1676”; and a cantata, called *Il Barcheggio,* is known to have been composed by Stradella for the marriage of Carlo Spinola and Paola Brignolo in 1681. These discrepancies are not, however, of sufficient moment to justify the rejection of Bonnet-Bourdelot’s account, which has been accepted as genuine by Burney, Hawkins, Fétis, and many other careful writers, including the remarkably accurate and conscientious Wanley.@@1 And it must be remembered, in its defence, that Pierre Bourdelot, by whom the materials for the *Histoire de la Musique et de ses Effets* were originally compiled, was an actual contemporary of Stradella, and died as early as 1685, when a host of the composer’s friends must still have been living, and able to give evidence on the subject of his fate. It seems there­fore only reasonable to assume that the main facts of the narrative are correctly given, though the dates may need confirmation; while for the embroidered versions of later writers the authors of the *Histoire* are certainly not responsible.

The finest collection of Stradella’s works extant is that at the Biblioteca Palatina at Modena, which contains 148 MSS., includ­ing eleven operas and six oratorios. A collection of *canti a voce sola* was bequeathed by the Contarini family to the library of St Mark at Venice ; and some MSS. are also preserved at Naples and in Paris. Eight madrigals, three duets, and a sonata for two violins and bass will be found among the Additional MSS. at the British Museum, five pieces among the Harleian MSS., and eight cantatas and a motet among those in the library at Christ Church, Oxford. Very few of these compositions have been published ; but an extremely beautiful *aria di chiesa,* entitled *Pietá Signore,@@2* has been frequently printed, under the name of Stradella, and popularly accepted as the air which produced so marvellous an effect upon the assassins. The piece, however, is not to be found in *San Giovanni Battista;* and its style so little resembles that of Stradella’s other works that no less decisive evidence than the discovery of an undoubted autograph could justify its ascription to him. On the other hand, no more extravagant mistake could be made than that of describing it, as some have done, as a forgery, perpetrated either by Fétis, Rossini, or Niedermeyer. Not one of these great musicians could have written it; and it is certainly no forgery, but a genuino work of the 17th century or the opening decade of the 18th. In the absence of trustworthy documentary evidence, all attempts to ascertain the real authorship of the piece must necessarily end in mere conjecture ; but the extraordinary similarity of its style to that cultivated by Francesco de’ Rossi, who is known to have been flourishing at Bari at the time of Stradella’s death, is very significant.

Much controversy has also been excited by another work, lately attributed to Stradella, viz., a *serenata* for voices and instruments, of which two copies only are known to exist,—one at the Con­servatoire at Paris, and the other, a late transcript, now at the Royal College of Music in London. The date of this *serenata* is absolutely unknown. Of evidence proving it to be a genuine work by Stradella there is none in existence. Yet the question of its authenticity is a most important one, for upon the strength of it Handel may perhaps be some day gravely accused of having stolen from the Italian composer some of the finest passages in *Israel in Egypt.*

The compositions of Stradella are remarkable for their graceful form and the tenderness of their expression. Detached move­ments will be found in Burney’s *History of Music* and the modern collection called *Gemme d'Antichità.*

STRADIVARIUS. See Violin.

STRAFFORD, Thomas Wentworth, Earl of (1593-1641), son of Sir William Wentworth, of Went­worth Woodhouse, near Rotherham, was born in 1593 in Chancery Lane, London. He was educated at St John’s College, Cambridge, and in 1611 was knighted, and mar­ried Margaret, daughter of Francis, earl of Cumberland. In 1614 he represented Yorkshire in the Addled Parlia­ment, but, as far as is now known, it was not till the parliament of 1621 that he took part in the debates. His position towards the popular party was peculiar. He did not sympathize with their eagerness for war with Spain, and he was eager, as no man of that time except Bacon was eager, for increased activity in domestic legislation. He was what, in modern times, would be called a reformer, and in those days a reformer was necessarily an upholder of the authority of the crown, in whose service the most experienced statesmen might be expected to be found, whilst the members of a House of Commons only sum­

moned at considerable intervals would be deficient in the qualities necessary for undertaking successful legislation. On the other hand, James’s conduct of the diplomatic struggle with Spain was not such as to inspire confidence, and Wentworth’s bearing was therefore marked by a certain amount of hesitation. He was, however, more than most men prone to magnify his office, and James’s contemptuous refusal to allow the House of Commons to give an opinion on foreign politics seems to have stung him to join in the vindication of the claims of the House of which he was a member. He was at all events a warm supporter of the protestation which drew down a sentence of dissolution upon the third parliament of James.

In 1622 Wentworth’s wife died, and in February 1625 he married Arabella Holles, the daughter of the earl of Clare. Of the parliament of 1624 he had not been a member, but in the first parliament of Charles I. he again represented Yorkshire, and at once marked his hostility to the proposed war with Spain by supporting a motion for an adjournment before the House proceeded to business. His election was declared void, but he was re-elected. When he returned to parliament he took part in the op­position to the demand made under the influence of Buckingham for war subsidies, and was consequently, after the dissolution, made sheriff of Yorkshire, in order to exclude him, as hostile to the court, from the parliament which met in 1626. After the dissolution of that par­liament he was dismissed from the justiceship of the peace and the office of *custos rotulorum* of Yorkshire.

Wentworth’s position was very different from that of the regular opposition. Ue was anxious to serve the crown, but he disapproved of the king’s policy. “ My rule,” he wrote December 1625, “which I will never transgress, is never to contend with the prerogative out of parliament, nor yet to contest with a king but when I am constrained thereunto or else make shipwreck of my peace of conscience.” In January 1626 he had asked for the presidency of the Council of the North, and had visited and made overtures to Buckingham. His subse­quent dismissal was probably the result of his resolution not to support the court in its design to force the country to contribute money without a parliamentary grant. At all events, he refused in 1627 to contribute to the forced loan, and was placed in confinement in Kent for his refusal.

Wentworth’s position in the parliament of 1628 was a striking one. He joined the popular leaders in resistance to arbitrary taxation and imprisonment, but he tried to obtain his end with the least possible infringement of the prerogative of the crown, to which he looked as a reserve force in times of crisis. With the approbation of the House he led the movement for a bill which would have secured the liberties of the subject as completely as the Petition of Right afterwards did, but in a manner less offensive to the king. The proposal was wrecked upon Charles’s refusal to make the necessary concessions, and the leadership was thus snatched from Wentworth’s hands by Eliot and Coke. Later in the session he fell into con­flict with Eliot, as, though he supported the Petition of Right in substance, he was anxious to come to a compro­mise with the Lords, so as to leave room to the king to act unchecked in special emergencies.

On July 22, 1628, not long after the prorogation, Wentworth was created Lord Wentworth, and received a promise of the presidentship of the Council of the North at the next vacancy. Even on political matters he had never been quite at unison with the parliamentary opposition, and in church matters he was diametrically opposed to them. Since the close of the discussion on the Petition of Right, church matters had come into greater prominence

@@@1 See No. 1272 in *Cat. Marl. MSS., Brit. Mus.* Wanley, how­ever, believed Stradella alone to have been murdered and the lady to have escaped.

@@@2 Called in some editions *Se i miei sospiri.*