

Introduction

Studies of the artistic representations of early modern monarchs tend to focus primarily on either those who spectacularly succeeded (Elizabeth I, Louis XIV) or those who spectacularly failed (Charles I). But what of the whole range of rulers who occupy the middle ground between these two poles, those who muddled through difficult circumstances and achieved a moderate level of success, only to be overshadowed by their mightier contemporaries? Can we not learn just as much—if not more—about the nature of early modern monarchy by examining those who rallied against the odds and persevered in the face of debilitating crises, even if in doing so they failed to achieve a prominent place in the grand narratives of European history?

Holy Roman Emperor Ferdinand III (r. 1637–57) is one such ruler who can offer valuable lessons to the scholar of the early modern era. One of the most neglected figures within the pantheon of Habsburg emperors, Ferdinand III was overlooked by historians already in his own day: aside from an unfinished biography published in 1656, the Emperor did not receive a book-length biography until 2008, 400 years after his birth.¹ This neglect is not difficult to fathom. In contrast to the undisputed triumphs of the emperors flanking his reign, Ferdinand III never saw a major victory during his years on the imperial throne; his reign instead corresponded to the most harrowing decade of the Thirty Years' War, and his lasting legacy is the brokering of a peace treaty that was decidedly unfavorable to the Habsburgs. Ignored not just in the larger histories of Western Europe, Ferdinand III barely has a place in the grand narratives of the Habsburg monarchy.

But it is precisely Ferdinand III's overshadowed position between two giants that makes his reign worthy of closer attention. Ferdinand II (r. 1619–37) and Leopold I (r. 1658–1705) were different emperors with different accomplishments and correspondingly contrasting legacies. Ferdinand II stands out as the militant Counter-Reformer pursuing an unrelenting course of re-Catholicization in the Empire, the success of which was bolstered by military triumphs at the battles of White Mountain (1620) and Nördlingen (1634) and confirmed (albeit temporarily) by the

¹ Lothar Höbelt, *Ferdinand III. (1608–1657): Friedenskaiser wider Willen* (Graz, 2008). The unfinished biography is Galeazzo Gualdo Priorato, *Historia di Ferdinando Terzo Imperatore* (n.p., 1656; reprint, Vienna, 1672).

Peace of Prague (1635).² Leopold I, on the other hand, ascended the throne during a time of relative peace; although no less devoted to the Counter-Reformation cause, his lasting image is that of the peaceful foil to the ambitious expansionist Louis XIV, as well as the patron of (and frequent performer in) lavish operatic spectacles.³ Leopold's greatest triumph, moreover, was the successful repulsion of the Turkish siege of Vienna in 1683, which led to the deliverance of Western Europe from the Turkish threat and helped elevate the Habsburgs back to the position of important players on the European stage.

So dissimilar was Leopold from Ferdinand II that his successes could have never followed directly upon the latter's reign. The elder Ferdinand's projects were unfinished at his death; the Peace of Prague was quickly undermined by France's declaration of war against the Habsburgs, which initiated the final phase of the Thirty Years' War. Ferdinand III's burden was the need to finish everything his father had started; although his maneuvering through the last decade of the war and the Peace of Westphalia may have weakened the Habsburgs' claims to world power, at the same time he managed to bring Ferdinand II's unfinished projects to a close with a relatively (and surprisingly) high degree of success, establishing within the Habsburg hereditary lands a sturdy foundation upon which Leopold could build.⁴

To borrow a popular and much debated trope from historians of the early modern era, Ferdinand III's reign coincides with a definite "crisis" in seventeenth-century Austria. From the Habsburg perspective, this was first and foremost a crisis of authority, as the dynasty struggled to maintain its position as a powerful political leader in the face of a losing war and changing balance of powers within the Holy Roman Empire and Europe as a whole.⁵ The very crux of the Austrian crisis occurred precisely during

² Important monographs on Ferdinand II's reign include Robert Bireley, *Religion and Politics in the Age of the Counterreformation: Emperor Ferdinand II*, William Lamormaini, S. J., and *the Formation of Imperial Policy* (Chapel Hill, 1981) and Steven Saunders, *Cross, Sword and Lyre: Sacred Music at the Imperial Court of Ferdinand II of Habsburg (1619–1637)* (Oxford, 1995).

³ See especially Maria Goloubeva, *The Glorification of Emperor Leopold I in Image, Spectacle, and Text* (Mainz, 2000).

⁴ This point is made in (among other places) Robert Bireley, "Confessional Absolutism in the Habsburg Lands in the Seventeenth Century," in Charles W. Ingrao (ed.), *State and Society in Early Modern Austria* (West Lafayette, 1994), pp. 36–53 and Bireley, "Ferdinand II: Founder of the Habsburg Monarchy," in R.J.W. Evans and T.V. Thomas (eds), *Crown, Church and Estates: Central European Politics in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (London, 1991), pp. 226–44.

⁵ The idea that the seventeenth-century "crisis" was essentially one of absolutism has been argued in Niels Steensgard, "The Seventeenth-Century Crisis," in Geoffrey Parker and Lesley M. Smith (eds), *The General Crisis of the Seventeenth Century*, 2nd edn (London,

Ferdinand III's reign; because he forms a crucial bridge between Ferdinand II and Leopold I, a close examination of his reign is necessary for a fuller understanding of the Habsburg dynasty during a critical time in European history.

A main premise of this book is that Ferdinand III's achievement was primarily a cultural one, a point that has been eloquently sustained in R.J.W. Evans's classic monograph *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy*.⁶ Instead of asserting and consolidating authority through increasingly bloated and ineffective government institutions,⁷ the Habsburgs were best able to strengthen their authority through the promotion of a distinctive court culture dominated by the Catholic faith. Although this culture manifested itself in many ways, one important locus for all cultural activity at court, especially as related directly to the Habsburgs' political power, was the Emperor's public image.

Ferdinand III provides an especially fascinating case study in monarchical representation, for the circumstances of the war forced him to revise the image he had cultivated at the beginning of his reign: that of a mighty, victorious warrior. By examining the revision of Ferdinand's image in the face of increasingly dire political and military circumstances, this book seeks to gain insight into the means by which Habsburg power was secured and stabilized in the troubled decade of the 1640s. In the process, it offers a new perspective on the representation of early modern monarchs, going beyond the well-known examples of such rulers as Elizabeth I and Louis XIV; this is especially true in that the main focus of inquiry, Latin-texted sacred music, has not been explored by scholars as a significant means of monarchical representation.

In recent years, scholars have argued that the representations of early modern monarchs were more than mere projections of a ruler's actual, perceived, or desired power and authority. Rather, in light of a wide range of studies that construe power not "simply as the capacity of sovereign agents to enact their will, but as complex negotiations between rulers

1997), pp. 32–56 and Theodore K. Rabb, *The Struggle for Stability in Early Modern Europe* (Oxford and New York, 1975), pp. 33–4.

⁶ R.J.W. Evans, *The Making of the Habsburg Monarchy, 1550–1700: An Interpretation* (Oxford, 1979). This point is also made in Howard Louthan, *Converting Bohemia: Force and Persuasion in the Catholic Reformation* (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 19–20.

⁷ On the imperial government, see Jeroen Duindam, *Vienna and Versailles: The Courts of Europe's Dynastic Rivals, 1550–1780* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 223–97; Evans, pp. 146–51; Henry Frederick Schwarz, *The Imperial Privy Council in the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge, MA, 1943); John P. Spielman, *The City and the Crown: Vienna and the Imperial Court, 1600–1740* (West Lafayette, 1993), pp. 53–74.

and subjects,”⁸ scholars such as Kevin Sharpe and Louis Montrose have identified monarchical representations as an important site of such negotiations, one of the primary means through which rulers sought both to maintain and also to actively construct their power.⁹ The ruler’s image thus not only reflected perceptions but also shaped them, in a complex process that flowed in both directions between rulers and subjects, mediated by the people in charge of creating the artworks. Representations acted as a dialogue within the shared discourse of power, projecting the monarch’s desired authority while simultaneously responding to the needs of his subjects.¹⁰ In order to maintain his power, a typical early modern ruler could not be a blind autocrat but needed to use his image to address his subjects’ concerns, justify his actions, and demonstrate how he served the people’s best interests, thereby securing good relations with the elites on whom he depended to finance his government, fill the ranks of his army, and keep his state running smoothly. The royal image was thus not only an assertion of power controlled by the monarch but also a means by which the monarch himself was controlled; it set expectations and limits, impressed but also reassured, and above all presented a model for the ruler to follow.

A corollary to the idea of representation as a negotiation between ruler and subjects is the idea that representations were also inherently unstable and open to diverse interpretations, that they held as much potential to undermine as to sustain authority. As Sharpe has written,

Authority in all ages has needed—and still needs—to be performed, written and displayed: to be publicized. But publication and publicization render authority public, that is constructed and determined by public audiences as well as communicated to them. By authoring and presenting themselves, rulers made themselves available to interpretation and so made readers and spectators of the scripts and spectacles of state into critics of government.¹¹

⁸ Kevin Sharpe, *Selling the Tudor Monarchy: Authority and Image in Sixteenth-Century England* (New Haven and London, 2009), p. 9.

⁹ Sharpe, *Selling*; Sharpe, “Sacralization and Demystification: The Publicization of Monarchy in Early Modern England,” in Jeroen Deploige and Gita Deneckere (eds), *Mystifying the Monarch: Studies on Discourse, Power, and History* (Amsterdam, 2006), pp. 99–115; Sharpe, “Representations and Negotiations: Texts, Images, and Authority in Early Modern England,” *Historical Journal*, 42 (1999): pp. 853–81; Louis Montrose, *The Subject of Elizabeth: Authority, Gender and Representation* (Chicago, 2006).

¹⁰ Kevin Sharpe, “‘So Hard a Text’? Images of Charles I, 1612–1700,” *Historical Journal*, 43 (2000): p. 384.

¹¹ Sharpe, *Selling*, p. 18.

This phenomenon impressed upon early modern rulers the importance of persuasion, in service of which the *form* of an artwork and the manner in which it was presented were equally important as its intended meaning. The type of media (medal, canvas, engraving, panegyric, theater, firework, music), the context in which it was presented (court festivity, joyous entry, religious procession, liturgical service), the means by which it was distributed (public exhibition, the commercial marketplace, a gift), the very style of an artwork (overwhelmingly elaborate, classically ordered and balanced, straightforward and popularizing, large scale or intimate); all of this directly impacted how audiences consumed and interpreted the image and to what extent they accepted or contested the ruler's power.¹² Regardless of the specific images on a triumphal arch or the words of a sermon, the sheer experience of being present at a joyous entry and at a coronation mass could announce a city's acceptance of the ruler's power and the divine nature of kingship, respectively; if, however, a picture of the arch or the text of the sermon were disseminated via print, what may have seemed to a spectator an ancillary embellishment could take on a life of its own and assume a new persuasive function for someone who had not been present at the original occasion. A large portrait hanging in a richly decorated antechamber conveyed power through its surroundings, while the same image reproduced in an inexpensive printed engraving could be given an entirely new context and function with a richly decorated frame.¹³ The same piece of music, furthermore, could be received differently when heard in either a private devotional service in the royal chapel or a public liturgy in a large cathedral, which in turn is different from reading the music in the pages of a commercial print.

To achieve success, the ruler thus needed to negotiate carefully between the many means of representation and the contexts in which they could be received, two concerns that will guide my readings of artworks throughout this book. Yet despite this need to direct the audience's interpretation as much as possible, no ruler ever had total control in the creation and distribution of his representations. The most well-known paradigm today is the conscious "fabrication" of Louis XIV through a carefully planned program under the auspices of centralized artistic academies,¹⁴ but that model was neither as "absolute" as is widely claimed nor applicable to the great majority of early modern monarchs. In most cases, a ruler's

¹² The importance of the type of media is discussed in Montrose, pp. 5–6 and Sharpe, *Selling*, pp. 41–52.

¹³ On allegorical frames in engraved portraits, see Elisabeth von Hagenow, *Bildniskommentare: Allegorisch gerahmte Herrscherbildnisse in der Graphik des Barock: Entstehung und Bedeutung* (Hildesheim, 1999).

¹⁴ Peter Burke, *The Fabrication of Louis XIV* (New Haven, 1992).

representation was conceived not by a single centralized authority but by a diverse, heterogeneous group consisting of the ruler, his family, government officials, courtiers, ecclesiastical figures, and other elites (including those not specifically attached to the court), all of whom had their own motivations and goals and for whom the glorification of the ruler could serve to legitimize their own power as much as it enhanced the monarch's.¹⁵ To this must be added the plethora of "unofficial" representations stemming from outside the court, including those created by foreign courts and artists as an homage to the ruler; appropriations of the official image for purposes unintended by the court; as well as underground, subversive images, which had the potential to have as great an effect on a ruler's representation as the laudatory representations authorized by the court. The image was also controlled to no small extent by the artists themselves: the writers, composers, painters, sculptors, architects, engineers, and other artisans and laborers, as well as the musicians, actors, and dancers who brought many of the creations to life. All of these creators could have their own motivations and agendas that affected the inception and reception of the work, and the effect is only multiplied in the case of the grand state spectacles (operas, processions, entries) conceived, created, and performed by epic numbers of people.

As the elected ruler of the large, disjointed Holy Roman Empire, Ferdinand III directly experienced these challenges of successful representation. Even without taking into account the crisis of the Thirty Years' War, the political constitution of Ferdinand's various realms demonstrates the precarious balancing act inherent in any representation. Within his hereditary lands Ferdinand acted as direct sovereign, but he depended on the estate assemblies for the day-to-day governing of his realm and the implementation of his political decrees.¹⁶ His political power as construed by his public image was directed primarily to the estates, whose best interest was served by supporting the Emperor's image in that it helped maintain their own (often considerable) political power. To support his imperial identity, the Emperor had also to use the same image to negotiate power with the electors and other principalities of the Empire, a much trickier proposition considering the varying levels of sovereignty enjoyed by the territories, not to mention the multiplicity of confessional loyalties throughout the realm. This audience, while respecting the institutions of the Empire, had different expectations of the reach of the Emperor's power. On top of this, Ferdinand III, like any other European monarch, had to be mindful of diplomatic relations with foreign powers throughout Europe, for which his image served yet another function.

¹⁵ Sharpe, *Selling*, pp. 20–21, 40; Montrose, p. 105; Goloubeva, pp. 2–3.

¹⁶ Duindam, pp. 274–9.

In all of these cases, the negotiations of power were mediated through the court, which played a significant, multifaceted role in the creation and consumption of the Emperor's image. On one hand, as the main agents through which the image was passed on to the estates and other sovereigns, individual ambassadors, administrators, and other courtiers served as the primary audience for whom official representations were intended. On the other hand, Ferdinand III regularly presented himself outside the walls of the Hofburg, through both processions and religious services in the city of Vienna and frequent travels to other cities of the Empire. On these occasions, the court as an entity served as the main vehicle of the Emperor's representation, together presenting through collective ceremonial actions Ferdinand's image to a broad audience comprising everybody from wealthy merchants to illiterate peasants. Even on these occasions, however, specific messages could be directed to the elites who comprised the Emperor's entourage. The court thus served a unique function as both audience and agent, which emphasizes the fluid, dynamic process through which the Emperor's image was created and consumed.

In light of this conception of the Emperor's representation as a negotiated, unstable commodity over which he could never exert complete control, it may come as a surprise that, throughout the book, I analyze Ferdinand III's image from a primarily "top-down" perspective—as a creation by the court with specific intended meanings—and pay little attention to reception and effectiveness. This approach, however, is grounded in specific practical, methodological, and conceptual circumstances. From the practical perspective, the surviving evidence almost demands a top-down approach; due to the relative paucity of documents (stemming no doubt from the neglect of Ferdinand III by later generations), the vast majority of surviving artifacts presenting the Emperor's image (especially during the 1640s) comes from official court sources, with little to no documentation of the behind-the-scenes machinations that went into their creation: publications (opera libretti, panegyrics, reports of court festivities) issued by the official court printer and other publishers under court auspices, music prints by court musicians, paintings and engravings by artists employed by the Habsburgs, and the like. The dearth of evidence of the reception of these works (in the form of eyewitness accounts of musical performances and court festivities, sales records of commercial products, and extensive evidence of the distribution of works throughout the realm) also creates a circumstance in which we have little choice but to analyze from the top down rather than the bottom up.¹⁷ Due to these limitations

¹⁷ In *Music and Wonder at the Medici Court: The 1589 Interludes for La Pellegrina* (Bloomington, 2008), Nina Treadwell analyzes the work's reception and effectiveness by

(on account of which we can often not be entirely sure who instigated an image), I have occasionally found it convenient to use the terms “the Emperor” and “Ferdinand III” as shorthand for the main agent behind the creation of imperial representations, but in most cases this needs to be understood as a synecdoche for the entire political establishment that had a stake in the image.

This is not to say, however, that I ignore the issue of the negotiation of the Emperor’s image or the malleability of interpretations. For one thing, in instances in which the author of a work is known—especially in the case of the music prints by Giovanni Felice Sances that serve as the main source for much of the music discussed in the book—consideration is always given to the author’s background and possible motivations, with an eye to how those motivations (which may or may not be in line with the goals of the Emperor and his court) may have affected the presentation and reception of the image. For another thing, in regard to published texts, Sharpe has drawn attention to the concept (originating with scholarship on the history of the book) of the “imagined reader” as an agent in their creation, for whom the author devises strategies to guide interpretation and ensure the intended reception of the text.¹⁸ This concept applies directly to the various printed materials discussed in this book, including Sances’s prints. By paying close attention to paratexts and other aspects of a print that add context and meaning to the works it contains, we can explore how the court approached the challenge of negotiating with a diffuse anonymous audience and directing the reader’s attention to an official interpretation. By reading between the lines of paratexts, approaching artworks as multivalent creations, and always keeping in mind the many possible interpretations that audiences may have brought to works, I aim to bring the audience into the construction of the representation as much as possible given the available evidence.

My top-down approach, moreover, accords with the larger goals I have set out for the book. Because I aim to elucidate the means through which Ferdinand III sought to maintain Habsburg authority at the end of a disastrous war, the *strategies* through which his public image was revised serve as more valuable avenues for inquiry than the reception and effectiveness of the resulting artworks. Even if audiences failed to grasp the meaning of an artwork, the meaning that the court intended

comparing the misinterpretations and misreadings in the various unofficial eyewitness accounts with the printed musical score and the official prose description of the event. Such an approach is not possible for me, given the available documents for the artworks I discuss in this book.

¹⁸ Sharpe, *Selling*, pp. 22–6.

it to communicate is still valuable.¹⁹ In the short run, one can easily dismiss Ferdinand III's representational efforts as a failure, judging by the absence of critical reactions to the artworks, the sparse evidence of their dissemination, and the rapid disappearance of the Emperor from the collective European memory. Viewed from a broader perspective, however, the strategies that I identify as guiding Ferdinand's representations lived on beyond his reign; as we will see, they seemed to guide aspects of later rulers' representations. Thus, even if the strategies did not bring Ferdinand III lasting posterity, they were still considered a valid model for later generations, from which fact we can deduce that they must have had some measure of success in promoting the image intended by the court. By examining imperial artworks in light of their presumed function during a critical time of transition for the Habsburg monarchy, I provide new insights into the ways that the arts, and especially sacred music, were marshaled in the service of monarchical representation.

This book falls into seven chapters divided into three parts plus an epilogue. Part I ("Setting the Stage") provides the necessary background for the investigation of Ferdinand III's representation during the 1640s. Chapter 1 sets up the central problem, providing a detailed look at Ferdinand's image as military victor during the late 1630s followed by a discussion of the events of the Thirty Years' War until 1643, during which time the imperial forces succumbed to increasingly disastrous defeats on the battlefield and the Emperor sought unsuccessfully to negotiate peace. This is then followed by an introduction to the main strategy through which the Emperor's image was revised, along with an explanation as to why sacred music proved to be the optimal medium through which to enact this revision. Chapter 2 provides a portrait of the main subject of the book, not through a biographical sketch but through detailed examinations of three important aspects of the Emperor's public life: his roles as Counter-Reformer, politician, and patron of the arts. These discussions, which include examinations of representations that relate to each role, provide a foundation upon which we can better understand the representations discussed in Part III. Chapter 2 also elucidates important concepts that ground my understanding of the Emperor's religious and political policies, most importantly the *Pietas Austriaca*, "anti-Machiavellianism," and "confessionalization."

¹⁹ In this regard, I follow Tatiana C. String, *Art and Communication in the Reign of Henry VIII* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), pp. 4–5: "What this book studies in particular is the *intent* to communicate. It is not a study of the *impact* of works of art in the communication process."

As music (and especially sacred music) has hitherto been little studied as a means of monarchical representation, Part II (“Means of Production”) examines the primary ways in which this ephemeral art was able to contribute to a monarch’s public image, with specific examples drawn from Ferdinand III’s musical patronage. Chapter 3 focuses on the musical performance. It first examines the main contexts in which music was heard at the Habsburg court—opera, Jesuit drama, and the Catholic liturgy—with an eye to how the combined effect of sensory stimuli helped present the Emperor’s image. The final section focuses on the music itself, discussing how sacred music was able to communicate to different listeners. Chapter 4 discusses the representational function of music when disseminated via the commercial print. After a general discussion of the means by which music prints could serve as representation, the bulk of the chapter discusses Sances’s substantial body of publications. The chapter concludes by considering additional prints by non-court composers that also contributed to Ferdinand III’s image during the 1640s.

Part III (“Music as Representation”) examines specific musical works that represented Ferdinand III and helped enact the revision of his public image. Chapter 5 discusses the phenomenon of musical portraiture, pieces of sacred music that present images of the Emperor and communicate the same sorts of messages found in painted or engraved images. Divided into two chronological sections, one focusing on music published in 1638 and the other on music published in the 1640s, the chapter also provides concrete evidence of the revision of Ferdinand’s image. Chapter 6 focuses on two seemingly contrasting aspects of the Emperor’s religious life: his Eucharistic piety and his adherence to mystical theology. The former manifested itself primarily in public displays of piety to a large audience, while the latter resided in the Emperor’s inner spirituality, presented primarily to the educated elites close to him. By examining imperial sacred music composed for these devotions, we learn that, despite differences in style, performance context, and dissemination, both Eucharistic and mystical motets served the same representational functions: providing a mirror of Ferdinand’s devout soul and a model for his subjects (and himself) to follow. Chapter 7 ties together many of threads discussed throughout the book with a discussion of the most important aspect of Ferdinand III’s public image: his devotion to the Blessed Virgin of the Immaculate Conception. Although in the early years of his reign the Emperor’s Marian devotion was of a private, personal nature, by transforming his private devotion into a public cult in the face of a siege of Vienna in 1645, Ferdinand brilliantly used his image to bind his subjects to him and assert his authority. This public cult was exemplified not only by the music of his chapel but by the construction of the *Mariensäule* (Marian column) in

Vienna's *Platz am Hof*, a monument that set an important precedent for Ferdinand's successors.

The book concludes with an Epilogue that provides an overview of the flourishing of artistic representations in many media during the 1650s, which constituted yet another revision of Ferdinand III's image after the Peace of Westphalia. The Epilogue also provides an assessment of the significance of Ferdinand's image and a consideration of the legacy that his representational strategies left for later rulers.

Before concluding this Introduction, I must discuss a few technical matters. When analyzing the harmonic language of music composed before 1660, the conceptual framework of our major–minor system of tonality is inadequate for describing the music's expressive effect. In this regard, I have found especially useful the modal–hexachordal system as explicated by Eric Chafe and elaborated upon by later scholars.²⁰ In this system, the harmonic framework of a composition is conceptualized via the hexachord, a scalar sequence of six pitches that correspond to the first six notes of our major scale. The Middle Ages acknowledged the existence of three hexachords (which served as pedagogical devices): the natural hexachord beginning on C, the soft (or *mollis*) hexachord beginning on F and featuring a B-flat, and the hard (or *durus*) hexachord beginning on G and featuring a B-natural. If the pitches of a hexachord are ordered not as a scale but in fifths from flattest to sharpest (that is, the hexachord C–D–E–F–G–A rearranged to F–C–G–D–A–E), they create a system of three interlocking hexachords, in which the natural hexachord is flanked by the other two hexachords, each extending a fifth beyond the central hexachord (see Table I.1). This system, or *cantus*, serves as a harmonic framework within which we can understand the music from Ferdinand III's court. The entire harmonic language of the composition is provided by the notes of the three hexachords, each of which can serve as the root of a triad. Only the six pitches of the central hexachord, however, serve as the available cadence points.

²⁰ Eric Chafe, *Monteverdi's Tonal Language* (New York, 1992); Beverly Stein, "Between Key and Mode: Tonal Practice in the Music of Giacomo Carissimi" (Ph.D. diss., Brandeis University, 1994); Susan Shimp, "The Art of Persuasion: Domenico Mazzocchi and the Counter-Reformation" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 2000).

Table I.1 The arrangement of hexachords in *cantus durus*

soft hexachord	B-flat	F	C	G	D	A	
natural hexachord		F	C	G	D	A	E
hard hexachord			C	G	D	A	E B

The beauty of this system is that it allowed composers to exploit the sharp and flat ends of the *cantus* for expressive effect, for example by harmonizing one section of a composition with chords based on the flattest notes (B-flat, F, C) and then harmonizing the next section with chords on the sharpest notes (A, E, B-natural). Composers could also create new systems by adding hexachords based on sharper or flatter pitches to either end of the basic system. The most common other system is the *cantus mollis*, which is centered on the *mollis* hexachord and flanked on the flat end by the hexachord containing two flats (E-flat, B-flat, F, C, G, D) and on the sharp end by the natural hexachord. One of the most expressive ways that composers employed the modal-hexachordal system was to switch during the course of a work between *cantus mollis* and *cantus durus*.

In my music examples, I have endeavored to remain true to the original source, which entailed reproducing all accidentals as they appear, even when this produces accidentals that are redundant according to modern practice. The editorial methods employed are those currently favored by A-R Editions in the series “Recent Researches in the Music of the Baroque Era” and include regularizing barlines and placing in angle brackets text repetitions indicated in the source by “ij.”²¹ Obvious errors in the source have been tacitly emended, and editorial accidentals and figured bass have been added in square brackets only when absolutely necessary. In the presentation of the texts of musical works, spelling and capitalization have been standardized, and punctuation has been added. The sources for individual lines in the motet texts are cited in endnotes at the conclusion of the chapter. In the transcriptions of the texts of all other documents, spelling, capitalization, and punctuation are reproduced exactly as in the original source. Unless stated otherwise, all translations are my own.

²¹ See Giovanni Felice Sances, *Motetti a 2, 3, 4, e cinque voci (1642)*, ed. Andrew H. Weaver, RRMBE, vol. 148 (Middleton, 2008), pp. 217–19.