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In Search of the Real Pandolfi:

A Musical Journey Between Innsbruck and Messina

Abstract

by

DAVID RYAN MCCORMICK

Despite the close similarity in composers’ names, it has never been clear if the twelve sonatas of op.3 and op.4 by Giovanni Antonio Pandolfi Mealli (1660) and a set of eighteen sonatas by Giovanni Antonio Pandolfi (1669) were composed by the same individual, especially since the two sets are written in such sharply contrasting musical styles. Using a range of archival and musical evidence, this study suggests, however, that one composer was indeed responsible, and that the difference in musical style can be explained by putting it in the context of the wider development of the sonata in Italy, and by understanding the musical culture of Innsbruck and Messina, the cities in which the two collections appear to have been composed. Focusing particularly on the 1669 Messina set, the study includes modern editions of nine of these sonatas.
Introduction

In 1978, Willi Apel was perhaps the first to note that a set of eighteen sonatas from 1669, attributed to one Giovanni Antonio Pandolfi, had remained almost completely unnoticed by modern scholars and performers.¹ Nearly three decades later, these sonatas still have received very little attention: only one movement of one sonata is known to have been recorded, only a handful of live performances have been documented, and no complete modern edition has been published.² Described on the title page as *Sonate cioé Balletti, Sarabande, Correnti, Passacagli, Capriccetti, e una Trombetta, a uno, e dui Violini, con la terza parte della Viola a Beneplacito*, this set, which has no opus number, was published in Rome by Amadeo Belmonte. These sonatas are often associated with Messina because the title page lists Pandolfi as a violinist in that city and because many of the sonatas are dedicated to musicians who are known to have been employed at Messina Cathedral.

Nine years earlier, in 1660, two sets of sonatas, attributed to one Giovanni Antonio Pandolfi Mealli (described on the title page as a court musician of Archduke Ferdinand Carl of Austria), were published in Innsbruck by Michele Wagner. These two sets, labeled op.3 and op.4, both carry the title *Sonate à Violino solo, per chiesa e camera* and contain six sonatas each. Because they were published at the same time and are stylistically identical, they will be treated here as a single unit.³ Unlike the 1669 works,

³ Friedrich Cerha has suggested that the two sets were published separately solely for the politically expedient purpose of offering two separate dedications- op.3 is dedicated to Anna di Medici, while op.4 is
the 1660 sonatas have received much more attention: there are a number of modern editions and recordings available, and Willi Apel and Ernst Kubitschek, amongst others, have offered stylistic analyses of the works.4

The little scholarly attention that has been given to the 1669 Messina sonatas has focused largely on the wide stylistic departure between them and the opp.3 and 4 sonatas. This stylistic change, along with the slightly different forms of the composer’s name and the lack of opus number in the 1669 set, has led some scholars to suggest that perhaps the 1669 sonatas are the work of a different composer. Unfortunately, there are no other works attributed to either a “Pandolfi” or “Pandolfi Mealli”, leaving no other points of musical comparison.5  If the Pandolfi Mealli active in Innsbruck published an op.1 or op.2, no copies have survived.6 In the course of this paper, however, I will use archival and musical evidence to suggest that both sets were composed by the same individual, and that Pandolfi and Pandolfi Mealli were one and the same person. I will then offer possible explanations for Pandolfi’s change in style by putting it in the context of the wider development of the sonata in Italy and by investigating the musical culture of Messina.

dedicated to Archduke Siegmund Franz: see the introduction to Giovanni Antonio Pandolfi Mealli, Drei Sonaten für Violine und Basso continuo, ed. Friedrich Cerha (Vienna: Doblinger, 1990).
5 A choral work of doubtful authenticity, Tantum ergo a 3 Voci A. Pandolfi is attributed to Giovanni Antonio Pandolfi Mealli in: Enrico Demaria, Il fondo musicale della Cappella dei cantori del Duomo di Torino (Lucca: Libreria Musicale Italiana, 2001), 398.
6 “Opp. 1 and 2 are missing, possibly at the bottom of the Danube inside the boat which sank when conveying the Innsbruck music library to Vienna in 1665. Failing that they may long since have been destroyed, used as book binding or nibbled to bits by church mice. One can only hope that they are languishing in some attic, library, archive, or organ loft, awaiting rediscovery, but there is also the nagging fear that maybe they never existed at all, in which case Pandolfi was indulging in some innocent braggadocio.” Andrew Manze, in accompanying booklet to Pandolfi: Complete Violin Sonatas performed by Andrew Manze and Richard Egarr, Harmonia Mundi, 1999, compact disc.
Musical Analysis of Pandolfi’s Style Departure between 1660 and 1669

To fully understand the attractiveness of the theory that the 1660 and 1669 sonatas were written by different composers, I will first show just how different the two sets are through musical analysis. For the purpose of clarity, in the course of this musical comparison, I will use a single name to describe what I believe is a single composer for both sets: Giovanni Antonio Pandolfi.

To begin, it may be helpful to understand the basic contents of each set. The twelve sonatas of the 1660 Innsbruck set, all scored for solo violin with a *basso continuo* part for unspecified instruments, show the clear influence of the *stylus phantasticus* sonatas of Giovanni Battista Fontana, Biagio Marini, and Marco Uccellini. They contain quick and dramatic changes of character, tempo, and meter and are full of highly virtuosic figurations. It is an idiosyncratic set, pushing melodic and harmonic boundaries. Like most abstract sonatas of the time, full cadences and tempo markings such as Adagio, Allegro, and Largo clearly delineate sections.

The 1669 Messina set, by contrast, contains eighteen sonatas that are primarily dance suites or single dances. The keyboard continuo instrument specified is organ, a strange choice for a set of dance music. The first six sonatas, described as *Capriccetti* in the source, are *a tre* works with melodic lines for two violins and *basso di viola.*\(^7\) The next eight sonatas are *a due* works for two violins and continuo, while the final four works are for solo violin and continuo. Although the *basso di viola* part is listed as *a beneplacito* (that is, at the discretion of the performer), Pandolfi wrote more melodically

---

*\(^7\)* Willi Apel has suggested that *basso di viola* refers here to viola da gamba: Apel, *Italian Violin Music,* 172. However, the range of the *basso di viola* part exceeds that of the gamba and must therefore be one of several sizes of violone, cello, or bass violin available at the time.
active bass lines for the *a tre* sonatas, making it likely that he considered bowed bass as optional only in the solo and *a due* works. The *stylus phantasticus* elements of 1660 are almost completely absent from this set: most movements are simple dances with little eccentricity in the melody and harmony, and even the solo violin works that contain no dance elements shy away from dramatic shifts of character and feature only a few moments of virtuosity.

*I. Form*

In general, Pandolfi takes very different approaches to form in the 1660 and 1669 sets. Every sonata from the 1660 Innsbruck set opens with an Adagio that is often characterized by rhapsodic violin figuration, usually with extensive use of the *trillo*, accompanied by an often static bass line. Though the number of movements varies, there are always at least two contrasting middle sections, and the final section of most of the sonatas features a return to the rhapsodic nature of the opening, usually with an Adagio marking.

The eighteen sonatas from 1669 take a more varied approach to form. There are two single-movement dances: a *balletto* for solo violin and an *a due* sarabanda. There are also two- and three-movement *capriccetti* and *balletti* which begin either with an allemande-like Largo or with an Allegro that often feature an eighth-note pick-up followed by a dotted quarter note. The movements that follow are labeled “La sua Corrente” or “La sua Sarabanda” (a designation that explicitly links these dances to their opening *balletto* or *capriccetto*). In addition, there is a *trombetta*, “La Spata Fora”, that
has many sections, including traditional Adagio and Allegro markings, plus sections marked “Battaglia”, “Arietta”, “Corrente”, and “Sarabanda”. This work is followed in the print by “Il Marquetta”, which has three movements marked passacaglio, aria, and brando. There are also four sonatas with no dance movements: “Il Tozzi”, “Il Raimondo”, and “Il Mauritio” all have three contrasting movements, while “Il Catalano” is a single-movement set of variations.

II. Ornamentation

Pandolfi’s use of ornamentation provides another interesting point of comparison. In his 1660 sonatas, Pandolfi shows himself master of inventive written-out ornamentation figures such as the trillo and groppo, a hallmark of stylus phantasticus composers. “La Sabbatina” is perhaps the best example of this. In the opening section, Pandolfi uses a trillo figure as a recurring motive, with the same figure occurring five times at various pitch levels (see fig. 1a). Pandolfi creates a cyclic approach by returning to this trillo figure in the closing section, this time with two descending notes instead of one (see fig. 1b). There are two other remarkable moments of virtuosic ornamentation in this work. In the Adagio that begins in m. 47, Pandolfi twice uses a remarkable groppo figure that ends in a jarring augmented second (see fig. 1c). Then, at the conclusion of the sonata, Pandolfi begins with a classic sighing figure that speeds up, changes pitch levels, and then slows down from 32nd notes to 16th notes in the final trillo (see fig. 1d).

While the 1660 set uses a rich variety of ornamental figures that are meticulously written out, Pandolfi leaves much up to the discretion of the performer in his 1669
sonatas. In place of written-out ornamental figures, in the 1669 set Pandolfi simply uses the markings *tr* and *t.* to denote an unspecified, improvised ornament. In contrast, Pandolfi uses the *tr* marking in 1660 exclusively to denote the presence of a written out *trillo* and never uses the *t.* marking. There are only five written-out ornaments in the entire 1669 set: two cadential *groppi* in “Il Mauritio” and three *groppo* figures in a single variation from “Il Catalano” (see Appendix B).

### III. Chromaticism

Pandolfi’s 1660 sonatas, like those of other *stylus phantasticus* composers, employ a great deal of unusual chromaticism. One of his favorite techniques is to surround a note with its neighboring half steps on either side, as can be seen in mm. 12-13 of “La Biancuccia” (see fig. 2). Pandolfi is also fond of unusual intervals like the augmented second. As we saw before in “La Sabbatina”, the Adagio at m. 47 features two such augmented seconds, both of which come at the end of an elaborate *groppo* (see fig. 1c). Pandolfi even uses a chromatic ground bass in “La Cesta” that uses all but one note of the chromatic scale (see fig. 3). There is almost no trace of this in the 1669 set, which is characterized by mostly simple, diatonic melodies.

### IV. Virtuosity

Another element that changes significantly between sets is the demand on the violinist.
For example, the 1660 set explores a wider range, using every note from the lowest open string up to “F6” in fifth position on the E-string, with most of the sonatas exploring nearly that entire range.\(^8\) By contrast, the 1669 set only utilizes notes above first position in three works: “Lo Giudice” and “Il Marquetta” have only brief third position passages, while “Il Raimondo” has several high passages.

“La Monella Romanesca” from the 1660 set serves as an excellent example of the variety of difficult figurations Pandolfi uses: rapid 32nd notes with large leaps, arpeggiated triplets and eighth notes, and slurred scalar passages, among others. Throughout the set, these virtuosic figurations often occur over long held notes in the bass. One of the more dramatic examples of this begins in m. 32 of “La Biancuccia” (see fig. 4). A six-measure pedal provides a tension-inducing impetus for violin fireworks that include sixteenth-note triplets, eighth notes, a sighing figure, and a trillo. This all spans the range from the violin’s lowest fingered note to an “E6”, one of the highest notes found in the set. In contrast, there are very few virtuosic passages in the 1669 sonatas. There are almost no 32\(^{\text{nd}}\) notes, and very few extended passages of 16\(^{\text{th}}\)-note figuration.

Archival Evidence for Common Authorship

Despite the striking differences between the two sets that I have just outlined, archival evidence links the biographies of the Pandolfi Mealli active in Innsbruck to the Pandolfi active in Messina, suggesting that the two collections were nevertheless composed by the same individual. After leaving Messina in 1674, Pandolfi spent several

\(^8\) Note names throughout this document are given in Scientific Pitch Notation where middle-C is “C4.”
years in Madrid, where surviving documents shed some light on his life. The archival material about Pandolfi from both Madrid and Messina is largely congruent with the activity of the Pandolfi Mealli in Innsbruck, providing strong evidence that we are dealing with the same individual. The archive of the *Capilla Real* in Madrid lists Pandolfi’s birthplace as Montepulciano, a town in southern Tuscany.\(^9\) The Pandolfi Mealli in Innsbruck may well have spent time prior to 1660 in Perugia, a town only about thirty miles from Montepulciano. Andrew Manze has suggested this link to Perugia due to a pair of sonatas from 1660 dedicated to Benedetto Stella, a Cistercian prior in Perugia.\(^10\)

Montepulciano and Perugia are also both near Florence, one of several places that Archduke Ferdinand Carl and his wife Anna di Medici visited on their travels through Italy in 1652.\(^11\) A number of scholars, including Friedrich Cerha, have suggested that Pandolfi was invited to become a court musician after being heard by the royal couple during this visit.\(^12\) In the course of their journey, they were entertained on their travels with ballets, operas, and other festivities, and hired at least one other musician on the trip,

---


\(^10\) Manze, “Pandolfi,” 4-5. Manze also suggests that Pandolfi was born between 1620 and 1634.

\(^11\) The royal couple also visited Mantua, Parma, and Modena on this trip. Pandolfi Mealli, *Drei Sonaten*.\(^12\)

\(^12\) Pandolfi Mealli, *Drei Sonaten*. While this may be true, Pandolfi does not seem to have arrived in Innsbruck until after the summer of 1653, as he does not appear in a list of Innsbruck court musicians that travelled to Regensburg that summer: see Walter Senn, *Musik und Theater am Hof zu Innsbruck: Geschichte der Hofkapelle vom 15. Jahrhundert bis zu deren Auflösung im Jahre 1748* (Innsbruck: Österreichische Verlagsanstalt, 1954), 364. In addition, there is no mention of Pandolfi in the letters of Atto Melani, a castrato active in Innsbruck in the spring and summer of 1653. Melani mentions a large number of Innsbruck musicians in his correspondence, making Pandolfi’s absence conspicuous. Roger Freitas, personal correspondence with the author; and Roger Freitas, *Portrait of a Castrato: Politics, Patronage, and Music in the Life of Atto Melani* (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 76-88. The only surviving records of Pandolfi’s employment date from 1660, where he is listed as a court violinist earning a salary of 200 guilders for board and 216 guilders for lodging: see Pandolfi Mealli, *Drei Sonaten*. 
opera composer Marc Antonio Cesti, who would become Kammerkapellmeister in Innsbruck.

Archival documents also suggest that the composer’s change of name between the 1660 and 1669 sets was just one of several variants he used throughout his career. Records in Innsbruck list him as Johann Antonio Mealli, Giovanni Antonio Pandolfi Mealli, and simply as Antonio Mealli. In Messina, he was known as Giovanni Antonio Pandolfi and as Antonino Pandolfino. Clearly this was a man accustomed to modifying his name according to local custom.

Musical Evidence for Common Authorship

Although this archival evidence is convincing, a comparison of the 1660 and 1669 sets focusing on different musical aspects than those we previously explored further supports their common authorship. The analysis that follows will, I hope, illustrate that though the sets are stylistically very different, they share some important common elements.

I. Form

Two solo sonatas in the 1669 Messina set have forms closely related to those found in the Innsbruck sonatas, due in large part to the absence of dance movements in these two works. Like the 1660 sonatas, “Il Raimondo” from 1669 has three extended

---

13 Senn, Musik und Theater, 265; 365.
sections with contrasting tempi and time signatures, while “Il Mauritio” has four such sections (see Appendix B). Like the 1660 sonatas, there are changes of affect, though these are more subtle in the two 1669 sonatas due to the lack of slow tempi (the movements are marked Allegro, Vivace, or Presto). Each section of “Il Raimondo” and “Il Mauritio” is in binary form, with each half repeated. Though repeats are extremely rare in the 1660 set, there is one notable exception: “La Bernabea” contains a number of binary form sections with repeats, linking this sonata to the forms found in the 1669 set.

II. Variation Techniques

In his 1660 sonatas, Pandolfi proves that he is a master of variation techniques; well over half of the sonatas have extended sections. “La Monella Romanesca” is perhaps the best example: at 25 measures, the ostinato is exceptionally long and runs through the entire piece, with nine variations in the span of 179 measures. There are three changes of tempo and meter (with the bass line diminished and augmented to match these changes), and the highly virtuosic violin figuration runs the gamut.

Pandolfi uses variation techniques only twice in 1669, though this is not surprising for a set primarily dedicated to dance suites. The passacaglio from “Il Marquetta” does not show the inventiveness of “La Monella Romanesca”, but at 89 measures, certainly matches the breadth and scope of the 1660 works (see Appendix B). However, the final sonata in the 1669 set, “Il Catalano”, is a compelling example of a more refined variation technique. At 28 measures, this is an even longer bass line than the one found in “La Monella Romanesca”, and while the violin figuration is not as
varied or virtuosic as in “La Monella Romanesca”, there is a sophistication here that links the two works (see Appendix B).

III. Bass Lines

As we saw before, the 1660 set is characterized by frequent pedals in the bass line, while the 1669 set has more rhythmically regular bass lines. Exceptions from each set make for compelling parallels between the two. “La Bernabea” from 1660 has no pedals in the bass line, and thus resembles the bass lines of the 1669 solo sonatas. In particular, the 3/2 section at m. 18 has a bass line that moves primarily in whole notes, much like the bass line at m. 16 in “Il Raimondo” (see fig. 5 and Appendix B). The 1669 set has one sonata, “La Spata Fora”, which makes extensive use of a pedal. The tonic is heard for the first 29 measures over trumpet calls, a technique used in nearly every section though never for as long as on this first statement. It is also interesting to note that the Largo at m. 114 much more closely resembles the kind of *stylus phantasticus* figuration of the 1660 sonatas (see Appendix B). This is a moment of intense affect in which the violins, playing in thirds over the tonic pedal, alternate rapidly and somewhat randomly between piano and forte.

IV. Dynamics

This use of dynamics as a device of affect is one feature that links the 1660 and 1669 sets together nicely. The example just mentioned above from “La Spata Fora”
shows a distinctive use of dynamics for the purpose of jarring affect. This is a device found several times in the 1660 sonatas. For example, at m. 189 of “La Biancuccia”, Pandolfi uses a rapid echo figure on pairings of four sixteenth notes (see fig. 6).

V. Virtuosity

Two works, “La Bernabea” from 1660 and “Il Raimondo” from 1669, differ greatly from the other pieces from their respective collections in terms of virtuosity. While the 1660 set in general is characterized by a wide range and many virtuosic figurations, “La Bernabea” maintains a much narrower range that requires no notes outside first position and has fewer difficult figurations, using thirty-second notes in only one brief passage. Likewise, “Il Raimondo” is found in a set characterized by a narrow range and few difficult passages, yet this sonata has several high passages, a range that extends to “E6”, and passages that require large, quick leaps back to first position (see Appendix B).

VI. Melodic Material

Though Pandolfi is more melodically and harmonically adventurous in the 1660 set, the 1669 set does have some striking moments of chromaticism such as the distinctive descending figure in m. 7 of “Il Monforti” (see Appendix B). This particular passage bears a strong resemblance to m. 34 in “La Clemente” from the 1660 set (see fig. 7). Perhaps Pandolfi’s most “signature” figure is the use of the descending half step from
F-sharp to F-natural on the E string. This is a distinctive sound on the baroque violin, enhanced by the shrill nature of the E string and the proximity to the nut. It is found in nearly half of the 1660 sonatas, with one of the most harmonically interesting examples at mm. 74-75 in “La Melana” (see fig. 8). In the 1669 set, Pandolfi uses this jarring figure in m. 48 of “Il Raimondo” (see Appendix B).

There are also some more ordinary melodic figures in the 1669 set that look very familiar. Comparing “La Bernabea” from 1660 with “Il Raimondo” from 1669 is particularly instructive. For instance, a comparison of mm. 72-91 of “La Bernabea” to mm. 51-62 of “Il Raimondo” reveals two major similarities (see fig. 9 and Appendix B). First is the syncopation at the opening of “Il Raimondo”, found in a number of places in both sets. Next is the use of ascending and descending repetitions of sixteenth note figures. The 3/2 section at m. 18 of “La Bernabea” is also very similar to the 3/2 section in “Il Raimondo” (see fig. 5 and Appendix B). Notice in particular the descending iterations of the motives that begin in m. 34 of “La Bernabea” and m. 22 of “Il Raimondo”. Not only are the motives similar, the bass lines both move primarily in descending stepwise dotted whole notes.

**For Church or Chamber?**

If, as I hope I have demonstrated, there are grounds for considering the Innsbruck and Messina sets as the work of one individual, we are still left to explain the dramatic shift in Pandolfi’s compositional style that took place between the publication of the two sets. It is perhaps convenient to simply argue that there is a genre shift here- from church
to chamber- that necessitates a style change. To the modern listener, the abstract sonatas of the 1660 set seem to be squarely in the *da chiesa* mold, while the dance suites of 1669 are more associated with the *da camera* style. However, I would argue that both the 1660 and 1669 sonatas actually show a mix of *da chiesa* and *da camera* elements, making it all the more strange that Pandolfi chose such different paths for the two sets. In the 1660 set, Pandolfi himself unambiguously specifies that these are “Sonate per chiesa e camera.” The 1669 set lacks such an explicit designation, but other evidence shows a clear dual purpose. On the one hand, the overwhelming presence of dance music and the set’s dedication to nobleman Giovanni Antonio La Rocca suggests that they should be seen as *da camera* sonatas. The La Rocca family is known to have had a scholarly Academy in Messina in the 17th century, and Pandolfi makes specific mention of this Academy in his letter of dedication. Thus, it would seem that this music may well have been performed at a gathering of the Academy at the La Rocca home.

On the other hand, there is evidence that Pandolfi also conceived this set as liturgical music. First, Pandolfi explicitly calls for organ as the keyboard continuo instrument, an instrument obviously associated with the church. Also, there is the curious work “La Domenga Sarabanda”, which translates literally to “Sunday Sarabande”. Perhaps even more compelling is the fact that Pandolfi dedicates many of these sonatas to colleagues at Messina Cathedral.\textsuperscript{15} Three works, “Il Catalano”, “Il Tozzi”, and “Il Falvetti”, are dedicated to *maestri di capella* at Messina Cathedral.\textsuperscript{16} “Il Mauritio”

\textsuperscript{15} Pandolfi’s main duties in Messina were apparently as a Cathedral violinist, though the Messina Senate also required him to teach between two and four students: see Donato, “La cappella musicale,” 161.
\textsuperscript{16} Ottavio Catalano was maestro di cappella from 1621 to at least 1647, Vincenzo Tozzi held the post from 1649 to at least 1664, and Michelango Falvetti held the post from 1685 to 1694, after Pandolfi had left Messina: see Giuseppe Donato, “La policoralità a Messina nel XVI e XVII secolo,” in *La policoralità in Italia nei secoli XVI e XVII: Testi della Giornata internazionale di Studi (Messina, 27 dicembre 1980)*, ed. Giuseppe Donato (Rome: Edizioni Torre D’Orfeo, 1987), 142-44; and Keith A. Larson. "Tozzi, Vincenzo,"
appears to be dedicated to tenor Pietro Maurizio, while “Il Monforti” is dedicated to violist Giuseppe Monforte, both musicians at Messina Cathedral. Finally, “Il Marquetta” is dedicated to chapel castrato Giovanni Marquett who was killed by Pandolfi in 1674, five years after the publication of the Messina sonatas.

The evidence thus points to Pandolfi composing a set intended to be performed both in a liturgical setting at the Messina Cathedral and to entertain the La Rocca Academy. There was certainly no great distinction at this time between da camera and da chiesa sonatas, and though dance music was generally not considered appropriate for church, there are in fact a few explicit examples of this, such as Agostino Guerrieri’s 1673 sonatas that include two apparent da chiesa sonatas with final movements that bear the label corrente. Thus, we can view both the 1660 and 1669 sets as sonate per chiesa e camera, making it necessary to look elsewhere for reasons for the large style departure.

A partial explanation is that the 1669 set is largely scored for two or three melody instruments, an instrumentation that often receives a less virtuosic treatment. Also, dance music is traditionally less complex than abstract sonatas. Indeed, a number of stylus phantasticus composers wrote dance music and a due and a tre sonatas that were less adventurous than their solo violin works. For instance, Uccellini’s 1645 collection

---

17 There is one possible dedicatee that has no connection to Messina: Angelo Ferrotti (“Il Ferrotti”) was a castrato who served in the household of Cardinal Francesco from the late 1620’s through the 1660’s and retired from the Sistine Chapel in 1654: see Margaret Murata. "Barberini," in Grove Music Online. Oxford Music Online, http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/subscriber/article/grove/music/01998 (accessed April 26, 2011).

18 Pandolfi apparently killed Marquett inside the Cathedral on October 21, 1674 and then fled on a French ship, first to France and then to Spain. In Spain, he was well-respected for his virtues and died a well-decorated priest. Giuseppe Donato, “Per la storia della Congregazione di Santa Cecilia di Messina nel Seicento,” Nuovi annali della Facoltà di Magistero dell'Università di Messina 1 (1983): 254-5. Archival evidence in Spain shows that Pandolfi began his service in Madrid on April 1, 1678 as a violinist in the Royal Chapel. In 1679, he traveled to Rome on personal business, returning to Madrid in 1682. In 1682, Pandolfi is listed as a “dependent” of the household of Savo Millini, the papal nunzio in Madrid: see Stein, “Desmarest,” 95.
Sonate, correnti et arie is a substantial collection of dances and sonatas for one to three instruments. The set opens with six solo sonatas that clearly display *stylus phantasticus* techniques such as rapid passagework and rhythmic freedom denoted by long held notes in the bass. Yet, as the set adds instruments, the pieces gradually become simpler. Near the end, there is a set of twenty *correnti* for violin solo, with an optional second violin part. These dances are the simplest pieces of the entire set, written in binary form with a very limited range. Marini takes a similar approach in his 1617 collection, *Affetti musicali*. The collection includes works for one to three melody instruments plus continuo, and has both dance music and pieces labeled “symfonia”, “canzone”, and “sonata”. The dance and ensemble music tends to be quite simple, while the solo abstract sonatas contain all the hallmarks of *stylus phantasticus*. This type of collection is characteristic of *stylus phantasticus* composers, where virtuosic solo works appear in collections of simpler dance and ensemble music. Thus, that Pandolfi chose to include less virtuosic, more rhythmically driven solo music in his 1669 set shows a different line of influence.

**Bolognese Influence**

Because we know nothing about Pandolfi’s life between 1660 and 1669, it is difficult to know what these influences may have been. What we do know is that Pandolfi curiously left Innsbruck on February 15, 1660, just weeks after publishing his opp.3 and 4 sonatas. There is no evidence that he departed with a new post secured
elsewhere, and we do not hear of him again until 1669, as violinist in Messina.\textsuperscript{19} However, his 1669 collection provides some musical clues to the influences he may have encountered in these years. Specifically, this collection bears a striking resemblance to the music of Maurizio Cazzati and his colleagues in Bologna, making it a possibility that Pandolfi spent some time there between 1660 and 1669. Though no archival evidence exists to prove this, it is interesting to note that the single surviving copy of his 1660 sets resides in the \textit{Civico Museo Bibliografico Musicale} in Bologna and that Bologna is on the route from Innsbruck to Messina. Careful comparison of the 1669 sonatas with examples from the Bolognese school will make the possibility of Bolognese influence even clearer.

\textit{I. Cazzati}

Through the course of the 17th century, the arranging of the dances in volumes of instrumental chamber music mainly by type (all the \textit{balleti} together, all the \textit{corrente} together, etc.) was gradually replaced by the grouping of unlike dances together. This became especially common among composers active in the 1660’s and 1670’s in Bologna. Because Cazzati (1616-1678) is considered by Willi Apel to be the founder of the Bolognese school of playing, and because his 1660 set \textit{Trattenimenti per camera} was

\begin{footnote}{
\textsuperscript{19} Pandolfi’s hasty departure so soon after publishing his opp.3 and 4 sonatas is especially curious considering the dedication of these sonatas to Anna di Medici (op.3) and Archduke Siegmund Franz (op.4). Had Pandolfi been planning his departure, he surely would have dedicated these sonatas to potential future employers. The timing of Pandolfi’s departure is also strange. He left two years before the death of Archduke Ferdinand Carl, an event that led to the dismissal of many musicians to reduce debt, and five years before the court was dissolved by Leopold I. Either of these events would have been a more natural time for Pandolfi to have moved on.\}


published in the very year that Pandolfi left Innsbruck, he will be considered as a first line of influence.\textsuperscript{20}

Let us first look at the contents of this set. There are eight \textit{balli} paired with \textit{corrente}, labeled with the familiar marking “sua corrente” found in Pandolfi’s 1669 works. There are also two \textit{brandi}, a \textit{passacaglio}, a \textit{ciaccona}, and a \textit{capriccio}. In addition there is one suite that contains an \textit{aria}, \textit{ballo}, and \textit{corrente}. Pandolfi uses many of these elements in his set. The \textit{ballo/corrente} pairs as well as the \textit{aria} suite certainly bear a formal resemblance to the dance pairs in Pandolfi, and although Pandolfi does not use the term \textit{ballo}, \textit{balletto} had an almost identical connotation at this time. The opening \textit{Aria} from Cazzati’s first dance suite nicely illustrates the possible Cazzati-Pandolfi line of influence. Cazzati’s \textit{Aria} melodically resembles the openings of “Il Tozzi” and “Il Muscari”, while the interplay of the top two voices in these works is also very similar. For example, compare mm. 5-7 of the Cazzati \textit{Aria} with m. 4-6 of “Il Tozzi” (see fig. 10 and Appendix B). Cazzati’s later works may have also influenced Pandolfi. Cazzati’s 1662 collection is almost exclusively \textit{balletto/corrente} pairs, while his 1669 collection, \textit{Varii e diversi capricci}, contains a variety of dance movements, as well as a number of \textit{capricci}.

\textit{II. The Second Generation}

But it is with the second generation of Bolognese school composers that Pandolfi has the closest connection. These composers were writing their dance suites after Pandolfi moved to Messina, suggesting that Pandolfi was not directly influenced by them,

\textsuperscript{20} Apel, \textit{Italian Violin Music}, 119.
but rather that they were all influenced by the same environment, perhaps specifically by Cazzati. This was the same sphere of influence that Corelli came into contact with when he arrived in Bologna in 1666, likely a strong influence on his *da camera* sonata style.

Pietro Degli Antonii (1648-1720), who during his lifetime served as *maestro di cappella* of three Bolognese churches and was a renowned cornettist, composed pairs of dances in his op.3 works from 1671. As in the Pandolfi set, each initial dance is linked to a partner using terms such as “sua corrente” or “sua sarabanda”. These initial dances, labeled “balletto”, clearly come from the same tradition as Pandolfi’s *balletti*. This is especially prominent in Antonii’s first Balletto, which begins with an eighth-note pick-up and has many dotted figures, much like Pandolfi’s “Il Candeloro” (see fig. 11 and Appendix B). Pietro’s brother, Giovanni Battista degli Antonii (1660-1696) took this a step further in his 1677 sonatas, creating dance suites of two to four movements. Although they are not melodically very similar to Pandolfi, they show the growing trend of multi-movement dance suites published in Bologna, which Pandolfi seems to have been influenced by.

Pandolfi’s works also share many characteristics with those of Giuseppe Colombi (1635-1694), who spent most of his life in Modena, but published his works exclusively in Bologna. Although organized differently to Pandolfi’s 1669 set, the presence of dance suites in Colombi’s op.3, published in 1674, is implied by the grouping of different dance types by key. Like Pandolfi, Colombi also arranges some his dances into pairs, with a few grouped into sets of three. Some of these groupings are identical to Pandolfi’s, such as *Balletto-Corrente* and *Balletto-Corrente-Sarabanda*, although other groupings, and the use of the Giga, are less familiar. While the *corrente* and *sarabanda* movements bear a
resemblance to Pandolfi, it is the balletti that are strikingly similar. Pandolfi and
Columbi both frequently open their balletti with an eighth-note pick-up followed by a
dotted-quarter. These balletti also make frequent use of dotted figures at the eighth-note
level, showing a striking similarity to the French allemande.\(^{21}\)

The 1665 marriage of Alfonso IV d'Este to Laura Martinozzi, niece of Cardinal Mazarin,
opened the court at Modena to French influences, a likely reason for Colombi’s fusion of
French and Italian styles in his dance suites.\(^{22}\)

Colombi and Pandolfi also use imitation in a similar way. Compare, for instance,
the imitation in opening of Colombi’s “Balletto primo” with that of Pandolfi’s “Il
Ferrotti” (see fig. 12 and Appendix B). Other very similar points of style between the
two composers’ works, such as the frequent use of a distinctive style of cadence in which
the upper voices have a minor 7\(^{th}\) followed by a major 7\(^{th}\) before resolving to an octave,
underline the clear affinity that Pandolfi’s 1669 set has with contemporary Bolognese
publications (see mm. 9-10 in fig. 12 and m. 5 in “Il Ferrotti” in Appendix B).

**Musical Culture in Rome, Messina, and Innsbruck**

In looking for reasons for Pandolfi’s shift to a more conservative style, geography
plays an important role. Pandolfi’s 1660 sonatas were written in and for Innsbruck,
where important Italian musicians such as violinist Giovanni Bonaventura Viviani,
castrati Giovanni Giacomo Biancucci and Atto Melani, and opera composer Marc

\(^{21}\) For examples of typical French allemande rhythmic profiles, see: Richard Hudson, *The Allemande, the

Antonio Cesti were imported to boost the prestige of the music establishment. Innsbruck was also home to famed English gambist William Young, whose lyra viol playing captivated guests in Innsbruck such as Queen Christina of Sweden and English merchant Robert Bargrave. Also, around the time of Pandolfi’s arrival, Innsbruck was home to a new, thriving opera house with Cesti at the helm.

Rome, where Pandolfi published his 1669 sonatas, was also a major European music center. Yet, Pandolfi does not seem to be taking any musical cues from Rome or Innsbruck in his 1669 sonatas. As Pandolfi was leaving Innsbruck, *stylus phantasticus* was gaining popularity in Austro-Germany, as seen in the compositions of Johann Heinrich Schmelzer and Heinrich Ignaz Franz von Biber. By 1669, *stylus phantasticus* had largely been replaced in Italy with less idiosyncratic and virtuosic writing. Yet, in Rome, where the 1669 set was published, the remnants of this style continued to be popular. Alessandro Stradella (1639-1682), Marco Ambrogio Lonati (1645-c.1715), and Lelio Colista (1629-1680) were all writing virtuosic sonatas that featured at least some idiosyncratic melodic lines over held bass notes. Pandolfi could have easily chosen to adopt this style of writing, which was much closer the style of his 1660 sonatas.

The musical scene in Messina provides some clues as to why he did not do this, though there is very little surviving evidence to help with this endeavor. Very little instrumental music appears to have been composed or published there, and examples of the little that was, such as a set of violin sonatas by Andrea Chiarelli from 1699, is now lost. This suggests that there was little emphasis on instrumental music. There was certainly no “violin school” of Messina and no great violinist-composers for Pandolfi to learn from or compete with. The city was focused on the polychoral music of its
Cathedral and the Messina Senate was mostly concerned with keeping up with neighboring Palermo, bringing in singers and *maestri di cappella* from Rome and other major artistic centers. It would thus seem that Messina was a musically conservative city where Pandolfi’s eccentric style from 1660 would have had no place, and without competition, displays of virtuosity would have been unnecessary.

**Conclusion**

While Pandolfi’s 1669 Messina Sonatas may seem conservative compared to his 1660 Innsbruck sonatas, both sets were at the forefront of the styles they were written in. The influence of his 1660 sonatas can be seen in the later works of Uccellini and in Schmelzer’s 1664 *Sonatae Unarum Fidium*. His 1669 sonatas are at the forefront of the development of the dance suite that culminated in the sonatas of Corelli. In fact, Pandolfi in many ways anticipated some of the developments in the dance suite made by Colombi, Pietro degli Antonii, and others. Yet, while shying away from the overt *stylus phantasticus* elements of his past, Pandolfi still managed to put his stamp on these works with the occasional idiosyncratic melodic or harmonic turn and his mastery of variation techniques. We may never know for certain why Pandolfi changed styles so drastically, but we can certainly trace elements of this style to the Bolognese school, and the conservative musical scene in Messina may also have played a part. Whatever the reasons, with charming melodies, a wide variety of forms, and sophisticated variation techniques, these works hold their own as a welcome addition to the baroque violin

---

repertoire and help to deepen our understanding of a critical period in the development of
the Italian violin sonata.
Appendix A: Musical Examples

Figure 1a. La Sabbatina, mm. 1-13.

Figure 1b. La Sabbatina, mm. 164-8.

Figure 1c. La Sabbatina, mm. 47-53.

Figure 1d. La Sabbatina, mm. 175-8.
Figure 2. La Biancuccia, mm. 12-14.

Figure 3. La Cesta, mm. 64-9.

Figure 4. La Biancuccia, mm. 32-8.
Figure 5. La Bernabea, mm. 18-40.
Figure 6. La Biancuccia, mm. 189-91

Figure 7. La Clemente, mm. 34-6.

Figure 8. La Melana, mm. 72-6.
Figure 9. La Bernabea, mm. 72-91.

Figure 10. Cazzati *Aria*, mm. 5-8.
Figure 11. Antonii *Balletto Primo*, mm. 1-8.

Figure 12. Colombi *Balletto primo*, mm. 1-10.
Appendix B: Transcriptions of Selected 1669 Sonatas

The following is an edition of nine of the eighteen sonatas in Pandolfi’s 1669 collection. The scores are based entirely on the sole surviving source, titled *Sonate cioé Balletti, Sarabande, Correnti, Passacagli, Capriccetti, e una Trombetta, a uno, e dui Violini, con la terza parte della Viola a Beneplacito*. The original print is in the *Biblioteca del Seminario Arcivescovile* in Lucca, Italy, though this edition is based on a microfilm copy. The source contains three part books, labeled *Violino Primo*, *Violino Secondo*, and *Organo, et Basso di Viola Insieme*. This edition presents a full score of each sonata. Because the original was printed using movable type, there are only scattered bar lines and no beaming of notes. This edition incorporates modern barline and beaming practices for purposes of clarity. Note values and time signatures are original, unless otherwise stated. Repeat signs are reproduced as they appear in the source, often creating bars with unusual numbers of beats and repeats to unusual places. In the source, most key signatures have a redundant flat or sharp (F#, for example, is often shown in two octaves) which has been omitted in this edition. Otherwise, key signatures have been left unaltered.

*Piano* and *forte* dynamics appear various ways in the source (spelled out, slightly abbreviated and using *p* and *f* marking). This edition uses only *p* and *f* to show dynamics. Dynamics and bowings are sometimes only found in one part, but should be observed by all. Also, this edition uses only fermatas found in the source, despite a frequent discrepancy between parts.
The numbering of the works is the editor’s and is therefore in square brackets. Notes or rests not found in the source but considered essential by the editor have also been inserted in square brackets. The source is inconsistent in its use of accidentals, often marking accidentals already found in the key signature, other times omitting them when they are clearly needed. Also, it is clear that some accidentals should remain for the entirety of a bar, while others obviously should not. In order to both transmit the ambiguities of the notation of the source, and to clarify the editorial intervention, this edition uses the convention that accidentals apply only to the note concerned, with subsequent editorial accidentals enclosed in parentheses above the notes. In addition, the source uses flats or sharps instead of natural signs to cancel accidentals while this edition uses the modern convention of natural signs.

The edition exactly reproduces the basso-continuo figures in the source. No attempt has been made to correct the obvious errors or to provide editorial suggestions where the source does not provide them. Natural signs have been used in place of sharps or flats according to modern convention.

Editorial notes for individual pieces are found below:

1. Il Tozzi

- The time signature at the *adagissimo* is “3” in the source. This has been modernized to 3/4 in this edition.
- At mm. 34-35 in the Violin 2 part the print is smudged. The final note in m. 34 and the first note in m. 35 are an editorial suggestion. The sharp appears to be a manuscript addition to the source.

- In m. 8 and m. 16 in the *Organo* part, a “B#2” is printed in the score. This seems to be a misplaced figure rather than an accidental and appears as such in this edition.

### 2. Il Candeloro

- The time signature of the *Corrente* is “3” in the source. This has been modernized to 3/4 in this edition.

- Eighth rests in brackets have been added at repeat signs to account for missing beats.

There is an extra beat in m. 21 that has been left in this edition.

- The second movement is listed as *La sua corrente* in the Violin 1 and *Organo* part books, but as *La sua Sarabanda* in the Violin 2 part book.

- There seem to be wrong notes in mm. 13-14; no solution is offered in the edition.

### 9. Il Ferrotti

- A reminder of the pickup note appears between the opening *Largo* and the *Sarabanda* in the source, but is omitted in this edition.

- The *largo* marking is missing in the *Organo* part at m. 11.
13. Spata Fora

- Repeat signs are often strangely placed, but have been left as they appear in the source. There appears to be no final repeat sign marked in the Organo part, though there is one repeat unique to the Organo part at the conclusion of the Largo, at m. 113.
- The markings *t.* and *tr* are left as in the source, though the difference in meaning is unclear, especially given that they often appear at the same time in the different violin parts.
- The Organo part is largely printed in lungas in the part book.
- The location of the *piano* marking in m. 5 of the Violin 1 part is unclear in the source. This edition has placed it on the fourth beat to make it consistent with other similar figures. Similarly, the location of the *p* marking in m. 5 of the Violin 2 part is unclear in the source, but has been made to match the Violin 1 marking.
- In the opening section the slurs over the staccato notes are sometimes unclear, but are always assumed to be over four notes.
- Beginning at m. 19, the triplets in the source are written as 16th notes; this edition shows them as 8th notes.
- The quarter notes in m. 22, 24, and the second beat of 25 in the Violin 1 part and m. 22 in the Violin 2 part are printed as a dotted-eighth with a triplet sign in the source.
- There is an extra measure of held “D4” in the Organo part around m. 28 in the source that is omitted in this edition.
- The Sarabanda/Allegro marking is missing from the Violin 2 part in m. 102. The Organo part is missing the Allegro marking here.
- The *Battaglia* at m. 56 is listed as *Vivace* in the Violin 2 book, *Allegro* in the Violin 1 book, and without tempo indication in the *Organo* part.

- The *Organo* part is missing the *Adagio* marking in the *Arietta* and the *Largo* marking at m. 110. The marking *e ariosa* is also missing from the *Organo* part at the *Corrente*.

- At m. 102 and m. 114, the “3” time signature in the source has been modernized to 3/4.

**14. Il Marquetta**

- At m. 90 the time signature has been modernized from “3” to 3/4.

- The *Organo* part prints the ground bass only once, followed by instruction: “*Si replica l’istesso Basso 18. Volte, e poi segue l’Arietta.*” In fact, this bass line must be played 22 times to end at the same time as the violins.

- The opening *Passacaglio* is marked *Allegro* in the Violin 2 part book, *Adagio* in the other parts.

- The Violin 2 part book ends with no repeat sign and an extra quarter rest, both ignored in this edition.

- The *Allegro* at m. 100 is found only in the Violin 1 part book. Also, the word *segue* is used only in the Violin 1 part book at the *Arietta* and *Brando*. In the *Organo* book, the abbreviation “*Arie.*” is used for *Arietta*.

- The direction at the conclusion of the *Brando* is taken from the *Organo* book. Both the Violin 1 and Violin 2 books omit the word *si*. 
15. Il Monforti

-A reminder of the pickup note appears after the final repeat sign in the source, but is omitted in this edition.

16. Il Raimondo

-The Violin 1 part has no tempo marking at m. 16 in the source, but Allegro appears in the Organo book.

-At m. 51, the Violin 1 part is marked Allegro while the Organo part is marked Vivace.

-At meas. 36, the Organo part has a dotted whole note in the source. This edition changes this note to a whole note to match the Violin 1 part and for the correct number of beats in the measure.

-There is no final repeat sign in either part book, though one would be appropriate here.

-The rhythm in m. 19 (and all such places) is notated in the source using a quarter note followed by a colored semibreve.

17. Il Mauritio

-A reminder of the pickup note appears after the final repeat sign in the source, but is omitted in this edition.

-The rhythm in m. 58 (and all such places) is notated in the source using a quarter note followed by a colored semibreve.

-At m. 14, the quarter note is a dotted quarter with a triplet marking over it in the source.

-The opening tempo is Allegro in the Violin book and Largo in the Organo book.
- At m. 17, the Violin part book is marked *allegro*, while the *Organo* book has no tempo indication.

- At m. 32, the Violin 1 part is marked *Presto*, while the *Organo* part is marked *Allegro*.

- The *Organo* book lacks a tempo marking at m. 48, while the Violin part is marked *Allegro*.

18. *Il Catalano*

- The time signature in the source is “C 3/2.”

- The rhythm in m. 13 (and all such places) is notated in the source using a quarter note followed by a colored semibreve.

- A reminder of the pickup note appears after the final repeat sign in the source, but is omitted in this edition.

- The slur in m. 58 of the Violin part could be over four or five notes, but has been made to match the other slurs.

- The Violin part has four extra eighth notes in m. 109. The notes “E5-A5-A5-A5”, which would have constituted a fourth beat, have been omitted in this edition.

- The *Organo* part has an extra measure between m. 66 and 67. A whole note “A2” and half note “G2” have been omitted from this edition.

- The *Organo* part lacks repeat signs at m. 15, 57, and 71. Each of these places simply uses a double bar in the source.
[1.] Capriccetto Primo à3

Il Tozzi

G. A. Pandolfi
[2.] Capriccetto Secondo à3

Il Candelo

G. A. Pandolfi
[9.] Balletto Secondo à2 Violini

Il Ferrotti

G. A. Pandolfi
[13.] Trombetta à 2 Violini

La Spada Fora

All'Illustrissimo Sig. Don Francesco Spada Fora
Amatore, e Professore della Musica, mio Padre Onorevolissimo

G. A. Pandolfi
[14.] Passacaglio à 2 Violini

Il Marquetta

G. A. Pandolfi
[15.] Balletto à Violino Solo

Il Monforti

G. A. Pandolfi
[16.] Capriccetto à Violino Solo

Il Raimondo
Al Sig. D. Pietro Raimondo mio Padrone Singolarissimo

G. A. Pandolfi
[17.] Capriccetto à Violino Solo

Il Mauritio

G. A. Pandolfi
[18.] Capriccetto à Violino Solo

Il Catalano

G. A. Pandolfi
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