical style marked by the delicate balance between chaos and order. His expressive use of dissonances comes here and there to evoke the affections

in the text. As opposed to the changing framework in Monteverdi's madrigals - like the shift between the homophonic settings in the first book to the contrapuntal surfaces of the fourth book - Gesualdo is consistent in building the formal structure of his madrigals under the Ferraran framework.

The harmonic language of both composers is extended from *Baci soave e cari* to their settings on *Luci serene e chiare*. Monteverdi uses tonal relations to illustrate parts of the text and emphasize syntactic groupings. Gesualdo introduces unresolved suspensions, third relations and minor/major shifts to evoke the affections of the text.

Monteverdi is more in control of the general structure of his music and is fond of using a variety of musical forms subordinated to the dramatic pathos. Gesualdo, on the other hand, prefers local harmonic blasts to evoke affections, as he usually does not alter the general framework of the Ferraran idioms in structuring his madrigals.

2.3 *T'amo Mia Vita*

2.3.1 Monteverdi's setting

One of the first things that we notice in Monteverdi's setting of *T'amo mia vita* is the use of *basso continuo*. The use of this device functions as a harmonic support for the dramatic canto solo in *T'amo mia vita* and goes beyond being an elective ornamentation for the music. As Tomlinson (1990) expresses; "The basso continuo, he realized before any of his contemporaries, allowed him to isolate at will a dramatic persona from his ensemble of five voices, to merge an imaginary music drama with the polyphonic commentary and narration of the madrigal" (p. 156). Furthermore, the functional use of this device affirms Monteverdi's mastery of the harmonic bass.

Monteverdi's *T'amo mia vita* is in the cantus durus d mode. Soprano solo, spoken by the beloved, descends stepwise from a' to d' over the continuo in the opening phrase. The emphasis over the fifth, the second and the tonic degrees via the use of longer note values and the stepwise motion of a perfect fifth is characteristic of song-like melodies. Monteverdi's opening phrase captures the dramatic pathos of the text with

its solo recitation. As Schrade (1969) mentions, the expressive use of the recitation “gives clear evidence that Monteverdi, uninfluenced by the Florentine theorists, had found his own artistic solution for the dramatic recitation” (p. 211). An important quality of Monteverdi as a composer is his ability to progress, by subordinating musical devices like recitation to the textual expression.

The following declamation in the lower three voices move in a series of fifth progressions in mm.5-9, highlighting the subdominant region in m.5 (D-g) , the dominant in m.6 (E-a) and the tonic in m.7 (A-d). The d chord in m.7 shifts its tonic function to a pivot for the dominant, in the peak of the melodic ascent, as m.8 introduces an authentic cadence on A, modulating to the fifth degree of the principal tone. The chromatic ascent of the melody in mm.5-6 leads up to c' on “vita”, while the stepwise descent to a' in mm.7-8 prepares the opening note of the refrain in m.9, which serves to move the music back to tonic with its descent from a' to d' in m.10.

The above-mentioned progression of fifths span the sharper end of the one flat hexachord, establishing the chordal range for the opening line of the text. The following declamation starting in m.11 shifts to the natural hexachord. A series of descending fifths in mm.11-16 delineate the chordal content of the natural hexachord minus F. The root movement of a third in m.14 over the restatement of “e in questa sola si soave parola” launches the progression of fifths to the sharper end of the natural hexachord, further highlighting the joy of the lover with an abrupt upwards move.

Following the perfect authentic cadence in m.9, the refrain comes back, untransposed but diminished in note-values. The whispering of the beloved is followed by the chorus assigned to the low three parts in m.11.

Monteverdi composes the syntactic group of vv.2-5 in a single passage in mm.11-22, until the narration of the lover is intervened by the refrain of the beloved in m.22. Monteverdi's dramatic musical structure keeps the syntactic group intact by omitting the entry of the solo recitation until the end of the phrase for v.5.

Throughout the piece, the form is determined by the epigrammatic contrast between the narrative and the descriptive parts of the text. Under this general principle of form, Monteverdi ingeniously maintains the grouping of individual lines between

vv.2-5, by using dominant-tonic relations in m.16, 18 and 20. As mentioned, the grouping of the verses via cadential treatment is a formal aspect of the madrigal.

The refrain starting in m.22 ascends from a' to d'' and transposes the solo recitation up a fourth. The duet of the soprano and the lower three voices in mm.25-28 functions as a dramatic device emphasizing the unity of the lovers. The cross-relation in mm.25-26 accentuates the lover's joy. Following "O voce", canto solo is restated up a step, creating contrast with the previous entrance.

Following the whispering of the beloved, v.5 commences in m.28. The monotonal declamation of the lover is sounded by two voices and it is restated by three in the following measure. The restatement is a third higher, resulting from the inversion of the tonic chord.

The individual cadential treatment of the verse is preserved by the use of dominant-tonic relations in the passage. Monteverdi composes the first statement of v.5 using the harmonic progression of I-V⁶-I in mm.27-28, and its restatement as I⁶-V^{6/4}-I in mm.30-31. The unity of the syntactic group of vv.4-6 is achieved by keeping the low trio intact and standing in the modal region of A between mm.28-34.

The above-mentioned grouping of the verses is further established by the use of octave leaps in the bass between mm.31-34. The use of a disjunct bass as opposed to the conjunct upper voices is a musical device widely used by Monteverdi. The division of the upper parts against the lower parts is influenced by the song-like structures as mentioned before. By adopting devices from song-like structures and subordinating them to structural uses, Monteverdi systematically develops the use of song-like elements in his madrigals.

To continue with, the harmonies between mm.28-40 emphasize the fifth degree of the principal mode by swinging between a and E. The emphasis on g# highlights the use of the natural hexachord in mm.28-34. Monteverdi moves the music to the flat region via circle of fifths motion between mm.35-37, traversing the harmonies C-F-Bb. The introduction of the Bb moves the music to the one flat hexachord between mm.36-40, which has been absent from the setting up to this point. The following phrase over v.8 modulates back to the principal mode with a plagal cadence on d in m.40, tonally preparing the forthcoming imitation over the final line.

Monteverdi's brilliant setting for v.9 merges the elements of song-like structures with northern idioms. Monteverdi illustrates the unification of the lovers by treating the solo recitation in a five-part imitation. The division of the upper and lower parts disintegrates for the first time in the composition, as the lover joins his beloved in a duet.

The imitation commences as the tenor engages the theme in m.40, followed by the bass and the quinto doubled at the third. Monteverdi divides v.9 into two, assigning a rhythmically altered version of the recitation theme for the former half of the verse. The bass serves a harmonic function throughout the passage, supporting the harmonic clarity of the imitation.

The imitation morphs into a three-part form in m.46, bringing back the devices of the canzonetta-madrigal. Following the authentic cadence in m.49, the rapid imitation recalls Gesualdo's imitation style influenced by the Ferraran idioms.

The declamation over “la mia vita sia” takes over in m.53, changing the setting for the latter half of the verse. The stepwise descent of the bass against the ascending inner voices in m.54 directs the passage to the final progression of the composition, over the pedal bass.

The form of the composition is determined by the epigrammatic structure of the text. Grouping of the narrative parts of the text against the discursive parts is an element of the epigrammatic style as discussed in the introduction. Contrasting elements in Guarini's epigrammatic text is augmented in Monteverdi's composition. He treats the discursive whispering of the beloved “T'amo mia vita” in refrains, coming back in m.9, m.22 and also following the declamation on “O voce” in m.26, creating a dramatic structure that is not even found in the text. The narrative parts of the text is assigned to the three low parts. For the setting of *T'amo mia vita*, Monteverdi brings back the epigrammatic style, marked by profiled contrasts, from his third and fourth books.

Another point worth mentioning is the systematic development of the setting of the upper voices against the lower voices, a device we have also seen in *Baci soavi e cari* and *Luci serene e chiare*. This method of composing has a dramatic function in

T'amo mia vita; the discursive text of the beloved is assigned to the canto solo where the narrative parts of the lover are sung by the three low voices.

The final section reintroduces the various harmonic regions used in the composition with modulations to a, d and g. As Chafe (1992) points out “the closing section seems to have been designed to sum up the modulatory regions of the piece in terms of the tonic key” (p. 119). The first statement of *T'amo mia vita* cadences on d in m.43, then suddenly modulates to the dominant in m.44 via the introduction of f#. The voices pile up in m.49 for the declamation on the A chord with an authentic cadence. The return to tonic occurs in m.53 and it is followed by the introduction of the g minor harmony for the final plagal cadence. The pedal bass and the slow rhythm accompanies the sustained g chord until the final harmony on D, concluding the composition with its ultimate return to the tonic.

The emphasis on the dominant and subdominant regions in different parts of the composition refers to the principal pitch of d, and reveals the use of a tonal center in the composition. Monteverdi's use of tonal language, exemplifying his developing style that we tracked down starting from his setting for *Baci soavi e cari*, is firmly established in *T'amo mia vita* from the fifth book of madrigals.

The harmonic movements in the composition function as expressive tools, creating tonal relationships between parts of the text by hovering around the principal tone. As a part of Monteverdi's musical style, which we have traced over from *Baci soavi e cari*, the harmonic movements in *T'amo mia vita* reveals an overlap of dramatic expression with an increasing use of a tonal language.

2.3.2 Gesualdo's setting

Gesualdo's *T'amo mia vita* opens with a declamation on the refrain. The rhythm is determined by the text. The melodic leap of the soprano in m.2 to f'' and the following stepwise descent to a' is reminiscent of the song-like melodies of Monteverdi. Furthermore, the above mentioned melodic leap creates an antecedent-consequent pair with the g''- c' motion in the soprano in the first measure. By using a song-like melodic style, Gesualdo captures the dramatic effect of the opening line of the text.

As opposed to the cantus durus system of Monteverdi's setting, Gesualdo's *T'amo mia vita* is in the cantus mollis d mode. The opening declamation ends with a half

cadence on D in m.3. The following imitation establishes the one flat hexachord with the Phrygian degree of the mode on Bb in m.6. The abundance of the eb pitch in mm.7-9 temporarily moves the music to the two flat hexachord and prepares the cadence on Bb in m.9.

V.2 is divided into two parts. Gesualdo's melodic figure and its rhythm is influenced by the text. The disjunct melody on “e in questa sola” anticipates the conjunct figure on “dolcissima parola”, which refers to the descending figure in the soprano from the opening phrase. The imitation shifts into a five-part declamation in m.8, setting up the authentic cadence in m.9.

Gesualdo's musical treatment for the following lines follows a similar pattern. He divides the lines into two complementary melodic parts and treats them in imitation. Then, he brings the individual voices together in declamation, preparing for the cadence. As opposed to the dramatic setting of Monteverdi, which includes a formal variety via the use of various dramatic devices, Gesualdo's formal structure for *T'amo mia vita* is organized by this scheme.

The following passage on “par che transformi” in m.10 introduces a chromatic motive influenced by Vicentino's chromatic tetrachord. Gesualdo's influence of Luzzaschi, who is a student of Vicentino, has been discussed in the previous chapter. Knowles (2014) puts forward that the chromatic figures in Gesualdo's music can be linked to the chromatic tetrachord of Vicentino, “Abandoning the impractical enharmonic genus, Gesualdo makes reference to the chromatic tetrachord in all his chromaticism” (p. 101). After introducing the figure in m.10, Gesualdo shifts back to the one flat hexachord, limiting the chromaticism in the passage with the eb/e juxtaposition.

The entries of the imitation on v.3 is directed from the bass to the soprano starting in m.10. Gesualdo divides the verse into two parts again, assigning a different musical motive for each part.

The descending figure on “liatamente il core” is bringing back the motive from the opening passage, creating a subtle motivic unity. The use of motivic unity through various means is a musical device favoured by Gesualdo as we have already seen in the previous analyses.

Gesualdo sets the music for vv.3-4 in the same passage, syntactically grouping them. He treats v.4 as a partial declamation in m.15, following the short imitation on the words “per farsene” in m.14, fulfilling the above mentioned formal scheme of his phrase structure.

The imitation on v.3 is succeeded with an elision of the musical figure over v.4 in m.14. The descending figure from m.3 comes back in variations for the phrase, revealing further motivic unity. The short imitative passage engages in a cadential progression in m.15, concluding the passage with an authentic cadence.

The following exclamation of the lover in m.16 descends a fifth to Bb, immediately softening the tone by moving to the flatter harmonic region. The following Eb chord in m.17 engages in an authentic cadence with the preceding Bb harmony and transposes the authentic cadence in m.15 a step lower, highlighting the move to the flat region in the middle part. The monotonal declamation on Eb in m.18 further emphasizes the flattest region of the two flat hexachord and the authentic cadence on Bb in m.18 ends the phrase. The robust introduction of the two flat hexachord contrasts with the predominant one flat hexachord setting of the first strophe, distinguishing between the parts of the composition and emphasizing the start of a new syntactic unit.

Gesualdo's formal scheme groups the first and the second verses as independent units while it treats vv.3-4 in a single passage. Monteverdi's grouping, on the other hand, treats the first verse independently and keeps vv.2-4 syntactically intact by omitting the entry of the canto solo until the end of the phrase for v.4 in m.22.

Gesualdo's different treatment of the syntax results from his avoidance of long phrases. Gesualdo's above-mentioned formal scheme, setting apart the different lines of the text and dividing the verse, disregards the syntax to maintain the general form of the madrigal. Monteverdi was able to distinguish between the different lines of the text through local dominant-tonic relationships while preserving the syntax by treating the verse group in a similar texture, assigning it to the chorus between mm.11-21. Gesualdo, on the other hand, is stagnant in using different forms of structure in his compositions subject to the thesis. Watkins (1991) describes Gesualdo's relation to the text as such; “He is more alert to the possibilities of

savouring, through extension and re-working, the textual climate of a given moment, less concerned with preserving the poetic integrity of the original” (p.142).

Gesualdo's treatment for v.5 shows a structural similarity with Monteverdi's setting. “O voce” is underlined with a monotonal declamation in mm.15-16. Gesualdo's use of contrary motion between outer parts via the leap of a fifth further emphasizes the line by contrasting the choral range between the long and short syllables of the text. The melodic leap of a fourth in the soprano in m.18 and the following stepwise descent brings back the melodic figure from the opening declamation, further stressing the motivic unity.

The above-mentioned stepwise melodic figure comes back again in m.19, in the imitation over v.6. The rhythm is altered to fit the text, revealing the emphasis on rhythmic declamation of the words. The imitative passage is marked by the rapid entrance of voices typical of Gesualdo's imitative style.

The imitation ends with an evaporated cadence on the Phrygian degree of the one flat hexachord in m.22, harmonically moving upwards. The declamation on “stampala nel mio core” further moves to the sharper region via the introduction of the Phrygian cadence of the natural hexachord in m.23. The orderly shifts between different hexachords contrast the lines of the text.

The following phrase on v.7 is in a homophonic setting, followed and preceded immediately by imitation. The rhetorical device in m.22 is called *noema* by Burmeister and it is described as a consonant homophonic section in a polyphonic setting. In rhetoric it is used to allude to a commonplace that is tacitly understood. Gesualdo prefers the use of a homophonic setting for the words “engrave it upon my heart”, alluding to the allegory.

For the setting of v.8, Gesualdo divides the line and treats the short figures in rapid imitation in mm.23-27. The voices pile on top of each other in m.26 and engage in a cadential progression that leads to the authentic cadence in m.28.

The varied cadence degrees of the composition seem to be balanced with the authentic cadence on g, the intermediary harmony of the system, in m.28. The varied cadence degrees and the abundance of modulations in Gesualdo's later style is pointed out by August Wilhelm Ambros, “Gesualdo is a dilettante who went away

from the established paths, and so far away that one could call him the 'the knight wandering about in the maze of modulation'" (as cited in Marshall, 1955).

Gesualdo's cadence degrees highlight all the three hexachords of the cantus mollis system with the use of the three Phrygian degrees authentic to them; Eb-D, Bb-A and F-E. The g chord is common to all three hexachords and stands as the middle region of the one flat hexachord, the balanced middle area of the cantus mollis system. Gesualdo's emphasis on g in m.28 concludes the tension between the flat and sharp regions of the composition and prepares the final passage.

Furthermore, the emphasis on the above-mentioned Phrygian degrees creates a further analogy to the erotic imagery of the text. According to the categorization of cadences of Galilei, the Phrygian cadence is described as soft, weak and effeminate, which is coherent with the erotic imagery in the text.

The final setting over the words of the beloved imitates the opening phrase in mm.29-31. The abrupt juxtaposition of Eb and the use of the Phrygian cadence in mm.29-30 refer to the flatter middle part of the composition. Gesualdo ends the composition with a final authentic cadence on G, preferring the middle harmony of the one flat hexachord, balancing the varied cadence degrees of the composition as mentioned.

2.3.3 Summary

The contrasting of the narrative and the descriptive elements in the text is masterfully reflected by the dramatic setting in Monteverdi's composition. As discussed, he composed the narrative opening of the text as a refrain, coming in between syntactic groups, emphasizing the words of the beloved in a dramatic setting. Gesualdo on the other hand does not reflect the epigrammatic elements of the text in his composition. Monteverdi illustrates the text with an authentic mixture of Netherlandish devices and song-like structures, which eventually enables him to form a dramatic setting, reflecting Guarini's text in its fullness.

Monteverdi's choral declamation in the lower voices serves as the dramatic chorus in *T'amo mia vita*. The systematic contrasting of the upper parts against the lower parts reflects the dramatic text in an authentic way. His song-like melodies from the earlier madrigals influence the solo recitation. The trio-like passages are used in imitative sections, providing the passages with clarity.

Monteverdi has mastered the structural use of harmonic bass and tonal regions in the setting of *T'amo mia vita*. Monteverdi's musical development is observable in every aspect, especially that of form, which creates a contrast with Gesualdo.

On the other hand, it is possible to trace the motivic unity in Gesualdo's setting which we also observed in the setting of *Baci soavi e cari* and *Luci serene e chiare*. His imitative passages are mostly formed by the variation of the motive from the opening phrase.

Gesualdo seems conscious in his preference for a simpler setting and form. The lack of contrasting words and the overall positive feeling in the text is reflected by his refrain from an intense chromatic language. He is stagnant in using expressive formal devices.



3.CONCLUSION

Claudio Monteverdi and Carlo Gesualdo are two distinguished musical figures of the Renaissance who embody contrasting approaches in their compositions. Their compositions encompass a wide range of different forms, including simple forms like the canzonetta on the one hand and the profound religious forms on the other. The madrigal stands in between these poles as the ground on which both composers matured their musical styles. This thesis tries to reveal the contrasting and similar aspects of the developing musical styles of the composers.

The first chapter of the thesis is an introduction to the madrigal form and the texts in hand. The historical background is discussed in this chapter as it is indispensable to understand the contrasting aspects of the musical styles in hand. Monteverdi's interest on song-like forms develops parallel to the spirit of the Reformation in Europe. The northern dominance over the music of the age and the myth of perfection mirrors the conservative approach of the counter-reformation movement. Monteverdi and Gesualdo refrain from being the sword for a side, but instead, they synthesize both ideas in their music. Their music reflects this phenomenon with a balanced mixture of northern and song-like musical devices.

The secular humanist spirit embedded in the madrigal expresses itself with the priority of the text over music. This background of the madrigal branches into the need to create affections over the text. A significant contrast between the composers' style appears in their answer to the above-mentioned need; Monteverdi is widely influenced by song-like structures while Gesualdo focuses on the exploitation of the northern musical devices. The main body of the thesis elaborates on this contrast and traces it in the works in hand.

The second chapter of the thesis deals with the form, melody, text setting and expressive devices in the compositions. Monteverdi's influence from the canzonetta form has been shown in individual elements like melody, phrasing and in the use of structural components like the trio-like passages and duet-like settings. *Baci soavi e cari* from the first book of madrigals demonstrated the use of these devices in their

pure form but at the same time revealed a premature understanding of form and syntax.

The following analysis on *Luci serene e chiare* reveals how Monteverdi incorporates complex Netherlandish counterpoint devices with song-like forms. A mastery of form is recognized in the way he reflects the epigrammatic style of the text. By incorporating elements from the Ferraran style of the madrigal as opposed to the strict Mantuan setting of the first book of madrigals, Monteverdi reveals his greatness as a composer; a constant progress in incorporating different elements into his compositions and masterfully sculpting new pieces, reflecting the text in new ways.

Monteverdi's setting for *T'amo mia vita* completes the analysis of Monteverdi's music by illustrating the final stage of his development as the thesis concerns; the subordination of musical materials to the dramatic pathos in its mature state. The above mentioned epigrammatic style, the synthesis of song-like forms and the Netherlandish counterpoint all act together in *T'amo mia vita* to illustrate Guarini's poem in a way that dramatically surpasses the original text. Monteverdi masters the form, the musical devices and the dramatic pathos in the fifth book of madrigals.

The musical settings of Carlo Gesualdo portray a different path into musical greatness. His setting of *Baci soavi e cari* reveals an abundance of the Ferraran idioms from the start. Gesualdo's melodic figures are influenced by the northern idioms as opposed to Monteverdi's song-like setting. With the exploitation of the complex northern counterpoint in his composition from the first book, Gesualdo foreshadows his musical style marked by an intense harmonic language and motivic virtuosity.

Gesualdo's *Luci serene e chiare* illustrates the second stage in his development. He introduces a chromatic language via the introduction of unresolved suspensions and sequences of root movement by thirds. The use of brisk imitations and the ordering of declamatory and imitative sections is emphasized, revealing the ongoing Luzzaschi influence.

Gesualdo's *T'amo mia vita* contrasts with Monteverdi's setting in two ways. The use of a more straightforward form reveals Gesualdo's disfavor of complex formal structures and the introduction of chromatic figures shows his preference for an

intense chromatic language that we do not often see in Monteverdi's compositions. The introduction of the chromatic figure in m.10 of *T'amo mia vita* is an example of his expanding chromatic language, which is already foreshadowed in his *Luci serene e chiare*. Gesualdo drifts further away from his former Luzzaschian influence by developing his own authentic musical language, marked by intense chromaticism and unusual progressions that serve as affective illustrations of the text.

The analysis of the harmonic language of the composers traces the use of modal and tonal regions in the compositions and reveal their relationship to the text. Both composers efficiently use contrasting harmonic regions to underline parts of the text.

In *Baci soavi e cari* both composers use hexachordal shifts to highlight the symbolisms in the text. Monteverdi reflects the life/death antithesis which is analogous to erotic imagery with the upwards and downwards motion in the cantus mollis system. Gesualdo introduces modal shifts as well, although the logic behind is different regarding patterning. Gesualdo's harmonic language introduces chromaticism and abrupt modulations to highlight textual imagery.

Luci serene e chiare reveals the use of tonal spaces in Monteverdi's music and the increasing use of chromaticism in Gesualdo's compositions. The unresolved suspensions and the dramatic use of cross-relations in Gesualdo's setting hints the abundance of intense chromaticism embedded in his later style. Monteverdi's affluence of fifth progressions and their use in highlighting the sub-regions of the main mode foreshadow the tonal relationships in his later works.

Monteverdi's harmonic language becomes increasingly tonal in *T'amo mia vita* via the structural use of dominant-tonic relations between the parts of the text. The composition reveals an overlap of tonal regions and dramatic expression, with an emphasis on the upper and lower fifth regions of the main mode, dominant and subdominant in the modern terminology. Gesualdo's setting, on the other hand, keeps the modal relations intact but introduces a chromatic figure resembling Vicentino's chromatic tetrachord.

Monteverdi's influence from the native forms develops into the use of harmonic bass and the systematic division of the upper voices against the lower voices. These musical devices evolve into the use of an expanded tonal language in his later works. Gesualdo's preference over small-scale expressive devices on the dramatic parts of

the text extends into the use of an intense chromatic language. The modal relations in Gesualdo's compositions weaken the centrality of a certain tone, enabling him to disrupt the flow of horizontal harmonic relations with affective chromaticisms of various sort, without the need to reconcile the primariness of a mode.

The priority of the text in the madrigal form assumes the use of dramatic musical devices to mirror the intense feelings embedded in the text. Therefore, the madrigal created the specific need that Monteverdi and Gesualdo answered in their own ways, developing their musical language, which evolved into dramatic compositions and profound religious works in their later period.



REFERENCES

- Ambros, A. W.**, (1862-1878). *Geschichte der musik*. Vol. IV, 236.
- Burmeister, J.**, (1993). *Musical poetics* (B.V. Rivera, Trans). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Chafe, E. T.**, (1992). *Monteverdi's tonal language*. New York: Schirmer Books.
- Davis, B.R.**, (2000). *Sorrow, death and musical rhetoric in the sacred works of carlo gesualdo* (Doctorate Dissertation). Available from Proquest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No: 9991290).
- Einstein, A.**, (1924). The Madrigal. *The Musical Quarterly*. Vol.10, No.4. Available on Jstor.
- Escobar, J. T.**, (2004). *Gesualdo's harsh and bitter music: expressive and constructive devices in the six books of five-voice madrigals* (Doctorate Dissertation). Available from Proquest Dissertations and Theses database (UMI No: 3125317).
- Galilei, V.**, (1581). *Dialogo della musica antica et della moderna*. Retrieved from IMSLP.
- Hill, J. W.**, (2005). *Baroque music: music in western europe. 1580-1750*. New York: W.W Norton & Company
- Knowles, J. I.**, (2014). *Modality and chromaticism in the madrigals of don carlo gesualdo* (Doctoral Dissertation). <http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/10127/>
- La Via, S.**, (2013). Alfonso Fontanelli's Cadences and the Seconda Pratica. *The Journal of Musicology*. Vol.30, No.1. Available on Jstor.
- Maniates, M. R.**, (1979). *Mannerism in italian music and culture. 1530-1630*. 370-379. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Marshall, G. R.**, (1955). *The harmonic laws in the madrigals of carlo gesualdo* (Doctorate Dissertation). Available from Proquest Dissertations and Theses database.
- Monteverdi, C.**, (1970). **Appendix A** *Madrigali a cinque voci libro primo*. Cremona: Athenaeum Cremonense

- Monteverdi, C.,** (1974). **Appendix D** *Madrigali a cinque voci libro quarto*.
Cremona: Fondazione Claudio Monteverdi
- Monteverdi, C.,** (1984). **Appendix G** *Madrigali a cinque voci libro quinto*.
Cremona: Fondazione Claudio Monteverdi
- Newcomb, A.,** (2010). The ballata and the “free” madrigal in the second half of the sixteenth century. *Journal Of The American Musicological Society*. Vol.63, No.3. Available on Jstor.
- Newcomb, A.,** (1980). *The madrigal at ferrera. 1579-1597*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Palisca, C. V.,** (1994). *Studies in the history of italian music and music theory*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Palisca, C. V.,** (1985). *Humanism in italian renaissance musical thought*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Perkins, L. L.,** (2000). Towards a Theory of Text-Music Relations in the Music of the Renaissance. In A. Kirkman, D. Slevin (Eds.), *Binchois Studies*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schrade, L.,** (1969). *Monteverdi creator of modern music*. New York: W.W Norton
- Tomlinson, Gary.,** (1990). *Monteverdi and the end of the renaissance*. Berkeley, LA: University of California Press.
- Vicentino, N.,** (1996) *Ancient Music Adapted to Modern Practice* (M.R. Maniates Trans). New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Watkins, G.,** (1991). *Gesualdo: the man and his music*. Oxford: Clarendon Press

APPENDICES

Appendix A: *Baci soavi e cari* – Claudio Monteverdi

Appendix B: *Baci soavi e cari* – Text

Appendix C: *Baci soavi e cari* – Carlo Gesualdo ⁵

Appendix D: *Luci serene e chiare* – Claudio Monteverdi

Appendix E: *Luci serene e chiare* – Text⁶

Appendix F: *Luci serene e chiare* - Carlo Gesualdo

Appendix G: *T'amo mia vita* - Claudio Monteverdi

Appendix H: *T'amo mia vita* – Text

Appendix I: *T'amo mia vita* – Carlo Gesualdo

⁵ All the scores related to Carlo Gesualdo are from IMSLP. See the references for the scores of Claudio Monteverdi.

⁶ Texts are from the Naxos Recordings.

Appendix A: *Baci soavi e cari* – Claudio Monteverdi

V. Baci soavi e cari

CANTO
Ba - ci so - a - vie ca - ri, Ci - bi del - la mia

ALTO
Ba - ci so - a - vie ca - ri, Ci - bi del - la mia

QUINTO
Ba - ci so - a - vie ca - ri, Ci - bi del - la mia

TENORE
Ba - ci so - a - vie ca - ri, Ci - bi del - la mia

BASSO
Ba - ci so - a - vie ca - ri, Ci - bi del - la mia

5
vi - ta, Ch'or m'in - vo - la - te or mi ren - de - te il co -

vi - ta, Ch'or m'in - vo - la - te or mi ren - de - te il

vi - ta, Ch'or m'in - vo - la - te or mi ren - de - te il co -

vi - ta, Ch'or m'in - vo - la - te or mi ren - de - te il co -

10
re,
co - re, Per voi con - vien ch'im - pa - ri Co - me un' al - ma ra - pi -

re, Per voi con - vien ch'im - pa - ri Co - me un' al - ma ra - pi -

re, Per voi con - vien ch'im - pa - ri Co - me un' al - ma ra - pi -

Per voi con - vien ch'im - pa - ri Co - me un' al - ma ra - pi -

15 20
Non sen - tajl duol di mor - t'e pur si

ta e pur si mo - re

ta Non sen - tajl duol di mor - t'e

ta Non sen - tajl duol di mor - t'e

ta Non sen - tajl duol

25

mo - re e pur si mo - re. Quan - t'ha di dol -
 e pur si mo - re. Quan - t'ha di dol -
 pur si mo - re si mo - re. Quan - t'ha di dol -
 pur si mo - re si mo - re. Quan - t'ha di dol -
 e pur si mo - re.

30

- ce a - mo - re, Per - ché sem - pr'io vi ba - ci, O
 - ce a - mo - re, Per - ché sem - pr'io vi ba - ci, O
 - ce a - mo - re, Per - ché sem - pr'io vi ba - ci, O
 - ce a - mo - re, Per - ché sem - pr'io vi ba - ci, O
 - ce a - mo - re, Per - ché sem - pr'io vi ba - ci, O
 - ce a - mo - re, Per - ché sem - pr'io vi ba - ci, O

35

dol - cis - si - me ro - se, In voi tut - to ri - po - se. E s'io po - tes - sia i
 dol - cis - si - me ro - se, In voi tut - to ri - po - se. E s'io po - tes - sia i
 dol - cis - si - me ro - se, In voi tut - to ri - po - se. E s'io po - tes - sia i
 dol - cis - si - me ro - se, In voi tut - to ri - po - se. E s'io po - tes - sia i
 dol - cis - si - me ro - se, In voi tut - to ri - po - se.

40

45 (b)

vo - stri dol - ci ba - ci La mia vi - ta fi - ni - re, Oh
 vo - stri dol - ci ba - ci La mia vi - ta fi - ni - re, Oh
 vo - stri dol - ci ba - ci La mia vi - ta fi - ni - re, Oh
 vo - stri dol - ci ba - ci Oh

50

che dol - ce mo - ri - re Oh che dol - ce
 che dol - ce mo - ri - re Oh che dol - ce mo -
 che dol - ce mo - ri - re Oh che dol - ce mo - ri -
 che dol - ce mo - ri - re Oh che dol - ce mo -
 Oh che dol - ce mo -

55

mo - ri - re! E s'io po - tes - siai vo - stri dol - ci ba -
 ri - re! E s'io po - tes - siai vo - stri dol - ci ba - ci
 re! E s'io po - tes - siai vo - stri dol - ci ba - ci
 ri - re! E s'io po - tes - siai vo - stri dol - ci ba - ci
 ri - re!

60

ci La mia vi - ta fi - ni - re, Oh che dol - ce mo -
 La mia vi - ta fi - ni - re, Oh che dol - ce mo -
 La mia vi - ta fi - ni - re, Oh che dol - ce mo -
 La mia vi - ta fi - ni - re, Oh che dol - ce mo -
 La mia vi - ta fi - ni - re,

65 70

ri - re Oh che dol - ce mo - ri - re!
 ri - re Oh che dol - ce mo - ri - re!
 ri - re Oh che dol - ce mo - ri - re!
 ri - re Oh che dol - ce mo - ri - re!
 Oh che dol - ce mo - ri - re!

Appendix B: *Baci soavi e cari* - text

Baci soavi e cari,
cibi della mia vita
c'hor m'involate hor mi rendete il
core,
per voi convien ch'impari
come un'alma rapita
non sente il duol di mort'e pur si more.
Quant'ha di dolce amore,
perche sempr'io vi baci,
O dolcissime rose,
in voi tutto ripose.
Et s'io potessi ai vostri dolci baci
la mia vita finire,
o che dolce morire!
(Giovanni Battista Guarini (1538-1612))

Sweet and dear kisses,
sustenance of my life,
which now steal away, now give back
my heart,
for your sake I must learn
how a stolen heart
feels no pain of dying and yet dies.
All that is sweet in love,
whenever i kiss you,
oh sweetest roses,
resides in you.
And if i could, with your sweet kisses,
end my life
oh what a sweet death!

Appendix C: *Baci soavi e cari* – Carlo Gesualdo

Ba - ci so - a - ve e ca - ri Ci - bi de la mia vi - ta

Ba - ci so - a - ve e ca - ri Ci - bi de la mia vi -

Ba - ci so - a - vi e ca - ri Ci -

Ba - ci so - a - ve e ca - ri Ci - bi de la mia vi - ta

Ba - ci so - a - ve e ca - ri Ci -

C'hor m'in-vo - la - te hor mi ren-de-te co - re

-ta Ci - bi de la mia vi - ta C'hor

-bi de la mia vi - ta C'hor m'in-vo - la - te hor mi ren-de-te il

- Ci - bi de la mia vi - ta C'hor

-bi de la mia vi - ta

hor mi ren - de - te il co - re hor

m'in - vo - la - te C'hor m'in - vo - la - te hor mi ren - de -

co - re hor mi ren - de - te il co - re

m'in - vo - la - te C'hor m'in - vo - la - te hor

hor mi ren - de - te il co - re hor mi ren - de -

11

mi ren-de - te il co - re Per voi con - vien ch'im - pa - ri
 - te il co - re Per voi con - vien ch'im - pa - ri
 hor mi ren-de - te il co - re Per voi con - vien ch'im - pa - ri
 mi ren-de - te il co - re Per voi con - vien ch'im - pa - ri
 - te il co - re Per voi con - vien ch'im - pa - ri

14

Non sen-te il duol di mor - te Non sen-te il
 Non sen-te il duol di mor - te
 Co-me un al - ma ra - pi - ta Co-me un al - ma ra - pi - ta Non sen-te il
 Co-me un al - ma ra - pi - ta
 Co-me un al - ma ra - pi - ta

(16)

duol di mor - te Co-me un al - ma ra - pi - ta Co-me un al - ma ra -
 Co-me un al - ma ra - pi - ta Co-me un al - ma ra - pi - ta
 duol di mor - te Co-me un al - ma ra - pi - ta
 - ta Non sen-te il duol di mor - te Co-me un
 Non sen-te il duol di mor - te Co-me un al - ma ra - pi - ta

19

- pi - ta Non sen - te il duol di mor - te

Non sen - te il duol di mor - te

Non sen - te il duol di mor - - - - te

al - ma ra - pi - ta Non sen - te il duol di mor - te di mor - te

Non sen - te il duol di mor - - - te e

22

e pur si - - - mo - - -

e pur si mo - re e pur si mo - - -

e pur si mo - re e pur si mo - - - -

e pur se mo - re e pur si mo -

pur si mo - - - re e pur si mo - - -

25

- re con - vien ch'im - pa - ri Non

- re Per voi con - vien ch'im - pa - ri Non sen - te il

- re Per voi con - vien ch'im - pa - ri

- re Per voi con - vien ch'im - pa - ri Co - me un al - ma ra - pi - ta

- re Per voi con - vien ch'im - pa - ri Co - me un al - ma ra - pi -

28

sen - te il duol di mor - te Non sen - te il duol di mor - - te
 duol di mor - te Co-me un al - ma ra - pi - ta
 Co-me un al - ma ra - pi - ta Co-me un al - ma ra -
 Co-me un al - ma ra - pi - ta Non sen - te il duol di mor - te
 - ta Co-me un al - ma ra - pi - ta Non sen - te il duol di mor -

32

Non sen - te il duol di mor - te
 Non sen - te il duol di mor - - - te e pur si
 - pi - ta Non sen - te il duol di mor - - te e
 Non sen - te il duol di mor - te di mor - - te pur si -
 - te e pur -

36

e pur si - - - mo - - re.
 mo - - - re e pur si mo - - - re.
 pur si mo - re e pur si mo - - re.
 - - - re e pur si mo - - - re.
 - si mo - re e pur si mo - - - re.

2. Quanto hà di dolce amore

Seconda Parte.

Per - che sem - pre io vi
Per - che
Quan - to hà di dol - ce a - mo - re
Quan - to hà di dol - ce a - mo - re
Quan - to hà di dol - ce a - mo - re

5
ba - ci Per - che sem - pre io vi ba - ci O
sem - pre io vi ba - ci sem - pre io vi ba - ci O
Per - che sem - pre io vi ba - ci sem - pre io vi ba - ci O
Per - che sem - pre io vi ba - ci O
Per - che sem - pre io vi ba - ci O

8
dol - cis - si - me ro - se
dol - cis - si - me ro - se In voi tut - to ri - po - se
dol - cis - si - me ro - se In voi tut - to ri - po - se
dol - cis - si - me ro - se In voi tut - to ri - po - se
dol - cis - si - me ro - se

11

Quan - to hà di dol - ce a - mo - - re

Quan - to hà di dol - ce a - mo - - re

Quan - to hà di dol - ce a - mo - - re Per - che sem - pre io vi

Per - che sem - pre io vi ba - - ci

Per - che sem - pre io vi ba - - ci

16

Per - che sem - pre io vi ba - - - - ci O

Per - che sem - pre io vi ba - - - - ci O

ba - ci Per - che sem - pre io vi ba - - - - ci O dol -

sem - pre io vi ba - ci sem - pre io vi ba - ci O

Per - che sem - pre io vi ba - - - - ci O

19

dol - cis - si - me ro - se In voi

dol - cis - si - me ro - se In

-cis - si - me ro - se In voi tut - to ri - po - se In

dol - cis - si - me ro - se In voi In voi tut - to ri - po - se

dol - cis - si - me ro - se In voi tut - to ri - po - se

23

— tut - to ri - po - se Deh Deh s'io po - tes -
 voi tut - to ri - po - se Deh Deh s'io po - tes -
 voi In voi tut - to ri - po - se Deh Deh s'io po - tes -
 In voi tut - to ri - po - se Deh Deh s'io po - tes -
 Deh Deh s'io po - tes -

26

- si ài vos-tri dol-ci ba - ci La mia vi - -
 - si ài vos-tri dol-ci ba - ci ài vos-tri dol-ci ba - ci La mia
 - si ài vos-tri dol-ci ba - ci ài vos-tri dol-ci ba - ci
 - si ài vos-tri dol-ci ba - ci ài vos-tri dol-ci ba - ci La mia
 - si ài vos-tri dol-ci ba - ci ài vos-tri dol-ci ba - ci

30

- ta fi - ni - - re O che
 vi - ta fi - ni - re O che
 La mia vi - ta fi - ni - - re O
 vi - ta fi - ni - re La mia vi - ta fi - ni - re O
 La mia vi - ta fi - ni - re

33

dol - ce mo - ri - re O che dol - ce mo - ri - re O che
 dol - ce mo - ri - re O che dol - ce mo - ri - re O che
 — che dol - ce mo - ri - re O che
 — che dol - ce mo - ri - re O che dol - ce mo - ri - re O che
 O che dol - ce mo - ri - re

37

dol - ce mo - ri - re O che dol - ce mo - ri - re.
 dol - ce mo - ri - re O che dol - ce mo - ri - re.
 dol - ce mo - ri - re O che dol - ce mo - ri - re.
 dol - ce mo - ri - re O che dol - ce mo - ri - re.
 O che dol - ce mo - ri - re.

Appendix D: *Luci serene e chiare* – Claudio Monteverdi

VIII. *Luci serene e chiare*

GANTO
QUINTO
ALTO
TENORE
BASSO
B.C.

Lu - ci Lu - ci se - re - ne e chia -

re, Voi m'in-cen - de - te, voi, Voi m'in-cen -
re, Voi m'in-cen - de - te, Voi m'in-cen - de -
re, Voi m'in-cen - de - te, Voi m'in-cen -
re, Voi m'in - cen - de - te, Voi m'in - cen -
re, Voi m'in - cen - de - te, Voi m'in - cen -

de - te, voi, ma pro - v'il co - re Nel - l'in - cen - dio, di - let - to,
- te, voi, ma pro - v'il co - re Nel - l'in - cen - dio, di - let - to, non
de - te, voi, ma pro - v'il co - re Nel - l'in - cen - dio, di - let - to, non
de - te, voi, ma pro - v'il co - re Nel - l'in - cen - dio, di - let - to, non
de - te, voi, non

20

non do - lo - - re. Dol - ci Dol -
do - lo - - re. Dol - ci Dol -
do - lo - - re. Dol - ci Dol -
do - lo - - re. Dol - ci Dol -
do - lo - - re. Dol - ci Dol -

25

- ci pa - ro - le e ca - re, Voi mi fe - ri -
- ci pa - ro - le e ca - re, Voi mi fe - ri -
- ci pa - ro - le e ca - re, Voi mi fe - ri -
- ci pa - ro - le e ca - re, Voi mi fe - ri -
- ci pa - ro - le e ca - re, Voi mi fe - ri -

30

te, voi, Voi mi fe - ri - te, voi, ma pro - vajil pet - to Non do - lor
te, Voi mi fe - ri - te, voi, ma pro - vajil pet - to Non do - lor
te, Voi mi fe - ri - te, voi, ma pro - vajil pet - to Non do - lor
te, Voi mi fe - ri - te, voi, ma pro - vajil pet - to Non do - lor
te, Voi mi fe - ri - te, voi, ma pro - vajil pet - to Non do - lor
te, Voi mi fe - ri - te, voi,

35

ne la pia - ga, ma di - let - to. O mi -
 ne la pia - ga, ma di - let - to. O mi -
 ne la pia - ga, ma di - let - to. O mi -
 ne la pia - ga, ma di - let - to. O mi -
 ma di - let - to. O mi -

40

ra - col d'a - mo - re:
 ra - col d'a - mo - re:
 ra - col d'a - mo - re:
 ra - col d'a - mo - re: Al - ma ch'è tut - ta fo - co e tut - ta san - gue
 ra - col d'a - mo - re: Al - ma ch'è tut - ta fo - co e tut - ta

45

Al - ma ch'è tut - ta fo - co e tut - ta san - gue
 Al - ma ch'è tut - ta fo - co e tut - ta san -
 Si strug - g'e non si
 Si strug - g'e non si duol, muor
 san gue

50

Si strug - g'e non si
 (h) gue Si strug - g'e non si
 duol, muor e non lan - gue. Al - ma ch'è tut - ta fo-co e tut - ta san -
 e non lan - gue
 Si strug - g'e non si duol,

55

duol, muor e non lan - gue, muor e non lan -
 duol, muor e non lan - gue. Si strug - g'e non si
 gue Si strug - g'e non si duol,
 muor e non lan - - gue

60

gue, muor e non lan - gue. O mi - ra - col d'a -
 duol, muor e non lan - gue. O mi - ra - col d'a -
 muor e non lan - - gue. O mi - ra - col d'a -
 muor e non lan - gue. O mi - ra - col d'a -
 muor e non lan - - gue. O mi - ra - col d'a -
 (#) (#)

65

mo - re: Al - ma ch'è tut - ta fo-co e tut - ta san - gue

mo - re: Al - ma ch'è tut - ta fo-co e tut - ta san - gue

mo - re: Al - ma ch'è tut - ta

mo - re: Al - ma ch'è tut - ta

mo - re: Al - ma ch'è tut - ta fo-co e tut - ta san -

70

Si strug - g'e non si duol,

Al - ma ch'è tut - ta fo-co e tut - ta san - gue

fo-co e tut - ta san - gue Al - ma ch'è tut - ta

fo-co e tut - ta san - gue Si strug - g'e

gue

Al - ma ch'è tut - ta fo-co e tut - ta san - gue

Al - ma ch'è tut - ta fo-co e tut - ta san - gue

fo-co e tut - ta san - gue Al - ma ch'è tut - ta

non si duol, Al - ma ch'è tut - ta fo-co e tut - ta

Al - ma ch'è tut - ta fo-co e tut - ta

75

Si strug - g'e non si duol,
 Si strug - g'e non si duol, muor e non lan -
 fo-co e tut - ta san - gue
 san - gue Si strug - g'e non si
 san - gue

80

Si strug - g'e non si duol, muor e non lan -
 gue Si strug - g'e non si
 duol, muor e non lan - gue
 Si strug - g'e non si duol, muor e non lan

85

gue muor e non lan - gue.
 gue muor e non lan - gue.
 duol, muor e non lan - gue.
 muor e non lan - gue, non lan - gue.
 gue muor e non lan - gue.

Appendix E: *Luci serene e chiare* - Text

Luci serene e chiare,
voi m'incendete, voi ma prova il core
nell'indeno, diletto, non dolore.
Dolci parole e care,
voi mi ferite, voi ma prova il petto
non dolore, nella piaga, ma diletto.
O miracol d'amore!
Alma che é tutta foco e tutta sangue:
si strugge e non si duol, more e non langue
Ridolfo Arlotti (ca. 1550-1613)

Serene and limpid eyes,
you inflame me, yet my heart
feels pleasure, not pain, amid the flames.
Dear sweet words,
you injure me, yet my breast
feels no pain, only pleasure, in its injury.
O miracle of love!
A soul filled with flames and blood
is tortured without pain, dies without languishing

Appendix F: *Luci serene e chiare* – Carlo Gesualdo

5

S Lu - ci se - re - ne, e chia - - re,

A1 Lu - ci se - re - ne, e chia - - re,

A2 Lu - ci se - re - ne, e chia - - re, Voi m'in-cen-de - te,

T Lu - ci se - re - ne, e chia - - re, Voi m'in-cen-

B Lu - ci se - re - ne, e chia - - re, Voi m'in-cen-

10

S Voi m'in-cen - de - te, voi, ma pro-va, il co - re Nell' in-cen-dio di -

A1 Voi m'in-cen-de - te, voi, ma pro-va, il co - re, ma pro - va, il co - re Nell' in-cen-dio di -

A2 voi, ma pro-va, il co - re, ma pro - va, il co - re Nell' in-cen-dio di -

T de - te, voi, ma pro-va, il co - re, ma pro - va, il co - re Nell' in-cen-dio di -

B de - te, voi, ma pro - va, il co - re Nell' in-cen-dio di -

15

S let - to, non do - lo - re, non do-lo -

A1 let - to, non do-lo - re, non do-lo - re.

A2 let - to, non do - lo - re, non do-lo -

T let - to, non do-lo - re, non do - lo - re, non do-lo -

B let - to, non do - lo - re.

20

re. Dol - ci pa - ro - le, e ca - - re, Voi mi fe - ri - te,
 Dol ei pa ro le, e oa re, Voi mi fe ri
 re. Dol - ci pa - ro - le, e ca - - re, Voi mi fe - ri -
 re. Dol - ci pa - ro - le, e ca - re,
 Dol - ci pa - ro - le, e ca - re,

25

voi, voi mi fe - ri - te, voi, ma pro - va, il pet - to ma pro - va, il pet -
 te, voi, ma pro - va, il pet - to, voi mi fe - ri - te, voi, ma
 te, voi, ma pro - va, il pet - to, voi mi fe - ri - te, voi, ma pro - va, il
 ma pro - va, il pet - to voi mi fe - ri - te, voi, ma pro - va, il
 ma pro - va, il pet - to voi mi fe - ri - te, voi, ma pro - va, il pet -

30 35

- to Non do - lor nel - la pia - ga, ma di - let - to, ma di -
 pro - va, il pet - to Non do - lor nel - la pia - ga, ma di - let - to, ma
 pet - to Non do - lor nel - la pia - ga, ma di - let - to, ma,
 pet - to Non do - lor nel - la pia - ga, ma di - let - - to, ma
 to Non do - lor nel - la pia - ga, ma di - let - to, ma di -

40

let - - - to, O mi - ra - col d'a - mo - re!
 di - let - - - to, O mi - ra - col d'a - mo - re!
 ma di - let - to, O mi - ra - col d'a - mo - re! Al - ma che, è
 di - let - to, O mi - ra - col d'a - mo - re! Al - ma che, è tut - ta
 let - - - to, O mi - ra - col d'a - mo - re!

Al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - co, al - ma che, è tut - ta fo -
 Al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - co, al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - co, al - ma che, è tut -
 tut - ta fo - - - - co, al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - - - - co, al -
 fo - co, al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - co, che, è tut - ta fo - co che, è tut - ta fo - co
 al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - co, al - ma che, è tut - ta

45 50

co, che, è tut - ta fo - co e tut - ta san - - - - gue Si strug -
 fo - - - co e tut - ta san - - - - gue Si strug - ge, e non si
 ma che, è tut - ta fo - co e tut - ta san - gue Si strug - ge, e non
 e tut - ta san - gue
 fo - - - co e tut - ta san - gue Si strug - ge, e

55

ge, e non si duol, mo - - re, e non lan - gue.
 duol, si strug - ge, e non si duol, mo - - re, e non lan - gue.
 si duol, mo - - re, e non lan - gue.
 Si strug - ge, e non si duol, mo - - re, e non lan - gue.
 non si duol, mo - re, e non lan - - gue.

60

O mi - ra - col d'a - mo - re!
 O mi - ra - col d'a - mo - re! Al - ma che, è tut - ta fo -
 O mi - ra - col d'a - mo - re! Al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - -
 O mi - ra - col d'a - mo - re! Al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - co, al - ma che, è
 O mi - ra - col d'a - mo - re! Al - ma che, è

65

Al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - co, al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - - co, che, è tut - ta fo - co
 co, al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - co, al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - - co - co al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - co
 tut - ta fo - co, che, è tut - ta fo - co, che, è tut - ta fo - - - - che, è tut - ta fo - co
 tut - ta fo - co, al - ma che, è tut - ta fo - - - co

70

e tut-ta san - - - gue Si strug - ge,e non si
 e tut-ta san - gue Si strug - ge,e non si duol, si strug -
 e tut - ta san - gue Si strug - ge,e non si duol,
 - e tut - ta san - gue Si strug - ge,e

e tut - ta san - gue Si strug - ge,e non si duol,

75 80

duol, mo - - re,e non lan - gue,
 ge,e non si duol, mo - - re,e non lan - gue,
 si strug - ge,e non si duol, mo - re,e non lan -
 non si duol, mo - re,e non lan - gue, mo -

mo - - re,e non lan - gue, mo -

85

mo - - re,e non lan - - gue.
 mo - re,e non lan - - gue mo - - re,e non lan - gue.
 gue mo - - re,e non lan - gue.
 - re,e non lan - - gue, re,e non lan - gue.

- re,e non lan - - - - - gue.

Appendix G: *T'amo mia vita* – Claudio Monteverdi

XVII. *T'amo mia vita*

5

CANTO T'a - mo, mia vi - ta!

QUINTO

ALTO La mia ca - ra vi - ta

TENORE La mia ca - ra vi - ta

BASSO La mia ca - ra vi - ta

B.C.

T'a -

La mia ca - ra vi - ta La mia ca - ra vi - ta dol - ce - men - te mi di - ce,

La mia ca - ra vi - ta La mia ca - ra vi - ta dol - ce - men - te mi di - ce,

La mia ca - ra vi - ta La mia ca - ra vi - ta dol - ce - men - te mi di - ce,

10

- mo, mia vi - ta!

e in que - sta so - la si so - a - ve pa - ro -

e in que - sta so - la si so - a - ve pa - ro -

e in que - sta so - la si so - a - ve pa - ro -

- la e in que - sta so - la si so - a - ve pa - ro - la par che tra -
 - la e in que - sta so - la si so - a - ve pa - ro - la par che tra -
 - la e in que - sta so - la si so - a - ve pa - ro - la par che tra -

T'amo, mia vi - ta! T'a -
 - sfor - mi lie - ta - men - te il co - re per far - me - ne si - gno - re.
 - sfor - mi lie - ta - men - te il co - re per far - me - ne si - gno - re.
 - sfor - mi lie - ta - men - te il co - re per far - me - ne si - gno - re.

- mo, mia vi - ta! T'a - mo, mia
 Oh, vo - ce
 Oh, vo - ce
 Oh, vo - ce

vi - ta!

vo - ce di dol - cez - za di di - let - to; pren - di - la

vo - ce di dol - cez - za di di - let - to; vo - ce di dol - cez - za di di - let - to; pren - di - la

vo - ce di dol - cez - za di di - let - to; vo - ce di dol - cez - za di di - let - to; pren - di - la

to - sto A - mo - re; stam - pa - la nel mio pet - to. Spi - ri so - lo per lei Spi -

to - sto A - mo - re; stam - pa - la nel mio pet - to. Spi - ri so - lo per lei Spi -

to - sto A - mo - re; stam - pa - la nel mio pet - to. Spi - ri so - lo per lei Spi -

t'a -

t'a - mol Mia

- ri so - lo per lei l'a - ni - ma mi - a:

- ri so - lo per lei l'a - ni - ma mi - a: t'a - mol Mia vi -

- ri so - lo per lei l'a - ni - ma mi - a: t'a - mol Mia

45

- molMia vi - ta t'a - molMia vi - ta

vi - ta (h) t'a - molMia vi - ta

la mia vi - ta si - a. la mia vi - ta si - a.

- ta la mia vi - ta si - a. la mia vi - ta (h)

vi - ta la mia vi - ta si - a. la mia

45

t'a-molMia vi - ta t'a - molMia vi - ta

t'a-molMia vi - ta t'a - molMia vi - ta t'amoMia vi - ta t'a - molMia vi -

la mia vi - ta si - a. t'a molMia vi - ta t'a -

si - a. la mia vi - ta si - a. t'amoMia vi - ta t'a -

vi - ta si - a. la mia vi - ta si - a. la mia vi - ta si -

55

la mia vi - ta si - a. la mia vi - ta si - a.

- ta la mia vi - ta si - a. la mia vi - ta si - a.

- molMia vi - ta la mia vi - ta si - a.

- molMia vi - ta la mia vi - ta si - a.

- a. la mia vi - ta si - a.

194

83

Appendix H: *T'amo mia vita* - Text

“T’amo mia vita!”, la mia cara vita
mi dice, e in questa sola dolcissima parola
par che transformi lietamenta il core
per farsene signore.

O voce di dolcezza e di diletto,
prendila tosto, amore,
stampala nel mio core.

Spiri solo per te l’anima mia,

“T’amo, mia vita”, la mia vita sia.

(Giovanni Battista Guarini; Rime, 1598)

“I love you, my life!”, my beloved
tells me, and with that one word so sweet
it seem my heart is joyfully transformed
to become its master.

O Love, quickly take this word
of sweetness and delight
and engrave it upon my heart.

Let my soul live for you alone,

“I love you, my life”, be my beloved.

Appendix I: *T'amo mia vita* – Carlo Gesualdo

XXI

„T'a-mo, mia vi-ta!“ la mia ca-ra vi-ta Mi di-ce

„T'a-mo, mia vi-ta!“ la mia ca-ra vi-ta Mi di-ce

„T'a-mo, mia vi-ta!“ la mia ca-ra vi-ta Mi di-ce e in

„T'a-mo, mia vi-ta!“ la mia ca-ra vi-ta Mi di-ce

„T'a-mo, mia vi-ta!“ la mia ca-ra vi-ta Mi di-ce

4

ein que-sta so - - la Dol-cis-si-ma pa - ro - la,
 e in que-sta so - la, e in que-sta so - - la Dolcis-si-ma pa-
 que-sta so - - la Dol-cis-si-ma pa-ro - - la, e in que-sta
 e in que-sta so-la, e in que - sta so-la Dol-cis - si-ma pa-ro-
 e in que-sta so-la Dol-cis - si ma pa-ro - - la, e in que - sta

7

dol-cis-si-ma pa-ro-la Par
 ro - - - la, dol-cis-si-ma pa-ro-la Par che tras -
 so - - la dol-cis-si-ma pa-ro-la Par che tras-for -
 - la, dol-cis - si - ma, dol-cis - si - ma pa-ro-la Par che tras-for - mi lie-ta-
 so - la dol - cis - si-ma pa - ro - la Par che tras-for - mi

11

che tras - for - - mi lie-ta-men - te il co - re, lie-ta-men -
 for-mi lie-ta-men-te, par che tras - for - - - mi lie-ta-
 mi lie-ta-men-te il co - re lie-ta-men - te il co - re, lie-ta-
 men - - te, lie-ta-men-te, lie-ta-men - te il
 lie-ta-men-te il co - - re, lie-ta-men-te il co - - -

14

teil co - re Per far - se - ne sig - no - - re. O vo - ce, o...
 men - teil co - re Per far - se - ne sig - no - re. O vo - ce, o...
 men - teil co - re Per far - se - ne sig - no - re. O vo - ce, o...
 co - - re Per far - se - ne sig - no - re. O vo - ce, o...
 re Per far - se - ne sig - no - re. O vo - ce, o...

17

vo - ce di dol - cez - zae di di - let - to,
 vo - ce di dol - cez - zae di di let - - to, Pren -
 vo - ce di dol - cez - zae di di - let - to, Pren - di - la to - sto, A - mo -
 vo - ce di dol - cez - zae di di - let - to, Pren - di - la to - sto, A -
 vo - ce di dol - cez - zae di di - let - to,

20

Pren - di - la tosto, A - mo - re, Stam - pa - la nel mio
 di - la tosto, A - mo - re pren - di - la tosto, A - mo - re, Stam - pa - la nel mio co -
 re, pren - di - la to - sto, A - mo - re, Stam - pa - la nel mio
 mo - re, pren - di - la tosto, A - mo - re, Stam - pa - la nel mio
 Pren - di - la to - sto, A - mo - re, Stam - pa - la nel mio

23

co-re! Spi - ri so - lo per te l'a - ni-ma mi - -
 - re! Spi - ri so - lo per te l'a - ni-ma
 co-re! Spi - ri so - lo per te l'a - ni-ma mi - a, so - lo per
 co-re! Spi - ri, spi - ri so - lo per te,
 co-re! Spi - ri so - lo per te, so - lo per te

26

- a, spi - ri so - lo per te l'a - - ni-ma mi - a. „T'a - mo, mia
 mi - a, spi - ri so - lo per te l'a - - ni-ma mi - a. „T'a - mo, mia
 te, spi - - ri so - lo per te l'a - - ni-ma mi - a. „T'a - mo, mia
 spi - ri so - lo per te l'a - ni-ma mi - - a. „T'a - mo, mia
 l'a - ni-ma mi - - a, l'a - ni-ma mi - - - a. „T'a - mo, mia

30

vi - ta“, la mia vi - ta si - a, la mia vi - - ta si - a.
 vi - ta“, la mia vi - - ta si - a, la mia vi - ta si - - a.
 vi - ta“, la mia vi - ta si - a, la mia vi - ta si - a.
 vi - ta“, la mia vi - - ta si - a, la mia vi - ta si - a.
 vi - ta“, la mia vi - - ta si - a.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Name Surname: Mert Soykan

Place and Date of Birth: Istanbul, 18.03.1990

Address: Yaverbey Sk, 19/3, Kadıköy-Moda, Istanbul

E-mail: soykme@gmail.com

B. Sc. : Sabanci University, Bachelor of Arts in Social and
Political Sciences - January 2013