

Petr Daněk

Rudolfian Prague as a Musical Centre in its time

The notion that Prague during the reign of Emperor Rudolf II was an important political and cultural centre of Europe has become commonplace in recent decades. And no wonder. For more than a hundred years this assertion has been reiterated by many studies and monographs in a range of social-scientific fields, has served as the subheading for an extensive exhibition devoted to Rudolf II¹ and has been fully appropriated by media and many authors of novels, popular non-fiction, television films and radio broadcasts.² In the following paper, I am not going to challenge this school-textbook truth. However, I would like to discuss the question whether the Prague court during the reign of Rudolf II truly was a musical centre, and if so, to what extent and level of importance.

What did the arrival of Rudolf and his court in Prague bring that was fundamentally original and new in the field of musical culture? An unequivocally new phenomenon in the organism of the city was the presence of the *Rudolfian Music Ensemble*, which came to Prague together with the emperor around 1580 as an essentially established and functioning body of musicians. Rudolf II had taken it over from his father Maximilian and made no significant changes in its personnel. Given his personal interests and preferences, with only few exceptions he paid no particular attention to it even in subsequent years. The musicians, whose presence at the court was essential for obvious reasons, came to Prague almost in their original »Viennese« make-up. This is apparent from archive sources, e. g. Hofstaat, from 1580³ and subsequent years. Besides the music director, this ensemble consisted of two organists, a copyist, a tuner, thirty adult singers, and an unknown number of boy singers. They did not come to their new place of work alone: they were followed by family members, sometimes quite numerous, and occasionally other relatives who were looking for better careers near the court. Also not insignificant in number was the *band of trumpeters*, of which there were about two dozen and who like the singers came to Prague without significant changes in their make-up. For Prague the arrival of such a large group of musicians was decidedly a cultural shock. Hitherto, the capital city of the kingdom (and actually just a small portion of its inhabitants) had known only the music ensemble of the governor, Ferdinand of Tyrol, and occasional appearances by part of the imperial ensemble in association with a few visits by the ruler. However, starting in the 1580s, a group of

- 1 The exhibition *Rudolf II. a Praha, Císařský dvůr a rezidenční město jako kulturní a duchovní centrum Střední Evropy (Rudolf II and Prague, Imperial Court and Residential City as a Cultural and Spiritual Centre of Central Europe)*, Prague 1997, and further *Katalog vystavených exponátů (Catalogue of Exhibits)*, Administration of Prague Castle, Prague 1997, where the most recent list of literature on this topic can also be found. Preparation of the exhibition and partial results of research on the issue gave rise to the Scientific and Documentation Centre for Research on Art and Culture of the Time of Rudolf II: Rudolfiana Studies at the Institute of Arts and Sciences in Prague, which opened on 3 January 2000.
- 2 E. g. novels by Josef Svátek, Zikmund Winter, Gustav Meyerink, the cult book by Angelo Maria Ripellino, *Magická Praha*, Prague 1996, and the popular movie *Císařův pekař, pekařův císař*. The issue of musical culture of Rudolfian Prague has received a relatively large amount of attention from music historians. Especially valuable are studies and works by Robert Lindell, Michaela Žáčková Rossí, Robert Sillies, Jan Bata, Kateřina Mařová, Martin Horyna, Lilian Pruett, Erika Honisch and a number of students of the seminar of Renaissance and early Baroque music at the Philosophical Faculty of Charles University in Prague. Cf. Petr Daněk, *Auswahlbibliographie zur Musikkultur am Hof Rudolfs II.*, in: *Studia Rudolphina* 2009, pp. 142–155; further Petr Daněk, *Partes rozličných autorův starých aneb výsledky semináře renesanční a raně barokní hudby na UK FF v Praze (1991–2010)*, in: *Musicologica Brunensia* 45 (2010), pp. 77–94.

- 3 Cf. Jaroslava Hausenblasová, *Seznamy dvořanů císaře Rudolfa II. z let 1580, 1584 a 1589*. Edice, *Paginae historiae* 4, Státní ústředí archiv, Prague 1996, pp. 39ff.; similarly Jaroslava Hausenblasová, *Der Hof Kaiser Rudolfs II., Eine Edition der Hofstaatsverzeichnisse 1576–1612*, in: *Fontes historiae artium* 9, Prague 2002.

professional musicians very large for its time settled in Prague, and in view of their secure employment with the court, they began systematically to »put down roots« in the city. They were not only performers: many singers as well as trumpeters were also active as composers, and their activity was not only a manifestation of the »uncontrollable talent and invention« of an individual, but essentially a craft. More than once they presented to Prague and then to the whole Kingdom of Bohemia examples of the best that was written in Central and Western Europe in the musical culture of the high Renaissance, both from interpretational and compositional points of view.

Older musicological literature usually dismisses the activity of those court musicians during the Bohemian reign of Rudolf II with a simple observation: they lived and worked isolated from the indigenous musical culture, without significant mutual influences; they were an interestingly colourful but closed enclave within conservative Utraquist Bohemia.⁴ If the influence of the Rudolfian ensemble on the indigenous environment is admitted at all, it is interpreted with a condescending smile in terms of »uncomplicated Czech musical feeling,« something which of course is hard to define.⁵ Are these theses still acceptable even today when there is no need to look for proofs of authenticity of an indigenous culture? Is it plausible to imagine that such a numerous group of musicians should be active for the entire thirty years during which it continuously stayed in Prague, and function only as related to the activities of the court, without getting involved in personal or professional relationships with the locals? Hardly. We can no longer accept this opinion, and many facts from the sources of the time support the exact opposite.

- 4 E. g. Josef Srb-Debrnov, *Dějiny hudby v Čechách a na Moravě*, Prague 1891, p. 42; Vladimír Helfert, *Dvůr Rudolfův: Dvorská kapela*, in: *Co daly naše země Evropě a lidstvu*, Prague 1939, p. 146; *Československá vlastivěda díl IX, Umění sv. 3, Hudba*, Prague 1971, p. 80; Robert Lindell, *Hudební život na dvoře Rudolfa II.*, in: *Hudební věda* 1989/2, esp. p. 104; *Hudba v českých dějinách*, Prague 1989, p. 128 etc.
- 5 E. g. Jan Racek, *Italská monodie z doby raného baroku v Čechách*, Olomouc 1945, p. 9.

The musicians did not live in isolation from the organism of the city. They made their homes in all of the town sections of Prague, physically close to other burghers, entering with them as well as with other strata of Czech society into personal, economic, existential and especially professional relations.⁶ On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the indigenous environment absorbed them only gradually. What else should we expect when their coming was a *sui generis* one-off import of an economically and culturally developed professional group? From a great deal of evidence it is apparent that the members of the ensemble themselves were responsive to their new environment. I think it was only natural self-preservation, for even if the court provided some security for the musicians, their incomes were irregular and actually insufficient, as we know from their repeated complaints. Czech society then naturally became the recipient of many musical activities of the Rudolfian musicians. Not long after the settlement of the court in Prague, composers associated therewith began finding *audiences* for their compositions in the Czech *milieu*. These activities were directly associated with the developing system of Renaissance *patronage* by the wealthy classes of the population.⁷ Thus we

- 6 Cf. Zdeněk Hojda, *Hudebníci Rudolfova dvora v ubytovací knize Malé Strany a Hradčan z roku 1606*, in: *Hudební věda* 1987/2, pp. 162ff.; Petr Daněk, *Die rudolfinsche Musikkapelle und die böhmische Musikkultur, Prag um 1600*, Freren 1988, pp. 39ff.; Jaroslav Čechura, Zdeněk Hojda, Marie Novozámská, *Nájemníci na Starém Městě pražském roku 1608*, Documenta pragensia monographica, Vol. 3, Prague 1997.
- 7 The topic of patronage has become an important area for many researchers, cf. Jaroslav Pánek, *Aristokratické slavnosti české renesance*, in: *Opus musicum* XIX/1987/10, pp. 289ff.; Jiří Pešek, *Poznámky ke struktuře a zaměření mecenátu císaře Rudolfa II.*, in: *Folia historica bohémica* 11, Prague 1987, pp. 365ff.; Robert Lindell, *Camillo Zanotti's Madrigalia tam Italica quam Latina (1590) as Rudolfine State Art*, in: *Prag um 1600*, Freren 1988, p. 193; Jaroslav Pánek, *Renesanční velmož a utváření hudební kultury šlechtického dvora*, in: *Hudební věda* XXVI/1989/1, pp. 4ff.; Jaroslav Pánek, *Dva typy českého šlechtického mecenátu v době Rudolfa II.*, in: *Folia historica bohémica* 13, Prague 1990, pp. 159ff.; Martin Horyna, *Vilém z Rožmberka a hudba*, in: *Opera historica* 3, České Budějovice 1993, pp. 257ff.; Sborník Poslední páni z Hradce, *Opera historica* 6, České Budějovice 1998; Michal Šronek, Jiří Roháček, Petr Daněk, *Václav Trubka z Rovín*.

find gradually increasing numbers of dedications of pieces and whole collections by Rudolfinian composers to members of the nobility and the higher social strata. Some, however, go even further: during his stay in Prague, Franz Sale, who was very active both as a composer and in high society, sent his compositions to people like the bishop of Olomouc, the Rožmberks in south Bohemia and burghers in Wrocław. A few years earlier, the composer Jacobus Handl Gallus, who worked in Prague, dedicated his compositions to the bishop of Olomouc,⁸ but he did not hesitate to send them as well to the *literati* of Rakovník.⁹ In all of the

above mentioned instances the consignment was accepted by the recipients, and the composers were rewarded. Works by Rudolfinian composers also gradually made their way into the repertoire of the burghers' *literati* brotherhoods. Initially their compositions were probably more commonly used by Catholic *literati* brotherhoods, but soon they became part of the regular repertoire with Utraquists.¹⁰ Most popular in Czech society were secular songs by Jacob Regnart, which also circulated as adjusted for the lute, often under Czech names.¹¹

And thus we arrive at another fundamental observation defining the importance of Rudolfinian Prague in the musical life of the Czech lands: the work of Rudolfinian musicians gave rise to a *music market*, the presence of which is an important trait of every musical centre, regardless of the century. The music market created new conditions for the development of all components of musical life. Its existence is best documented by the dynamic development of music printing in Prague, which began in the early 1580s, linked above all to the Prague printer Jiří Nigrin, who during the quarter century of his activity issued more than sixty pieces

Studie o měšťanském mecenátu v rudolfínské Praze, Umění XLVII/1999/4, pp. 295ff.

- 8 Due to the unquestioned acceptance of inaccurate information even in specialised literature, it is necessary to emphasise that Jacobus Handl Gallus worked in Prague outside the court ensemble. In recent years his work has been systematically studied by Slovenian colleagues, who among other accomplishments very carefully prepared a new edition of Handl's works – cf. *Monumenta artis musicae Sloveniae*, Ljubljana 1985–2010, where to date 22 volumes of Handl's compositions were published; further, a catalogue of Handl's compositions published in print – cf. *Gallusov katalóg, Seznam Gallusovih skladb*, ed. E. Škulj, Ljubljana 1992, and a number of thematic collections on the anniversary of Handl's death – cf. *Gallusovi predgovori in drugi dokumenti*, ed. E. Škulj, Ljubljana 1991; *Gallusov zbornik, Príspevki k Gallusovi biografiji*, Ljubljana 1991; *Gallus Carniolus in evropska renesansa I.–II.*, edd. D. Cvetko, D. Pokorn, Ljubljana 1991.
- 9 For Franz Sale, cf. letter from the bishop's office dated in Olomouc, 11 January 1594, cf. Brno, Státní oblastní archiv, Fond G 83, Matice moravská, inventory number 156–200, Kopiař 33 fol. 2–3. For notification I owe my thanks to Prof. Jiří Sehnal; František Mareš, *Rožmberská kapela, Časopis Musea království českého 1894*, p. 217; Soa Třeboň, CR z Rožmberka 23a, fasc. V, komorní účty, No. 3; Sale dedicated his Prague print of *Dialogismus octo vocum de amore Christi sponsi* from 1598 to the municipal council in Wrocław, complete specimen stored in the music department of the National Library in Prague under the call number 59 E 710. The newest contribution to Sale's stay in the Czech lands is the work by Jana Vedralová, *Francesco Sale: Canzonette, Vilanelle & Neapolitane*, Prague 1594, essay, Ústav hudební vědy FF UK, Prague 1999, Šárka Hálečková, *Varhanní introity Franze Sale ve vídeňském rukopisu Ms. XiV.714*, essay, Ústav hudební vědy FF UK, Prague 2011, and Petr Daněk, *Dum pulsantur organa. Znovunalezený tisk Francisca Saleho z dílny Jiřího Nigrina (1598)*, in: *Per saecula ad tempora nostra. Collection of works for the sixtieth birthday of Prof. Jaroslav Pánek*, Prague 2007, pp. 434–440. For

Handl Gallus cf. *Gallusovi predgovori in drugi dokumenti*, ed. E. Škulj, Ljubljana 1991, pp. 18ff., also Zikmund Winter, *Spisovatelé a umělci na žebrotě, Sebrané spisy Z. Wintera sv. XI, Ze starodávných radnic*, Prague, undated, p. 106.

- 10 Besides those in print, works of Rudolfinian composers are found e.g. in the *literati* manuscripts from Kutná Hora (Luython, Schoendorf, Monte, Regnart), Prague (Regnart, Monte, Luython), Český Krumlov (Sale, Kerle, Monte), Rokycany (Luython), Chlumec n. Cidlinou (Luython), Jaroměř (Monte, Regnart), Ústí n. L. (Regnart, Zanotti, Monte), and Klatovy (Monte). Rudolfinian musicians are also listed under their compositions in a noteworthy manuscript of uncertain provenance, today in Brno, Department of music history of the Moravian Museum, call number A 7077 (Monte, Regnart). See also Theodora Straková, *Vokálně polyfonní skladby na Moravě v 16. a na začátku 17. století*, 3. *Hudební instituce na Moravě a jejich repertoár*, in: *Časopis moravského muzea LXVIII*, 1983, pp. 152–153; Theodora Straková, *Sborníky vokálně-polyfonních skladeb na Moravě*, in: *Nové poznatky o dějinách starší české a slovenské hudby*, Prague 1988, pp. 63–70.
- 11 Cf. Jiří Tichota, *Bohemika a český repertoár v tabulaturách pro renesanční loutnu*, in: *Miscellanea musicologica XXXI*, Prague 1984, esp. p. 190.

of music in print.¹² The majority of composers represented therein were court musicians, and it is clear that Nigrin expected sales of his printed works not only in the Czech lands but abroad as well. Besides Nigrin, some other printers attempted to publish music. Besides many simple and even occasional efforts,¹³ an ambitious project was accomplished in the years 1609 and 1611 by another Prague printer, Nicolaus Strauss, who in those years published a collection of polyphonic masses by the emperor's organist, Charles Luython, in a technically demanding folio format. The music-printing production of Prague workshops is so considerable that together with the origin of a local market it also substantiates the place of Prague within a European framework. It is not uninteresting that as late as the 1630s music printed in Prague appears in the offerings of contemporary German book trade fairs. And the reverse is also true: the involvement of Prague and Bohemia in the international trade in printed music is evidenced today by the more than two hundred printed works of vocal polyphony, which can be found in Czech archives and libraries.¹⁴ Although it is only a fraction of the original amount, it is so varied that it makes clear that in the late 16th century music from all over Europe of those times, including the newest production, was being performed in the Czech lands. One of the impulses given to Czech

musical culture by the court was the expansion of the forms and genres of music performed in the Czech lands in favour of more secular and modern pieces. At the same time, however, the question also arises as to why this import and also the considerable production of villanellas, canzonettas, madrigals and other types of secular compositions by Rudolfian composers did not encourage original Czech secular music with Czech texts on a broader scale than it is suggested by the documents preserved. Similarly underestimated and unappreciated – both historically and commercially – is the fact that many court composers living in the Czech lands published their works in foreign printing offices. The collections of one of the most famous of them, Philippe de Monte, especially in the last two decades of his life, might serve as an example. Although they were written in Prague, which is attested by dedications dated in that city, they were published in renowned printing offices in Venice and Antwerp.¹⁵

We would be facing many similar questions were we to study the incidence and work of *instrumentalists and instrument makers*. Whereas in the decades preceding the move of the imperial court to Prague, instrumentalists and instrument makers were not very numerous and limited to town trumpeters, organists, and players of unspecified instruments, after the arrival of the court we find more abundant evidence of their presence, of the diversity of instruments and of their work. Professional instrumentalists appeared also among the burghers, as well as in the service of the nobility. And there was a concomitant growth in the number of musical instruments owned by members of all strata of Czech society. This is attested by inheritance documents as well as by property registers of noblemen.¹⁶ This

12 For Nigrin, in more detail see in particular Miriam Bohatcová, Josef Hejnic, *Knihovna Jiříka Nigrina a jednotlivé »Prorocství« Jindřicha Demetriana*, Sborník Národního muzea v Praze, Prague 1981, pp. 73ff.; Petr Daněk, *Nototiskařská činnost Jiřího Nigrina*, in: *Hudební věda XXIV/1987/2*, pp. 121ff.; Petr Daněk, *Tisky vokální polyfonie pražské provenience do roku 1620*, in: *Documenta pragensia X/1*, Prague 1990, pp. 219ff.

13 Cf. Strauss's single sheet *Gratulatio Oder Glückwünschung* from 1612 printed in the studio of Robert Lach, *Drei musikalische Einblattdrücke aus der Zeit des dreissigjährigen Krieges*, in: *AfMw I/1918*, p. 236.

14 Cf. Petr Daněk, *Tisky vokální polyfonie, hudební teorie a tabulatur v Čechách, 1500–1630*, dissertation thesis, FF UK, Prague 2005, where a commented list of prints kept in the Czech Republic can be found. One also finds a similar situation in Moravia, as shown in the study by Theodora Straková, *Vokálně polyfonní skladby na Moravě v 16. a na počátku 17. století*, in: *Časopis moravského muzea LXVI–LXVIII*, 1981–1983.

15 The first dedication of a Monte collection dated from Prague is apparently *Il Libro sesto de Madrigali à Cinque Voci* from May 1575; the last one is from January 1600 for the collection *Il Libro Secondo di Madrigali à 7 voci*. Cf. Georg van Doorslaer, *La vie et les oeuvres de Philippe de Monte (1521–1603)*, Brussels 1921, pp. 219 and 232.

16 An interesting contribution to the question is the study by Jiří Pešek, *Z pražské hudební kultury měšťanského soukromí před Bílou horou*, in: *Hudební věda XX/1983/3*, pp. 242ff.

emancipation of instruments is undoubtedly related to the penetration of new style tendencies in music, which were especially rooted in Italy. Also in this respect members of the Prague court probably played their irreplaceable part. During its work in Prague the ensemble kept changing, and in a certain way it witnessed developments in its national and professional make-up.

Not without significance is the fact that many musicians died in Prague: among others, Giovanni Battista Pinello in 1587, Camillo Zanotti in 1591, Jacobus de Kerle in 1591, Paul de Winde in 1596, Franz Sale in 1599, Jacob Regnart in 1599, and Philippe de Monte in 1603. And they were replaced by others. The way new members of the ensemble were selected is in itself an example of how Prague had become a truly important musical centre of Europe at that time. Two documentable trends provide examples: among musicians we begin to find the same surnames repeatedly, sometimes in several generations, and at the same time, it is also clear that Rudolfinian Prague began to attract musicians from relatively remote and very diverse regions of Europe. It is also of interest that some musicians attempted to obtain a position at the court but failed to do so despite their relatively high degree of renown (as in the case of Tiburtio Massaino)¹⁷ or succeeded only after a second attempt (Giovanni Battista Pinello)¹⁸.

An interesting phenomenon in this regard is the popularity of Rudolfinian Prague among musicians from northern Italy, especially from Brescia, Udine and Cremona. Whole families, especially of trumpeters, moved from these cities to Prague near the end of the century to find new jobs and

de facto also new homes,¹⁹ including the families of Turini, Galeno, Mosto, Orologio and Sagabria. The Prague work of several generations of the Mosto family is still today attested by the tombstone in the cloister of the St. Thomas Monastery in Malá Strana. It is remarkable that the court was not *a priori* closed to the local population; among the members of the ensemble, soon after its move, we also find names of Czech origin (Kašpar Třeboňský, Václav Pondělí, Bedřich Pernica, Andres Krejčí).²⁰ The court musicians were sometimes rewarded for their services by special favour of the emperor, which was manifested, for example, by his sending a personal wedding gift (Sinibaldi, 1579) or by repeated ennoblement (e.g. Luython 1587, Ardesi brothers 1589, Jan Sixt 1601, Zigotta 1602).²¹

Whether collectively or as individuals, musicians of the imperial court working in Prague became *authorities* in musical matters, something which in my judgement is another prerequisite for the successful functioning of any centre. They were visited and consulted, they served as mediators in securing music and instruments, and most importantly they were invited for celebrations and

17 Cf. Tiburtio Massaino, *Motetten und Instrumentalcanzonen*, Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich, Bd. 110, Graz, Wien 1964, ed. R. Monterosso; E. Hintermaier, *Die Kirchenmusik und Liturgie-Reform Wolf Dietrichs*, in: *4. Salzburger Landesausstellung Fürsterbischof Wolf Dietrich von Raitenau Gründer des barocken Salzburg*, catalogue, Salzburg 1987, esp. pp. 299–300.

18 Cf. Pavla Němcová, *Giovanni Battista Pinello. Muteta quinque vocum, Pragae 1588. Příspěvek k poznání hudební kultury předbělohorských Čech*, diplomová práce, Ústav hudební vědy FF UK, Prague 1996.

19 G. Vale, *La Cappella musicale del Duomo di Udine*, in: *Note d'Archivio per la storia musicale* 7, Roma 1930, pp. 87ff.; C. Lunelli, *Notizie di alcuni musicisti a Praga nel cinquecento*, in: *Atti dell'Accademia Roveretana degli agiati contributi della classe di scienze filosofico - storiche e di lettere*, 1970–73, pp. 137142; Michaela Žáčková Rossi, *Gregorio Turini. Život a dílo rudolfinského hudebníka s několika rožmberskými střípky v závěru*, in: *Folia Historica Bohemica* 19, Prague 1998, pp. 59ff.

20 Cf. Ludwig R. Köchel, *Kaiserliche Hofmusikkapelle in Wien von 1543 bis 1867*, Wien 1869, Albert Smijers, *Die kaiserliche Hofmusik-Kapelle von 1543–1619*, Studien zur Musikwissenschaft 1919/6, pp. 139–186, 1920/7, pp. 102–142, 1921/8, pp. 176–206, 1922/9, pp. 43–81; Dušan Šlosar, Miloš Štědroň, *Zúdobí rudolfinské kapely některá česká jména*, in: *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity*, H 18, 1983, pp. 31–33; Jaroslava Hausenblasová, *Der Hof Kaiser Rudolfs II., Eine Edition der Hofstaatsverzeichnisse 1576–1612*, *Fontes historiae artium* 9, Prague 2002.

21 Cf. Videň, Haus-, Hof- und Staatsarchiv, Familienakten S 100, Musicus Mauro Sinibaldi, 22.11.1579, and further Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv, Reichsakten – Nobilitatis, Charles Luython 1.4.1587, Ardesiové 15.9.1589, Jan Sixt z Lerchenfelsu 3.9.1601, Lucas Zigotta 3.9.1602 ad.

other special occasions.²² Here are a few examples: in the 1590s, trumpeter and imperial musician Lukáš Zigotta (apparently quite well-known in Prague)²³ supplied Ladislav Velen of Žerotín with scores, strings, musical instruments and fresh information about happenings at the Prague court.²⁴ At the same time the Rožmberks sent him »six boys to learn music.«²⁵ The emperor's organist visited South Bohemia in 1593 for a guest appearance.²⁶ During his visit to Prague in 1600, Pierre Bergeron noted in his diary the occasions on which he had met the court ensemble, and he abounded in praise: »On Friday, 28 July, eighteen trumpeters and two timpanists came on the order of His Majesty to the residence of the marshal to play at his table [...] On Thursday 3 August, the marquis and I went to visit the agent from Mantua, and then continued for dinner with the marquis of Castiglione. [...] While we were at table, a servant kept the air fresh with a big fan, and during the meal we were entertained by the excellent imperial ensemble with an outstanding viola player.«²⁷ The emperor's musicians apparently played at many quite diverse social events: in 1611 an imperial orchestra consisting of many members performed, with the emperor's blessing, when the

foundation stone was laid for the Lutheran Church of the Holy Saviour in the Old Town of Prague.²⁸

My last evidence demonstrating the importance of Rudolfinian Prague as a music centre comes from *visits by musicians from abroad* during that time. It is a topic which should almost be of the greatest importance in our considerations here; we must, however, admit to lacking sufficient knowledge and sources to deal with it in more depth. We roughly know that Prague and Český Krumlov too for instance were visited repeatedly by the Prince of Bavaria, accompanied by musicians headed by Orlando di Lasso.²⁹

Stefano Felis, a member of the retinue of the papal nuncio Antonio Puteo, used his stay in Prague to publish his first book of masses in the print shop of Jiří Nigrin.³⁰ Prague printing shops were also used by Silesian and Lusatian composers such as Jan Knefelius and Šimon Bariona Madelka from Opole. Similarly, we know although without further details that in 1595 the young Claudio Monteverdi stayed in the imperial city as a member of the retinue of

22 I take up several of the aspects of these activities in my study Petr Daněk, *Svatba, hudba a hudebníci v období vrcholné renesance. Na příkladu svatby Jana Krakovského z Kolovrat v Innsbrucku 1580*, Opera historica 8, České Budějovice 2000, pp. 207ff.

23 Cf. e. g. a peculiar piece of testimony *Deník rudolfinského dvořana, Adam mladší z Valdštejna, 1602–1633*, edd. M.Koldinská, P.Maťa, Prague 1997, p. 89 and Zdeněk Hojda, *Hudebníci Rudolfova dvora v obyvatelství knize Malé Strany a Hradčan z roku 1608*, in: *Hudební věda* XXIV/1987/2, esp. p. 165.

24 František Hrubý, *Ladislav Velen z Žerotína*, Prague 1930, p. 43.

25 František Mareš, *Rožmberská kapela*, Časopis Musea království českého, 1894, p. 217.

26 Martin Horyna, *Od husitství do Bílé hory*, Jihočeská hudební kultura 15. a 16. století, in: *Jihočeská vlastivěda*, Hudba, České Budějovice 1989, p. 35.

27 Cited from the edition *Tři francouzští kavalíři v rudolfinské Praze*, Prague 1989, pp. 59, 65ff.

28 The participation of the imperial ensemble on this occasion is repeatedly mentioned in the literature, e. g. Anton GINDELY, *Geschichte der Gegenreformation in Böhmen*, Leipzig 1894, p. 121; J. Lukášek, *Jáchym Ondřej hrabě Šlik*, Prague 1913, p. 95; Hans Joachim Moser, *Lutheran Composers in the Habsburg Empire 1525–1732*, in: *Musica Disciplina*, Vol. III, fasc. I, Rome 1949, p. 8.; Hans Joachim Moser, *Die Musik im frühevangelischen Österreich*, Kassel 1954, pp. 25–26, where we also find the incipit of the composition for eight voices by Martina Krumbholz, *Und da die Baulente*, composed for this occasion; Josef Petráň, *Staroměstská exekuce*, Prague 1971, before p. 193.

29 Cf. Horst Leuchtman, *Orlando di Lasso. Sein Leben*, Wiesbaden 1976, states that Lasso was already present in Prague during the coronation of Maximilian as the King of Czechs in 1562 and that he obtained 100 thalers from the emperor for the »presentirte gesanng« during his next visit in 1570. Cf. Leuchtman pp. 47, 50, 121 etc. Lasso's contacts with the Prague Rudolfinian court and the Czech lands need further study which could throw light on the origin and authenticity of Lasso's autograph from the State archive in Třeboň; cf. Leuchtman p. 318, picture 10. It is not uninteresting that in 1581, Lasso asked Rudolf II for a privilege to print his own compositions. Cf. Leuchtman, p. 194.

30 A specimen of this print can be found in the library of the Strahov monastery in Prague under the call number D.H.V.25/2. See also Petr Daněk, *Nototiskařská činnost Jiřího Nigrina*, in: *Hudební věda* XXIV/1987/2, esp. p. 132.

the Duke of Mantua.³¹ Not mentioned at all in the literature to date is the presence of musicians from the court of Saxony who accompanied the Saxon Elector Christian II on his grand visit to Prague in 1607.³² Also still unevaluated are repeated visits to Prague by Michael Praetorius, who provided several reports on the city's musical culture in his treatise *Syntagma musicum*.³³ Research on musical life in the palaces and homes of aristocrats residing in Prague has only just begun. However, it is apparent that some of them, like Karl von Lichtenstein,³⁴ and of course the Rožmberks but also Jindřich Julius, Duke of Brunswick³⁵ and Jiří Ludvík, Landgrave

of Leuchtenburg, cultivated music systematically and with great care. For them, Prague was a place of existential and social significance, and their presence in that city required musical accompaniment.³⁶

In January 1612 Rudolf II died in Prague. The court had already been stagnating for some time as a result of a power crisis. The new emperor Matthias moved the court to Vienna soon after his coronation. For the musicians, however, this change was not as simple as it had been in the early 1580s. Many of them were sent into retirement but without ever receiving any pension payments; others were simply sacked, and some left the ensemble for other jobs or decided to remain in Prague. More than half of the musicians of the ensemble of emperor Matthias were new people. Those who remained in the ensemble belonged mostly to the generation which had gained engagement in Prague after 1602. Some of them, assistant Kapellmeister Alessandro Orologio for example, initially left but shortly thereafter returned to Prague, apparently for personal reasons.³⁷ No member of Emperor Matthias's ensemble could remember the court's moving in 1583. For all of them, in any case, employment by the Habsburgs ended with the year 1619. The new ruler Ferdinand professed a different life style, one for which he

31 Monteverdi's presence is mentioned in several studies and in most monographs on the composer. Cf. e. g. Theophil Antonicek, *Claudio Monteverdi und Österreich*, in: *Österreichische Musikzeitschrift* XXVI/1971, p. 266; Paolo Fabri, *Monteverdi*, Torino 1985, pp. 44ff.; Miloš Štědroň, *Claudio Monteverdi, génius opery*, Prague 1985, pp. 22ff.; Miloš Štědroň, *Claudio Monteverdi und die böhmische Länder*, in: *Sborník prací filozofické fakulty brněnské univerzity*, H 23/24, 1988, pp. 13–17. Interesting details about the relationship of the Gonzagas and the Habsburg court have recently been published by Jürgen Zimmer, *Die Gonzaga und der Prager Hof Kaiser Rudolf II. Kunsthistorische Fragmente*, *Umění* XLVII/1998/4, pp. 207–221, and Otto G. Schindler, »Die wälischen Comedianten sein ja guet...«, *Die Anfänge des italienischen Theaters am Habsburgerhof*, *Opera historica* 8, České Budějovice 2000, pp. 107ff. Schindler's study offers some very useful information about the work of Italian musicians and actors on our territory, and in a way presents Czech musicology with new questions.

32 Cf. e. g. R. J. W. Evans, *Rudolf II. a jeho svět*, Prague 1997, esp. p. 115.

33 E. g. Praetorius mentions a Rudolfinian musician named Dominicus, who knew how to play a twelve-course cittern and owned an instrument »welche fast so lang als eine Baßgeige seyen sol.« He names one of the musicians of the time Charles Luython, cf. Michael Praetorius, *Syntagma musicum*, vol. II, *De Organographia*, Wolfenbüttel 1619, pp. 55, 204.

34 Cf. Herbert Haupt, *Fürst Karl I. von Liechtenstein, Hofstaat und Sammeltätigkeit*, *Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte des Fürstenhauses Liechtenstein*, Band I/2, Wien 1983, e. g. pp. 158–163ff.

35 Important findings about the Prague work and contacts of Jindřich Julius have recently been published in a monograph by Hilde Lietzmann, *Herzog Heinrich Julius zu Braunschweig und Lüneburg (1564–1613)*, *Quellen und Forschungen zur braunschweigischen Geschichte*, vol. 30, Braunschweig 1993, which, however, contains very little information about his extensive musical activities, cf. p. 17. See also *Hofkunst*

der Spätrenaissance. Braunschweig-Wolfenbüttel und das kaiserliche Prag um 1600, catalogue of the exhibition, Braunschweig 1998.

36 Cf. Petr Daněk, *Valerius Otto Lipsiensis – Fürstlich Lichtenbergischer Organist in Prag*, in: *Otto, Neue Paduanen, Editio simiae ludentes* 3, Prague, pp. IVff. 1993. The research on the musical activities of the Czech nobility (or those who lived in the Czech lands) requires new and very close source investigation. Our knowledge to date and the interpretations based on it are very incomplete and in a way even misleading. They are *de facto* limited to the Rožmberk family and the hypothesis concerning Kryštof Harant. However, just a cursory look into the archives of other aristocratic families (Lobkovic, Pernštejn, Hradec, Smiřice, Redern, Žerotín, Šlik etc.) promises many discoveries that have the potential to change the current interpretation of Czech musical culture of the High Renaissance. Cf. e. g. the anthology of Václav Bůžek and Pavel Král (edd.), *Slavnosti a zábavy na dvorech a v rezidenčních městech raného novověku*, *Opera historica* 8, České Budějovice 2000.

37 Cf. Archiv hl. m. Prahy, Ms.567, f.162a, a written record from 1617 attests the presence of Orologius in Prague.

needed musicians born or at least trained in Italy and skilled at playing the »new music.« And this marked the definitive end of the Rudolfinian music ensemble, which had been one of the last centres of late Renaissance music. After its activities ended, however, Prague still had retained more than just a few retired musicians. Despite the consequences of the ensuing dramatic historical developments in Europe and the changes in the Kingdom of Bohemia affecting the whole of its society, the city managed to conserve the essentials of what had originated there during the Rudolfinian era: it remained an important musical centre for the Czech lands, prepared to reflect impulses from the various cultural areas of an expanding world.

An attentive and well-informed reader will probably question the validity of the last few sentences. And no wonder. Czech musicological literature to date has interpreted the period after 1620 as a »time of uninterrupted and systematic devastation of the whole country,«³⁸ to which Cicero's phrase »inter arma silent musae« applies. As a consequence, according to the prevailing notion, Prague turned back into a provincial town as far as music is concerned.³⁹ Recent research, however, shows that even after 1620 and during the Thirty Years War, music in the Czech lands was being composed, performed and consumed – in all possible manners and ranges of quality, and of course in relative continuity with previous developments. In this process, Prague played the objective role of an important centre which competed successfully with the seat of the emperor, Vienna. Only within the logic of this fact are we able to explain the presence of the Italian »Monteverdian« opera stars and instrumentalists in the 1620s and 1630s, the organisation of the grand

mannerist celebration »Phasma Dionysiacum« in Prague in 1617, the work of Cardinal Harrach of Prague, the wide-ranging work of the Jesuits and the presence of the violinist Giovanni Battista Buonamente of Mantua in Prague in 1627.⁴⁰ It is true that by coincidence the extensive social, political and property changes in European (and Czech) society in the first half of the 17th century were accompanied by a fundamental change in musical style in Europe. This fact, however, seemingly still dims or shifts our perception and interpretation of the development of musical culture in the Czech lands after 1620. It is, nonetheless, apparent that any future evaluation of the early Baroque in the Czech lands will have to take into account the study of the much more extensive cultural context of the whole Central European area and put aside *a priori* doubts about the cosmopolitan character of the culture of that time. ◀◀

38 Cf. Jiří Sehnal, *Pobělohorská doba (1620–1740)*, in: *Hudba v českých dějinách*, Prague 1989, p. 157; we find the same conception of early Baroque music in the Czech lands in the work of Jaroslav Bužga, *Hudební barok (1620–1740)*, in: *Československá vlastivěda IX, Umění*, vol. 3, *Hudba*, pp. 87–105; further, Jaroslav Bužga, *Hudebníci a hudební instituce v období baroku v českých zemích*, Příspěvky k dějinám české hudby III, Prague 1976, pp. 5–40; and recently Tomislav Volek, *Die Barockmusik in Prag*, in: *Prager Barock*, Schallaburg 1989, pp. 359–381.

39 Cf. Bužga, *Hudební barok*, p. 88.

40 Cf. Paul Nettel, *Giovanni Battista Buonamente*, in: *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 9, 1926, pp. 528–542; *Dějiny českého divadla I*, Prague 1968, p. 249; Herbert Seifert, *Frühes italienisches Musikdrama nördlich der Alpen*: Salzburg, Prag, Wien, Regensburg und Innsbruck, in: Markus Engelhardt (ed.), *Monteverdi-Rezeption und frühes Musiktheater im deutschsprachigen Raum*, Frankfurt a. M. 1996, pp. 29ff.; Herbert Seifert, *Das erste Musikdrama des Kaiserhofs*, in: *Österreichische Musik - Musik in Österreich, T. Antonicek zum 60. Geburtstag*, Wiener Veröffentlichungen zur Musikwissenschaft, vol. 34, Tutzing 1998, pp. 99111; Otto G. Schindler, *L'incoronazione ungherese di Eleonora I Gonzaga (1622) e gli inizi del teatro musicale alla corte degli Absburgo*, in: *Quaderni di Palazzo* 5, Milano 1999, pp. 71ff.; Otto G. Schindler, »Die wälischen Comedianten sein ja guet...« *Die Anfänge des italienischen Theaters am Habsburgerhof*, *Opera historica* 8, České Budějovice 2000, pp. 107ff. The literature on the Phasma Dionysiacum is already quite extensive, cf. e. g. Schindler, *Die wälische Comedianten*, p. 120.