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ABSTRACT

This dissertation is an analysis of Giovanni Antonio Terzi's lute intabulations contained in his two Venetian lute books of 1593 and 1599. These works are discussed in relation to other lute intabulations in sixteenth-century Italian prints and manuscripts. The dissertation discusses the origins of lute intabulation, its philosophical background, and performance practice. Terzi's style of ornamentation in comparison with his contemporaries is central to the discussion. The *musica ficta* in the tablatures is analysed and discussed for its relevance to interpretation in the vocal models. Terzi's fantasia style is compared with his intabulation style, and an attempt is made to interpret the meaning of Terzi's performance indication "in concerto". The second volume reviews modern transcription practices and includes 45 transcriptions of intabulations and fantasias by Terzi and his contemporaries.
The subject of this dissertation is wider than its title implies. It examines the intabulations of Giovanni Antonio Terzi but attempts to place his work within the larger historical context of late sixteenth-century lute music. I have worked from the premise that to have analysed the style of one intabulator only would have been of limited value. Terzi's intabulation output is but a small part of a very large genre which has yet to be researched comprehensively. Although the subject of intabulation has been of interest to scholars for some time, especially regarding musica ficta and ornamentation. To my knowledge no one major study has been devoted to Italian lute intabulations. I have therefore devoted considerable space to comparing Terzi's intabulations with those of his contemporaries, and have attempted to place his contribution generally within the late sixteenth-century repertoire. However, since the study is centred around Giovanni Antonio Terzi's two lute books of 1593 and 1599 it is possible that the importance of some lute intabulators may have been overlooked or underestimated. The need to form a complete picture of sixteenth-century lute intabulations, as well one of the period after 1600 is one which I trust will be met by future scholarship.

It is my belief that a reason for the comparative paucity of interest in intabulations, and hence, the bulk of Terzi's work, relates to a lack of understanding of works of a "second-hand" nature. A chapter has been devoted therefore to a discussion of the renaissance philosophy of imitazione out of which the genre was generated.

The major part of this dissertation focuses on four large essays on ornamentation, musica ficta, performance practice and the renaissance concept of imitation in the
arts. Many of the vocal works intabulated by Terzi were also arranged by other Italian lutenists. Comparisons of intabulations of any single work, with those of other lute intabulators, along with the vocal models where available, supply useful information on the practice of intabulation in general and instrumental music in particular. Specifically, such a study can signal the rise of autonomous instrumental music, showing its point of departure from vocal music.

Biographical aspects have not been researched in depth in this dissertation. An initial search of the archives in Bergamo revealed little on Terzi's professional or personal life, therefore I considered that time could be more profitably spent searching for musical sources than for biographical information which in the end may not have been forthcoming.

The second volume of this dissertation contains the bulk of the musical examples under discussion. It includes transcriptions of most of the intabulations for which I was able to find the vocal models. As well, I have transcribed many of the Terzi fantasias and other absolute music which serve as useful comparisons with the intabulations. The intabulations are scored with the vocal models as well as any other available Italian lute sources of interest. I have not included a transliteration of Terzi's tablatures since they are readily available in facsimile editions. To reproduce them would be redundant. A full list of sources for the transcriptions as well as a lengthy discussion of my editorial policy is also provided in Volume Two. The appendices of Volume One contain statistical summaries and data, as well as additional material. Included is a list of bollettini corrections found in editions of Terzi's Libro Primo held in libraries in Bologna and Florence (pp.355-356). Also included are incipits of five Terzi dances found in other manuscript and printed sources which hitherto
appear not to have been identified (pp. 359-361). Appendix 3 is a bibliography of Terzi's intabulations and contains new source information (pp. 362-373). To assist the reader, a transliteration of the contents of Terzi's lute books is given on pp. x-xii.

An explanation about bibliographical citations is necessary. Since this dissertation includes discussion of many composers and works, to avoid excessively lengthy footnotes it has been necessary to reduce some of the citations to abbreviations. These take three forms. First, Terzi's two books *Libro Primo* (Venice, 1593) and *Libro Secondo* (Venice 1599) are cited as Terzi (1593) and Terzi (1599) respectively. Second, Galilei's two *IL Fronimo* editions of 1568 and 1584 are cited as Galilei (1568) and Galilei (1584) respectively. Third, three standard bibliographical tools used throughout have been valuable in the search for sources. The work without which this study would not have been possible is H.M. Brown's *Instrumental Music Printed Before 1600* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965/R1979). Items listed in this bibliography are cited according to its catalogue numbering. For instance, Francesco Spinacino's *Intabulaturadella Lauto / Libro secondo* (Venice, 1507) which is the second item entered in Brown's bibliography for 1507, is referred to as Brown 1507/1. It is hoped that in the reading of this dissertation, any inconvenience incurred by needing to refer to Brown's bibliography is balanced by more concise footnoting. Similarly, the standard *RISM* numbering is used, along with the catalogue numbering in the *Bibliografia della Musica Italiana Vocale Profana, pubblicata dal 1500 al 1700*, eds., E. Vogel, A. Einstein, F. Lesure and C. Sartori (Staderini, 1977). These items are referred to as *NV* followed by the appropriate number. A full list of abbreviations is given on pp. viii-ix.
Throughout the dissertation it has been necessary to refer the reader to transcriptions in the second volume. To avoid confusion with any other work referred to, "Volume II" means the second volume of this dissertation, while "vol.2" refers to the second volume of another source. All translations are my own unless otherwise acknowledged.

The lute music analysed has been restricted mainly to manuscript or printed music in Italian lute tablature. These are admittedly arbitrary distinctions. The research has traced the development of lute intabulation style up to Terzi's publications at the end of the sixteenth century. The repertoire reviewed has been defined by the type of notation, that is, Italian lute tablature, since to define by virtue of the authors' place of birth is considerably more arbitrary.

I have received assistance from many individuals and institutions during the research and writing of this dissertation. I am indebted to the staffs of the following institutions: the Biblioteca comunale, Como; the Civico museo bibliografico musicale, the Biblioteca Statale, Lucca; Bologna (formerly called, Biblioteca comunale annessa al Conservatorio musicale); the Biblioteca nazionale centrale, Florence; the Biblioteca Riccardiana, Florence; the Biblioteca universitaria, Genoa; the Biblioteca Estense, Modena; the Archivio di Stato, Modena; the Biblioteca del Conservatorio di Musica, Naples; the Biblioteca del Conservatorio "G. Rossini", Pesaro; the Biblioteca Casanatense, Rome; the Biblioteca S. Cecilia, Rome; the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Rome; the Biblioteca nazionale centrale, Rome; the Biblioteca nazionale universitaria, Turin; the Biblioteca capitolare, Verona; the British Library, London; The London University Library; and the Biblioteca Berensen, Villa i Tatti, Florence. Above all, I am grateful to the staff of the Library of Otago
University, Dunedin, for their continual patience and willingness to trace source material.

I have been fortunate to receive financial assistance, without which this work would not have been possible. I acknowledge receipt of a generous scholarship from the University Grants Committee of New Zealand which funded the first three years. I also acknowledge an Italian Government scholarship, awarded through its Embassy in Wellington, which enabled me to undertake eight months research in Italy. Without this generous gift the work would have been a dry exercise. I wish to thank the staff of the New Zealand Embassy in Rome for their valuable advice and friendship, and particularly Ambassador Gordon Parkinson and his wife Margaret Parkinson for their inestimable practical and personal assistance during my Italian visit.

I am grateful to many individuals who have helped with this work: to Claire Leighton and Dr Ray Harlow for help with translations; to Mabel Court for proof-reading; to Professor John Drummond who gave me encouragement when I needed it; to Professor Howard Mayer Brown with whom several short discussions and generous help have been inspiring and valuable; to Dr Patrick Little who edited the manuscript in its last stages and resolved some difficulties; to Professor P. Petrobelli for advice and for accessing Italian libraries; to Professor John Steele who inspired the idea, who has supervised the work throughout, and whose encyclopaedic knowledge has been invaluable; and finally to Billie McLeod whose vision, encouragement, and personal support have been responsible for the completion of the work.
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second volume of this dissertation
The tables of contents of Libro Primo and Libro Secondo are here transcribed with editorial additions given within [ ]. Rubrics from the body of the books, additional to wording of the tavola, are given within ( ). A facsimile copy of the tavola of Libro Secondo follows on p. xii to show the divisional titles which in this book, unlike Libro Primo, are not given in the tavola according to the page sequence.

**LIBRO PRIMO**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>page</th>
<th>title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Motiatti a 4. &amp; a 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ego rogabo a 4. Di Andrea Gabrieli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Virgo prudentissima a 4. Di Giulio Renald.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tu es Pastor ouium. a 4. Del Palestina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Angelvs (Angelus) ad pastores a 4. Del Palestina.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Susrexit a 5. Di Marc' Antonio Ingnieri. (Ingegnero)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Qui me confessus a 5. Di Claudio (Merulol da Correggio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Veni in or tvm (hortum) meum a 5. Di Orlando Laso.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Ad dominum cam (CD) tribuler a 5. Di Gio. Cauaccio.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Madrigali a 5. & a 6. con i suoi contraponti.**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Vestiva i colli. prima parte. a 5. Del Palestina per suonar a duo liutti, &amp; solo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Contraponto sopra Vestiva i colli. per suonar (sonar) a duo liutti in quarta &amp; (e) in concerto.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Cosi le chiome mie. Seconda parte a duo liutti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Contraponto sopra il predetto per suonar come di sopra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>S'ogni mio ben a 6. Del Striggio per suonar solo &amp; a duo liutti, &amp; in concerto (concerti).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Contraponto sopra il predetto (S'ogni mio ben) per suonar come di sopra, ma a l'unisono.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Un'altro contraponto (c'otraposto) sopra l'istesso a l'unisono.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Anchor ch'io possa dire a 6. del Striggio per suonar solo, &amp; a duo liutti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Contraponto (c'otraposto) sopra il predetto (Anchor ch'io) a (e a) l'unisono (unisono) per suonar a duo (doi) liutti, &amp; in concerto (coterto).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Canzioni Francesce, & Italianes.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>page</th>
<th>title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Susanne un Iour (iour). Canzon Francesce a 5. Di Orlando Laso. a la quarta per suonar (sonar) solo, &amp; a duo (doi) liutti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Contraponto sopra l'istessa (Susanne un iour d'Orlado) per suonar (a duo liutti in quarta, &amp; in Concerto) come di sopra.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Petit Iaquet, Canzon Francesce a 4. Di Claudio (Marulo) da Correggio per suonar solo, &amp; a duo (doi) liutti.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Contraponto sopra l'istessa per suonar in vnisono, &amp; in concert. (Contraponto sopra Petit Iaquet, Canzon francesce di Clau da Correggio per suonar come di sopra).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>A due (doi) liutti vnisoni, Canzon (Cazone) di Claudio da Correggio a 4. Primio liutto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>Secondo liutto in rieposta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Segue vndeci (undeci) canzoni (Cazoni) del Mascara per suonar in concerto, &amp; solo. Canzone prima numa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(Canzone) Seconda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>(Canzone) Terza.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(Canzone) Quarta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(Canzone) Quinta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>(Canzone) Sesta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>(Canzone) Settima.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>(Cazone) Ottava.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>(Cazone) Nona.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>(Canzone) Decima.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>(Canzone) Vndecima (undecima), &amp; vit (ultima).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Madrigali diversi a 5.**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Quando fra bianche perle a 5. prima parte. Di Gio: Maria Nanino.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Sentomi apripsi. Seconda parte.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Caro dolce ben mio. a 5. Di Andrea Gabrieli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Quando i vostr (vostr) begli occhi a 5. Del Marenzio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Verrà mai il di. a 5. prima parte. Di Costanzo Porta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Fera gentili. a 5. prima parte. (Rore)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Perche si stratto è il nodo. Seconda parte. (Rore).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ah, chi mi rompe il sonno.

Preludio dell'autore (de l'Autore)

Fantasia dell'autore (de l'Autore)

Gagliarda Prima

Gagliarda (della) Tamburina (Tamburin.)

Leggiadre ninfe di (del Luca)

Marenzi a 6.

Candide perle a 6.

Quando mirai di Moratio Vecchi a 4. (Le parole per cantare sono sotto al Basso.)

Di pianti e di sospiro a 3. di Giuliano (Ulanio) Paratico (la parola si nonno cantar sott'al Basso, & nel Canto.)

Ah, chi mi tien il coré di Gio. Giacomo Gastoldi a 3.

Come faro cor mio di Antonio Martaro (Mortoro sotto il Basso) a 3.

Fantasia in modo di Canzon Francese (Francesa) di Francesco (Gioesifo) Guami

Volu (dell'autore) Fantasia terza.

Canzon Francese (Francesa)

Ioiianza di Adriano (Willart) Gagliarda Terza (dell'autore.)

Gagliarda Quarta (dell'autore.)

Nasce la pena mia di (del) Alessandro Striggio a 6. (con Passaggi.)

Balli diversi.

Un'altra gagliarda

Marenzio a 6.

Oagliarda Terza (del) Auttore.

Oagliarda Quarta

Nascela penami del (d) Alessandro Striggio a 6. (con Passaggi.)

Candide mezzo per b molle in trei modi.

Volta Francese

Ballo Bolo (Balo) Alemano Secondo

Vn'altra gagliarda

Marenzio a 5. (con il suo contrapunto)

Balletto Francese

Volta Francese seconda

Volta Francese terza

Volta Francese quarta

Ballo Alemano Primo

Ballo Bolo (Balo) Alemano Secondo

Ballo Alemano Terzo

Balletto (dell'autore) Fantasia terza.

In te Domine speravi di Claudio Merulo da Correggio a 6.

Padoana (Padouana) Prima

Volta Francese terza

Volta Francese quarta

Ballo Alemano Primo

Ballo Bolo (Balo) Alemano Secondo

Ballo Alemano Terzo

Toccata dell'autore (dell'autore)

Toccata dell'autore (dell'autore)

In te Domine speravi di Claudio Merulo da Correggio a 6.

Balletto Francese

Volta Francese seconda

Volta Francese terza

Volta Francese quarta

Ballo Alemano Primo

Ballo Bolo (Balo) Alemano Secondo

Ballo Alemano Terzo

Toccata dell'autore (dell'autore)

Balletto (dell'autore) Fantasia terza.

Padoana (Padouana) Prima

Volta Francese terza

Volta Francese quarta

Ballo Alemano Primo

Ballo Bolo (Balo) Alemano Secondo

Ballo Alemano Terzo

Toccata dell'autore (dell'autore)

Balletto (dell'autore) Fantasia terza.
38 46 (Liutto Primo.) Canzon Francese Allermifault, (Allermifault & Cinque Voci) di Adriano [Willaert]. Per sonar (suoner) a due Liutti (vnisoni) a 4.

49 Per il secondo Liutto

39 52 Non hebbe tante foglie a 3.

40 52 Non vedo hoggi (Non ved’hoggi’l ili sole a 3. di Ruggiero Giouannelli (Del Giouanelli).)

41 53 Mi parto chi sorte via a 3 del detto (Del Giouanelli). Se di dolor io potessi morire di Giulio Rinaldi (Renaldi) a 5.

43 55 In Deo sperai dall’istesso a 6. (In Deo sperai cor meum di Claudio da Correggio & Sei Voci.)

44 56 Hodie completi (sunt) a 4. di Andrea Gabrielli (Gabrielli). Padoana Seconda (Seconda) a 4.

46 60 Padoana Terza

47 61 Fantasia in modo di Canzon Francese (del’Autore) (dell’Autore) a 4.


49 64 (Vn’altra) Fantasia di Paolo Iusti (Tusti) a 4.


52 62 Branie terzo

53 68 Branie simple Francese

54 69 (Gagliarda (dell’Autore) Ottavia) Gagliarda a 4. di Alessandro Striglio, per sonar a modo di viola Bastarda in Concerto con Liutto grande (Ch’vorà fede, A Cinque del Striglio accomodato & modo di Viola bastarda per suonar in Concerto cit Liutto grande).

56 74 Mandaturno (douobis), a 5 di Pietro Vinci (à le parole sono sotto à la parte del Basso) a 5.


58 77 (Ekaudi Seconda Parte.)

59 77 La velosa vista a 3. di Horatio (Oratio) Scalatta (le parole sono per Cantar il Basso) a 5.

60 78 Qual più crude l’altere del detto (del medesimo)Scaletta (le parole sono per Cantar il Basso) a 5.

61 80 Gagliarda Decima

62 81 Erano i capi d’or, Prima & Seconda parte a 5. di Gio. Maria Nanino (Seconda Parte Non era l’miandri suo) a 5.

63 83 Amorosa fenice, di Gio. (Mara) Causcio a 5.

64 84 Ballo Alemano Quinto dell’Autore. a 5.

65 84 Ballo Alemano Sexto

66 85 Donna la bella mano di Archangelo da Bergamo a 5. (Di Gianetto) Palestina a 5.
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CHAPTER ONE

GIOVANNI ANTONIO TERZI: AN INTRODUCTION

Part one. The Music

Like most lute books of the second half of the sixteenth century, Terzi's Libro Primo (1593) and Libro Secondo (1599) are compilations of four genres of lute music: dance, fantasia, lute-song and intabulation. The title pages of both books attest to the varieties of intabulations, fantasias and dances contained within:
IL SECONDO
LIBRO
DE INTAVOLATURA
DI LIUTO
DI GIO. ANTONIO TERZI
DA BERGAMO.
Nella quale si contengono Fantasie, Motetti, Canzoni, Madrigali, Pass'e mezi, & Balli di varie, & diverse sorti.
Novamente da lui data in luce.
[printer's mark]
IN VENETIA,
Appresso Giacomo Vincenti 1599.

1. *Libro Primo* is printed in a facsimile edition by Antiquae Musicae Italicae Studiosi (Milano, 1966), and both *Libro Primo* and *Libro Secondo* are printed in a facsimile edition by Studio Per Edizioni Scelte, series 45 (Florence, 1981). Individual pieces from Terzi's books have been published in various sources, cited in Brown 1593/7 and Brown 1599/11, (see also Appendix 3, this volume) but there is not to my knowledge a published modern edition of either book. Reginald Smith-Brindle claims to have transcribed *Libro Primo* but this does not appear to have been published. (Listed in "Reginald Smith Brindle: Works for Guitar", *Guitar and Lute*, no.15, (Honolulu, October 1980), p.9.)
THE GENRES

1. Classification

Of the total of 154 pieces in the two lute books, well over half of them (85) are dances, fantasias, canzonas, toccatas and preludes. Terzi includes a wide variety of single dances: gagliarda, courante, courante Francese, balletto (Francese, Polaco, Italiano and Alemano), padoana, bariera, volta Francese and preambulo for solo lute. In addition he gives 12 paired dances - pass'e mezzo paired with either a gagliarda or a saltarello, a ballo Tedesco with a saltarello, and a ballo Tedesco with a gagliarda. As we would expect, the pairs of dances share the same mode and related thematic material. Terzi included 16 fantasias in all, six in Libro Primo and ten in Libro Secondo. However these so called fantasias actually comprise two genres - fantasia, and fantasia in the style of the canzona. Not all of the fantasias are original Terzi compositions. Four pieces in Libro Secondo are assigned the title Fantasia in modo di Canzon Francese di ... (followed by the name of the composer), but they are not fantasias in the sense that we understand the term, that is, an instrumental composition whose form and invention springs "solely from the fantasy and skill of the author who created it." Rather, they are intabulations of instrumental canzonas, in which the original form and structure is preserved. Indeed, they do not differ stylistically in any significant way from Terzi’s intabulations on vocal models. Neither are they

2. This total conforms with the numbering in H. M. Brown, Instrumental Music Printed Before 1600, a bibliography (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965/R1979), and does not take into account the second of pairs of dances (totalling 11) nor the contrapunti and second lute parts (totalling 12), nor the seconda parte of intabulations (totalling 9).
3. For a summary of the contents of both books see Appendix 1.1
5. Luis de Milán (1535), New Grove, vol 6, p. 380.
significant from Terzi's intabulations of canzonas, which are classified separately in the Tavole. It seems then, that apart from his own fantasias, Terzi is using "fantasia" synonymously with "intabulation", since the fantasia in modo di Canzon Francese is merely an intabulation of an instrumental canzona with some added ornamentation.

2. Attribution

The six fantasias in Libro Primo are claimed as Terzi's own, along with five gagliarde and one ballo. One piece, a gagliarda, is attributed to Terzi's father. Of the ten fantasias (including the fantasias in the style of canzonas) in Libro Secondo, only five are directly attributed to Terzi. Here, besides the fantasias, ten other pieces are claimed to be Terzi compositions: one preludio, one preambulo, three gagliarde, two toccate, one ballo, one contrappunto (to go with an intabulation) and a canzona for four lutes. Fantasias attributed to other composers in Libro Secondo are as follows:

Fantasia in modo di Canzon Francese di Francesco Guami (p. 10)
Un'altra fantasia del ditto (p. 10)
Fantasia di Giovanni Gabrieli (p. 62)
Fantasia di Paolo Tusti (p. 64)
Fantasia come di sopra (ie. in modo di Canzon Francese) di Vicenzo Bell'haver (p. 91)

6. Compare for instance Volume II, nos. 23 & 34.
8. Gagliarda nova del Padre del'Auttore, Terzi (1593) p. 121.
9. Terzi (1599) pp. 2, 39, 61, 89, & 93. See also this volume, p. 318.
The two Guami instrumental ensemble canzonas are actually by Gioseffo Guami, not his brother Francesco Guami, and the composer Paolo Tusti is a complete unknown. His name is spelt as Tusti on page 64, but Justi [Justi] in the Tavola for which an alternative spelling could well be Giusti. It was common practice in the sixteenth century to borrow sections from vocal or instrumental works of other composers and even to claim a complete work of another as one's own. We cannot be absolutely sure, therefore, whether Terzì really composed those pieces carrying his name. Conversely, we may ask whether those dances not attributed to Terzì could be his nonetheless. It could be a mistake to assume that the lack of attribution implies, as Carol MacClintock has suggested, that all other dances were by other composers.

3. Instrumentation

Rubrics in Terzì's books give more indication of performance practices than most lute books of the sixteenth century, but they do not satisfy all questions pertaining to instrumentation. Much of our interpretation of just how the intabulations were to have been performed must therefore be conjectural. Ricciardo Amadino, the publisher of Terzì's first book, indicated that the volume included music suitable for various performance media, that as well as lute solos some pieces could be played "in concerto", and others as lute duets. It is not immediately clear what precisely Terzì or Amadino meant by "in concerto", a term which the

10a. See p. 320.
11. See p. 320 for further information on Tusti (Justi).
11a. On parody and unattributed lute music see Chapter 6, pp. 303-321.
12. Terzì (1599) p. 117.
15. This matter is the subject of investigation in Chapter 5. See also Appendix 1.2.
publisher of Libro Secondo, Giacomo Vincenti, also employed in the body of the book but not in the Tavola. Although these are clearly ensemble intabulations, no further directions are given as to whether the ensemble joined by them is vocal, instrumental or a mixture of both. Sixteen intabulations in Libro Primo are marked "in concerto". Five of these contain contrappunti,\(^6\) that is, ornate second lute parts, which may be performed in a variety of ways with the first lute or in the ensemble.\(^7\) In this volume too, 11 intabulations of Fiorenzo Maschera's ensemble canzonas are marked "in concerto" but without accompanying contrappunti being given.\(^8\) Only one intabulation in Libro Secondo is marked "in concerto", and that is Striggio's Chi farà fede accommodato à modo di Viola bastarda per suonar in Concerto con Liutto grande.\(^9\) This intabulation is unusual also for its imitation of the viola bastarda which is capable of extensive ornamentation throughout the polyphony, and that it is to be played with a larger lute (perhaps a theorbo or an archlute). However, music for the larger lute is not supplied. Five pieces, two in libro Primo and three in Libro Secondo are intabulations for lute duet but are not labelled "in concerto".\(^{10}\) The last piece in Libro Secondo is a magnificent canzona for four voices to be performed in two choirs of lutes, each pair tuned a fourth apart.

Undoubtedly these volumes were directed toward the amateur lutenist who would most of the time have been playing for his or her private amusement, but it must not be assumed that the "solo" intabulations were always performed alone. Libro Secondo contains a type of intabulation missing

---

16. Terzi's spelling is usually contraponto, and occasionally contrapunto.
19. Terzi (1599) p. 70. See also pp. 231-232.
20. Terzi (1593) Canzone a doi liutti unisoni by Claudio Merulo, pp. 48-57; Duets in Terzi (1599) pp 30, 45, 106.
from Libro Primo - canzonette with text underlay but without a mensural vocal part. Although there are no instructions to the effect that these canzonette were to be sung to lute accompaniment, such performance is clearly possible. The publisher, Giacomo Vincenti, groups all 12 pieces with text underlay together in the Tavola but the pieces are scattered throughout the body of the book. Hence a further genre, lute-song, is contained in Terzi's books if we accept text underlay to be evidence of intended vocal performance of some kind. If text underlay implies lute-song performance, the absence of text does not exclude that possibility either, as any text of an intabulation may have been committed to memory by the lutenists.

THE INTABULATIONS

Of the 69 intabulations included in the two lute books (not counting the five fantasia/intabulations mentioned above), approximately one quarter are arrangements of motets, all the rest being intabulations of secular vocal works. (Appendix 1.1) In the Tavole of both books the motets are listed separately from the madrigals, chansons, and canzonette. Thus the vocal forms are distinctly separated, but just as there is an apparent blurring of distinctions between original and derived music in the fantasias, intabulations of instrumental and vocal models are categorised together. Under the title Canzon Francese in Libro Secondo we find intabulations of Willaert's French chansons Jouissance vous donneray and Aller m'y fault together with an intabulation of Maschera's instrumental ensemble canzona Villachiera, as well as an eight-voiced canzona for four lutes written by Terzi himself. Whether or not Terzi's canzona was originally a vocal chanson we do not know, but in any case it is clear that Terzi makes

21. Canzonette a 3 4 & 5 voci, con le sue parole, Terzi (1599) pp. 8, 9, 52-53, 74, 77-78, 114-115.
no distinction between intabulations of vocal chansons and intabulations of instrumental canzonas. Strictly speaking an intabulation of a chanson is a canzona, so really they are all canzonas, and this is obviously how Terzi thought of them. Similarly, in Libro Primo under the category of Canzoni Francese, & Italiane we find an intabulation of Lassus's Susanne ung jour listed with intabulations of 11 Maschera instrumental ensemble canzonas as though they are of the same genre.

Intabulation has been described as an arrangement in tablature notation for keyboard, lute or other plucked instrument, of a vocal composition, in which all or almost all of the voices of the vocal composition are incorporated into the arrangement.\(^\text{22}\) If a definition were to take into consideration Terzi's contribution to the genre which includes arrangements of instrumental canzonas, it would be as follows: an arrangement for a solo instrument, or for instrumental performance within an ensemble, of a pre-composed vocal or instrumental work, in which the form and most of the polyphonic structure are preserved. This definition would exclude those pieces in which sections of original material are inserted, such as we find in the so called parody-fantasias, but would include highly ornate intabulations except where the polyphony is totally destroyed by the ornamentation.\(^\text{23}\)

Attribution to the original vocal composers is thorough in the Tavole of both lute books. In Libro Primo only one intabulation, Rore's Fera gentil is unattributed. Libro Secondo cites one French chanson as incerto, and one canzonetta, Non hebbe tante foglie is unattributed.\(^\text{24}\) The

---

24. The model could be from Alessandro Orologio's Canzonette a tre voci ... Primo libro (Venice, 1593) [NV 2062] but I have not been able to verify this.
thirty known original composers of Terzi's intabulations were either Italian, or (like Rore, Willaert, Wert, Lassus and de Monte) of the Franco-Flemish school who of course spent most of their working lives in Italy. Not all of these composers were of Terzi's generation: Rore and Willaert may have been born some 50 years before Terzi.\textsuperscript{25} Most of Terzi's intabulations were arrangements of works that were well known. Judging by the number of times they were intabulated in keyboard and lute sources, some of the vocal works used as models were extremely popular. For instance, included are arrangements of pieces also favoured by other intabulators, such as Lassus's \textit{Susanne ung jour}, Palestrina's \textit{Vestiva i colli}, Alessandro Striggio's \textit{Nasce la pena mia} and \textit{S'ogni mio ben} and Willaert's \textit{Jouissance vous donneray}.\textsuperscript{26} Generally, Terzi did not present to his public the exotic, novel, foreign or unfamiliar. Moreover, the variety of intabulations offered - motets, madrigals, canzonas, chansons, and canzonettas - along with the wide variety of dances and abstract pieces, attest to the universal appeal of his repertoire. He offered further variety in possible performance media, and the intabulations themselves show considerable variety in the degree to which they are ornamented. Some are so highly ornamented that only the most accomplished lutenists would have been able to cope with them, while others are very simple. In short, the volumes would have had something to offer everyone in terms of taste and ability and would have presented reasonable variety for the money.

\textsuperscript{25} See below for an estimation of Terzi's age.

\textsuperscript{26} Appendix 3 lists the known lute sources in Italian tablature, and H.M. Brown, \textit{Instrumental Music Printed before 1600, a bibliography} (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965/1979) lists other lute and keyboard sources.
OTHER SOURCES OF TERZI'S MUSIC

In sources outside Terzi's lute books I have found only a few pieces attributed to him, although there could of course be others unattributed in other sources. Two Terzi dances were reproduced in Georg Leopard Fuhrmann's Testudo Gallo-Germanica. Novae et Nun, (Nuremburg, 1615). One of these, Passomezo, in G sol re ut b. mol / Antonio del Pergamasco [sic] on page 85 is from Terzi's Libro Primo (p.102) and is reproduced in Fuhrmann's book without alteration. The other, Passomezo in F fa ut b. mol / Antoni del Pergamasco [sic] (p.97) is not from either Terzi book but must have come from a manuscript source.27 A further piece that could possibly be a Terzi composition, entitled simply Pergamasco [sic], is published on page 182 of Fuhrmann's lute book.

In the manuscript London Add.31389,28 two pairs of dances are attributed to Jo Ant° of Bergamo, but none of these correspond to music in Terzi's lute books:

Pavana 'ala Feraresa' di Jo. Ant° da Bergamo (fol.19)
El Saltarello di la stessa Padoano (fol.19v)
La Tintorella di Jo Ant° da Bergamo (fol.20v)
El Saltarello di la stessa Tintorella (fol.21)29

27. For incipit see Appendix 2.1e.
29. Incipits of these four pieces are given in the present volume, Appendix 2.1a - 2.1d. Another Saltarello entitled La Tintorella is printed in Brown 1536/9 no.12, p.38, and is available in a modern edition in L.H. Moe, Dance Music in Printed Italian Lute Tablatures from 1507 to 1611, PhD.diss., (Harvard, 1956).
Part two. Biographical details

Little is known of Terzi's life other than that he was an accomplished singer and lutenist, and that his father was a musician. He is mentioned in the writings of Donato Calvi as a literary man of Bergamo who "loved vocal music, but even more that of instruments; and if with his voice he emulated the harmony of the heavens, with the sound of his lute he vied with that of the angels".  

From the prefaces to his two books we can glean a few clues to Terzi's life. We know that Libro Primo was dedicated to a knight, Bartolomeo Fino who was quite young at the time of the dedication (1593) and who himself played the lute. Terzi alluded to an obligation he felt toward Fino, so perhaps Terzi was in Fino's employment. If so, his allegiances had changed five years later when he dedicated his Libro Secondo to a signor Sillano Licino. In his dedication to Licino, Terzi revealed that by this stage in life he was in relative retirement and that his strengths were waning. Hence if he considered himself to be old or aging, he could have been in his fifties, given that in the sixteenth century a man was old at 40 or 50. The dates (1550-1620) that MacClintock gives for Terzi must be pure guesswork unless she is privy to uncited information.

31. Libro Secondo was signed 10. Novembre 1598 but it was published by Vicentino in the following year. It is not known whether Sillano Licino is related to Agostino Licino the composer of two volumes of canonic duos. New Grove, vol.10, p.826.
Information on the lives of the two gentlemen, Licino and Fino is not immediately available, but an archival search in Venice could possibly yield some biographical details which could in turn tell us more about Terzi's musical career.

A period of research in the Biblioteca Civica Angelo Mai in the town of Bergamo, Terzi's birthplace, revealed little other than a Terzi family tree. This included two people named Giovanni Antonio Terzi, one whose son Bortolo died in 1719, and another who died in 1748. The period it portrays then is about a century later than the time of the Giovanni Antonio Terzi of this study. However, I reproduce it here for the sake of completeness.
PREFACE TO LIBRO PRIMO (facsimile)

AL MOLTO ILLUSTRÉ
MIO SIGNORE, ET PADRONE OSSERVANDISSIMO
IL SIG. CAVALIER BARTOLOMEO FINO.

G. A. Terzi 14

Di V.S. Molto Illustre

Diutissimo Servitore

Gio: Antonio Terzì.
PREFACE TO LIBRO PRIMO

To my Most Illustrious Lord and respected patron,
Signor Cavalier Bartolomeo Fino

Among the seven arts which venerable antiquity has, not without good reason, called liberal there is (it seems to me) none which was in more esteem and reverence than Music. Thus, only those who had understanding of Music were considered true sages - Themistocles33 whose honour suffered considerably through deprivation of Music, and many others of those centuries can bear witness to that. For that truly happy age was well acquainted with blessed Alerice, mother and mistress of Knowledge, who knew very well that the deprivation of Music meant none other than a great proof and lack of life, it being none other than perfect order, than wisdom, life and soul of the world. How able it is (by means of its consonant harmonies) to ravish souls and unite them in God. Your Most Illustrious Lordship, I might say to You (no less), that in the sound of Your divine Lute, King of the other instruments, you have been able Yourself to recognise such important and miraculous effects accompanied by the highest delight. Thus, among the other virtues through which Your Lordship makes Yourself so highly regarded in the world, even at such a young age, You possess also the divine virtue of Music with its great glory, and (taking respite from Your more serious studies), You practise Music with great recreation of mind. Thus, You will well be able not only to judge these works of mine with prudence, but also, should there be need, defend them with great authority from the turbid and poisonous blasts of contradiction. So I dedicate them and consecrate them to

33. The Athenian general Themistocles (c.535-470 BC) suffered humiliation from his colleagues when he demonstrated that he was unable to improvise on the lyre after a banquet. The story is given in Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, LI, Chap. II; and Cicero, *Tusculanes*, LI, 4.
Your Name, not with the intention of thereby giving You fame or acclaim, (since your Name and Surname and those of Your ancestors are by themselves all too bright and resplendent in the eyes of the world and widely known throughout the land which is divided by the Apennines and circumscribed by the sea and Alps), but rather in the hope that I can, by dedicating them to You, give to this cherished labour that immortality which it can aspire to from Your authority, for which the author could not hope by himself. I shall omit to say that in doing so I give satisfaction to the desire which I have, and have always had, of showing (with albeit some small sign) how my feelings are toward You. Neither shall I say that in doing this I shall in part, not lessen the many obligations I owe You (this would be impossible) but, rather, make them manifest to the world as a sign of gratitude; and in the eyes of this my testimony (as it were a document of collateral) to constitute myself as Your debtor and, in consequence, perpetual servant (in view of sane and right judges who will recognise the size of the debt). It remains for me to beg You to deign with Your accustomed greatness of spirit to accept these humble labours of mine, and to deduce from the meagre talent the presence of a ready will, which nonetheless is Yours and will ever be. Without further ado I pray God for the greatest blessing for you, and kiss Your hands.

Venice, 15th July 1593

Your Most Illustrious Lordship's
most devoted servant,

Gio. Antonio Terzi
AL MOLTO ILLVSTRE ET ECCELL. MO SIGNOR MIO OSSERVANDISSIMO
IL SIGNOR SILLANO LICINO.

Veste mie fatiche del Secondo Libro (quali siano) non per brama di gloria, ne perche io mi creda col mezzo loro poter giungar altri mi sono lasciato indure, ò dover hora dopo le prime publicar al mondo, conciofa che il tranquillo mio stato in una vita assai rimessa, e le mie deboli forze lontane da ogni persuasione di me stesso mi rendono libero affatto dall’uno ò l’altro de simili pensieri: ma fi bene parte gli stimoli de gli amici a ciò fare mi hanno incitato, ò molto più con dolce violenza me ne ha astretto il desiderio, che un pezzo fu mi sollecita à douer con qualche piccolo segno se non riconoscere, almen mostrar di conoscere la grandezza de favori, ò benefici in ogni tempo, à occasione da V. Sig. ricevuti, nel cui nobilissima persona concorrendo tutte quelle qualità che à fornir conformo, è veramente Heroico soggetto à richieggo, meglio sia il tacere, che imperfectamente ragionarne, non essendo questo il suo luogo, né il mio intenso. Accetti V.S. il picciolo dono che io le confacio, che se benignamente (come io spero) sia accolto nel prezioso tesoro della sua gratia potrà per aumentarla salire in quel pregio dove per se stesso non bafla di asfissiar, ò col fine le bacio la mano pregandole somma felicità.


Di V. Sig. molto Illustre, ò Eccellentissima

Denissimo Seruitore

Gio: Antonio Terzi.
PREFACE TO LIBRO SECONDO

To the most Illustrious and Excellent Lord, to whom I owe the greatest respect, Signor Sillano Licino,

I have allowed myself to be persuaded to follow my first labours with the publication to the world of these, my efforts (whatever they may be) with the Second Book, not through desire for glory, nor because I believe that through them I can assist anyone, (since my quiet state in a life of relative retirement and my weakening strength have in fact, far from all self-persuasion, made me free of thoughts of either kind). Rather, in good part, the gently persuasive urgings of my friends have induced me to do so (to publish), so that the desire has come to me and I am stimulated to feel obliged in some small measure, if not to recompense, at least to show recognition of the magnitude of the favours and benefits which I have received at all times and on all occasions from Your Lordship, (in whose person concur all those qualities which gather together to furnish a perfect and truly heroic subject, but it would be better to remain silent on this than to recount imperfectly, this not being the place nor my intent). I pray Your Lordship to accept this little gift which I consecrate to You, which, if it is kindly received into Your Grace's precious treasury will perhaps ascend to that value which by itself it would not suffice to aspire to. In conclusion I kiss Your hand, wishing You the highest blessedness.

Venice 10 Nov. 1598.

Your most Illustrious and most Excellent Lordship's most devoted servant,

Gio. Antonio Terzi
CHAPTER TWO

LUTE INTABULATION: AN INTRODUCTION

THE ORIGINS OF INTABULATION

Because we have many written examples of intabulations in the sixteenth century and few from the previous centuries, it would be easy to assume that intabulations were a phenomenon of that period, with few or no historical precedents. However, as David Fallows reminds us, "serious historical errors have been committed on the assumption that sophisticated music existed only where sources survive" and goes on to survey known fifteenth-century sources of lute music. The few extant pre-sixteenth-century sources containing intabulations of vocal music give the impression of written improvisations. The beautifully decorated heart-shaped manuscript in Biblioteca Oliveriana at Pesaro contains seven arrangements of songs, for which the oldest model can be dated 1503. Perhaps the earliest written lute intabulation we have is of Johannes Vincinet's rondeau, *Fortune par ta cruauté* arranged for voice and lute. This is in a fragment of a manuscript in the Bologna University library which Fallows has positively identified as a late

In this arrangement, the lower two voices are notated in tablature for the lute while the singer has the superius in mensural notation.

Rather than assuming that prior to the few extant late fifteenth-century sources, music for the lute was not notated, it is likely that the professional lutenists, at least, read from mensural notation as well as improvising. Timothy McGee points out that professional musicians such as Francesco Landini and Conrad Paumann played the organ and harp, as well as the lute, and that the reason why a musician would have played instruments demanding dissimilar techniques was two-fold. First, such instruments would have been played by people who read music (a rare attribute), and second, they were the most practical instruments for the performance of polyphonic music. However, McGee misguided argues that the Faenza Codex, a manuscript in mensural notation, is not for wind instruments, harp or keyboard as scholars have previously thought, but is for lute duo. Admittedly, much of the music does fit well on two lutes, but it is highly unlikely that music for two lutes would have been written in score notation. Besides, there is no evidence that two lutes ever performed alternatum masses. Nonetheless, the prevailing style in the Faenza Codex, that of an ornamental superius and a lower-pitched arrangement of the tenore without ornamentation, is one which conforms with descriptions of the playing of Pietrobono, a well-known fifteenth-century lutenist. We have evidence, for instance, of a certain Zanetto being employed as Pietrobono's

tenorista, who was perhaps a lutenist or a viol player. His role was to supply the lower part or parts of a chanson, or a basse dance pattern, on top of which Pietrobono would have improvised or embellished a melodic line. 7

Clearly, as Fallows points out, the tenorista, playing or learning the lower parts of a chanson, would need some kind of score reduction, which could be either in mensural notation or in tablature. Unfortunately, if we do not accept McGee's argument for the Faenza Codex, there is possibly only one example, that cited by Fallows, of a fifteenth-century chanson in mensural notation which would fit such a description. 8

The invention of German tablature was attributed by Virdung in Musica getutscht (1511), to the blind lutenist Conrad Paumann who died in 1473. 8a More important though than knowing who invented tablature, (and we do not know as yet of persons responsible for the invention of French and Italian tablature), is to ask why it was invented. Since it is known that the professional fifteenth-century lutenist relied mainly on memory and improvisation, the question arises as to why an altogether different and less flexible system evolved or was invented. In the case of Paumann it is clear that, being blind, he would not have wanted to record his inventions for his own use, so he must have been recording his music for the benefit of others (and perhaps for posterity). A need, then,

8a. L. Lockwood, op. cit., p.121; also D. Fallows, op cit., pp.28-29. Although some doubt has been cast on the accuracy of Virdung's statement it does, according to Fallows (p.10), seem plausible, since German lute tablatures were current in the early 1470's.
must have been felt by non-professional lutenists to have such a simple notation. This was a need nourished by middle-class affluence, and necessitated by the evolution of a new technique which enabled polyphonic playing. Existing beside the older plectrum technique, finger-plucking technique (which by the 1480's was well established), enabled the solo lutenist to represent fully the polyphony of a three-part chanson. The ability to represent two parts or more on one lute was, in the absence of vocal scores, a task to which tablature notation was best suited.

Since we do not have many sources of lute tabulations before the last few decades of the fifteenth century, we must rely on other evidence - writings and paintings - of performance practice. Professor Brown, in his illuminating paper on the fifteenth-century chanson has reconstructed from iconographical evidence the most likely instrumental and vocal combinations, apart from a cappella performance, for the fifteenth-century chanson. A frequent portrayal in painting is one of a lutenist and one singer, in which the lutenist would most likely play the tenore with a plectrum, accompanying a singer on the superius (the contratenore being a voice that can easily be omitted). Equally common is the portrayal of two singers and a lute in which the lute would be plucking one of the three parts, possibly the contratenore. It is clear that songs were also sung to the harp or keyboard - two instruments capable of polyphony. With the evolution of finger-plucking technique the same accompanying role could also have been performed by a lutenist. In a purely instrumental ensemble, the combination of lute and harp seems most favoured. The harp would most likely be playing the two lower lines and the lute the upper line.

This manner of dividing the voices of the model remains visible in the Spinacino duets of the first decade of the sixteenth century. In Spinacino's duets the first lute is given relentless passage work based loosely on the superius part, while the second lute plays the two lower voices without adding further ornamentation. Brown suggests that Spinacino "probably intended to counterfeit an older convention" in which the first lute improvised with a plectrum while another instrument capable of polyphony furnished an accompaniment. This is supported by the similarity of styles in the earlier sources compared with Spinacino, and also by the fact that Spinacino calls the second lute part a tenor. This undoubtedly relates to the earlier term tenorista, meaning the person (playing lute, harp, organ or viol) who supplies the lower two voices of a canzona.

As an accompanying and solo instrument the lute was more popular than any other in renaissance Italy. This popularity is manifest in frequent depiction in paintings, and the high proportion of lute books that issued from the Italian publishing houses from 1507. In the period 1500 to 1600, at least 110 lutes books were published in Europe in Italian tablature. In addition, over one hundred publications in French and German lute tablature and others for related instruments such as the vihuela and the cittern were published in Europe. At a time when the European economy produced a rising middle-class merchant group,

12. Brown 1507/1, nos. 8-12 & 1507/2, no. 29.
14. Quantitative evidence cannot be provided from iconographical evidence of course, but can be provided by publication listings for each instrument: see H.M. Brown, Instrumental Music Printed Before 1600, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965/R1979), p. 478-480.
15. Excluding vihuela tablature, and re-issues of volumes, the number of volumes that we are aware of is around 75. See Appendix 1.3.
16. For a complete listing of these sources see H.M. Brown, op. cit.
leisure was a new commodity which enabled and nurtured amateur music-making. Only members of an affluent class could afford to buy the early printed lute books (which at the beginning of the century were as expensive as a new lute).\(^{17}\) Besides, only amateur lutenists would have needed printed lute music. As Robert Spencer says, the professional lutenist would not have needed such a \textit{vade-mecum}, and in any case, to have played another lutenist's music would have been unthinkable.\(^{18}\) The tablature notation-systems in use, being pictorial, were ideal for those with little or no musical training, and would have encouraged the musically untrained person to learn the instrument. Some volumes such as Galilei's \textit{Il Fronimo} and Le Roy's \textit{Les Instructions pour le Luth}\(^{19}\) were clearly directed to the amateur and included such elementary instructions as how to tune the instrument, and how to read tablature. Most lute books include easy as well as more difficult pieces and a mixed repertoire of genres that would have appealed to the largest number of people. Clearly servicing the needs of the amateur, some books were didactic in character, while others were show-pieces of a particular lutenist's art, and yet others were anthologies.

**MODERN ATTITUDES TO INTABULATION**

It is astounding that the largest genre of sixteenth-century instrumental music has been largely ignored and even treated with contempt by some modern scholars and performers.\(^{20}\) Recently for instance one of England's leading

---

20. For example, in the \textit{Harvard Dictionary of Music} (Cambridge, 1944/R1982), W. Apel wrote that "The artistic importance of this sometimes overwhelmingly large repertoire is very slight [except] from the sociological viewpoint ..." (p.416)
lutenists wrote that he finds the genre of little value for recital purposes. Scholars have afforded the genre more attention than performers, but the interest has usually been restricted to evidence of *musica ficta* practice and ornamentation. This is not to say that these lines of enquiry are not important. Indeed, because of the precision of the notation of pitch in lute tablature, tablatures offer valuable information in both areas, especially when they are compared with their vocal models. A scholar who has never treated the genre lightly is John Ward. As early as 1952 he wrote that "the intabulation of vocal music presents itself, not as the débris of performance practice but as one of the keys to sixteenth-century instrumental practice." Jean-Michel Vaccaro also defends the importance of the genre and writes:

"This genre is really the basis of the repertoire of lutenists in the Renaissance. Why would they have devoted themselves to an activity that was so unsatisfactory? Would it be possible to admit that they would have contented themselves in transcription, with a compromise of bastardizations and gross approximations?"

The genre has not been totally neglected - some dissertations have dealt specifically with intabulation - but given its size, the attention received is disproportionate to the attention given to the dance and fantasia genres. A dissertation dealing specifically with intabulation is Lee Eugene Eubank's study of the Spanish repertoire in which he emphasises that intabulations serve

as guides to the improvisation practices of the sixteenth century.24

While a few scholars, then, have recognised the importance of intabulation, performers have generally not followed suit. The lack of attention modern performers have given to intabulations is perhaps understandable when one considers first that many of the pieces are technically demanding, and second that unfamiliar vocal music on which the intabulations are modelled, may not appear relevant to the musical needs of a twentieth century solo performer. Third, and perhaps more important, in this century performers tend to be slightly suspicious of music which so openly copies the music of other composers. Professor Brown in his valuable contributions to the subject is the only scholar I am aware of who has actually advocated performance of intabulations, by suggesting that present day performers study sixteenth-century intabulations to learn how to make their own arrangements of vocal music.

Lutenists today, who lean so heavily on a repertory made up almost exclusively of fantasias and dances, do not fairly represent sixteenth-century reality.25

... [and]


25. H.M Brown, "The Importance of Sixteenth-Century Intabulations" (soon to be published), a copy of which Professor Howard Mayer Brown kindly supplied me. p.3.
... performers today, it seems to me, have been timid in exploring the published repertories and applying what they can learn from sixteenth-century musicians about how to arrange for themselves the vast amount of superb vocal music that could have been and was arranged for solo and ensemble performance by instruments in the Renaissance. 

LUTE INTABULATIONS IN SIXTEENTH-CENTURY PRINTS

Within the lute books in Italian tablature we find four genres—dance, lute-song (which includes intabulations of frottole), abstract music (such as the fantasia, toccata, canzona and ricercare) and intabulation. Most volumes included two or more genres. Only the publications of part-songs in mensural and tablature notation such as those published by Vecchi, Vincenti and Verovio in the 1590's consisted of one genre exclusively. It was more usual in Spain than in Italy to categorize the material within a volume according to the nature of the vocal models. Vihuela books by Valderrában, Narváez and Fuenllana are divided into sections, according to both the genre and the secular or sacred nature of the models. It is rare to find an Italian lute book containing intabulations of exclusively sacred or secular music, though an exception to this is Barberiis's Libro Quarto of 1546. This includes an intabulation of an entire mass—the Missa, Ave Maria of Antonio Fevin. Of Barberiis's other two lutes books published in the same year, one is a compilation of intabulations of madrigals and chansons and the other a compilation of intabulations of motets. It is more usual for the genres and types of intabulations to be integrated within one volume, as they are in Terzi's books.

28. Brown 1547/5, 1538/1, & 1554/3.
29. Brown 1546/2 fols. 2-16v.
There is so much in common between intabulation and the other genres, dance and absolute music, that at times definitions can become blurred. Although much dance music is not associated with polyphony, one group of lute dances is directly related to vocal music. A collection of dances derived from vocal models is found for instance in Abondante's *libro primo*. Here many of the dances have song titles which demonstrate their vocal origins. The dance *Zorzi gagliarda* for instance originates from the song *Occhio non fu* by Azzaiolo. Another well known Azzaiolo song *Ti parti cor mio* is known in dance form as *La Torcia*. These dances appear to be for solo performance but there is no reason to suppose that other instruments, or voices even, may not have been involved. In fact one lute book, Gastoldi's *Balletti a tre voci* is a collection of dance-songs (mostly originally composed by Gastoldi), per cantare, sonare, & ballare. Another source of lute music, one which demonstrates a genuine bridge between instrumental and vocal music is the group of dances and songs with recurring harmonic patterns, such as the *ruggiero* (inspired by Ariosto's *Orlando furioso*), the *romanesca*, and anything under the general title *aria da cantare*. These could be played as dances, or could act as an unchanged harmonic accompaniment over which various stanzas could be sung.

To intabulate music of instrumental origin, as Terzi did with his arrangements of Maschera, Tusti, Gabrieli and Guami canzonas, although rare, is not without precedent.

32. For a full discussion on this subject see L.H. Moe, *Dance music in Printed Italian Lute Tablatures from 1507 to 1611*, PhD. diss., (Harvard, 1956), Chapter 6.
33. Brown 1546/1.
35. ibid., no. 12, see also Example 5.9, pp. 256.
37. See Chapter 5, p. 223.
38. A source of *Arie da cantare* can be found in Ms. Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, II 275 (Cavalcanti lutebook), fols. 9-36.
Twelve keyboard ricercari by Giulio da Modena (Giulio Segni) were intabulated for lute in Francesco da Milano's Libro Settimo. Some of them had also been intabulated by Joan da Crema in his Libro Primo (1546). Furthermore, two instrumental ensemble ricercari of Annibale Padovano were intabulated in Fallamero’s Il Primo Libro, and Ward cites 13 ricercari by Costanzo Antegnati in a lute manuscript in Vesoul, as well as the arrangement of a Francesco da Milano fantasia and 19 vihuela pieces in Henestrosa's keyboard tablature.

Of the approximately 1200 intabulations published in Italian tablature, many are different arrangements of the same vocal original. The pattern of dissemination of vocal models throughout Europe in lute and keyboard books provides a unique insight into the popularity of particular vocal pieces and their composers. To trace such patterns would undoubtedly be a fruitful subject for future research. The following are the most popular madrigals and chansons found within Italian lute books of the latter half of the century:

- C. de Rore, Anchor che col partire
- P. Sandrin, Doulce memoire
- A. Striggio, Nasce la pena mia
- G. Berchem, O s'io potessi donna
- J. Arcadelt, Quando io penso ai martire
- O. di Lassus, Susanne ung jour
- T. Crecquillon, Un gai berger
- P. da Palestrina, Vestiva i colli

40. Brown 1546/10, nos. 4 & 7.
41. Brown 1584/3, nos. 41-42.
43. See Appendix 1.3. The total of 1200 does not indicate the total number of vocal works used as models for intabulations in Italian tablature, but the number of intabulations printed in Italian tablature, excluding those in reprinted volumes.
44. For lute and keyboard intabulations refer to H.M Brown Instrumental Music Printed Before 1600 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965/R1979). under the appropriate title.
One madrigal whose popularity is demonstrated by the number of times it was arranged for lute or keyboard, is Palestrina's *Vesti di colli*. It was intabulated for lute in five printed lute books (three in Italian tablature and two in French prints), as well as in four known Italian manuscripts, and seven other instrumental sources, including didactic diminution manuals. Beyond 1600, it is found in one Italian lute print, one French lute print, and two fantasias for keyboard attributed to John Bull. 46

In Italian lute books the relative proportions of the four genres, dance, lute-song, intabulations and abstract music, remained much the same throughout the sixteenth century. If lute-song and intabulation are regarded together as arrangements of vocal music, then in any quarter-century period, they comprise between 50% and 66% of the total output. In the first 25 years of the century intabulation did not play as prominent a role in the lute prints as abstract music. The lute-song intabulations of *frottole* by Bossinensis, Tromboncino and Cara 47 comprise virtually half of the total output. For the next 25 years the situation is reversed. That is, the few examples of lute-song—Willaert's intabulations of Verdelot's *frottole*—form only a small portion of the total. From 1550 to 1599 half of the total number of pieces published were arrangements of vocal music. Of these, lute-song and intabulation were in a proportion of about two to three. Lute music directly derived from vocal music equalled in quantity non-vocally derived music. However, when one also considers dance music indirectly derived from vocal music, the proportion is much higher. In fact it will be seen from the discussion in

46. This is indicated in the summary of Appendix 1.3.
47. Brown 1509/1, 1511/1, 1527/1.
Chapter 6 that abstract music is also often directly connected with vocal music.

Given the obvious popularity of intabulations, it seems likely that they functioned for the amateur lutenist as a way of listening to his or her favourite madrigal or motet in the most readily available form. In the sixteenth century this form of music-making was one of the few ways that amateurs could enjoy their favourite madrigals, motets, and frottola without necessarily performing them with others. But as well as providing the amateur lutenist with a means to enjoy well-known polyphonic music in private, intabulations were considered in part at least, to be good didactic material from which to learn the art of fantasia. There is enough evidence in Italian and Spanish literature of the expressed need to learn the necessary skills for the invention of fantasia, diminution, and improvisation through intabulation of vocal works, for us to be sure that this was one of their functions. Spanish and Italian authors on music such as Bermudo, Ortiz, Ganassi, Galilei and Sebastiani wrote that the invention of fantasia should come after study based on the performance of the best pieces of vocal music. 48

TECHNIQUES OF INTABULATION

When a vocal work originally for four to six voices is transferred to the lute, the texture oscillates between polyphony and homophony because of technical necessity: often a part must occupy a string already occupied by another voice. A modern transcription of a lute intabulation does not necessarily realistically represent the actual sound. The transcription can be made to appear largely homophonic, completely polyphonic, or somewhere in between.

If a transcription was to attempt to show the actual sound literally it would at times represent complete polyphony and at other times only vaguely reflect the polyphony. The lute is unable to sustain a note for longer than the generally accepted time span of a semibreve, and as with all fretted instruments, left-hand fingering peculiarities often inhibit the polyphony. However, a lutenist can, by emphasising some notes more than others, create an illusion of fuller polyphony even where it is actually impossible to sustain some of the notes for their full length. But in spite of the best efforts of the most skilled arranger and performer, a four-part vocal score intabulated for solo lute may at times be a mere echo of the original. By taking a passage of an intabulation and transcribing strictly according to the length of time notes can be sustained on the lute, we can illustrate that at times the polyphony cannot be fully reproduced (Example 2.1). I do not suggest however that this method be followed in transcription. "Realistic" transcription would be subject to variation according to how one fingers a passage, the dimensions of a player's hand, the size of the lute, and in Le Roy's words (in the 1574 translation), "according to the goodness of the Lute." Even if all these things were equal and standardized, a further factor - human perception - would exclude the possibility of "realistic" transcription. An instrument such as the lute, demands a type of creative input from the listener that a loud instrument does not, simply because of its subtle, delicate sound. The listener is then mentally disposed to exercise his or her imagination further by filling out the implied polyphony. For the sixteenth-century listener, this would have been a natural process, since the vocal models would most likely have been very familiar.

50. Ibid., fol. 22/p. 21. For a discussion of transcription policies in general, and the particular policy of this dissertation, see the introduction to Volume II.
Quite possibly, this discrepancy between the ideal and reality contributes, in the absence of familiarity with the model, to present-day lutenists' reluctance to include intabulations in their programmes.\textsuperscript{51}

In his thorough evaluation of intabulation in the French sixteenth-century repertoire, Vaccaro discusses the process of intabulation in terms of reorganisation of

\textsuperscript{51} In the few instances where performers have included Italian lute intabulations in recordings, they have worked particularly well when paired with vocal renditions of the model, as in the following examples: The Art of the Netherlands, Early Music Consort of London, \textit{EMI} SLS 5049; Lassus, Motets and Chansons, The Hilliard Ensemble, \textit{EMI} WI 9692; O Vilanella, The Consort of Music, director A. Rooley, WRI 6574 D.
pitch, timbre, intensity, and articulation. His basic thesis is that the material must rework the relationship of text to music. He concludes that passaggi do not merely fill in gaps but are used to emphasise a particular voice, that "their role is not a matter of [technical] compensation, but of musical style".\footnote{Il faut insister sur le fait que leur rôle n'est pas d'ordre compensatoire mais essentiellement d'ordre stylistique, J.M. Vaccaro, op.cit., p.139.} It is clear, however, that in almost every Terzi intabulation some ornamentation is placed in bars of little or no activity, for the sake of musical continuity. But there is much more to ornamentation than mere pragmatism. It is the complex relationship of ornamentation to the model's structure and text that is explored in Chapter 3 of this dissertation. Owing to the lute's relatively small range of pitch and dynamics, some modifications are inevitable in the process of translating notes from voices to lute. By far the greatest modification occurs when the intabulator either adds so much ornamentation that the original structure is disguised, or actually inserts sections of new material. In either case a re-compositional process is involved, or, putting it another way, the intabulator has collaborated with the composer.

A necessary modification results from the reduction of the vocal music from five or six voices to four. It was very common at the beginning of the century for an intabulation to omit one of the voices of the model completely. All of Spinacino's four-voiced models are reduced to three parts, either by condensing the two inner voices or by omitting one voice most of the time.\footnote{H.L. Schmidt III, The First Printed Lute Books: Francesco Spinacino's Intabulatura De Lauto, Libro Primo and Libro Secondo (Venice: Petrucci, 1507), Ph.D. diss., (North Carolina, 1969), p.18.} In most frottola collections four voices were reduced to two in the lute intabulation, leaving out the alto and giving the canto to the solo singer.
Towards the end of the century in the lute-song arrangements of frottole, villanelle and canzonette, the lute played all three voices, often doubling the sung canto. The omission of complete polyphonic voices from intabulations became rarer towards the end of the century. That is to say, notes were omitted only from time to time in an intabulation. Terzi, in his arrangements of five and six-voiced models for instance, attempted to include all voices. Rather than leave out one or two voices throughout an intabulation, he omitted a part for a few bars where its inclusion was impractical or awkward. However, even when he tried to represent five or six-part polyphony fully, the linear aspects of the inner voices are inevitably blurred somewhat (for example the quinto part in Example 2.2). The necessity of occasionally leaving out a part has been well discussed by, among others, Galilei and Le Roy. Galilei says that the two outer voices must always remain intact but that the best note to omit when necessary would be one which forms an octave with another part. Le Roy, too, despite the extreme care with which he always represents the polyphony, concedes in one instance that where two parts share the same pitch, four parts may become three "to avoid much strainynge of the hand". He goes on to say that a note is omitted where the music requires it, such as in an ornamental passage, "not so much for all that for necessitie, as for the pleasautnesse of the sounde". On the other hand he talks of the lute's superiority over the Virginal being its ability to represent

---

55. Galilei (1584), p.55. Galilei gives an example of a Palestrina madrigal, *Saffra quest'herbe & fiore*, in which he leaves out notes, "not because of heedlessness, but thoughtfully to amplify their grace and lightness". (p.52).
EXAMPLE 2.2
Palestrina, *O bella Ninfa mia*, bb. 12-13

the same pitch on two courses. This is an ideal to be realized wherever it is physically possible, and in the opening bars of a piece (such as in the example he gives) it works particularly well. Terzi also, whenever possible, preserves the polyphony where two voices enter on the same note, by intabulating the note on two courses simultaneously.

Another compromise which lute intabulators often have to make is to reiterate a note of a semibreve or longer. Le Roy says that a good lute will hold its sound for as long as a semibreve, but all the same he alters some semibreves to minims. Terzi usually leaves semibreves as they are, but reiterates notes longer than that, particularly when a semibreve is tied to a minim across the beat.

The first task on intabulating a piece for lute, would be to choose an appropriate pitch-level into which the model can be transcribed. It is well known that before the eighteenth century there was no precise pitch standard. It is also clear from many Spanish and Italian sources that beyond the middle of the sixteenth century, lutenists or vihuelists imagined their instruments to be tuned at a certain pitch. In other words they "changed the instrument for the music" rather than "changed the music for the instrument".\textsuperscript{62}

Vincenzo Galilei makes it clear that a note can be placed anywhere on the lute and he gives examples where the top course is equal to $g'$, $a'$, $c''$, $d''$, $e'$ and $b'$ in the untransposed modes. In the modes transposed down a fifth, the top strings are equal to $g'$, $a'$, $c''$, $d''$, $f'$, and $b$ \textit{flat}.\textsuperscript{63} He admits that all of these transposition levels are possible, but says that the two most suitable ones are where the top course equals $g'$ (Example 2.3), in both the transposed and untransposed modes:

Although these two examples which have been explained to you are the most common ways to intabulate, nonetheless, players have been accustomed to vary the string or fret in playing any note of those shown to you.\textsuperscript{64}

---


64. Ancora che questi due esempi dichiaratovi, siano i modi più comuni, hanno non dimeno i sonatore usato variare corda, e tasto, nel sonare qual si voglia nota delle mostrate. Galilei (1584), p. 9.
He goes on to explain that the reason why players "have wanted to vary the strings and frets in this way" (that is, to transcribe to various pitch levels) is "firstly from necessity, and then in order to facilitate and add grace to the modulations."\footnote{Eumatio: Perche hanno così voluto variare le corde e tasti, non facendo (com'io credo) alcuna variazione d'amoronia? Pronimo: Per due importanti rispetti. Prima per necessità, poi per facilitare, e aggiungere gratia alle modulazioni. ibid., p.9.} I take this to mean that he would place an intabulation at the nominal pitch which allowed for the greatest utilisation of open courses, especially at cadences. This would not only be the most technically expedient thing to do, it would also assist the music: the tuning would be easier to control, and the tone would be superior in the positions closest to the nut. It was this need to have open courses in the cadences (Galilei specifically refers to needing F on the tenore course in a mode containing Bb) that sometimes necessitated scordatura.
of the contrabasso. Galilei cited Francesco da Milano's intabulation of *La Battaglia Francese* as an example where tuning the contrabasso down to F is necessary. He also mentioned that some players had found it necessary to tune their top string to F fa ut in transposed keys. In reality though, Galilei set most of his intabulations to pitches other than G when it suited him.

Le Roy suggests setting a vocal piece to the lute according to the eight modes, but it is clear from the examples he gives that in fact he chose transposition levels according to the range of the model and the physical comfort of the lutenist, not the modes. He says that it is sometimes necessary to set the lowest note of the bass an octave higher than in the model, rejecting the possibility of solving the problem by "setting the song one note or twoo higher [because] it would be harder for the hande, and the grace of the plaie would bee woorsser". He also rejects the option of tuning the contrabasso a tone lower, as that too would add to the lutenist's technical difficulties. Whatever else he may profess, then, in practice it is the ease of execution which determines his choice of transcription levels.

Terzi did not discuss his reasons for choice of transcription levels, but it is obvious from the music that two principles operated: he chose transcription levels firstly according to the tessitura of the model, and secondly to facilitate open courses for the finals of the prevalent cadences. In those intabulations for which models are available, it can be seen that he uses six "tunings" only. In the untransposed modes he transcribes as though for lutes whose top strings equal g', d'', and a'', and in the

67. See Volume II, nos. 6 & 21.
Most of Terzi's intabulations require a seventh course tuned a tone below the sixth, but a few call for the seventh course to be tuned a perfect fourth below the sixth. A few intabulations require only six courses, and one utilises the top five courses only.

69. Appendix 1.4 gives the transposition levels for all of Terzi's intabulations with available models, along with their requirements in terms of the number of courses.

70. Five courses:
   (1593), no 5; (1599), no. 89;
Six courses:
   (1593), no. 12; (1599), nos. 9, 39, 56, 58, 63, 80 & 87;
Seventh course tuned a fourth below the sixth course:
   (1595), nos. 10, 13, 14, 16 & 27; (1599), nos. 10, 12, 16, 49 & 57.
All other intabulations need a seventh course tuned a tone below the sixth course.
CHAPTER THREE

ORNAMENTATION

Part one. Introduction

Before the fifteenth century very little lute music was notated in tablature, and lutenists' reliance on mensural notation was probably very slight.1 The earliest sources of printed lute music, Spinacino's Libro Primo and Libro Secondo and Dalza's Intabulatura de Lauto2 demonstrate a style, particularly in the ricercari and intabulations, which can be traced back to the improvisation practices of the fifteenth century. Towards the middle of the sixteenth century, polyphonic imitation prevailed in lute music over the freer, less organised style of the first decade, and is exemplified in Francesco da Milano's fantasias and intabulations. The invention and rapid growth of movable-type printing nurtured a reliance by the affluent amateur lutenist upon notated lute music to the extent that the 1540's saw a boom in music printing in Europe.3

Growing emphasis on music-reading skills is demonstrated by the widespread dissemination of didactic manuals in mensural notation. These provided ornamental formulae and ready-made embellishments for singers and

2. Brown 1507/1, 1507/2, 1508/2.
3. Around 45 lute and vihuela books printed in the 1540's are cited in H. M. Brown, Instrumental Music Printed Before 1600, a bibliography (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965), pp. 63-122.
ornamentation

instrumentalists. Publication of volumes of vocal music with written ornamentation which in the preceding century would have been largely left to improvisation, does not however demonstrate a cessation of improvisation practice. Rather, they are examples of written out improvisations from a period in which the improvisation of elaborations remained prolific. There is a danger that we may take written music too literally, supposing for instance that a lutenist would not have freely embellished a literal intabulation according to his or her technical ability, as was the practice among singers of the period. Indeed, there is evidence that even when lute music was endowed with written passaggi, the performer was free to add further small ornaments. Such ornaments, for which the Italians did not have a generic term but which the English lutenists called "graces", differ from passaggi in that they start and end on the same note and are slurred by the left hand fingers rather than individually articulated. As a rule, they were not written down except as conventional signs in a few prints and manuscripts. Perhaps the most explicit exposition on "gracing" sixteenth-century lute music is given in the Capirola lute book.5 Vitali, the compiler of the manuscript, wrote in the preface:

When you see those [red] dots it means that you should play a 'shake' on that fret. Everybody will notice that it is an ornament as it is not indispensable. Those who know how to play, put [these graces] wherever they like. I wrote them down just to show you where it is nice to play them - [in fact] these 'tremoli' are very elegant when played in the right places. 6

Vitali was as much concerned with demonstrating where to place the graces ("dimostrarti dove li stano bene afarli") as he was in showing how to execute the ornaments. Instructions like these are rare, for such skills were usually gained from listening to other good performers. This was the method recommended by Wyssenbach in 1550, and Besard in 1603. Poulton suggests that the reason why graces were not often indicated is that they were part of a live tradition, and that the necessary signs were not available to printers. Also it is likely that all lutenists were familiar with a small stock of graces, but just where they were placed in the music was a matter for personal choice and subject to variation. Brown makes the observation from a Capirola Padoana in which graces are added to the beginning of the piece only, that "the performer, having been shown the way, can put others wherever his instincts tell him and the technique of his instrument allows."

The two types of ornaments (improvised graces and written passaggi), fall within E.T. Ferand's two categories of improvisation - absolute and relative. Ferand distinguishes between simultaneous invention and execution, and that in which an established composition is subjected to temporary alteration of the moment. These concepts are analogous with Richard Erig's distinctions between "composition" and "improvisation" in ornamentation. Such distinctions, which may have been considered antitheses in the nineteenth and, to a lesser extent, twentieth centuries, were of course not regarded as such in the sixteenth century. Erig said of the didactic ornamentation manuals, that they "stand paradigmatically between improvisation and

11. R. Erig and V. Gutmann, Italian Diminutions, The Pieces with more than one Diminution from 1553 to 1638 (Zürich, 1979), p.9.
composition", and this could equally be said of the lute intabulations. Although many of the printed intabulations included ornamentation, there is every reason to believe that the lutenist would have been free to add further graces.

The adequate assessment of the vast amount of material in the sixteenth-century ornamentation manuals as it pertains to lute intabulations would need a separate investigation. Nonetheless, the opportunity to compare Terzi's style of ornamentation, however superficially, with examples from the manuals, is too convenient to bypass. Many of the more popular madrigals that Terzi intabulated were also embellished in the didactic manuals and so offer valuable comparative material. This chapter takes its impetus from Brown's suggestion that in the sixteenth-century, "musicians took pleasure in obscuring the structural elements of a composition rather than making them as plain as possible." Brown clearly found this to be the case in the didactic elaborations, and in some early sixteenth-century intabulations. However, it does not necessarily follow that this tendency was a consistent feature in lute intabulations throughout the whole of the sixteenth century. It is the extent to which ornamentation

14. Erig and Gutman, op. cit., no. 7 p. 133; no. 9 p. 172; no. 10, p. 211; no. 22, p. 347. See also the present thesis' Volume II, no. 38 p. 290, included in a different version in Erig and Gutman, p. 187. For further transcriptions of Bessano see Volume II, no. 8 p. 88, no. 9 p. 97, & no. 17 p. 177.
disguises structural features of the model in Terzi's intabulations which is the subject of the following discussion.

Part Two. Analysis of Terzi's style

This investigation of stylistic features of Terzi's ornamentation in intabulations begins with the smallest elements - units of two, three and four notes - and proceeds to the larger organisation of those elements. Analysis centres on the following aspects:

(1) the smallest cells, or units, of ornamentation applied between pitches given in the model,
(2) the rhythmic values of those units,
(3) the intervals and voices of the model on which Terzi predominantly placed his ornaments,
(4) patterns of cadential ornamentation,
(5) the contribution of passaggi to the polyphonic structure of the model,
(6) the relationship of ornamentation to text, and aspects of interpretation such as tempo,
(7) evidence of self-imitation within the passaggi.

The data for analysis of such aspects of Terzi's ornamentation, are gathered predominantly from eleven intabulations selected as representative of a variety of styles. Prior to analysis, general musical assessments were attained from playing Terzi's intabulations on the lute over a period of several years.

16. Transcriptions are in Volume II: no. 1 p. 15, no. 2 p. 22, no. 8 p. 88, no. 9 p. 97, no. 11 p. 124, no. 12 p. 134, no. 13 p. 142, no. 16 p. 154, no. 17 p. 177, no. 23 p. 232, & no. 34 p. 257. Included in this sample are solo intabulations of madrigals and motets, highly ornamented intabulations for duo or in concerto performance, two highly ornate solo intabulations with the additional indications con passaggi and à modo di viola bastarda, and instrumentally derived intabulations.
THE UNITS OF EMBELLISHMENT

The varieties of figuration that Terzi produces in his *passaggi* are such that unless classified into units of two, three, and four notes according to their shape, few consistent patterns other than conjunct movement emerge. Before such units can be codified, three phenomena must be investigated separately: firstly, the interval of the model being ornamented, secondly, the pitches of the ornamental unit, and thirdly, the rhythm. A problem arises in classification because it is often not clear from the tablature which interval is being ornamented, particularly when the *passaggi* cross from one voice to another. Example 3.1 illustrates difficulties that can arise when an ornament is classified according to the interval it is ornamenting. Here the quaver unit could be seen to be ornamenting from a to a, or a to f. Similarly the crotchet e in the bass could be classified as a passing note to f or an auxiliary note of d. The transcription's part-writing is not necessarily clarified on comparison with the model, because Terzi's ornamentation often cuts through the original polyphony. For the purpose of analysis therefore, the units are classified according to their shape, regardless of the interval they ornament, and initially regardless of their rhythms. Hence the ornamental units in the following tables are given with two possible final pitches where applicable. Codification on this basis facilitates comparison among Terzi's intabulations.

EXAMPLE 3.1
TABLE 3.1
Terzi's non-cadential ornamental units, classified in groups of 2, 3, & 4 notes presented in their order of frequency of occurrence within each group. (Nominal pitches).

Two-note groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>c, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>e, f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>g, h</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three-note groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a, b, c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>d, e, f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>g, h, i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four-note groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a, b, c, d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>e, f, g, h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>i, j, k, l</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\text{ornamentation 47}\]
TABLE 3.2
Data from Table 3.1 presented in the order of frequency of occurrence overall. (Nominal Pitches).
The characteristics of the smallest elements of Terzi's passaggi and the way they combine uniquely for each intabulation can be seen from an analysis of Terzi's ornaments, classified as units of two, three, and four notes. Table 3.2 gives, in order of their frequency of occurrence, Terzi's ornamental units as they are found between any two harmony notes of the model. The same information classified into two-note, three-note, and four-note groups with the most frequently employed rhythms for each group is given in Table 3.1.

To summarise Tables 3.1 and 3.2, the most frequently recurring ornamental units are of the following four types.

(1) Those which move conjunctly in the same direction: descending, C1, A1, B1, and their inversions C2, A2, and B3.

(2) Two four-note figures C4 and C3 with their inversions, retrogrades and retrograde inversions C5, C6, C9, C14, C8, and C7.

(3) The three note unit B2 and its inversion B5

(4) and B4.

17. As tabulated in Appendices 1.5 to 1.7.
It is clear that Terzi more often than not employed ornamental units which move conjunctly; indeed they account for over two thirds of all of the units. Of the units which incorporate leaps there are three types:

(1) The most common are those which contain a leap of a third - C3 and B4 - along with their inversions, retrogrades and retrograde inversions. The interval of the leap usually outlines the harmony of the moment, and invariably the note immediately following the leap returns to fill the space created (Example 3.2a).

(2) Sometimes however, a leap of a third does not outline the harmony but is part of a cambiata figure.

EXAMPLE 3.2
(Volume II no. 16, p. 160, bb. 16-18)

(3) The less commonly used units of C11, C16, C17, C18, C24, B9, B10 and B12 include leaps larger than a third in which the interval outlines notes of the harmony, such as in Example 3.2b. Some units, C15, C16, C18, C30 and C31, are triadic. The units A3, A4, and those containing octave leaps are employed in the bass more often than elsewhere.

18. For statistical data see Appendix 1.5.
TABLE 3.3
Ornamental units from eleven Terzi intabulations, presented in the order of frequency of occurrence within each intabulation.

STRIGGIO Nasce la pena mia

MARENZIO Liquide perle

GUAMI La Diodatina

BIGGI Gandise perle

MARENZIO Leggiadre ninfe
Table 3.3 cont.

GABRIELI Caro dolce ben mio

INGEGNERI Surrexit

MARENZIO Quando i vostri begli occhi

PALESTRINA Tu es pastor oviium

MASCHERA La Martinenga

MONTE Ahi chi mi rompe
Terzi's embellishments are not as uniform among individual intabulations as the above discussion may suggest. Rather, he ornamented each intabulation with a unique combination of ornamental units that ensured a different character for each piece of music. It is clear from Table 3.3, which indicates the most frequent units used in individual intabulations, that while the conjunct units C1, C2, A1 and B1 feature prominently, there is nevertheless a different combination of ornamental units for each intabulation. The most frequent units in each of these intabulations are not solely those of conjunct motion in a single direction, but include those such as C3, C4 and B2.

The model's melodic characteristics undoubtedly influenced Terzi's choice of units for each intabulation. His choices were limited in any case by the melodic nature of the model, since its melodic intervals predetermine to a large degree the ornaments that can be applied. A model whose melodies consist mainly of stepwise movement severely limits the type of passaggi that can be applied, if the intabulator is intent on preserving the original harmony notes. All the same, Terzi clearly made stylistic choices in line with the musical character of the model. In the intabulation of Leggiadre ninfe, the almost constant stepwise ornamentation is consistent with the conjunct canto melody and is in keeping with the mood of the text, "Leggiadre ninfe e pastorelli amanti" (Graceful nymphs and loving shepherds). Similarly, the predominance of ornaments with a \( \overline{\underline{\text{}}\text{}} \) rhythm in the intabulation of Tu es Pastor ovium imitates \( \overline{\underline{\text{}}\text{}} \) at the opening of the Palestrina motet.

19. The statistical data for Table 3.3 are given in Appendix 1.5.
RHYTHM (Data in Appendix 1.7)

Rhythmically Terzi did not display much variety or originality in his elaborations. The rhythms he assigned to the ornamental units are limited in type, small in number, and conservative. The two most frequent figures in the two-note group, (a) \( \frac{d}{c} \) and (b) \( \frac{d}{b} \) occur in 75% of the units. Less common are figures (c) \( \frac{d}{a} \) (d) \( \frac{c}{a} \) (e) \( \frac{a}{c} \) and (f) \( \frac{a}{b} \), with any other rhythmic group being very rare. In the three-note group (a) \( \frac{c}{b} \) is used for 40% of the units. This is more than the next three groups (b) \( \frac{b}{b} \) (c) \( \frac{b}{a} \) and (d) \( \frac{a}{a} \) combined. Three-note units are more often than not used to preclude a four-note group with the rhythm ![](image) or ![](image).

One never encounters ornamental triplets in Terzi's intabulations, let alone any other irregular figures such as quintuplets or septuplets. By far the most common rhythms in the four-note group are (a) \( \frac{c}{b} \) and (b) \( \frac{b}{b} \), often in phrases of continuous quavers or semiquavers several bars long. For variety, especially at cadences, units of (c) \( \frac{d}{a} \) are found occasionally, and in the very virtuosic intabulations Terzi often wrote demisemiquaver passaggi.

In the four-note group (Table 3.1), units other than even quavers, semiquavers, or demisemiquavers are distinguished by having the longest note values at the beginning of the beat, followed by shorter values on a weaker part of the beat, as for instance figure (f) \( \frac{d}{c} \). In the three-note group, the smaller note values similarly fall on the weaker part of the beat, as in figure (a) \( \frac{d}{c} \). However, some of the time Terzi placed the shorter note values at the beginning of the beat as (e) \( \frac{d}{c} \) and (g) \( \frac{d}{c} \). How he distributed these and simple two-note figures within the bar varies considerably, for in some intabulations most \( \frac{d}{c} \) or \( \frac{d}{c} \) figures are placed on weak
beats of the bar, but in others considerably more freedom is evident.

**Distribution of rhythm within the bar**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>crotchet beats</th>
<th>Erano i capei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2/2 1 2 3 4</td>
<td>(Vol.II, no.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In his intabulation of Nanino's *Erano i capei*, Terzi assigned pairs of quavers or semiquavers equally to strong and weak parts of a beat. In this respect he deviated from the preferred sixteenth-century stylistic practice of placing smaller note values on the weaker beat, or on the weaker part of the beat.

Most of the time Terzi followed the common sixteenth-century vocal practice of using smaller note values at the conclusion of a *passaggio* than at its outset. However, he sometimes deviated from this practice by beginning *passaggi* with smaller note values. Examples of this can be seen in the intabulation of Striggio's *Nasce la pena mia* in which these figures begin on the beat:

b.6  b.6  b.27

---

22. See for example Volume II, nos.7, 9, 19 & 11.
23. Volume II, no.16.
Syncopation is rare within Terzi's solo intabulations but common in the contrapunti intabulations and in the very highly embellished intabulations. The rate of movement in some sections of these intabulations becomes very fast indeed, and when they include syncopations (such as those below) it is difficult to imagine even the most accomplished lutenist performing such rhythms literally. They would probably be only approximated at that speed, as in any case they give the impression of rubato notated.

Rore, Non mi toglia (Vol. II, no. 21)

```
bb. 31-33 & 50
b. 57
```

Striggio, S'ogni mio bene (Vol. II, no. 6)

```
b. 8
b. 9
```

Terzi usually ornamented so that the original pitch of the model was retained at the beginning of each minim beat. Where crotchets occurred melodically in the model, he ornamented from minim to minim, whilst including all original notes within the ornamental unit, such as in Example 3.3a. Very occasionally in a solo intabulation, but frequently in the contrapunti, Terzi wrote ornaments in which their initial pitches were not those of the model. In such cases, however, they are always concordant with the existing harmony (Example 3.3b).

**EXAMPLE 3.3**

(a) Vol. II, no. 23, b. 13.
(b) Vol. II, no. 9, bb. 3 & 4
In essence, Terzi's harmonic concern always seemed to be to preserve the minim beat consonances of the vocal models. He also usually ensured that a weak crotchet beat was consonant with all other sounding parts, but on occasion when he did write passing crotchet dissonance, it was usually "unsounded" dissonance. The new dissonances Terzi produced were usually cadential suspensions (Example 3.4a), and more often, mild 4/3 dissonance resulting from cadential groppi (Example 3.4b).

**EXAMPLE 3.4**
(a) Vol. II, no. 12, b. 11  (b) Vol. II, no. 2, b. 8

**EXAMPLE 3.5**
(Vol. II, no. 17, bb. 53-54)

24. For ease of transcription of the *contrappunti* in Volume II the transcription method (a) is used, but for purposes of analysis the units of ornamentation are classified according to (b).
In the highly ornamented intabulations such as Striggio's *Nasce la pena mia* and Marenzio's *Liquide perle* the passaggi often imply polyphony by a single florid line, in much the same manner as in a Bach unaccompanied violin sonata. Example 3.5 illustrates with two transcriptions of the same extract, that large leaps in Terzi's passaggi can imply polyphony. Undoubtedly the lutenist would have been aware of the polyphony and would have emphasised important top, bottom and middle notes and sustained them for as long as possible. Terzi's highly ornamented intabulations differ from the others in that whereas normally the ornamentation would lead stepwise from one note of the model to another, in the highly ornamented intabulations an ornament occasionally begins and ends on the same note. This can result in large leaps from one ornamented note to another.²⁵

**COMBINATIONS OF ORNAMENTAL UNITS²⁶**

Although the units cited here can be seen in Terzi's intabulations as simple two-, three- and four-note ornaments, they are of course more usually grouped in combinations of two or more units to a minim or semibreve. Variety of figuration is evident in the way Terzi rarely combined pairs of identical units in a sequential manner other than to produce ascending or descending scales. On the other hand, there is little variety in the actual intervals used in the passaggi: of the 32 most frequent pairs of ornamental units in Table 3.4, two-thirds contain units which are conjunct in one direction.

---

25. See for example Volume II, no.17, bb.13 & 21 (pp.180 & 182), also no.3 bb.16 & 17 (p.32).
26. Appendix 1.6 gives the statistical data for Tables 3.4 & 3.5.
TABLE 3.4
Pairs of ornamental units in order of frequency

1. C1+01
2. B1+01
3. C2+02
4. B2+A1
5. C4+01
6. C1+C2
7. B3+C2
8. A1+01
9. B4+C2
10. C6+01
11. C4+06
12. C7+01
13. O5+C2
15. B2+03
16. C3+C3
17. C3+C10
18. C3+C2
19. C4+C2
20. C7+03
21. C5+03
22. A2+C2
23. B3+03
24. B6+C2
25. B4+02
26. O6+08
27. C4+C8
28. C1+03
29. O31+C11
30. A2+01
31. C4+C3
32. A1+C11
Overall, the three combinations that Terzi used the most (Table 3.5, figs. 1, 2 & 3) are those of ascending and descending scales spanning an octave. Most of the other common types involve conjunct movement contrasting in direction or shape. The few existing examples of sequential units are to be found in Terzi's intabulations of instrumental music. While the units themselves are of the type most commonly represented in sixteenth-century ornamentation and are not in any way extraordinary, Terzi combined them in such a way to give each intabulation a unique ornamental figuration. This variety is illustrated by Table 3.5 where surprisingly few pairs occur more than two or three times among the ten intabulations. Even the most common group (C1+C1) is not the most important ornamental feature of every intabulation. The salient characteristics are as follows:

(1) The ornamentation in two highly ornamented intabulations, Nasce la penna mia, and Liquide perle consists predominantly of scale-figures spanning an octave or more.

(2) In contrast, the two instrumentally derived intabulations in this sample, Maschera's La Martinenga and Guami's La Diodatina, contain figures incorporating leaps such as those in C10+C10 and C31+C11.

(3) The intabulation of Gabrieli's Caro dolce incorporates the ornamental figure C6+C8 in bars 14 and 15. This is unusual in that it is a standard cadential pattern (groppo) which in this case is not being used cadentially.

27. See for example Guami's canzona La Diodatina, Volume II, no. 34, bb. 10 & 14 (pp. 258 & 259).
28. The combination C1+C1 occurs only nineteen times within the sample of eleven intabulations. Pairs occurring once only are too numerous to represent in Appendix 1.6.
TABLE 3.5
The most common five-note to eight-note ornaments in ten Terzi intabulations, presented in order of frequency of occurrence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ornamentation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STRIGGIO Nasce la pena mia</td>
<td>C1+C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B1+C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C4+C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2+C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B3+C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C7+C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARENZIO Liquide perle</td>
<td>C1+C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G2+C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1+C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUAMI La Diodatina</td>
<td>C4+C6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G7+C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C10+C10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B4+C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C3+C11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C18+C5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICCI Candide perle</td>
<td>C3+C3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARENZIO Leggiadre ninfe</td>
<td>G4+C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MONTE Ahì chi mi rompe</td>
<td>C1+C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C2+C2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C6+C1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.5 cont.

GABRIELI Caro dolce ben mio

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
E1+C1 \\
G6+C8 \\
A1+C5
\end{array}
\end{equation}

INGEGNERI Surrexit

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
C1+C2 \\
G2+C2 \\
E4+C2
\end{array}
\end{equation}

PALESTRINA Tu es pastor ovinum

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
E2+A1 \\
G8+C2 \\
A2+C1
\end{array}
\end{equation}

MASCHERA La Martinenga

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{c}
C4+C3 \\
A1+C11 \\
C2+C2
\end{array}
\end{equation}

(4) Distinguishing it from all the others, the intabulation of Palestrina's *Tu es Pastor ovinum*, employs the less common rhythmic groups $\text{\footnotesize$\frac{\text{T}}{\text{\scriptsize2}}$}$ and $\text{\footnotesize$\frac{\text{4}}{\text{\scriptsize2}}$}$

**ORNAMENTED INTERVALS AND TEXTURE** (Appendix 1.8)

Since the melodic structure of sixteenth-century madrigals and motets employs a preponderance of smaller intervals, it is not surprising to find that most *passaggi* are placed on the small intervals of descending seconds, ascending seconds, and descending thirds in that order of priority. The intervals ornamented most often in the bass are the descending third, descending fifth and ascending second. Naturally, the intervals of the model's bass will generally be larger than in the other voices. A significant statistical difference is that 60% of the bass ornamentation is placed on descending intervals, and 40% on ascending
intervals when ornamenting within the original voicings (Appendix 1.8b).

One third of the *passaggi* cross from one polyphonic voice to another. This gives the opportunity to ornament wider intervals than those dictated by the melodic shape of the model. In the voice-crossing passaggi, the interval Terzi ornamented most frequently was the ascending fifth. This is followed, in order of frequency, by the descending and ascending third, and descending fifth. In the highly ornamented intabulations Terzi at times ornamented large intervals, wider than two octaves, as the writing moves freely from the treble to the bass pitches of the model.

In intabulations in which Terzi endeavoured to represent the polyphony fully (as he did in most solo intabulations), the ornamentation is distributed among the voices. Two thirds of the ornamentation remains within the individual polyphonic voices, but the remaining third crosses from one voice to another in a way which blurs the original part-writing. Of the *passaggi* remaining within the original voices, the bass receives slightly less ornamentation than the treble voice (See data below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average textural distribution of passaggi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>treble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inner voices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voice crossings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As averages these figures can disguise the at times marked differences between individual intabulations, as the following examples illustrate. In Terzi's arrangement of Bicci's *Candide perle* most of the *passaggi* cross voices, whereas in Maschera's *La Martinenga* it is predominantly the treble and inner voices that are ornamented.
Cadential ornaments

The ornamentation of cadences was considered to be important enough in most sixteenth-century treatises to receive special consideration. Terzi responded to the structure of phrases by placing more ornamentation at cadence points than anywhere else. His cadential ornaments are placed predominantly on the leading note, but there are some instances where Terzi ornamented other notes.

1. Leading-note ornaments

Most of the leading-note ornaments embellish a suspension already given in the model, but often when none had been given Terzi added one. This is one of the few situations where Terzi altered the given harmony.\(^{29}\) The two leading-note ornaments Terzi used more than any other were the groppo, which is a conventional trill with a turn, (Table 3.6, fig.A:1), and the simple quaver ornament familiar from vocal music (Table 3.6, fig.A:15). Terzi avoided monotony in his passaggi by using various groppi and by extending the suspension with quaver and semiquaver figures (Table 3.6, figs.A:10 to A:33). Common to most groppi is the turn c, b, a, b preceding the final (Table 3.6, figs.A:1-7).

\(^{29}\) For an example see Volume II, no. 12. p.135 (b.17).
TABLE 3.6
Terzi's leading-note graces
(pitches generalised to tonic C)
Ten percent of Terzi's leading-note ornaments do not involve suspensions, since they are not provided in the model (Table 3.6, exs. B & C). In those cadential ornaments which do include a suspension, there are enough varieties of ornamental figuration preceding the groppo to avoid stock cadential formulae (Table 3.6D). The most common approach to the groppo is from a third below, as in exs. D1, D2, D4, D5, D6, D11 and D26 of Table 3.6. 30

30. The two most frequent cadential ornaments are A1 and A15, which comprise 36% and 25% respectively of the total in the sample.
By writing different *passaggi* in approach to a stock trill and by varying the simple suspended leading-note ornament, musical variety in the ornamental cadences is ensured. Predictability is further avoided by allowing many cadences to stand in their original simplicity, unornamented.

2. "Non leading-note" ornaments.

**TABLE 3.7**

**Cadential "non leading-note" ornaments**

(a) ![Musical notation](image1)

- No. 11, bb. 32, 33
- No. 19, bb. 50, 51

(b) ![Musical notation](image2)

- No. 20, bb. 32, 33
- No. 19, bb. 50, 51

(c) ![Musical notation](image3)

- No. 23, bb. 64
- No. 2, bb. 19

(d) ![Musical notation](image4)

- No. 19, bb. 28
- No. 13, bb. 14

(e) ![Musical notation](image5)

- No. 21, bb. 30
- No. 19, bb. 28

(f) ![Musical notation](image6)

- No. 20, bb. 34
- No. 21, bb. 30

**Notes:**
- No. 11, bb. 41: perfect
- No. 20, bb. 32, 33: imperfect
- No. 19, bb. 50, 51: phrygian
- No. 23, bb. 64: plagal
- No. 2, bb. 19: phrygian
- No. 19, bb. 28: plagal
- No. 13, bb. 14: plagal
- No. 20, bb. 34: perfect
Terzi sometimes ornamented the bass or another voice of the cadence as an alternative to ornamenting the rising leading-note of the perfect cadence, or the falling semitone of the plagal and phrygian cadences. One fifth of the cadential ornaments are on a voice other than the leading-note progression (Table 3.7). Sometimes the ornament crosses the voicing (exs. d, e & f), but more frequent are the bass ornaments of examples g, h and i. One occasionally finds in the treble voices of perfect or imperfect cadences (Table 3.7 exs. a & b) "non leading-note" ornaments which are similar in shape to those Terzi would use for the leading-note. The melodic ornaments for the phrygian and plagal cadences differ from "leading-note" ornaments only in that they do not perform a leading-note function, although they do in fact lead to the tonic (exs. c, d, e & f). In phrygian cadences Terzi wrote whole-tone groppi but never ornamented the falling semitone progression of the bass (exs. c, e & f). The plagal cadence, however, is more likely to have the bass ornamented, thus emphasising the descending fourth or ascending fifth progressions (exs. g & h). There are a few instances of similar ornamentation of perfect cadences (ex. i). In ornamenting the bass of the plagal cadence Terzi particularly favoured the ascending four-note figure of ex. g.

PATTERNS OF PASSAGGI DISTRIBUTION

One of the most striking features of Terzi's intabulations is that the amount of ornamentation applied to them varies from nearly nothing,³¹ to almost constant passaggi.³² Thus we find intabulations in which

32. For example, Volume II, no. 16 p. 154, no. 18 p. 191, no. 6 p. 56 (lutes 2 and 3), & no. 17 p. 177 (lute 2).
ornamentation is applied primarily to preserve the musical flow, and those which are virtually recomposed. Within these two extremes Terzi's intabulations can be classified into four structural schemes referred to here as (1) stop/start pattern, (2) sectional ornamentation, (3) constant ornamental overlay, and (4) a climactic structure through increasingly complex ornamentation.

1. **Stop/start pattern** (Illustrated in Appendix 1.9a &b)

   Terzi's *passaggi* are most often applied in a stop/start pattern where one or two ornamented bars continually alternate with several unornamented bars. This pattern is the direct result of placing emphasis on the cadence, and preserves much of the model's polyphony. A graphic example of this pattern is given in Appendix 1.9a. The intabulation of this madrigal, Gabrieli's *Caro dolce*, carries *passaggi* on 40% of the minims, evenly distributed in short sections of quaver, semiquaver and a few demisemiquaver *passaggi*. This technique produces an intabulation full of variety in which the original motet or madrigal is nonetheless easily recognisable. Here as in all of Terzi's intabulations, *passaggi* are avoided in the opening and closing bars of the madrigal. Nanino's madrigal *Erano i capei* (Appendix 1.9b) receives lighter ornamentation, that is on only 22% of the model, which is distributed in short sections.

2. **Sectional ornamentation** (Illustrated in Appendix 1.9c)

   Whereas the stop/start ornamental pattern stems from emphasis on the cadence, sectional distribution of *passaggi* results from treating each phrase separately, and placing more ornamentation on any repeated material.

33. For example, Volume II, no. 1 p. 15, , no. 2 p. 22, no. 4 p. 40, no. 5 p. 47, no. 7 p. 71, no. 8 p. 88, no. 9 p. 97, no. 11 p. 124, no. 13 p. 142, no. 19 p. 201, no. 20 p. 212 , & no. 34 p. 257.
A clear example of this is Terzi's intabulation of Maschera's canzona _La Martinenga_. Here Terzi responded to the form A A B C C by overlaying the repetitions of A and C with almost constant _passaggi_, while leaving the first statements of each section almost entirely literal.

The madrigal and motet forms do not of course lend themselves so readily to sectional ornamentation. Nonetheless there is some evidence that at times Terzi ornamented in response to the text. For instance, he sometimes left an entire line of the text unornamented, which suggests that he was highlighting the poetic form. Thus in Ingegneri's _Surrexit_, whole phrases such as "posuit pro ovibus suis" and its repetition are left free of _passaggi_. Although in this intabulation not every musical or textual repetition receives contrasting amounts of ornamentation, it nevertheless demonstrates Terzi's sensitivity to the form of the model. In _Surrexit_ he left the section of "Alleluias" free of ornamentation, no doubt because of the increased proportional speed in the triple-time section. He similarly left the triple time sections unornamented in Marenzio's madrigal _Leggiadre ninfe_, as well as the two other phrases on the words "coronare" and "cantate". Marenzio's tossing around of a four-note figure between pairs of voices on "cantate", and his "crowning" of the word "coronare" with running quavers are clear examples of word painting to which Terzi responded by allowing the phrases to stand in their original state.

34. Volume II, no. 2, bb. 20–23 & 26–29 (pp. 25 & 26).
35. Volume II, no. 12, bb. 12 to 14, & 47 to 58 (pp. 135 & 138–139).
3. Constant *passaggi* (Illustrated in Appendix 1.9d)

Terzi did not apply the maximum amount of *passaggi* possible for the sake of virtuoso display. Usually his most heavily ornamented intabulations serve special purposes. The intabulations of Marenzio's *Lique perle* and Rore's *Non mi toglia il ben mio*\(^{37}\) for instance are lute duets wherein the first lute part is entirely free of ornamentation and the second is like a notated, single-line improvisation. Similarly, he arranged *S'ogni mio bene*\(^{38}\) for three lutes (or alternative solo or duo performance) in which the first lute part is literal and the other two highly ornamented. In performance then, the unadorned first lute part would ensure recognition of the model even though the *contrappunti* may be heavily disguised with *passaggi*.

However, two intabulations are exceptional in that they do appear to be written expressly for ornamental exuberance. Striggio's *Nasce la mia pena* for solo lute carries the unique rubric "con passaggi" (Appendix 1.9d) which seems to imply that Terzi's other solo intabulations do not by comparison, contain *passaggi* worth mentioning. It is indeed true that some of his contemporaries ornamented like this more often,\(^{39}\) and so Terzi may well have included this intabulation to demonstrate his capabilities. Or he may have included it simply for the sake of variety. Highly ornate also is the intabulation of Striggio's *Chi farà fede* with the indication "accomodato a modo di Viola bastard per suonar in Concerto con Liutto grande".\(^{40}\) In this piece 97% of the model is ornamented by quaver, semiquaver, and

---

38. Volume II, no.6 p.56.
39. For example, see some highly ornamented intabulations in Simone Molinaro's *Libro Primo* (Venice 1599), and (earlier) Hans Newsidler's *Der and er theil des Lautenbuchs* (Nuremberg, 1536).
40. Terzi (1599) *Tavola* and p.70.
ornamentation

72
dermisemiquaver *passaggi*. There are a few places of repose, but otherwise the ornamentation is constant, ranging from the highest to the lowest notes of the model as rapidly as possible, in the manner of the viola bastarda. This intabulation is clearly not intended to be used by both instruments: it differs from viola bastarda writing, where all the chordal notes would need to be on adjacent strings; for the lute that is not a consideration.

It would be quite a challenge for the listener to identify the original Striggio madrigals in performances of these two intabulations. However, Terzi did leave a bar or two unornamented at the beginning and during the course of the piece, thus assisting recognition. One is reminded of a modern counterpart - jazz - in which audiences relish the recognition of a well-known song that is heavily disguised by sophisticated improvisation. It appears that in these two Striggio madrigals Terzi was aiming to disguise the original phrases and structure of the madrigal in a way that he did not usually attempt in a solo intabulation.

It was a constant practice of Terzi's to leave the first few entries of the madrigal or motet unornamented. Even in the highly ornamented *contrappunti* intabulations he never began with ornamentation. Similarly he generally left the head of an imitative point free of embellishment in a solo intabulation, especially if it was in the canto. Thus, he clearly did not aim to disguise the model beyond the point of recognition.

4. **Climactic structure** (Illustrated in Appendix 1.9e)

Terzi rarely progressively increased the density of *passaggi* in a climactic manner in his intabulations. However, in one intabulation, Merulo's *In te domine*
ornamentation after an initial five bars free of ornamentation, the passaggi progress gradually from quavers to semiquavers which towards the end (bar 50) become almost continuous. In another example, passaggi in Nanino's Quando fra bianche perle build to a climax toward the end of the prima parte. In the seconda parte of this intabulation though Terzi distributed the passaggi in a stop/start pattern.

PASSAGGI IN RELATION TO TEXT, TEMPO AND GENRE.

Why Terzi left some intabulations entirely free of ornamentation, and not others, is a matter for conjecture. In seeking a reason for this one could forget that musical taste, whim even, may have influenced an intabulator's musical choices. It has been mentioned previously that Terzi applied different quantities of passaggi to intabulations according to the performance media intended. At one extreme the continuous flowery lines of the contrapunti are made musically viable by the unadorned support of the first lute part. It would be logical to assume then that at the other extreme, in literal intabulations, the amount of ornamentation applied was also determined by the intended performance media. Naturally, a solo lute can support only a certain amount of ornamentation, and will differ in style from a contrapunto intabulation which does not attempt to fully represent the polyphony. It is tempting to think that the lightly ornamented intabulations have a different role - accompaniment to one or more voices. Some literal intabulations such as the texted canzonette of Vecchi, Paratico and Nanino are clearly song accompaniments. To three intabulations by these composers, Terzi added only one ornament. The texted intabulations are similar in their simplicity both to the frottole accompaniments of the early sixteenth century and to Galilei's monodic

42. Volume II, no. 7 p. 71.
arrangements for bass voice and lute later in the century.\textsuperscript{44} Hence, it is logical to assume that the canzonette in Terzi's book would also be performed as lute-songs. It is puzzling though why Rore's \textit{Fera gentil}, which is neither texted nor includes a notated vocal part, should be entirely free of ornamentation. There is no written indication in this intabulation to the effect that it should accompany voices (although of course that does not necessarily exclude the possibility). Since two other known Italian lute intabulations of this madrigal\textsuperscript{45} are also free of passaggi, one could gain an impression of a consensus among the three lutenists. This would be erroneous however, since almost all of the intabulations by both Fallamero and the author of Ms. Genoa F.VII/1 are literal. It is unlikely that any of the three lutenists had copied one of the others, since there are enough differences of \textit{musica ficta} and other details for that to be impossible. Is it possible that Terzi was responding to the mood of this madrigal, a lover's lament? He may have considered flowery proliferations to be inappropriate to the spirit of the madrigal, and have similarly regarded Archangelo da Bergamo's \textit{Donna la bella mano,}\textsuperscript{46} which he also left unadorned. If so, he was only practising what Nicola Vicentino had recommended, that "every singer should pay attention when singing lamentations or other sad compositions, not to make any elaboration, as the sad compositions will then be happy."\textsuperscript{47} But if Terzi was responding to the poetry, this was not his prime concern in every case, for his intabulation of Gabrieli's \textit{Caro dolce},\textsuperscript{48}

\textsuperscript{44} See discussion on p.263-267 of Ms.Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Fondo Landau-Finaly, Ms.Mus.2.
\textsuperscript{45} Fallamero, \textit{Il Primo Libro de Intavolatura da Liuto} (Scotto, Venice, 1584) p.18; and Ms. Genoa, Biblioteca Universitaria, Ms.F.VII/1, fol.3v.
\textsuperscript{46} Terzi (1599), p.85.
\textsuperscript{47} \ldots ogni cantante avvertirà quando canterà, lamentationi, ò altre compositioni meste di non fare alcuna diminuzione, perche le compositione meste, pareranno allegre \ldots L'Antica Musica ridotta alla Moderna Prattica, (Rome, 1555), facs.ed., (Basel, 1959), Book 4, Chapter 42, p.88 (recte 94).
\textsuperscript{48} Volume II, no. 8, p.88.
although a lament, supports ornamentation on 40% of the model. Other reasons might have been the desire for variety for its own sake, or to give beginners some easier pieces to play. Although Terzi did not say so explicitly, he may well have shared the philosophy of Hans Newsidler, who wrote concerning his intabulation of Josquins's *Memor esto verbi tut*, "I have not embellished the psalm, it is very good in itself; moreover, a beginner also should have something to play in this book."49 Neither the secular nor sacred nature of the models appear to make any difference to the degree of ornamentation Terzi applied. The five motets transcribed in Volume II of this dissertation receive as high a proportion of passaggi as some of the secular intabulations. Much of the ornamentation in the rhythmically less active motets compensates for the lute's relatively inferior sustaining ability. In the sections consisting mainly of minims and semibreves it is clear that passaggi are applied to assist in sustaining the polyphony.

There does not appear to be a correlation between the amount of ornamentation, and the time signatures of the models. In the *misura di breve* pieces Terzi ornamented 40% of the minims, while 20% of the minims are ornamented in the *misura comune* (*note nere*) madrigals. This 2:1 ratio seems to indicate that Terzi regarded the minim value of *alla breve* as approximately equal to the crotchet value of *note nere* in terms of its ability to accommodate ornamentation. In other words, on the average, he ornamented the same proportion of tactus values.49a


49a. Data given in Appendix 1.10
IMITATION OF THE WORDS (Example 3.6)

Considering Terzi's ornamentation in relation to specific words and phrases of the text, it is clear that at times he was responding to the text of the model rather than merely translating the pitch complex into an instrumental medium. While not a constant feature, some clear examples of word painting suggest that Terzi considered the meaning of the text, even though the intabulation may not have accompanied a singer. The types of passaggi he used to illustrate a part of the text are not necessarily different from those he would have used anywhere, but at times the relative position of the passaggi suggests word-painting. As we have seen, Terzi's vocabulary of ornamental phrases did not vary significantly from ascending and descending scales and turning figures, but in relation to surrounding passaggi, on occasion Terzi clearly represented specific words of the text. Although the following categories overlap, representations of text can be broadly classified in terms of literal representation of words.

1. Words of motion

The words "wind", "agitation", and "surging waves", are depicted by passaggi of turning motion. The extracts of passaggi from Palestrina's O bella ninfa mia (Examples 3.6a & 3.6b), and Nanino's Quando fra bianche perle (Example 3.6h), while not extraordinary in themselves, stand out in relation to surrounding lighter ornamentation.
EXAMPLE 3.6
Terzi's word painting

PALESTRINA O bella ninfa mia b.20

(a) vento (wind)
(b) commesso cielo (tumultuous sky)

MARSZIO Leggiadre ninfe bb.28-31

(c) ...

(d) ...

per tessere ghirlandette (you weave your charming garlands)

per tessere ghirlandette

(e) bb.76-77

... viva, viva (hurray/long live)

NANINO Quando fra bianche perle p.6

(f) ...

... canto (song)

(g) ...

... eterna loda (eternal praise)

(h) b.144

... l'aura onde (surging waves)
Example 3.6 cont.

GABRIELI Caro dolce ben mio b.18

... languisce'ë b.80 ... languisce'ë (languish) b.71

... lascierò (I will leave) ... farà partita (I will depart)

MARENGIO Liquide perle

... Ahì (ah) b.31-32

INGENGERI Surrexit b.38

... morì (die)

MONTE Ahì chi mi rompe b.12

... speranza (hope)

BICCI Candide perle

... labbra sìdente (smiling lips) ... natiare spargeote (you scatter nectar)

... sospiri ardenti (passionate sighs)
2. Words of exclamation

The word "ahi" which is frequently used in madrigals as a general exclamation of woe or surprise, Terzi almost always illustrated by virtuoso ascending and descending scales in semiquavers and demisemiquavers. It seems that many madrigalists set works such as this on semibreves and breves it could be that Terzi was merely ornamenting such bars for musical continuity. However, these particular passaggi are so characteristically virtuoso that it seems that Terzi was actually representing the exclamation "ahi" (Example 3.6m). Another exclamationary word "Viva", meaning "hurrah" or "long live ..." is illustrated by figures of turning motion (Example 3.6e).

3. Flowers and song

The words "garland", and "song" are given similar turning four-note phrases. In the intabulation of Marenzio's Leggiadre ninfe the phrase "per tesser ghirlandette" (you weave your charming garlands) is set with three-note or four-note ornaments suggestive of weaving (Example 3.6c). Here Terzi painted over Marenzio's original word-painting with figuration clearly illustrating the words (Example 3.6d).

4. Words indicating negative emotion or death

In the motets it sometimes appears that Terzi was illustrating a word such as "surrexit" with an ascending scale, but this is not the case, because he was just as likely to set the same word on a descending scale. In these cases Terzi was obviously not word-painting, but there

50. Volume II: no. 17, bb. 31-32 (p. 184); no. 16, bb. 23-24 & 42 (pp. 162 & 168); no. 18, bb. 38 & 48 (pp. 197 & 199); no. 13, bb. 48-49 (pp. 145-146).
51. Volume II, no. 2, b. 8 (p. 23).
52. Volume II, no. 2, bb. 7 & 8 (p. 23).
are places where such figures could well be illustrative of a part of the text, as for instance in Ingegneri's *Surrexit* where figures of descending motion represent the concept of death (Example 3.6n).

Similarly, in Gabrieli's *Caro dolce ben mio*, Terzi's dramatic descending scales (Examples 3.6i & j) accompany the word "languish", and agitated figures suggestive of flight accompany sentiments of departure (Example 3.6k & l).

5. Positive sentiment

The words "hope", "boldness", "eternal praise", "smiling lips" and "nectar" are highlighted by turning figures (Example 3.6 g, o, p & q), and "Passionate sighs" in Bicci's *Candide perle* is illustrated by similar four-note turning phrases (Example 3.6r).

*Marenzio's Leggiadre ninfe* 53

This madrigal amply illustrates Marenzio's word-painting technique, and Terzi's response to it. There is scarcely a melisma in this madrigal which is not related to the text - from the simple ascending quavers on "ninfe" (bb.2 and 6), to the long turning melismas on "coronare" (bb.33-42) and the shorter ones on "cantate" (bb.63-66 and 69-72). Marenzio used a typical "mannerist" device by setting "In questo ombroso valle" (in this dark valley) in black minims and semibreves (bb.12-14), and Terzi's response was to indicate the rhythm in the tablature with a single "3". In contrast, at the triple time change at bar 47, which is in the same proportion as bar 12 but not set in black notation, Terzi indicated the time change in the usual way with a single "3".

Marenzio set the word "flowers" (from "A sceglier fiorda fiore") on a four-note turning figure which Terzi extended with similar figuration. The phrase "per tesser ghirlandette" (you weave your charming garlands), Marenzio set with one of his characteristic dotted rhythm phrases depicting flowers\textsuperscript{54} (Example 3.5d). At the first statements of this phrase Terzi left Marenzio's phrase as it was, but in the following entries weaved his own garlands of semiquavers among the voices (Example 3.6c). At the end of the original madrigal the rhythmic figure \texttt{J} is tossed from one voice to another (the polyphonic treatment of which is lost to a large extent on the lute). Terzi further adorned this with turning semiquaver figures (Example 3.6e).

Textual imagery in examples such as these indicates that Terzi acknowledged the indebtedness of this music to the text. In retaining references to poetic imagery, not only is the transition to absolute music seen to be incomplete, but the practice also exemplifies the Renaissance philosophy of imitazione delle parole.\textsuperscript{55}

**PASSAGGI AND IMITATION**

Degrees of imitation can be seen between passaggi and the model, as well as between elements of the passaggi. Three aspects of passaggi imitation in Terzi's intabulations are evident:

1. passaggi which coincide with textual rhyme, or with the repetition of similar melodic points,

\textsuperscript{54} For a vocabulary of Marenzio's word-painting see James Chater's Luca Marenzio and the Italian Madrigal (Michigan, 1981), Chapter 5; and on "flowers" in particular, see Chater vol. I, p. 53 and Chater vol. II, p. 129.

\textsuperscript{55} For discussion of the concept of imitazione see Chapter 6.
(2) *passaggi* which borrow some motivic element from the model, and

(3) figural imitation of new melodic elements from the *passaggi*.

1. Rhyming imitation

Terzi employed in one intabulation a type of rhyming imitation where he placed *passaggi* that were in some way similar at points of textual rhyme. The ornamental figures do not rhyme motivically, but do so by virtue of their placement with the text. In the *prima parte* of Monte's *Ahi*, *chi mi rompe* which is the octave of a sonnet, Terzi responded to textual rhyme with musical rhyme by placing similar semiquaver ornaments on "speranza" (b.9 and b.11), "ariva" (b.15), "dormiva" (b.17), "sembianza" (b.23), and "baldanza" (b.27).

Ahi, chi mi rompe il sonno, ahi, chi mi priva,
misero, di quel ben ch'ogn'altro avanza?
Chi mi leva di man quella speranza
Ch'era già lasso, pur condott'ariva?
Era meco madonn'hor ch'io dormiva,
E sì dolce m'appare a la sembianza,
Che di seco parlar preso ho baldanza,
I miei chiusi pensier' tutti li apriva.

A more usual technique of Terzi's was to reiterate a figure on a recurring syllable or melodic point. In Palestrina's *Tu es Pastor ovium*, Terzi ornamented the syllables "-lo-" from "apostolorum" and "-di-dit" from "tradidit" with the same motive every time they occurred in the model (Example 3.7a & b). A less literal imitation of this type occurs on "ómnia" (Example 3.7c). Similar imitations can be seen in Nanino's *Quando fra bianche perle*, (Example 3.8), and Bicci's *Candide perle*, (Example 3.9).

EXAMPLE 3.7
Palestrina, Tu es Pastor ovium

(a)
Prin - cep A-pó-stó-ló - num, bb.22-29 (4X)

(b)
ti - bi tra - di - dit De - b.30 (3X) and bb.59-60 (2X)

(c)

EXAMPLE 3.8
Nanino, Quando fra bianche perle

(a)
E che per far bb.37, 40, 44 (3X)

(b)
E l'au - ra on - de bb.140-146 (3X)

EXAMPLE 3.9
Bicci, Candide perle

(a)
la-bra ri - den - bb.17-18 (2X)

(b)
che Ne - la re spar - ce bb.23-25 (2X)
In the intabulation of Merulo's *In te Domine speravi* Terzi motivically ornamented repetitions of melodic elements, as well as textual features (Example 3.10). From halfway through Merulo's first point at bar 5 there are four stepwise descending notes on "non confundar". On the syllable "-fun-" Terzi ornamented with a \( \uparrow \ \downarrow \) motive, and on the repetition of the melodic point he placed that motive on the same point in the phrase, which was then on the syllable "con-". Later in the motet, in different imitative points and on different texts, Merulo varied the musical phrase while retaining the element of three or four descending notes of pitches B A G. On the G Terzi consistently placed a four-note motive regardless of the text at that point (Example 3.10, fig.2). The same rhythmic figure \( \uparrow \ \downarrow \) which was used at the beginning of the intabulation is placed at varying points in those phrases (Example 3.10, fig.1).

**EXAMPLE 3.10**
Merulo, *In Te Domine speravi*

(a) \[ \]

(b) \[ \]

(c) \[ \]

(d) \[ \]
At repetitions of a phrase in Marenzio's *Quando i vostri begli occhi*, Terzi ornamented imitatively, at the same time varying the motivic material. The phrase "onde uccidete voi potete" is set eight times; three times with one ornamental phrase and five times with another (Example 3.11).

**EXAMPLE 3.11**

*Marenzio, Quando i vostri begli occhi*

The arrangement of Maschera's *La Martinenga*, originally written for instrumental ensemble, received a more "instrumental" treatment. Maschera set his first point in two-part, then three-part imitation. In response Terzi

**EXAMPLE 3.12**

*Maschera, La Martinenga*
ornamented notes two to five of the first entry, but on the second entry he ornamented notes four to seven (Example 3.12a & b), since using exactly the same ornamentation each time would have resulted in an ungrammatical dissonance in bar 13. Later, in bar 50 of the canzona, Terzi was able to ornament a point the same way four times since such harmonic problems did not arise (Example 3.12c). This ornament and a similar one at later repetitions of the phrase (figs. 1 & 2) resulted in sounded suspensions at bar 51, a rare event in Terzi’s intabulations.

2. Figural imitation of the model

Frequently while ornamenting, Terzi developed a feature of the model either by imitating the style of the original in some general way or by adopting a specific figure for motivic development, often in diminution.

An example of the imitation of a stylistic feature is seen in the intabulation of Palestrina’s Tu es Pastor oviwm. Terzi’s constant use of a $\text{fig}$ figure could well be in imitation of $\text{fig}$ figures in the model (Example 3.13a). Similar to the imitation in Palestrina’s motet is the echoing of $\text{fig}$ figures by $\text{fig}$ in Merulo’s In te Domine speravi (Example 3.14a).

EXAMPLE 3.13
Palestrina, Tu es Pastor oviwm

\[\text{EXAMPLE 3.13}\]

Palestrina, Tu es Pastor oviwm
Sometimes Terzi imitated indirectly by adopting passaggi reminiscent of melodic features in the model. Terzi responded to the long melismas in Ingegneri's *Surrexit* by writing passaggi of similar style in diminution (Example 3.15). Imitation by diminution is not uncommon in Terzi's intabulations. Instances of this may be seen in arrangements of motets of Palestrina (Example 3.13b), Merulo (Example 3.14b) and Gabrieli (Example 3.16).

**EXAMPLE 3.14**

Merulo, *In te Domine speravi*

(a) [Musical notation]

(b) [Musical notation]

**EXAMPLE 3.15**

Ingegneri, *Surrexit*

[canto bb.1-4]

**EXAMPLE 3.16**

Gabrieli, *Caro dolce mio*

[canto bb.16-17]
Terzi occasionally adopted a specific motive from the model and developed it in his intabulations. Direct figural imitation can be seen in a Marenzio madrigal (Example 3.17) and in a bass figure in a Bicci madrigal (Example 3.18) which anticipates by two bars a figure in the alto. Although the motives are of a type that Terzi used constantly, their juxtaposition suggests that Terzi was consciously imitating from the model.

**EXAMPLE 3.17**
Marenzio, *Quando i vostri begli occhi*

![Example 3.17](image)

**EXAMPLE 3.18**
Bicci, *Candide perle*

![Example 3.18](image)

3. **Figural self-imitation**

Motivic development of new figuration in the passaggi, independent of any figuration of the model, was a technique that Terzi used most frequently in his highly ornamented intabulations. The greater proliferation of passaggi in these arrangements allowed freedom of figuration but required musical techniques to unify the work melodically. Analyses of three Striggio madrigals, *S'ogni mio bene*, *Nasce la pena mia*, and *Chi farà fede*, illustrate well the technique of developing a three-note or four-note element for motivic interplay (Examples 3.19, 3.20 & 3.21). Using this technique in the contrapunti imparts unity and character to the second-lute part, contrasting with the literal intabulation of the first-lute part. In these three intabulations Terzi consistently developed a figural element for one or two
bars, following this with the development of another figure. Often one figure seems to grow from another, so that there is a sense of organic mutation in the way the passaggi unfold during the course of the intabulation. Example 3.19 illustrates self-imitative figures from the opening phrase (fig. a). A few bars later a phrase used in imitation (fig. b) derives from the inversion of the opening phrase. Figs. c to f give examples of the mainly three-note motives which Terzi liked to cluster closely together within phrases of passaggi. Such motives are used constantly in varying combinations in most of the highly ornamented intabulations.

EXAMPLE 3.19
Striggio, S’ogni mio bene – contrapunto 1
By way of further illustration, the contrapunto secondo of S'ogni mio bene, (Example 3.20, fig. a) leads by diminution to fig. b which extends to an interval of a third. This in turn leads naturally to the descending triads of fig. c which relate to the following figs. e, f, h & i.

**EXAMPLE 3.20**

Striggio, S'ogni mio bene - contrapunto 2

(a) [Staff notation]

(b) [Staff notation]

(c) [Staff notation]

(d) [Staff notation]

(e) [Staff notation]

(f) [Staff notation]

(g) [Staff notation]

(h) [Staff notation]

(i) [Staff notation]
EXAMPLE 3.21
Striggio, *Nasce la pena mia*

EXAMPLE 3.22
Striggio, *Chi farà fede*
Sometimes Terzi placed imitative figures in syncopation against the tactus as in Example 3.20c. He also at times manipulated a figure containing two elements, interchanging them as in figs.1 & 2 of Example 3.22h. Example 3.21 illustrates four elements used for motivic imitation in the intabulation of Striggio's *Nasce la pena mia*.

The intabulation of Guami's instrumental canzona *La Diodatina* received a treatment markedly different from all of the above examples. Guami developed his melodic material by taking a figurative element from each imitative point and using it for the head of each subsequent point, returning to the initial melody near the end of the canzona (b.36). The imitation of each melodic point unfolds freely by rhythmic or melodic variation after the head has been stated. While Guami's canzona is not a fully developed "variation canzona" such as those of Frescobaldi published in the 1640s, a kernel of variation technique is evident nonetheless. Guami's style is comparable with the *ricercari* of Adrian Willaert which develop melodically by the mutation of each statement of the point.

Terzi in his intabulation of *La Diodatina*, takes Guami's variation technique a step further by leaving the head of each phrase unornamented then developing the continuation of the melody with different *passaggi* for each entry (Example 3.23). Terzi's technique, then, is part way between the mutating variations of Willaert and the systematic variation technique of Frescobaldi.

---

57. *Canzoni alla Francese in Partitura sel signor Girolamo Frescobaldi ... Libro Quarto ...* (Venice, 1645). For a transcription see Volume II, no. 34 p. 257

SUMMARY OF TERZI'S STYLE OF EMBELLISHMENT

Terzi's ornamentation is conservative both in its figuration and its harmonic application. On the rare occasions that he added dissonance to a minim beat he usually did so in the form of a suspension before a cadence. The two-, three- and four-note elements which Terzi used predominantly, do not differ in melodic shape from those found in melismas in the madrigals and motets used as models. That is, they move mainly conjunctly, with occasional leaps which are carefully quitted. Because Terzi's ornaments are in smaller note values than melismas.
of the models, he allowed himself greater rhythmic freedom. Whereas in sixteenth-century vocal music it is rare to find isolated pairs of crotchets on a strong beat, unless followed by a dotted minim or syncopation, Terzi freely placed such isolated pairs of notes of relatively smaller values at strong parts of the bar or beat.

With the exception of the highly ornamented intabulations, which either serve as *contrapunti* or carry special indications such as *con passaggi*, Terzi's ornamentation does not generally obscure the structural elements of the model. Moreover, the ornamentation can be seen to highlight the structure by such methods as:

1. Always leaving the opening bars of an intabulation unornamented,
2. Usually allowing the head of a melodic point to be free of ornamentation,
3. Ornamenting with respect to the poetic form of the text; and
4. Drawing attention to the polyphony by placing ornaments at identical points of the phrase.

In the highly ornamented intabulations Terzi "recomposed" the music in the sense that he introduced new motives which were generally independent of the models' figuration, developed them for several bars, and then employed another motive for development. The way in which the intabulation unfolds motivically is suggestive of variation technique, since more often than not there is a similarity between subsequent motives.

It is evident from examples of word-painting and one example of textual rhyme, that in intabulating for the lute, Terzi sometimes took into consideration poetic meaning and form, even when the intabulations were published without a text.
Terzi ensured variety among his intabulations by several means. Though constantly drawing upon the same vocabulary of two-, three- and four-note ornamental units, he avoided monotony by combining them uniquely in each intabulation. Even in cadential ornamentation, where he used stock ornaments of the type found in any sixteenth-century ornamentation treatise, he avoided monotony by:

(1) varying the ornaments within a single intabulation,
(2) refraining from habitually ornamenting every cadence in the model,
(3) varying the approach to the groppo,
(4) occasionally ornamenting voices other than those with the leading-note, and
(5) presenting intabulations with different proportions of ornamental overlay.

Terzi preserved and developed some features of the model by:

(1) choosing figuration that in some way reflected the character of the model,
(2) developing some of the model's figural elements in his passaggi, and
(3) illustrating the poetic imagery of some of the text by means of characteristic figuration.
EARLY SIXTEENTH-CENTURY PRINTED INTABULATIONS

From the five extant lute books published by Petrucci in the first decade of the sixteenth century it is possible to see the origins of three distinctly different intabulation styles. The three performance media indicated for the early intabulations—duets, solos, and lute songs—undoubtedly reflect fifteenth-century practice, and are further developed throughout the sixteenth century. The amount of ornamentation varies depending on the function of the genre, the duets having an unequal distribution of ornamentation between the players, and the lute-song accompaniments being generally plain.

1. Duets and free ornamentation

The vast majority of the pieces in Spinacino's two lute books of 1507 are intabulations of Franco-Flemish vocal music previously published in Petrucci's Harmonice Odhecaton A, Canti B, and Canti C. Although published in the sixteenth century, the Spinacino lute books record a style of ornamentation which is backward looking, owing more to fifteenth-century improvisation traditions than to sixteenth-century ornamentation practice. It was common practice from at least 1500 for one lutenist to improvise freely upon the treble of a chanson while another lute, or a harp, played either the unornamented tenore, or both the tenore and contratenore voices. This practice has been well documented from iconographic sources, and the writings of

59. Listed in H. M. Brown, Instrumental Music Printed Before 1600, a bibliography, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965/R1979) as Spinacino 1507/1, Spinacino 1507/2, Dalza 1508/2, Bossinensis 1509/1, Bossinensis 1511/1.
theorists such as Tinctoris. Owing much to this earlier tradition, Spinacino's intabulations for two lutes assign the lower two voices of the model to the second lute (which Spinacino calls the tenor) in almost unadorned form, while the first lute has an almost constant proliferation of quaver ornamentation on the higher voice or voices. Arranged thus for two lutes is Hayne van Ghizeghem's three-part chanson *De tous bien pleines* and the anonymous four-part chanson *Fortuna desperata*. In the four-part work the first lute embellishes both the canto and alto in a free improvisatory style. Not only do these duets have the appearance of written improvisation, they also record the evolution of lute-technique from the quill to finger plucking which occurred toward the end of the fifteenth century. The embellished first-lute part could be played equally well with the new "thumb under first finger" technique or with the quill, but in either case such single-line ornamentation clearly developed from fifteenth-century improvisations on chansons. This becomes apparent when one compares extant examples of written improvisation, such as


those in the *Faenza Codex*, with Spinacino's duets. The first lute has a single-line ornamentation while the second lute requires the newly developed technique of plucking with the right hand thumb and two fingers.

In the Spinacino duets we see a style of writing, retained in essence throughout the century, in which the two parts take an unequal share of both the original voices and ornamentation. In spite of the fact that the new sixteenth-century technique allowed writing where both parts of a duo took an equal share, the older tradition is still visible in most of Terzi's duets. His duets differ from Spinacino's in stylistic details, of course, and Terzi's *contrapunti* are technically much more demanding than any of Spinacino's first lute parts. Nonetheless the older style is prevalent. However, Terzi did not write in this style exclusively; his intabulation of Willaert's *Aller m'y faut* for instance, is written so that the two lutes share equally in both the original part-writing and the ornamentation. In the Spinacino and Terzi duets we see yet another similarity. Spinacino leaves his cadences unadorned in the duets, preferring, as Nordstrom observes, "to gain emphasis by slowing the motion rather than by increasing it." Such emphasis by underemphasis is a device still to be found almost a century later in some of Terzi's *contrapunti* duets where the almost constant semiquaver *passaggi* are relieved by longer note values at the cadence.

64. R. Huestis, *Transcriptions from the Faenza Codex*, (Westwood: USA, 1971); and McGee, *op. cit.*, passim.
67. For example *Non mi toglia il ben mio*, Volume II, no. 21, p. 218.
2. Solo intabulations

The new sixteenth-century lute technique enabled the lutenist to handle both passaggi and harmonic support in a solo intabulation. In an intabulation of a piece such as Agricola's Tandernaken, Spinacino constantly shifted the attention from one part of the texture to another ornamenting one polyphonic part at a time. This manner of applying passaggi continued to develop throughout the century.

Not all of Spinacino's solo intabulations carry constant passaggi; others such as that of Obrecht's Christe de si dedero are rather lightly ornamented. His solo intabulations are generally ornate, however, a typical example being the intabulation of Brumel's Mater patris et filia. Here, as he often did, he preceded the intabulation with an eight note ornamental figure, and treated much of the opening as a harmonic structure on which passaggi could be built. It is not until the eighth bar of the model that Spinacino allowed a melodic voice to enter unadorned. (Terzi also avoided obscuring the opening bars of solo intabulations in this way). Yet in spite of Spinacino's passaggi concealing many of the voice entries in both the solos and duets, his tendency to slow down the movement at cadences does indicate a sensitivity to the melodic structure of the model.

The ornamental style of Spinacino's contemporary, Dalza, is similar in its concentration on "gap-filling" passaggi, but Dalza was more likely to emphasise a cadence by a leading-note groppo, as in his intabulations of Tromboncino's Poi che voise la mia stella (Example 3.24a) and in Poi che'l ciel contrario adverso (Example 3.24b).
The *groppi* so prevalent later in the century are not yet evident in Spinacino's music.

**EXAMPLE 3.24**

**Dalza**

(a) ![Musical Example](image)

(b) ![Musical Example](image)

The freedom with which Spinacino applied dissonance belongs only to the first few decades of the sixteenth century. Nordstrom observes that "Spinacino disregards consonances on strong beats except at the beginning of each measure, sometimes producing some striking dissonances."\(^73\) The treatment of dissonance, and other features such as frequent false-relations and large leaps within the *passaggi*, mark the main differences between the styles of early and late sixteenth-century intabulations.

3. **Song accompaniments**

Many early intabulations are lute-song arrangements of predominantly homophonic partsongs. This genre is in marked contrast to the duet and solo intabulations, because the intabulations serving as accompaniment are usually unornamented. Clearly, too much ornamentation would have been in conflict with the supportive accompanying role of the lute part. The two Bossinensis books of 1509 and 1511 and that of Tromboncino and Cara of the 1520s\(^74\) contain a large number of arrangements of *frottole* for solo voice and lute accompaniment. Of a similar nature are Willaert's

---

73. Nordstrom, *op.cit.*
74. Brown 1509/1, 1511/1, 1527/1.
intabulations of Verdelot's madrigals75 of 1536, after which there is an apparent gap in literal arrangements of partsongs until Gorzanis's and Antonelli's napoletane and Fiorino's vilanelle of the early 1570's.76 Then from 1589 to 1595 we know of eleven published volumes devoted exclusively to song arrangements, as well as twenty songs in mensural notation included in Fallamero's Primo Libro of 1584.77 There is no record of lute-song arrangements of this type published in Italy between 1536 and 1570, but it would be wrong to assume that this form of music-making went into temporary decline. For one thing we cannot assume that what we call solo lute intabulations were never used to accompany vocalists, and secondly there are plenty of examples in manuscript of intabulations for song accompaniment.78 But since many factors contribute to the preservation of manuscripts for posterity, quantitative assessments based on extant manuscripts would invite error. We can probably assume though that since most manuscripts contain more intabulations than any other genre, and often include a text, that the amateur lutenist was more interested in song accompaniment than in any other form of music-making on the lute. The one consistent feature among these collections is

76. Brown 1507/1, 1570/5, 1571/4.
77 Brown 1584/3. See also Appendix 1.3.
78. Ms. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Rés. Vmd. ms. 27, (contains 89 accompaniments to vocal pieces, 48 of which are Petrucci frottole); Ms. Verona, Biblioteca della Società Accademia Filarmonia, Ms. No. 223 (intabulations are texted and written in partbook form with the same lute accompaniment with each part); Ms. Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Ms. C. 311 (intabulations include a vocal part in mensural notation); Ms. Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, II/275 (contains texted arie da cantare). There are also simple intabulations of vocal music in: Ms. Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Fondo Landau-Finaly Ms. Mus. 2; Ms. Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Fondo Magliabechiano, XIX. 168; Ms. Lucca, Biblioteca Statale, Ms. 774; Ms. Naples, Conservatorio di Musica, Ms. 7664; Ms. Pesaro, Conservatorio di Musica, Ms. Rari b. 10.
the almost entirely literal nature of the lute accompaniments. Only occasionally does one find a small cadential trill.

One can probably safely assume that the texted intabulations of Terzi were intended as song accompaniments and it may well be that some of the untexted intabulations, especially the literal ones, could have been included for accompanying purposes. Aside from this question, it is clear that intabulation as song accompaniment was a distinct thread of development running parallel to other forms of intabulation, and that the simple nature of such accompaniments did not change significantly from the beginning of the sixteenth century to its close.

MID CENTURY DEVELOPMENTS

1. Francesco da Milano, Bakfark and contemporaries

   We might logically expect a gradual quantitative increase in the application of ornamentation to intabulations from early to late sixteenth century. While this is true to some extent, the pattern of change is not simple. Consistent developments emerge not so much in increasing complexity of ornamentation but more in the relationship between the passaggi and the structure of the model, as well as in the intabulator's method of handling dissonance, and other aspects of style.

79. For a fuller discussion on this subject see this Chapter 5.
80. "The presence of a complete text beneath the music ... indicates that the line can be sung but does not prove that it need always be sung, and the absence of a text does not necessarily signal an instrumental part." H.M. Brown, "Instruments and Voices in the Fifteenth Century Chanson", in Current Thought in Musicology, ed., J.W. Grubbs (Texas, 1976/R1977), p. 90.
A mature style of ornamentation is evident as early as 1536 in the publications of Francesco da Milano.\(^81\) His style of writing for the lute signals a stylistic revolution against the music of Spinacino and Dalza in his treatment of dissonance, and in his sophisticated ornamentation.

Francesco did not apply ornamentation as freely as the early intabulators. Indeed, some of his intabulations such as that of Janequin's *Martin Memento*\(^82\) are almost literal, the only significant ornament being a scale figure filling a semibreve chord (b.93). A feature in Francesco's work also visible in Terzi's is the practice of reiterating a tied suspended note. Such dissonances, and the writing of some additional suspensions, are the only accented dissonances that Francesco employed - the accented passing notes that Spinacino was fond of are absent.

Francesco departed most radically from the style of Spinacino and Dalza by writing *passaggi* which were identical or similar at entries of an imitative point. This is clear in Janequin's *Le chant des oyseaux*\(^83\) where Francesco applied an ornament (Example 3.25) to the same point at the repetition of a musical entry. In this respect he shares a stylistic characteristic with Terzi. The two intabulators also used similar ornamental units. A leap within Francesco's *passaggi* would either be consonant, or would behave as in a cambiata figure and be immediately resolved. Essentially there is little difference between Terzi's and Francesco's styles of ornamentation, except that some of Terzi's intabulations are ornamented more extensively. They both used *passaggi* in some places to compensate for the

81. Brown 1536/3, 1546/6, 1546/7, 1546/8, 1547/2, 1566/1.
lute's weaker sustaining powers, to emphasise cadences, and to impart an instrumental style appropriate to the lute. Nothing Francesco wrote is ever predictable or dull; he did not, for example, find it necessary to ornament every cadence with the same *groppo*. Rather than clutter an intabulation with excessive ornamentation, Francesco would, when appropriate, simplify it, as in Example 3.26, if so doing rendered a section more technically accessible, or musically viable on the lute.

**EXAMPLE 3.25**

*Francesco da Milano*

*Janequin, Le chant des Oyseaux*

**EXAMPLE 3.26**

*Francesco da Milano*

*Richafort, De mon triste desplaisir*

---

The middle decades of the century saw the publication of a variety of intabulations ranging from lightly ornamented to very ornate. Borrono's intabulations printed in 1548 are virtually literal and Bianchini's works, from the same period (1546), are only lightly ornamented at cadences. Lightly ornamented intabulations were not however exclusive to this earlier period. Fallamero's lute book for instance, which was printed as late as 1584, uses ornamentation very sparsely. Conversely the mid-century intabulators Barberiis and Rotta applied ornamentation liberally.

A mid-century intabulator who embellished his solo intabulations considerably was Joan Maria da Crema. His intabulation of Layolle's Lasciar il velo for instance ornaments 40% of the model in a stop/start pattern. How this arrangement differs from others of this period is that it does not draw attention to the structure of the model either with groppi or with diminished rhythmic activity at cadences. Furthermore da Crema left out many of the suspensions of the model. The units of embellishment are the same as those found in any intabulations from Francesco da Milano to Terzi, except that on one occasion (bar 10) da Crema started and ended an ornament on the given note, leaping on to the next note rather than proceeding to it step-wise (Example 3.27). This practice, very rare among

86. A literal Borrono intabulation is J'ay mis mon cuer, (Brown 1548/2, fol.H2v), and for a lightly ornamented Bianchini intabulation see Berchem's O s'io potessi donna, (Brown 1546/5, fol.E1v).
89. Brown 1546/15, for example Gombert's Levavi oculos meos p.35v.
intabulators, can be seen in Giovanni Maffei's vocal ornamentation of the same madrigal.\textsuperscript{91}

\textbf{EXAMPLE 3.27}
\textit{Maria da Crema, b. 10}

Gintzler's intabulation of the same madrigal a year after da Crema,\textsuperscript{92} makes an interesting comparison, for here the intabulator emphasised cadences with a variety of \textit{groppi} placed either on the leading note or on other voices. While Gintzler, like da Crema, ironed out some of the suspensions, he also added further suspensions (bars 14, 34, 62) and an accented passing note (bar 34).

Since during the course of the century there is such a wide variety in the degree of ornamentation applied to intabulations, and no simple progression towards increasing complexity, ornamentation must have been largely a matter of personal choice, dependent no doubt on the technical ability of the intabulator as a lutenist but also on the intended performance medium. The inclusion, within a single publication, of both near-literal and also very ornate intabulations is not unusual either. Such variety can be seen in Terzi's two prints as well as in those of earlier intabulators such as Francesco and Bakfark. It must be remembered of course that the publication of one author's volume may represent the collected intabulations of half a life-time and furthermore, that it may not necessarily contain intabulations made by that author alone.

\textsuperscript{91} ibid., p. 110.
\textsuperscript{92} ibid., p. 107.
The Hungarian Valentin Bakfark holds an important place in the history of Italian lute music. He settled in Padua for the last five years of his life (1571-1576), and his music was disseminated throughout Italy by the publication of two lute prints in Italian tablature. These books contain a large number of intabulations. Three Bakfark intabulations discussed below demonstrate this variety of treatment. An intabulation in which Bakfark ornamented only 22% of the original is Janequin’s *Martin menoit.* Throughout this piece Bakfark almost exclusively used the *groppo* of Example 3.28a and the dotted figure of Example 3.28b as cadential ornamentation, along with a few stepwise *passaggi* on minims and semibreves. In contrast, he ornamented his intabulation of Verdelot’s *Ultimi miei sospiri* on more than half of its original notes. In this intabulation Bakfark used the same ornaments as he did in *Martin menoit* (examples 3.28a & b), the only different figuration being a new *groppo* (Example 3.28) which is in fact similar to the *groppo* of *Martin menoit*.

EXAMPLE 3.28
Bakfark
(a) *Martin menoit*, (b) *Martin menoit*, (c) *Ultimi miei sospiri*

---

93. Brown 1553/1, 1565/1.
From this it appears that Bakfark did not prize variety particularly highly. Indeed, the same ornaments can be seen throughout his intabulations and fantasias.

Preserving the structure of the model, however, took high priority. In his intabulation of *Ultimi mei sospiri*, Bakfark kept the first statements of new imitative points free of *passaggi*. He further highlighted the structure by emphasising cadences with *groppi*. Most of his ornamental units are conjunct. Any incorporated leaps either outline the harmony or occur on relatively weak beats and are immediately resolved. Bakfark did not produce on-the-beat dissonances other than the reiteration of the model's suspensions and in this respect his style is identical with Terzi's.

**EXAMPLE 3.29**

Bakfark
Arcadelt, *Quand'io pens' al martire* b. 1 & b. 3.

(a) ![Staff notation for Bakfark's intabulation of Arcadelt's *Quand'io pens' al martire*](b). (b)

Bakfark's intabulation of Arcadelt's *Quand'io pens' al martire* is almost as highly ornamented (80%) as Terzi's solo intabulations marked *con passaggi* and *à modo di viola bastard*. In this arrangement Bakfark left the first chord unornamented, following it with ten bars of continuous *passaggi*, then five contrastingly plain bars. The remarkable aspect of this intabulation is that in spite of its highly ornamental nature, neither the model's bass nor the treble

---

96. For example, *Ultimi mei sospiri*, phrases "Chi mi las sate" b. 9 & b. 13, and "A chi morir' mi ved'", b24, and "Dite o belta, b31 etc. Benkö and Homolya, *op. cit.*, no. 20.
are unrecognisable – the original melodic material is always audible. Similarly, he invariably preserved the form of the model by leaving the beginning of each new imitative point free of ornamentation.\textsuperscript{99} From the beginning of \textit{Quand'io pens'al martire}, Bakfark utilised self-imitative figuration unrelated to melodic elements of the model. All through this piece he used the stock figures of Example 3.28 (which occur throughout his intabulations) and the additional ornaments of Example 3.29. In this intabulation a figure appears which we see later in the century in both Terzi's and John Dowland's works. This is a sharpened leading-note cadence followed by a rapidly descending scale in which the leading-note is subsequently flattened (Example 3.30).\textsuperscript{100}

\textbf{EXAMPLE 3.30}

\textbf{(a) Bakfark} \hspace{1cm} \textbf{(b) Dowland} \hspace{1cm} \textbf{(c) Terzi}

Like Francesco, Bakfark reiterated the original suspensions as well as writing further suspensions into the \textit{passaggi}.\textsuperscript{101} The stepwise ornamental units in Bakfark's intabulations are no different from any other to be found in intabulations from 1536 onwards.

The mid-century Italian-tablature repertoire is free of intabulations containing constant \textit{passaggi} from the opening

\textsuperscript{99} Benkő and Homolya, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 83-86, entries of new points at bars 12, 21, 30, 35, 37, 41, 51, 54.
\textsuperscript{100} Benkő and Homolya, ibid., p. 78, bb. 34 & 43; Dowland's \textit{Melancholy Galliard} b. 32, modern edition in D. Poulton's \textit{The Collected Lute Music of John Dowland} (London, 1974), p. 102; and Terzi, Volume II p. 130, b. 41.
\textsuperscript{101} Benkő and Homolya, \textit{op.cit.}, pp. 76-79, b. 3, b. 18, b. 22, b. 23.
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bars. Intabulations of this type which conceal the melodic structure of the model are found in Hans Newsidler’s Der ander theil des Lautenbuchs, printed in German tablature in 1536. Thibault colourfully described one intabulation from this source as “prattling along gaily, dispersing generously the too-well-known ornamental motives, and [Newsidler] seeming to enjoy his own virtuosity”.102 Other Hans Newsidler intabulations apart from the 1536 volume are much less ornamental, as are those of his son Melchior, published in two books of Italian tablature in 1566.103 In his intabulation of Ferrabosco’s madrigal Io mi son giovinetta for instance, Melchior’s ornamentation is light, occurring mainly at cadences with occasional quaver passaggi.104 He focused attention on cadences by consistently employing the same groppo (Example 3.32), and in this respect his style is similar to Bakfark’s. In this intabulation at least, Melchior made no attempt to secure variety at cadences, and the only concession to virtuosity that Melchior allowed himself was to extend the final cadence with two extra bars of passaggi.

EXAMPLE 3.31
M. Newsidler, Io mi son giovinetta, b. 20

103. Brown 1566/2, 1566/3.
2. Galilei's intabulations

A wealth of material pertinent to the understanding of intabulation, and other aspects of lute music, is provided by Galilei's *Il Fronimo*,\(^{105}\) published in 1568 and revised in 1584. Through many intabulation examples and valuable explanatory text in the form of a dialogue between Fronimo and his pupil Eumatio, Galilei elucidates matters with an attention to detail not to be found elsewhere in the sixteenth-century Italian lute repertoire, and *Il Fronimo* provides clear statements that could otherwise be deduced only by analysis. The value of *Il Fronimo* to present day scholarship has not yet been fully realised, and certainly in the area of intabulation has scarcely been touched.\(^{106}\)

Two principles pertinent to the intabulation process are expounded throughout *Il Fronimo*: first, the intabulator should be true to the intentions of the original composer,\(^{107}\) and second, everything should be done strictly within the confines of contemporary contrapuntal theory. Galilei made it plain (through Eumatio) that "it is impossible to intabulate music for the lute, or to

---


106. In so far as this study relies on Galilei's writings, it does so only by way of contrast and comparison with aspects of Terzi's style and as such does not pretend to be a full account of Galilei's work. See bibliography for references to recent research by Claude Palisca and Nino Pirrettta, and earlier studies by Fabio Fano and Oscar Chilesotti.

107. In reference to the length notes should be held in a particular example, Fronimo suggested that they ought to be full provided that the number of parts does not exceed the number of strings. ... *i principij si fatti per esprimere maggiormente l'intentione del compositore, devono esser pieni, non però che eccedino le corde, la quantità delle parti ...* Galilei (1584), p51
play it correctly on any other instrument without the knowledge and practice of counterpoint.  

EXAMPLE 3.32
Galilei (1584) pp. 28–29
(a) esempi primi

(b) esempi secondi

Fronimo admitted to Eumatio that the imperfection of the lute lies in the fact that, unlike the organ, it cannot "hold the voice according to the value of the note" but later he rates the lute higher in many respects:

108. Credo hornei, come si dice, havervi fatto toccar con mano, esser cosa impossibile l'intavolare la Musica nel Liuto, ò in qual si voglia strumento sonarla rettamente, senza la cognizione, & practica del contraponto ... Galilei (1584), p. 57, see also ibid., p. 8.
The famous organists) Claudio da Coreggio [Merulo] and Giosepho Guami ... not by failure of their art and knowledge, but the nature of the instrument, have not expressed and will never be able to express the affections of the harmonies, such as harshness, softness, sharpness and sweetness, and consequently shrieks, laments, complaints and weeping, and ultimately calmness and passion, with such grace and wonder as the excellent players of the lute are able to do."

Galilei conceded that the texture in intabulations of more than four voices must be reduced when the complexity of the model necessitates it. He recommended that the intabulator leave out one or two notes within the texture, provided that neither the third nor the fifth of the chord be omitted. The best note to omit, he said, would be an octave doubling."

Galilei also recommended that the intabulator ornament passages to fill in the harmony.

110. Claudio da Coreggio & Giosepho Guami .... i quali tutti non per diffetto del'Arte & saper loro ma della natura dello strumento, non hanno possuto, non possano, ne potranno mai, esprimere gli affetti delle Armonie come la durezza, mollezza, asprezza & dolcezza; & conseguentemente i gridi, i lamenti, gli stridi, i pianti, & ultimamente la quiete e l'furore, con tanta gratia, & maraviglia, come gli Eccellenti Sonatori nel Liuto fanno, ... Galilei (1584), p.51.

111. ... per accrescergli leggiadria come di sopra vi dissi, far tacere alcuna nota delle parti di mezzo, tutta volta però, che ella non vieterà alla grave la terza, o la quinta, o alcuna delle replicate, per che tali consonanze (come necessarie) cantando a quattro, non gli devono mai mancare, ma potrete lasciare alcuna di quelle che faranno ottava con qual si voglia parte ... Galilei (1584), p55.

112. Dovete hora sapere che tutte le consonanze semplici & composte, quando nelle cantilene si trovano incomposte, sono state dai pratici & dotti sonatori, nell'intavolarele e sonarle, diversamente composte, & per darvi sopra questo qual che avvertimento, & regola, che vi possa servire per comporre ciascuno incomposto intervallo, dico che occorrà dovi, potrete alle volte pigliarvi licentia d'accomodare i primi esempij [Example 3.31a] nel modo che sono accunci i secondi [Example 3.31b]. Galilei (1584), p28.
giving examples in three and four parts (Example 3.32a), with their possible embellishments (Example 3.32b). The ornamental figures that Galilei gave as examples move almost entirely conjunctly, and are distributed equally among the treble, inner, and bass voices, as well as crossing from one part to another. With one exception (esempi secondi no. 7) the ornaments are consonant both at the beginning of a bar, and on subsequent strong beats.

EXAMPLE 3.33
Galilei (1584), p. 35-36

Galilei gave very explicit rules about the harmony which may result from the application of passaggi. He stated that every time an ornament moves by leap to another string, the finger should be released from the previous string, and that both notes outlining that leap must be consonant with all the other parts (Example 3.33e). He further said that

113. ... ogni volta che farete muovere qual si voglia parte di salto, è necessario che quella corda d'onde la parte mossà si leva, e quella dove ella si posa siano consonanti con tutte le parti ... Galilei (1584), p36
a part must not leap from one discordant note to another. 114
Galilei gave examples, transcribed here as Example 3.33, and
an explanation of their faults, of which the following is a
précis.

fig. (a)  The soprano does not have regard for the intervals
of a sixth followed by a ninth which it forms with
the tenor.

fig. (b)  This is better than the previous example because
the soprano Bb forms a sixth with the tenor.

fig. (c)  This example is worse than the first because the
passaggi in the soprano form two dissonances with
the tenor, one after the other.

In none of the figs. (a), (b) or (c) did Galilei object to the
soprano G on the second minim producing a descending
accented passing note, presumably condoning it because it is
"unsounded" and on the weaker part of the bar.

fig. (d)  Galilei considered fig. (d) to be the worst of the
given examples, but gave no explanation why.
Presumably it was the Eb-E false relation that he
disapproved of.

fig. (e)  This demonstrates how both notes of a leap can be
consonant with all the other parts.

fig. (f)  Galilei gave this as an example of the error of
using an augmented octave, or a diminished octave
between the voices, which he calls "errors truly
deserving much blame".

fig. (g)  Finally, Galilei gave this as an example (in
mensural notation) of good counterpoint "in which

114. ... & questo è che molte volte la diminuzione da loro
aggiunta alle parti, la fanno inadvertentemente col
movimento separato apportare due dissonanze una dopo
l'altra ad alcuna di esse parti, ... Galilei (1584), p.35.
the fourth crotchet in each case is consonant with the other parts".\textsuperscript{115}

It is also, according to Galilei, "a gross error" not to ornament by progressing from long notes to short notes in a smooth manner. He complained that it is "a very great error and one which is little considered by a great part of the men who practise the profession, which is, to move from the semibreve, to the chroma or semichroma as you see here."\textsuperscript{116} He then cited as a bad example (Example 3.34) a passage where a smooth progression of passaggi did not occur and followed this example with two pieces "conceived in a proportioned way", in which the passaggi progress smoothly from \texttt{\textbackslash,} to \texttt{\textbackslash,} to \texttt{\textbackslash,} to \texttt{\textbackslash,}.\textsuperscript{117} The first of these pieces is given here as Example 3.35.

\textbf{EXAMPLE 3.34}

\textit{Galilei (1584) pp. 36}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{example3_34.png}
\end{figure}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{115} \textit{la quarta semiminima di ciascuna casa, sia consonante con l'altre parte, come udirete sonando [qui] ...Galilei (1584), p. 36.}
\item \textsuperscript{116} \textit{Quest'altro ancora è uno errore grandissimo; e poco considerato da una gran parte degli huomini che fanno tal professione; il quale è di passare dalla semibreve alla croma o semicroma come vedete qui, ... Galilei (1584), p. 36}
\item \textsuperscript{117} \textit{Il che dovete fuggire, e fare che delle parti e dal tutto, ne nasca un modo proportionato di procedere, come farà quello de due sottoposti esempi, nel secondo de quali haverete una fuga al'unisono, da sonar con due liuti, dopo sei tempi. Galilei (1585), p37.}
\end{itemize}
3. Galilei's revised intabulations

In his 1584 revision of *Il Fronimo*, Galilei provides us with rare insight into the actual process of revising intabulations. Although some of the intabulations in the 1584 edition remained much the same as the 1568 edition, others received additional ornamentation. Intabulations of Animuccia's *Nasce la gioia mia*, 118 and Rore's *Non mi tolga'l ben mio* 119 for instance received no further ornamentation, but had some revisions of fingerings and *musica ficta* details. Galilei's revisions of Striggio's *Nasce la pena mia* and Ferrabosco's *Io mi son giovinetta* however received considerable addition ornamentation.

(i) Striggio's *Nasce la pena mia*¹²⁰

An increase in Galilei's application of ornamentation to intabulations in the 1584 edition is evident in his revision of Striggio's *Nasce la pena mia* where he corrected some mistakes (b.43), refigered certain passages (b.37), and added further ornamentation.¹²¹ Similarly his 1584 intabulation of Palestrina's *Vestiva i colli* was revised with substantial additional *passaggi*, particularly in the *seconda parte*.¹²² New *passaggi* in the revised version add to the existing cadential ornamentation, providing musical continuity in places of little activity, strengthening the bass (b. 26, b.28), and increasing tension before a cadence (b.53). Galilei's fingering revisions are interesting too. In the Striggio madrigal, the revisions produce stronger cadences, as in bar 33 where he reiterated a suspension which had previously been tied. Similarly, in bar 27 a new left-hand position makes possible a suspension which previously could only have been implied. A further revision at bar 55 adds a note that had been previously omitted, and enables the voices to remain on the same courses.

Galilei's *passaggi* are distributed predominantly among the treble and inner voices, with some part-crossing, in a manner common to most sixteenth century intabulations.

**textural distribution**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>treble</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inner parts</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bass</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part-crossing</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹²¹ *Nasce la pena mia* in Galilei (1568), p.24 receives 19% ornamentation, in Galilei (1584), pp.44 receives 27% ornamentation. See Volume II, no.16 p.154, for a transcription of both versions.
The ornamental units Galilei employed most often in this intabulation are those Terzi also used constantly (Example 3.36). And like Terzi, Galilei ornamented small intervals of descending seconds, ascending thirds, descending thirds and unisons.

**EXAMPLE 3.36**
Galilei (1584)
Ornamental units in *Nasce la pena mia*

The ornamental units are predominantly conjunct in this intabulation. Galilei's *passaggi* rarely contain leaps, but where they do, they form the interval of a third in which both notes are consonant with the other parts (b5, b14, b15, b42, b43, b49). Oddly, Galilei broke his own rule regarding the consonances of leaps, where at bar 53 of the revised version of this intabulation the bass leaps onto a C# which is dissonant with the tenor, (Example 3.37) but which is then immediately resolved.

**EXAMPLE 3.37**
Galilei (1584) b.53
Striggio, *Nasce la pena mia*

Terzi's and Galilei's practices differ with regard to the harmonic aspect of leaps within *passaggi*. Both intabulators, with rare exceptions, were careful to ornament from minim to minim in such a way as to preserve the original harmony, but whereas Galilei's leaps usually outlined the harmony, Terzi's leaps were often dissonant with the harmony. Since it violated his rule concerning the consonance of leaps, Galilei did not use the peculiarly
instrumental figure such as the one employed by Terzi in his intabulation of the same madrigal (Example 3.38).

EXAMPLE 3.38
Terzi, b.47
Striggio, *Nasce la pena mia*

Galilei's *passaggi* are distributed in a stop/start pattern. He ornamented mainly at cadences, and added some continuous quaver *passaggi*. Galilei and Terzi both used similar cadential ornaments but neither intabulator regarded the adornment of cadences as obligatory (Example 3.39).

EXAMPLE 3.39
Galilei's cadential ornaments in *Nasce la pena mia*

Galilei organised his *passaggi* in groups of two to four quavers or as semiquaver *groppi* at cadences. In grouping notes of unequal value, Galilei used figures such as \( J \), \( \frac{1}{1} \) and \( \frac{1}{2} \) in which the smaller values fall on the weaker part of the beat. There is only one instance in this intabulation of a pair of quavers placed on the strong part of the bar (b.10). Galilei's *passaggi* are self-imitative only once in this intabulation (bb.22-24). Imitation of motives either from the model or the *passaggio* itself does not seem to be an important aspect of Galilei's style. Since Galilei never ornamented elaborately, the need did not arise for figural self-imitation as a unifying device.

Galilei did not respond to the A B₁, B₂ form of *Nasce la pena mia* by embellishing the B2 section considerably more
than the B1 section. Rather, he conservatively retained elements of the passaggi of the B1 section without repeating them in any thematically systematic way.\textsuperscript{123} Neither did he make any attempt to represent the meaning of the text by word-painting as Terzi has been seen to do. Twice in \textit{Nasce la pena mia} Galilei wrote passaggi on a note which, although belonging to the harmony, rose higher than the written soprano pitch (bb.23 & 24). An occasional practice of both Galilei and Terzi, this seems to be a means of enlivening the model's harmonically static breve and semibreve chords. Such writing is more effective than merely reiterating a chord (see b.42).

(ii) \textit{Io mi son giovinetta}

It is valuable to our understanding of intabulation style that Galilei published both Eumatio's intabulation of \textit{Io mi son giovinetta} and Fronimo's corrected version, as well as a bar-by-bar commentary. Since it offers a unique opportunity for comparison, the first half of the Ferrabosco ballata is presented in Example 3.40 with the tablatures, their transcriptions, and the vocal model which has been transposed down a fourth from Einstein's edition to accommodate the tablatures.\textsuperscript{124} Einstein's \textit{musica ficta} recommendations are given above the stave, and agree with all of Fronimo's \textit{ficta} interpretations, with the exception of a sharp in bar 3 and another in bar 6. There are two other versions of Galilei's intabulation - in the 1568 printing of \textit{Il Fronimo} - but the differences between the two editions are slight. (In Example 3.40 any signs exclusive to the 1568 print are placed in square brackets.)

\textsuperscript{124} Galilei (1568), pp.27 & 34; Galilei (1584), pp.47 & 56. The vocal model used in the transcription of Example 3.40 is from Alfred Einstein, \textit{The Italian Madrigal} (1949), p.56. There is another modern edition of Galilei in Fano, \textit{op.cit.}, p.89, which unfortunately contains some errors.
EXAMPLE 3.40
Galilei (1568) and (1584)
D. Ferrabosco, Io mi son giovinetta

ornamentation 122
Example 3.40 cont.
ornamentation 124

Fronimo (that is, Galilei) began by admonishing Eumatio for making "two great errors" in the first bar: "the first is that you have made the tenore move with the basso, from the minor third to the octave without the semitone, and your second error is to make the contralto move from the tenth to the octave with the lowest part, likewise without [the semitone]." The tenore C in bar 1 is sharpened in Fronimo's version to comply with the application in the model of the musica ficta rule of approaching a perfect interval from the nearest imperfect interval. Secondly, for the same reason, Fronimo sharpened the contralto F in the last beat of bar 1. In the second bar he rearranged the rhythm signs, omitting the G which was not in the vocal model at that octave. In the third bar he cancelled a ficta interpretation of Eumatio's which did not conform to the rule applied in bar 1. Galilei did not interpret the G as a subsemitonium modi.

Fronimo objected in the third bar, third beat, to the "two twelfths between the parts of the bass and that of the soprano". The interpretation of this passage is not entirely clear. Galilei could have been objecting to the soprano rising above the model to a' (a 12th above d), but (more probably) he mistakenly wrote twelfth for tenth, thus objecting to the doubling of the third of the chord by the tenore and canto. The ornament at the end of the bar was also simplified in revision, with an ornament that was "without doubt simpler and more melodious". Fronimo altered the fingering of the chord on the third beat of the second bar which he called "difficulty without any purpose".

125. Voi ci havete fatto due grandissimi errori, ... Il primo de quali è il fare andar la parte del Tenore con quella del Basso, dalla Terza minore all'ottava senza il semitono, & il secondo commettete nel far venire la parte del Contralto con la grave, dalla decima all'ottava, pur senza ... Galilei (1584), p.48.
126. ... non vedete voi che le sono due duodecime tra le parte del Basso e quella del Soprano, non era meglio accocia così. Che era senza errore piu semplice, e piu armoniosa. Galilei (1584), p55. See comment in Fano, ibid., p.cviii.
preferring the open strings. Elsewhere in the revision of this intabulation Galilei also rewrote the tablature in ways which simplified the technical requirements of the left hand without altering the pitches, as in the second beat of bar 3. It is not necessarily more difficult to play in the higher left-hand positions but it can be more difficult to make a musically smooth transition to a subsequent lower position. Besides, the tuning is easier to control with a longer string length. One can see such left hand simplifications in almost all of Galilei's revisions from the 1568 Il Fronimo. Where he substituted a higher position in a revision he did so in order to realize a suspended note.

In bar 4 Fronimo altered a simple slip (cipher 2 in place of cipher 3 on the third course) and refingered a note (fourth crotchet) from an open course to a fingered course, so that the note "does not occupy the part of the contralto".¹²⁷ (Frankly I cannot see what he means at this point since the original fingering did not interfere with any other voice.) However, giving the same advice at bar 7 he refingered an arrangement of Eumatio's which clearly did interfere with the part-writing.

Fronimo corrected Eumatio's misreadings in bar 5 which had produced a parallel octave (A to G) on the second beat, and in bar 6 Eumatio had apparently "taken too much licence" by interpreting a sounded suspension as a tied suspension. In the following bar Eumatio made the opposite mistake of reiterating a suspended note.¹²⁸ Galilei fastidiously

¹²⁷. Non fate mai che una parte occupi il luogo dell'altra: non vedete che quel zero che voi fate su la mezzana, ha da essere un quattro sul Tenore; per non occupar la parte del Contralto, Galilei (1584), p55.
respected the model, but where necessary he compromised. The suspended D in the alto of bar 5 for instance is omitted because the difficulties in executing it would not have rendered a worthwhile musical result.

In bar 8 Fronimo corrected a parallel octave (Bb to G) by altering the tenore b flat to d in the first chord. The tenore alteration g to d in the next chord seems unnecessary and could well have been a misreading by Galilei or the publisher (right cipher on the wrong course). In the penultimate bar of the first half of this intabulation Fronimo added some passaggi to the cadence, and in the final chord he supplied the raised third.

4. Summary of Galilei's style of embellishment

Galilei's intabulations are more literal than Terzi's, and appear to reflect a different philosophy. Galilei intabulated merely to facilitate a realisation on the lute that was as true as possible to the original polyphony, never to improve upon or recompose the material in any way. A modest amount of passaggi was added simply to assist the melodic flow where the lute's sustaining powers declined, and to intensify cadences. It is made very clear both from his commentary and from examples of intabulations, that he avoided the type of ornamentation that could blur the polyphony. In this respect he was more concerned than Terzi to produce a lute arrangement that was as true as possible to the original and which adhered to strict contrapuntal rules. In spite of a notable increase in the application of passaggi to some of Galilei's 1584 revisions in *Il Fronimo*, he clearly aimed for clarity. Fronimo disagreed with Eumatio's suggestion that he should have included newer and more difficult canzoni in his first lute book which "would better demonstrate his art". Fronimo replied that "his art was revealed best by those simple old songs, since it was just as difficult to intabulate them so that they sounded well on artificial instruments. Then they would be praised
for exactly the same reason as an ugly old woman would be, who by means of make-up and a beautiful dress was made to appear young and beautiful." Galilei emphasised simplicity and clarity above novelty, difficulty, and density of *passaggi*. Rather than a vehicle for technical display, ornamentation was for Galilei a device to represent a polyphonic work by way of maintaining individual polyphonic strands where the lute would otherwise have difficulty sustaining them. Where he did not consider ornamentation necessary he did not use it at all. The intabulations of *Qual miracolo Amore*, and *Non mi toglià*, for example, are entirely free of ornamentation except for a simple *groppo* at the final cadence of the latter.  

Galilei was careful to ensure that melodic points did not become obscured by *passaggi*. He consistently kept the heads of imitative points free from ornamentation. It may seem odd that the theorist who criticised the contrapuntal style so strongly in *Dialogo della musica antica et moderna* of 1581 should be so careful to preserve the polyphony in his lute intabulations. On the other hand, since the source of his objection (the conflict of vocal polyphony with the...
sense of the text), is absent in intabulations, there is no conflict between Galilei's monodic theories and his upholding of the polyphonic ideal in intabulations. It is likely that Galilei's dislike of ornamental flourishes for their own sake in lute intabulations, stemmed from his belief that in vocal music "the niceties of imitative counterpoint" should be subordinate "to the expression of the text". 131

To summarise,

1. Both Terzi and Galilei took great care with dissonances resulting from passaggi, Galilei being the more conservative in this respect.
2. Galilei, in intabulating for the lute, did not consider the meaning of the text in the literal way that Terzi did on occasion.
3. Galilei took more care than Terzi not to obscure the polyphony with passaggi.
4. Whereas Terzi wrote some intabulations that delighted in virtuoso embellishment for their own sake, Galilei always wrote with respect for the original work, adding passaggi for practical reasons only. This difference between the two intabulators could well owe something to Galilei's continuing involvement with lute-song, whereas Terzi seemed more interested in creating solo and instrumental ensemble intabulations. This aspect of intabulation will be evaluated in Chapter 5.

MANUSCRIPTS AND ORNAMENTATION

In the manuscripts consulted for this study the ornamentation is very light, often non-existent, and at times the model is simplified. If the lute music found in manuscripts reflects the technical expertise of amateur lutenists, then we can assume that the printed lute books show the upper level of technical abilities of a few. A Florentine manuscript\textsuperscript{132} omits notes from chords, presenting a predominantly three-part texture\textsuperscript{133} as does a manuscript from Genoa, but in a more random fashion.\textsuperscript{134} Since the omission of a voice in a four-part texture was practised by Tromboncino in making lute-song arrangements, (albeit because he claimed to be in a hurry),\textsuperscript{135} it is likely that these manuscript intabulations were also written as accompaniments, and that possibly the compiler of the book sang one of the vocal lines.

Two manuscripts consulted which contain a significant number of highly ornamented intabulations are the beautifully presented book of Capirola's lute music of about 1517,\textsuperscript{136} and a later manuscript compiled by Pietro Paulo Raimondo of Como, dated 1601.\textsuperscript{137} Les Rottner in his thesis on Capirola's intabulations, observed that Capirola used ornaments motivically, and that in some intabulations he "shows a conscious attempt at assimilating the ornament to the original melodic figuration".\textsuperscript{138} In other words, Capirola placed ornaments at the same part of an imitative point at successive entries of that point. In this respect

\textsuperscript{132} Ms.Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Fondo Magliabechiano, XIX.168.
\textsuperscript{133} For example, Volume II, no.37 p.279.
\textsuperscript{134} Ms.Genoa, Biblioteca Univeritaria, Ms.F.VII/I.
\textsuperscript{135} A. Einstein, \textit{The Italian Madrigal}, Vol I, p.48.
\textsuperscript{137} Ms.Como, Biblioteca Comunale, senza segnatura (Raimondo lutebook).
he anticipated Francesco's style rather than reflecting Spinacino's, although he did share Spinacino's tendency to initiate elaboration from the first bar. Another stylistic difference between the two early intabulators is that where Spinacino wrote long continuous sections of passaggi in notes of one rhythmic value, Capirola provided greater rhythmic variety.¹³⁹

Striggio's madrigal Nasce la pena mia, intabulated in the Raimondo manuscript of 1601, is worth examining as an example of a fairly ornate manuscript intabulation.¹⁴⁰ Raimondo left the first two bars free of ornamentation, simplifying two chords in the second bar. From bars three to eight he gradually increased the stepwise quaver passaggi until the ninth bar, after which, until bar 35, the passaggi are almost continuous. At the breve chord in bar 41, Raimondo took the opportunity, as Terzi did in the same bar of his intabulation, to provide a virtuoso semiquaver and demisemiquaver ornament. Up to this point the heads of imitative points are relatively free of ornamentation, but from the beginning of the long repeated section, (bars 42-58), the character changes somewhat into passaggi of absolutely continuous quavers, constantly shifting from one voice to another. Although in his intabulation of this madrigal Terzi increased the intensity of the passaggi a little in the repeated section, the sense of "variation" is not as obvious as it is in the manuscript. Raimondi concluded with a four-bar coda, a practice not unknown, but rare.¹⁴¹

---

¹³⁹. Compare for instance the two intabulations of Agricola's Si dedero in Composizione di Messer Vincenzo Capirola, op cit., p.115 and Spinacino (Brown 1507/2, fol.29v), and the two intabulations of Obricht's Christe de si dedero in Composizione di Messer Vincenzo Capirola, op cit., p.70 and Spinacino (Brown 1507/2, fol.4v).
¹⁴¹. See for instance, M. Newsidler's, Io mi son giovinetta, and Gostina's, Susanne ung jour, both transcribed in Volume II, no.41 p.310, & no.44 p.315.
LATE SIXTEENTH CENTURY PRINTED INTABULATIONS

The last quarter of the sixteenth century saw the publication of almost as many lute-song intabulations as solo or duo intabulations. Apart from Galilei's revision of *Il Fronimo* in 1584, and Terzi's two books, the only printed solo and duo lute intabulations in Italian tablature are by Barbetta, Fallamero, and Molinari. Fallamero's intabulations in his *Primo libro* of 1584 are, as previously mentioned, very lightly ornamented, if at all. We cannot assume, however, that the simple nature of the solo intabulations indicates that they were for song accompaniment, since Fallamero had also included twenty intabulations for solo voice in mensural notation. (In any case Fallamero's frequent careless omission of bars would preclude performance with singers unless the omissions were rectified.)

Barbetta in his *Novae Tabulae Musicae* of 1582 ornamented his intabulations a little more than Fallamero but no more imaginatively, employing the same *grappo* at most cadences with very little variety (Example 3.41). Neither did he respect the melodic structure of the model, since stepwise *passaggi* cross from the end of one imitative point to the beginning of another, with the result that all the intabulations resemble each other somewhat.

---

142. For data refer the summary of Appendix 1.3.
143. Brown 1582/1, 1584/3, 1599/7.
145. See Volume II, no. 16: p. 157 (b. 10) & p. 164 (b. 29); and no. 17 p. 177 (b. 3).
The intabulation by Gostina of Lassus's chanson *Susanne ung jour*, included in Molinaro's publication, is worthy of attention not only because Terzi and many others arranged this popular chanson, but because it is one of the few examples we have, apart from Terzi's, of a printed solo intabulation from the final decade of the century. Gostina's *Susanne ung Jour* is a very highly ornamented intabulation. Although it carries about as much ornamentation as Terzi's highly ornamental "*con passaggi*" arrangement of Striggio's *Nasce la pena mia*, it is simpler and more accessible technically than Terzi's. Unlike the other intabulations in Molinaro's publication, Gostina added ornaments to the first bar. The style of this intabulation is so similar to Terzi's *contrappunti* and *in concerto* intabulations that it would not be too far fetched to suppose that this could also have been written for ensemble performance of some sort.

Gostina's style resembles Terzi's *contrappunti* intabulations in two important respects. First, he ornamented imitative points motivically (Example 3.42), and second, he adopted an ornamental figure such as one in Example 3.43 and used it for several bars, exchanging it for another figure in subsequent bars. Example 3.42 illustrates Gostena's motivic elaboration on Lassus's pair of opening imitative points. The first and third, and second and fourth entries are ornamented with similar figuration. Gostina

ornamented motivically also on "Fust en son coeur triste" (bars 28 to 35), and at the entries of "de ce corps mien vous avez jouissance" (bars 61 to 68). Thus he highlighted the melodic structure of the model while in other respects he wrote over the original melodic material, disregarding the structure. In Example 3.44 for instance, he used the harmonic structure of the model on which to hang his own figuration. Gostina treated dissonance more freely than Terzi, frequently omitting the original suspensions (bars 12, 13, 19, & 27), and writing new ones elsewhere (bars 143 & 64). Also in Example 3.44 he changed the modality from G minor to G major.

EXAMPLE 3.42
Gostina, Susanne ung jour, bb. 1-6

first entry, canto second entry, contratenore

third entry, quinta parte fourth entry, basso
EXAMPLE 3.43
Gostina, Susanne ung jour
(a) bb. 1-6 (b) bb. 7-15 (c) bb. 16-17 (d) bb. 25-27

EXAMPLE 3.44
Gostina, Susanne ung jour, bb. 71-72
Part four. Didactic Manuals for Ornamentation

Extant ornamentation manuals of the sixteenth century\(^\text{148}\) do not specifically mention that their tables of ornamental formulae are suitable for the lute; neither is there any indication that would lead us to believe that they should not apply to the lute. In fact many authors of the didactic manuals, if they specify instruments or voices, are just as likely to indicate that the music is equally suitable for both:

*Motetti, Madrigali, et canzoni Francese ... diminuiti per sonar con ogni sorte di stromenti, & anco per cantar con semplice voce da Giovanni Bassano. (Venice, 1591).\(^\text{149}\)

It is clear all the same that some of the books were directed towards singers more than to instrumentalists (Maffei, Bovicelli) while others were directed towards instrumentalists alone (Ganassi, Virgilio). But as Brown points out, "even when a book is written with one specific instrument in mind, like Ganassi's *Fontegara* on the recorder, the author is careful to insist that his advice can be more widely applied."\(^\text{150}\)

Common to most didactic manuals are tables of cadential ornaments, or tables of the numerous ways to connect each melodic interval ornamentally. Most of the ornaments are common to all of the authors. There is nothing unique about the elements of elaboration used by the lute intabulators; the *passaggi* and *groppi* used by Terzi, or any other lutenist of the sixteenth century for that matter, can be found in

---

149. Brown 1591/2.
any one of the ornamentation manuals. The ornaments used for the lute are, however, generally much less ambitious than those of the didactic manuals. The total number of ornaments used by the lutenists is minute compared with the large compilations in the manuals. Terzi employed only a tiny proportion of those tabled by, for instance, Ganassi, Bassano, and Francesco Rognioni.151

There are two ways that the didactic authors approached the ornamentation of a melodic interval. One, which is really a "grace", was to start and conclude an ornament on the given note, and the other was to ornament from one pitch to another, filling in the interval as it were. The second method, that is the application of passaggi, is by far the most common, as it produces a smoother melodic line and is more likely to be used in continuous ornamentation. The application of passaggi which proceed mainly conjunctly from one note of the model to another can produce some harmonic barbarisms. Hence Ganassi admonished his readers "to begin and end their passaggi on the main note of a melody so that the counterpoint will still be correct as composed."152 Ortiz also gave attention to single-note ornamentation, (that is, beginning and ending the ornament on the given note) as a means of avoiding parallel octaves, but in practice it was more common to fill the interval ornamentally. In most elaborations in the manuals it is possible to find a few examples of single-note ornamentation, just as one sees them occasionally in Terzi, but in both the manuals and lute tablatures this is the exception rather than the rule. A good example of the use of single-note ornamentation can be seen in Bassano's elaboration on Marenzio's Quando i vostri begli occhi in

151. Brown 1535/1, Brown 1598/1. Francesco Rognioni, Selva de Varii Passaggi (Milan, 1620), a photocopy of which was kindly sent to me by Professor Howard Mayer Brown.
152. H.M. Brown, "op. cit., p. 23.
which some of the original interval leaps are retained (Example 3.45). Bassano was equally capable of doing the exact opposite, that is, of ascending by step from a given pitch, then leaping downwards to the next original pitch (Example 3.46a). This ornament and another incorporating octave leaps (Example 3.46b) are of the type also found in Terzi’s intabulations of instrumental canzonas.

The treatment of dissonance varied depending on whether the author conceived of ornamenting from semibreve to semibreve, minim to minim, or crotchet to crotchet. Imogene Horsley has pointed out that “Ganassi prefers to use the whole note as the time-unit being ornamented”, either ignoring any intervening notes, or incorporating them as part of the ornament. Other manuals treated the minim as the basic unit, but at times changing to the crotchet or semibreve unit, whereas Bassano generally preserved the crotchet harmony.

In the examples cited here from ornamentation manuals and lute intabulations, it is clear that the authors aimed to preserve the basic consonances of the model, but in faster passage work they take certain liberties in the form of accented passing notes and leaps which depart from the immediate harmony. Horsley makes the observation that it was not until the seventeenth century that there was the close correlation between theory and practice in instrumental music that there was in vocal music. "This was particularly true of music for lute and keyboard instruments, where the departure from strict counterpoint included a freer use of dissonance on long notes as well as the writing-in of coloratura passages."  

**INSTRUMENTATION**

It could be said that for the whole of the sixteenth century there was one practice and one common source of ornamental formulae from which any instrumentalist or singer could draw his or her elaborations, and that there was no differentiation in style between vocal and instrumental practice. But as Horsley observes, "the fact remains that, even if the ornaments are the same, special skills are required in playing them on the different instruments."  

The instrumental techniques shaped particular arrangements so that even in the cases where the arranger did not specify the instrumentation, stylistic characteristics are evident. Elaborations for voice tend to be a little lighter in ornamentation and avoid awkward leaps within the passaggi, and some authors such as Dalla Casa and Bovicelli carefully observed principles of relating passaggi to the text. Conversely, the work of other authors, such as

---

156. Brown 1584/1, 1584/2, 1594/3.
Virgiliano, is obviously instrumental in style, and in all arrangements for the *viola bastarda* one encounters angular outlines absent in texted elaborations.

In spite of emerging stylistic differences, it is not until Virgiliano's *Il Dolcimelo* of approximately 1600, and Francesco Rognioni's *Salve de varii passaggi* of 1620 that the music is presented separately for voice and varieties of instruments. Virgiliano's book\textsuperscript{157} is in three parts. The first book gives incomplete tables of ornaments for each interval. The second book contains *ricercari*, *madrigali*, and *canzoni*, presented according to the instruments' ranges, with such titles as *Ricercata per Viola Bastarda e Lauto*,\textsuperscript{158} and *Ricercar di Flauto: Cornetto: Violone: Trasversa; e simili*.\textsuperscript{159} The third book was to give instructions on the tuning and playing of various instruments, including the lute, but it remained unwritten.

Francesco Rognioni's book is divided into two parts, containing in the first book, tables of ornaments and music examples for the voice, and in the second book, examples for instruments. Rognioni discussed the technical peculiarities of wind instruments, particularly the *cornetto*, the *viola bastarda*, *lira da gamba*, *lira da brazzo*, *viola da gamba*, and *viola da brazzo*. Then, to follow, he gave tables of ornaments suitable for all the instruments, concluding with six arrangements based on madrigals in which he specified the instrumentation. His distinctions were not absolute though, for he offered some choice of instrumentation. An elaboration of Lassus's *Susanne ung jour* for instance is

\textsuperscript{157} *Il Dolcimelo d'Aurelio Virgiliano dove si contengono variati passaggi, e diminuzioni così per voci, come per tutte sorte d'instrumenti musicali; con loro accordi, e modo di sonare.* (unpublished MS, ca. 1600) in facsimile ed. M. Castellani, (Florence, 1979)

\textsuperscript{158} *ibid.*, p. 52.

\textsuperscript{159} *ibid.*, p. 72.
for either violin or trombone in the style of the viola bastarda.\textsuperscript{160} To an arrangement of \textit{Susanne un giorno} written specifically for \textit{viola bastarda}, he added the clause "\ò altro instrumento",\textsuperscript{161} and he further blurred the distinction between vocal and instrumental music by writing that the first book, besides "demonstrating the art of polished and gracious singing", was "also useful to players for imitating the human voice":

\begin{quote}
Nella prima [parte] de quali si dimostra il modo di cantar polito, è con gratia ... Cosa ancora utile è Suonatori per imitare la voce humana. Nella seconda poi si tratta de passaggi difficili per gl'instrumenti ...
\end{quote}

All the same, Francesco Rognioni made it clear that he was operating under two sets of rules, one for voices and one for instruments, by specifying that a Mortara canzona was elaborated on vocal principles, and Palestrina's \textit{Vestiva i colli} and others to follow, were not.\textsuperscript{163} Indeed, many of the theorists (Zarlino in particular), believed instruments to be inferior to voices and that the best thing an instrumentalist could do in compensation would be to imitate the human voice. Ganassi advised the recorder player to imitate the rise and fall of the human voice and the nature of the words\textsuperscript{164} and Bovicelli suggested to singers that,

\begin{quote}
... in singing one must as much as one can, imitate the words; that is, sad words are not to be adorned with \textit{passaggi} but are to be accompanied with stresses and a plaintive voice.
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{160} \textit{Modo di passagiar per il Violone Over Trombone alla Bastarda}, (II: p.61).
\textsuperscript{161} \textit{ibid.}, (II: p.63).
\textsuperscript{162} \textit{ibid.}, title page.
\textsuperscript{163} \textit{Modo di paseggiar [sic] con regola naturale al Canto} (II: p.57), \textit{'Modo di Passeggiar [sic] con diverse Inventioni Non regolati al Canto} (II: p.59).
\textsuperscript{164} \ldots adunque debbe imitare la voce humana cioè che essa ale [sic] volte creste e mancha: per imitare la natura de le parole ... (Brown 1535/1, capitulo.24).
If the words are happy, use *passaggi* and thus give them vivacity.\(^{165}\)

Statements such as Francesco Rognioni's, that "the charm of the song consists principally in expressing well and distinctly the words that one sings" are common among the didactic manuals.\(^{166}\) If, then, the duty of a singer was to imitate the words, and the duty of the instrumentalist was to imitate not only the nature of the voice but also the meaning of the words, it is not surprising that we should find examples of word-painting in Terzi, even in the absence of a text. In this respect Terzi's intabulations reflect the spirit of the Renaissance rather than looking forward to the Baroque period. If a study were to be devoted to this phenomenon in all sixteenth-century lute and vihuela music it would, I suspect, not be found to be a rarity. Thibault for instance says of Narvaez's intabulation of Josquin's *Mille Regretz*, that "were the words to be sung, they would fall exactly as in the vocal version, and when some embellishments are added, it is not to produce a decorative effect, but with the intention of underlining the sense of a word ... "\(^{167}\)

**STYLE AND ORNAMENTAL COMPLEXITY**

It is immediately obvious that lute intabulations are much simpler than the ornamentation manuals. For example, a comparison of six lute intabulations of Rore's *Anchor che*
col partire with ten versions from the didactic literature, clearly demonstrates the less ornate style of a lute intabulation. Any solo lute intabulation of Terzi's is less ornate than a single-line elaboration of Bassano or Bovicelli. On the other hand, a Terzi contrapunto intabulation, such as Palestrina's Vestiva i colli, competes very well with a Bassano or Bovicelli version in density of elaboration. Naturally the first lute in a lute duet is capable of a great deal more ornamentation than a solo intabulation, since it can elaborate in a single continuous line, accompanied by the second lute representing the polyphony in unornamented form.

The most significant stylistic differences between Terzi's contrapunto intabulations and the didactic arrangements are rhythmic. The use of continual dotted rhythms, called clamatione or accenti by Diruta, a style developed extensively in the seventeenth century, is totally absent from Terzi's work (Example 3.47). Francesco Rognioni employed such figures sequentially in his elaborations of

EXAMPLE 3.47

169. Volume II, no. 9 p. 97.
Vestiva i colli as did Bartolomeo in his basso solo arrangement and Bovicelli in Anchor che col partire. Terzi however, never used dotted figures sequentially in this manner, and neither did he write passaggi in groups of triplets or septuplets such as we find tabled by Ganassi. Such irregular rhythmic groups were used also by Bartolomeo de Selma in Vestiva i colli, and Richardo Rogniono and Dalla Casa in Anchor che col partire.

Just as there is some variety of style and practice within the lute intabulation genre, so there are stylistic differences between authors of the didactic manuals. Common to the diminution manuals is the tendency, as Brown argues, for performers "to prize independence and variety above uniformity - yet another indication that performers in the sixteenth century are little concerned with making obvious the structural features of the music." Individual arrangers disguised structural features to greater and lesser extents, as the following comparison between Bassano and Richardo Rogniono illustrates.

In the two Richardo Rogniono elaborations of Anchor che col partire, one marked "per sonar con ogni sorte di stromento" and the other "per la viola bastarda", the ornamentation is as complex and dense as any contemporary elaboration. In fact the writing is so dense with demisemiquavers at times that it is hard to imagine any instrumentalist being able to cope with it at anything like the required speed. But, if Dalla Casa's comment that "all the ornaments are struck note for note and in their correct

173. Ibid., pp. 351-2.
176. Erig and Gutman, op. cit., bb. 72-80.
180. Hemidemisemiquavers in transcription, ibid., bb. 35-42.
"ornamentation" is universal, to play an elaboration such as this at speed would have been the intention.\textsuperscript{181}

Richardo Rogniono made no attempt to retain the melodic structure by allowing imitative points to enter unornamented. On the contrary, he often began passaggi on the opening note of a point, and even went out of his way to avoid using an ornament which may have coincided with a repeat of melodic material. In this arrangement he used two ornaments (Example 3.48 a & b) several times at the beginning of a point, (one of which approached a note from the third below in a way that Bovicelli favoured) but he avoided using the same figure at repetitions of melodic material. In fact he swapped the ornaments of one version with those of another to avoid any thematic consistency.\textsuperscript{182} At other repetitions of melodic/poetic points he aimed, it seems, for variety rather than consistency of figuration by varying the ornaments considerably, adding to their complexity.

**EXAMPLE 3.48**

R. Rogniono

\begin{align*}
\text{(a)} & \quad \text{(model)} \\
\text{(b)} & \\
\text{(Rogniono b.33)} & \quad \text{(b.22)}
\end{align*}

In the Dalla Casa arrangement of this madrigal for viola bastarda,\textsuperscript{183} the embellishment wanders freely among

\textsuperscript{181} Dunque ogn'uno batti la minuta à nota per nota, e porti le quattro figure [that si, croma, semicrome, treplicate, and quadruplicate] tutte con il suo tempo, se desidera far buon profitto (Brown 1584/2, fol.A1). See also similar comment by Rognioni - Bisogna che il passaggio sia di note eguali, & si senta à nota per nota, che non sia ne troppo presto ne troppo tardo. ma si tenga la strada di mezzo ... R. Rognioni, op.cit., p.3); See also similar comment by Zacconi in R. Donington, The Interpretation of Early Music (London, 1963/R1977), p.165.

\textsuperscript{182} See the phrase partir da voi, in Volume II, no.38, bb.22 & 33 (pp.297 & 301).

\textsuperscript{183} Volume II, no.38 p.290, Dalla Casa 1.
the voices in a manner that is similar to other arrangements for this instrument. The Dalla Casa version and the two by Richardo Rogniono, also for viola bastarda, disguise the melodic structure of the model so entirely that one would be hard pressed to recognise the original madrigal. Unlike the other embellishments of this madrigal, these three arrangements ignore the intervening rests from the end of an imitative point in one voice, to the beginning of a point in another voice, connecting them with long flourishes. In the third and fourth bars for instance, Dalla Casa's arrangement leaves the pitch of the basso, and rises to the first note of the imitative point of the canto in a highly ornamental fashion. Richardo Rogniono's viola bastarda arrangements do the same but less dramatically. Later, however, Rogniono's embellishments are every bit as dramatic as Dalla Casa's earlier interconnecting embellishment. 184

It appears that the viola bastarda, because of its technical versatility, appealed more than any other as the instrument to display the art of virtuoso diminution. This instrument, which Rognioni calls "the queen of all the instruments," is imitated in one of Terzi's most complex solo intabulations. His intabulation of Striggio's Chi farà fede "à modo di viola bastarda" imitates the viola bastarda's style of wandering freely between the treble and bass pitches of the model. This intabulation is clearly not written for a viola bastarda, because the notes forming chords are not written on adjacent strings as they would have to be for a bowed instrument. In fact it differs from viola bastarda music by its very inclusion of the vertical element. Like Dalla Casa and Rogniono, Terzi treated this madrigal as an harmonic structure on which to graft

184. Volume II, no.38, bb.13-14 (p.294)
185. La Viola Bastarda, qual è Regina dell' altri instromenti, per paseggiare [sic] ... R. Rognioni, op. cit., II: p.2).
as many passaggi as possible, totally disregarding any polyphonic aspect of the model.

Bassano's arrangements could be equally ornate at times, but he usually emphasised the beginning of imitative points by leaving them free of passaggi. Of his three versions of Anchor che col partire, version two, because of its ornamental complexity and angular lines, appears to be instrumentally conceived. The other two are texted, and their simpler style, (like the texted versions by Bovicelli and Dalla Casa), suggests vocal performance. The most ornate of Bassano's arrangements has the rubric "per sonar piu parti" which would seem to suggest that it was based on two or three voices of the model. On the contrary, it is an embellishment of the basso with only a slight excursion into the tenore at bar 37. Otherwise the embellishment preserves the pitch of the basso at the beginning of each minim beat, (crotchet beat in transcription), wandering far from that pitch before the beginning of the next beat. This example of Bassano differs considerably from others of his which carry similar indications. For instance his elaborations on two Marenzio madrigals - Quando i vostrì and Liquide perle - both marked "per piu parte", are ornamented on successive polyphonic entries of the basso, quinto, and tenore, in a manner which always makes the polyphony clear. Both Bassano's arrangements of Quando i vostrì and the "per sonar piu parte" version of Anchor che col partire cover a range of an octave and a fifth (A-f') - perfectly managable vocally - whereas versions by other composers specifically marked "for viola bastarda" have a much wider range of two octaves and a fifth. In one case the range is as much as three octaves and a sixth. That the Bassano version is

188. Volume II, no. 17 p. 177
more likely to have been written for voice than for the viola bastarda, is suggested by its smaller range and the inclusion of the text.\(^{191}\) While the presence of a text can never be taken as conclusive evidence of vocal performance, it appears significant that none of the other viola bastarda versions carry a text.

Not every author agreed with Zacconi's advice to set forth opening passages "simply and clearly, so that the entry of each part may be better heard."\(^{192}\) Bovicelli's vocal elaboration of Anchor che col partire, while not as ornate as some of Rognioni's versions, nonetheless conceals the beginnings of imitative points with ornaments. Bovicelli had a predilection for a slide from a third below the first note of a polyphonic point. This he used without regard for imitative entries, thus disguising the melodic structure. However, he did leave sufficient melodic material unadorned overall, to facilitate recognition of the original madrigal.

In general, as would be expected, the texted elaborations are simpler than the untexted ones, while the viola bastarda versions are the most complex and the least related figurally to the original melodic material. In highly ornamented examples like these, the arrangers, especially Bovicelli and Rogniono, used motivic interplay as a means of unifying what would otherwise have been mere unrelated ramblings and in so doing they "recomposed" the model melodically, in a style approaching free fantasia. They attained a degree of unity in their elaborations, using the same method as Terzi in his highly ornamented intabulations, which was to employ a figure sequentially for two or three bars. Terzi's use of figural self-imitation such as that seen in S'ogni mio ben'havete is, however, much more consistent and structured than the examples discussed here. This technique is actually documented by the theorist

\(^{191}\) This is contrary to Brown's suggestion, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 47.\(^{192}\) Donington, \textit{op.cit.}, (1977 edition), p. 165.
Zacconi, who "encourages the performer to add to a composition in his improvisation a new element of motivic interplay, quite independent of the composer's intention."\(^{193}\)

Consistent figural embellishment of successive melodic entries, which in effect emphasised the original structure, was rare in the didactic manuals, whereas Terzi employed the technique often. Some authors ornamented with regard to the model more than others. Diruta in his 1593 treatise *Il Transilvano* clearly advocated respect for the polyphony when he wrote:

"You must first understand that when you embellish, you do so in the parts that do not carry the imitation, but when you want to embellish the imitation, you must take care to use the same embellishment for all the identical imitative points."\(^{194}\)

**VIRGILIANO**

A clear set of guide lines on how to embellish was left by Virgiliano in his manuscript *Il Dolcimelo*.\(^{195}\) This book serves as a useful comparison with Terzi's style of ornamentation for two reasons: Virgiliano was a contemporary of Terzi, and his musical examples are specifically instrumental. Below is a translation of his rules of embellishment.

---

Rules of embellishment

1. The division should run as much as possible in conjunct motion.

2. All the minute [passaggi] must be one good and the other bad. [i.e. consonance must alternate with dissonance.]

3. Those minute that leap must be all good [consonant].

4. The given note should always be played at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end of the beat. When it is not convenient [to return to the given note] at the middle, one must at least always play [a note] nearby that is consonant and never dissonant with that note, except as a fourth above it.

5. When the given note rises, the last note of the minute should also rise, and vice versa.

---

196. Virgiliano, Il Dolcimelo, fol.3:

Regole della Diminuzione

1. La diminuzione caminar deve per grado il più che sia possibile.
2. Tutte le Minute debbono essere una buona, e l'altra cattiva.
3. Quelle Minute che saltano, debbono essere tutte buone.
4. La nota del soggetto vuole esser sempre toccata nel principio; nel mezzo, e nel fine della battuta. E quando nel mezzo non tornasse commodo; si deve almeno toccar vicino in luogo, che gli sia consonante, e non mai dissonante; eccetto nella quarta di sopra.
5. Quando il soggetto camina in su; l'ultima nota delle minute deve ancor ella caminar di giù in su; e così pier] contrario.
6. It will be stylish to make a scale-movement spanning an octave, ascending or descending, and to return [to the given note] when convenient.

7. When one leaps an octave, it must be to the octave above, and not the octave below, to avoid collision with the other parts.

8. The division should never depart from the given note by more than a fifth below or above.

9. Only in the case of these two semibreve G's may the divisions be allowed to depart seven steps above or below the given note; but it is allowed only in a rush of semiquavers.

10. When one finds two successive thirds stepping upwards, as it is permissible to use the fourth below [the G], since it is the octave of the final third, as:

Contrariwise, when one finds two thirds descending, it is permissible to do the same, [i.e. transpose the last note up an octave] as:

---

6. Sarà bella maniera correre un'ottava di lungo o in giu, o in su; quando torni cómodo.

7. Quando si salta un'ottava; si deve fare in quella di sopra, e non in quella di sotto; per non incontrar l' altre parti.

8. Non deve la Diminuzione discostarsi mai dal soggetto più d' una Quinta sotto, o sopra.


10. Quando si trovano le due Terze di sopra; come [example] si concederà di potersi servire della Quarta di sotto, perché sarà l'ottava dell'ultima Terza come [example]. Così per contrario, quando si troveranno le due terze di sotto, far si potrà lo stesso; come [example].
The only arrangement of a polyphonic piece that Virgiliano included - Palestrina's Vestiva i colli - provides a revealing comparison with Virgiliano's rules. Although he said that conjunct motion was preferable, he often employed large leaps (Example 3.49a) in his passaggi, as well as sections of sequential thirds (Example 3.49b), and very instrumental figures beginning and ending on the same notes (Example 3.49c).

**EXAMPLE 3.49**

Virgiliano, *Vestiva i colli*

(a) ![Example 3.49a]

(b) ![Example 3.49b]

(c) ![Example 3.49c]

His second rule appears not to imply that the first of every pair of notes in the passaggi must be consonant, but rather that the passaggi must be consonant at the minim beat as in Example 3.50. But he breaks this rule too by writing an accented passing note a few bars later (bar 12) on the first beat of the bar.

**EXAMPLE 3.50**

Virgiliano, *Vestiva i colli*

Rule three seems to apply to leaps occurring in quaver passaggi, but not in faster note values, where greater

freedom is allowed (b.9, Example 3.50). Just what Virgiliano meant by rule four is not clarified by his arrangement of *Vestiva i colli*, as he only occasionally returned to the original note before ornamenting the next, and neither did he follow his own edict that the direction at the end of a note's embellishment should be the same as the model's. Octave spans running up and down he obviously relished. They are an important part of his vocabulary as indeed they are of any of the didactic authors.

His warning against descending an octave by a leap because of the danger of colliding with the other parts, does not of course apply in this case where the polyphony is reduced to a single-line embellishment. Virgiliano did not adhere to the rule of not deviating from the original pitches by more than a fifth. In bar 33 for instance (Example 3.51) he wrote *passaggi* an octave above the canto pitch of the model, and there are no examples of the *passaggi* ascending a minor seventh above the original as in rule nine. The type of octave transposition mentioned in rule ten he applied often, indeed as did any of his contemporaries. Oddly, this elaboration breaks off at bar 41, to resume a few bars later without ornamentation. Perhaps the performer was expected to elaborate further by improvisation.

EXAMPLE 3.51

200. *ibid.*, p. 357, bb. 32-34.
While there is a gradual increase in the application of passaggi to lute intabulations through the course of the sixteenth century, this is not the most significant stylistic development pertaining to ornamentation. There are isolated indications of an increasing use of ornamentation in, for example, Galilei's revisions in the 1584 edition of Il Fronimo, and it is certainly true that Terzi's most ornate arrangements are more complex and virtuoso than those of Francesco da Milano some fifty years earlier. However, no simple pattern is evident of a development from literal intabulations at the beginning of the century to highly ornate intabulations at the close of the century. Rather, there is a great variety in the degree of ornamental density to be found, not only between examples of early and late sixteenth-century intabulations, but also within single sources. By far the most obvious patterns of development emerge in relation to style. Significant stylistic changes can be seen in the harmonic treatment of passaggi, and where they are applied within the texture.

From Francesco da Milano onwards, dissonance is treated with greater care, consistent with evolving polyphonic theory and practice. Accented passing notes on strong beats are very rare, and any dissonance additional to that of the model is more commonly the result of reiterating a suspended note at a cadence. Such alteration was clearly considered necessary by the intabulators in order to compensate for the inability of the lute to sustain some notes for the required length. The beginnings of strong minim beats are almost always consonant with the harmony, although in the very fast passage work, liberties are allowed such as passing dissonances on the relatively weak minim or the crotchet beat. It is usually against sustained harmony that such dissonances occur; in other words, it is "unsounded" dissonance that is permitted. Just as the greater momentum of passaggi allows harmonic freedoms not to be found in the
vocal models, so the rhythmic patterns in lute passaggi are freer, particularly in placing a pair of relatively small-value notes on a relatively strong beat.

Clearly there is a stylistic change from the intabulations of Spinacino and Dalza to those of the last decades of the century, but the most significant stylistic development occurred between the publications of the early intabulators and those of Francesco da Milano. The earlier style is characterized by a freer treatment of dissonance, shown in large leaps, false relations, and accented passing notes. Such freedom of harmonic style did not exist after the middle decades. A particular characteristic of Spinacino's duet intabulations is preserved almost a century later. Like Spinacino, in most of Terzi's duets one lute reproduces the polyphony unadorned, while the other performs an improvisatory-like elaboration.

Some mid-century intabulators such as Bakfark varied their figuration very little, relying on the same stock ornaments regardless of the melodic character of the model. Terzi, on the other hand, while also relying heavily on stock stepwise formulae common to all sixteenth-century intabulations, nonetheless characterized the intabulations so that each was slightly different. This characteristic of musical consistency is shared with Francesco da Milano, with whom Terzi also shares artistic excellence.

From the intabulations of Francesco da Milano the best intabulators began to characterise their elaborations with motivic interplay. The new figural consistency within passaggi, which was not necessarily related to figuration of the model, introduced musical elements which led in the most ornate pieces towards a recompositional process. This is especially clear in Terzi's contrappunti intabulations. Taken to extremes, which in Terzi's elaborations is often the case, the recompositional process actually takes precedence over the preservation of the polyphonic character.
of the model. Existing beside this extreme in Terzi's work is its opposite of literal intabulation. Whatever purpose the arrangements served, almost all of the middle and late sixteenth-century lute intabulators included both lightly and more heavily ornamented intabulations within the same publication. Terzi epitomized this tendency to include a wide variety of elaborations; a practice which is no less than the expression of musical individuality and variety.

Existing alongside those intabulations which completely or almost completely disguise the model's polyphony, is a tendency to elaborate in a way which preserves or emphasises the structure of the model. Particularly in the works of Terzi and Francesco da Milano, we find examples of consistent imitative motivic structure, that is, the application of an ornamental motive at the same point in successive imitative entries. While a process such as this might disguise the melodic character of the model, at the same time it highlights the structural features. Within the category of light to medium elaborations, the intabulator consistently respected the melodic features of the motet or madrigal. Almost all lute intabulators during the sixteenth century (an exception being Barbetta) left the opening bars free of passaggi, as well as most of the heads of imitative entries. Almost without exception (excluding Terzi's contrapunti elaborations) the passaggi kept within the bounds of the range of the vocal model. The result was that even fairly ornate intabulations, such as some of Bakfark's, outlined the upper voice of the model in a way that preserved the melodic structure. Furthermore, recognition of the model was ensured by the bass which was the least ornamented part of any intabulation.

Because of the importance placed on cadential ornaments, the lightly-ornamented intabulations throughout the century had their ornamentation concentrated at cadence points. The resulting stop/start pattern of distribution is more common than that of more or less continuous application
of ornamentation. Thus the sectional structure of the model is as pronounced in such a lute intabulation as it would be when performed as an unornamented madrigal or motet.

It is of further significance that with two exceptions, Terzi's very ornate intabulations belong to either contrappunti or in concerto elaborations. Because the original polyphony is preserved by another lute, or supported by other instruments, what at first appears to be a heavily disguised intabulation, while one cannot deny the extravagance, is not so. Certainly the most ornate lute intabulation has nowhere near the exuberant virtuosity found in the didactic manuals, which in any case must have been examples by the authors of the utmost in technical display and are not necessarily representative of normal improvised practice.

The examples within Terzi's work of representations of the meaning of the text are similar to the word-painting techniques of the "mannerists". While not a constant feature of his work, evidence of word-painting technique reflects a willingness to continue to respect the vocal origins of the intabulation despite its new instrumental medium. Such treatment indicates that the transition to instrumental thinking was not yet complete by the end of the century, that solo instrumental music was not absolute.

In conclusion, the lute intabulations of Terzi and other sixteenth-century lutenists, while sharing many stylistic features do not collectively reflect a simple progression through time, of a growing tendency to use the model merely as a harmonic basis on which to drape parasitic elaboration. While that tendency was certainly evident in some lute intabulations, as it was in the didactic elaborations, it coexisted with the converse tendency to respect or even highlight the polyphonic structure of the vocal model, even at times allowing poetic allusions.
It is indicative of the sixteenth-century musician's apparent freedom of musical expression that there should be the two extremes of the literal intabulation coexisting with the highly ornamented intabulation. 201 In the literal intabulation the essential musical structure of the model is mirrored in an instrumental medium, the only transformation resulting from differences in timbre, volume and pitch. In an ornamented arrangement the intabulator is collaborating in the compositional process by adding figuration which may either highlight or disguise the structure. Indeed, some of the very ornate intabulations are no less original or instrumental in style than fantasias written specifically for the instrument, not all of which were entirely original in any case as is demonstrated in Chapter 6.

Another factor accounting for variety of intabulation style within a single publication is undoubtedly the function of the intabulations. The music may have been arranged for all sorts of practical reasons and purposes: for the enjoyment at first hand of a vocal work to accompany a singer, singers, or other instrumentalists, and for technical display by a highly competent soloist, all of which call for different degrees of ornamentation. The function of intabulations is the subject of investigation in the chapters to follow.

201. For further discussion on the ornate intabulations see Chapter 6, pp.304-306.
CHAPTER FOUR

MUSICA FICTA

Part one. Introduction

TABLATURES

Lute intabulations, unlike vocal music, would not seem to give editors or performers the task of applying *musica ficta*, since in most cases the tablature can be taken as read. Because of their precise relative-pitch notation one could easily assume that lute tablatures would offer indisputable *ficta* interpretations applicable to their vocal models. It could also be assumed that there is little need to apply *musica ficta* editorially to the lute tablatures themselves. However, lute tablature arrangements of polyphonic vocal works can not necessarily be taken literally. For one thing, some tablatures in printed sources need editorial *ficta*, either because the intabulator did not apply it accurately, or because he or she actually failed to apply it through a lack of knowledge of contemporary music theory. Secondly, *musica ficta* is not a problem to which there is one solution. Rather, like ornamentation, it is a performance practice that could vary according to time, place and personal taste. Besides, there is little agreement among modern scholars about the degree to which instrumental practice may be applied to contemporary vocal music, for even if we agree that instrumental and vocal practices share the same theoretical basis, we need to take into account variables such as the specific locations and the decades
from which the tablatures arise, as well as the competence of each intabulator.

Among present-day scholars, Howard Brown and John Ward are almost alone in unequivocally agreeing that lute (and vihuela) tablatures can be utilized as evidence for *musica ficta* application to the vocal models. Brown, citing evidence from Gafurius, Burtius, and Canassi, justifies applying *musica ficta* from lute tabulations to vocal music on the grounds that "instrumentalists and vocal music both shared the same theoretical basis in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries". Of the opposite view, Margaret Bent is adamant that tabulations should not be taken as evidence of *musica ficta*, on the grounds that they "are not so much transcriptions as arrangements." Neither does she agree with Brown that instrumentalists and vocalists operated under the same set of beliefs and principles, or at least even if she agrees that the theory was shared, she is convinced that the techniques force separate practices:

Neither modern notation nor tablature can provide the only, or the most correct, or even an accurate representation of what singers operating under a totally different set of constraints and options ... would have produced.3

This view is supported by Lewis Lockwood, who says that "there is no reason to assume that the practices followed by instrumentalists were carried over into the vocal literature, where the tradition of solmization and *musica ficta* particularly applies."4

3. ibid.
Several scholars take tablatures into consideration under restricted conditions. Although Edward Lowinsky is encouraged that one of his readings is confirmed by the *musica ficta* within a lute intabulation, he warns that instrumental transcriptions of a work should be "used with caution, more as signposts than as models." Like Lowinsky, Geneviève Thibault used tablatures as evidence in her discussion of vocal *musica ficta* practice, while cautiously bearing in mind that "they may have been written too many years after the original, when tastes and conceptions changed". She views Spinacino's intabulations of Josquin's chansons for example, not as "works of art but as a faithful testimony of the use [of *musica ficta*] at a given period" but stresses the need to restrict one's interpretation to the precise period in which the tablature was written. Clearly, the greater the distance in time between the vocal model and the intabulation, the less accurate the tablature is likely to be as a guide to *musica ficta* interpretation. But just how wide the time-gap can be before stylistic discrepancies show is yet to be established. Like Thibault, Charles Jacobs believes that rather than being involved in the search for one perfect solution, we should expect to find many different practices. Jacobs reminds us that "*musica ficta* has to do with performance practice, therefore it is logical that there should be a divergence of practice" attributable to "differing *musica ficta* practices in the various countries or to deficiencies in the sources, or both."

Of course it is true, as Bent says, that lute intabulations are arrangements. However, this in itself surely need not imply that an arrangement of a vocal work is any less informative of contemporary musica ficta practice than a transcription, especially when one considers how careful intabulators were to include as much of the original polyphony as possible. In the same vein, scholars have suggested that tablatures are invalid sources of evidence because they are full of mistakes. This John Ward strongly refutes regarding the vihuela repertoire, saying that they "were, as a rule, concerned with accuracy, and frequently printed tables of errata." This claim is supported in Terzì's case by bollettini corrections in two copies of his Libro Primo held in Bologna and Florence. These editorial emendations clearly demonstrate Terzì's (or Amadino's) intention to produce the most accurate reading possible. However, not every lute print is as free of mistakes as Terzì's, and manuscripts are even more likely to contain copyist's errors. Simple errors, though, are relatively easy to detect, consisting as they usually do, of a wrong cipher on the right line of tablature, or the right cipher on the wrong line, or a misplaced rhythm sign. Of a more serious nature are not mere mistakes, but those individual intabulations (or even whole sources) which demonstrate incompetence on the part of the intabulator. As we shall see, not every intabulator is as careful or as knowledgable of contemporary musica ficta theory as Terzì, and this must be taken into account in the assessment of each source's reliability.

Keyboard tablature of the sixteenth century offers an interesting parallel to lute tablature. The old German

10. Ward, ibid.
11. See Appendix 1.11.
keyboard tablature in common use from the mid-fifteenth century to about 1530, stands precisely mid-way between lute tablature and keyboard score as a semi-mensural and semi-tablature notation. Perhaps not surprisingly then, musica ficta needs to be applied in many cases, as John White found in his edition of Johannes de Lublin's keyboard intabulations in German tablature:

The problems of musica ficta are ever present, despite the conventions of tablature notation in indicating accidentals. Contradictions abound. Parallel passages and parallel versions of the whole compositions within our collection show that many more accidentals were played than indicated, at least on occasion, but some of the intabulations so contradict their vocal models that the modern performer may feel somewhat secure in following his own discretion.\footnote{12}

\textit{EXAMPLE 4.1}

\textit{Anchor che col partire, bb. 26-29.}\footnote{13}

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{example4_1.jpg}
\end{figure}

In a later example, notated in the "new" German keyboard tablature, Ammerbach's intabulation of Rore's Anchor che col partire is in places clearly deficient in musica ficta (Example 4.1).

Spanish keyboard tablature with its numerical systems, is similar to lute tablature in its pitch-relative precision, and more especially in the way the hexachord system is hidden from the performer by the numbers. This would lead one to expect precise and consistent musica ficta in intabulations, but such precision cannot to be taken for granted. Eubank, for one, found that "accidentals in Henestrosa, Ortiz and Cabezón are unclear and inconsistent, whereas those for vihuela are unequivocally consistent".\textsuperscript{14} It could be then that the Spanish keyboard tablatures, most of which were set out so that each voice had its own line, enabled the performer to solmize each polyphonic part mentally, so that the intabulator could expect certain musica ficta adjustments to be made by the performer. Polyphonic layout, also a property of German keyboard tablature after 1570,\textsuperscript{15} could account for musica ficta deficiencies in Ammerbach. If so, it does not account for the earlier sources such as Johannes de Lublin.

Well into the seventeenth century, additional musica ficta continued to be needed in keyboard music as well as in some vocal publications. Editors of English keyboard music such as Hilda Andrews, Alan Brown, J.A. Fuller Maitland and W. Barclay Squire have all found it necessary to add editorial accidentals to their editions.\textsuperscript{16} We do not know of

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
course whether, like modern editors, contemporary keyboard musicians added their own editorial accidentals to conform with vocal practices, or whether they played as written, following a different instrumental practice.

Inconsistent and deficient *musica ficta* interpretations in some lute tablatures lead to the question of whether the performing lutenist was expected to apply *musica ficta* to the intabulations. But it is inconceivable that the sixteenth-century performing lutenist was expected to add *musica ficta* to tablatures according to contemporary vocal conventions, for the simple reason that they were tablatures. It would take a lutenist well schooled indeed in polyphonic theory to reconstruct mentally from tablature, the original four-part, five-part, and in some cases six-part polyphony, accurately enough to apply *musica ficta* rules. In the case of the lute, the intabulator in possession of the vocal original in mensural notation would have been in the best position to interpret the rules of *musica ficta* on the performer's behalf. Since this is also true of keyboard tablature, (although to a lesser extent) we must reason that marked differences in interpretation between intabulations and their vocal models can only be interpreted as variants of taste, dependent on time and place, and in some cases, as evidence of "instrumental style".

Acknowledging the need for caution in applying lute tablature *musica ficta* indiscriminately to vocal music, it is in my view negligent to ignore the prolific evidence of tablatures simply because there are problems inherent in considering it. Certainly it would be mistaken to disregard tablatures on the grounds that instrumental and vocal music did not share the same theoretical basis. All the evidence points to the fact that the theorists did not begin seriously to differentiate between music for voices and music for instruments until near the end of the sixteenth century. This is true at least as far as instrumental
arrangements of vocal music are concerned; dance music on the other hand has on the whole existed independently of polyphonic music. Brown also reminds us that there must have been a consensus of practice, at least some of the time, since "lutenists often played with vocal ensembles and with solo singers, [and] they had to fit their parts to music that was sung." 17 Admittedly, in the period we are most concerned with — the end of the sixteenth century — instrumental and vocal styles were beginning to diverge. Indeed, one of the aims of this investigation is to ascertain to what extent, if any, intabulations pointed toward a development of instrumental style independent of vocal music, by their departures from the accepted polyphonic musica ficta practices.

A further aim of this chapter is to determine how a modern editor may apply musica ficta from intabulations to vocal music. One method of doing so would be to form a picture of agreed practices through analyses of many tablature sources from a specific period and location. We may hope that the gradual accumulation of research will make such study possible in the future, but until then the best we can do is assess each individual source. Even if we do agree that tablature sources are relevant to vocal music, it seems expedient to exercise caution in the direct transference of musica ficta from a single tablature to its source. It would surely invite inaccuracies to attempt to apply accidentals from an intabulation to an original which may have been composed say half a century previously, or in a different part of Europe where vocal styles may have differed. In Terzi's case, for example, the motet Beatus homo by Rore 18 was first published almost 50 years before

Terzi intabulated it. Obviously, it would be dangerous to use the Terzi intabulation as an unqualified demonstration of *musica ficta* practice applicable to this motet. If modern scholars take into consideration the three variables—time, distance, and reliability of sources—intabulations may yet prove invaluable.

This chapter takes as its point of departure the following quotation from Howard Brown, in which he indicates a positive role for intabulations in the rediscovery of vocal *musica ficta* practices.

Certain aspects of performance practice emerge more clearly from intabulations than from any other source... They offer a vast and largely unexplored repertory for the investigation of *musica ficta*. That they were made by a wide variety of musicians—some good and some bad, some early and some late, and some northern and some southern—increases the profit and insight one can draw from their study.19

It is hoped that the following discussion of Terzi's *musica ficta* may contribute, in conjunction with other studies of lute intabulations, to the growing picture of (as Lockwood succinctly puts it) "well-informed relativism on the matter."20

GUIDELINES FOR THE APPLICATION OF MUSICA FICTA

Rules or more properly guidelines, applying to *musica ficta* have been drawn from sixteenth-century and earlier sources by various modern scholars. Lowinsky has presented perhaps the most thorough set of *musica ficta* guidelines, classifying them under the headings *causa necessitatis* and *causa pulchritudinis*, pertaining to perfect and imperfect intervals respectively.21 The following *musica ficta*

---

guidelines are presented here as a brief summary of
generally agreed principles which apply to the discussion of
lute intabulations.  

1.  Causa Necessitatis

(i) Mi contra fa prohibits the simultaneous sounding of
imperfect octaves, fifths and unisons. Although the rule
prohibiting the sounding of mi from one hexachord with fa
from another hexachord excludes simultaneous false relations
(except as ornaments), it does not prohibit successive
false relations. The mi contra fa rule does not apply to
passaggi, nor any submetrical notes since "all notes not
treated as main harmonic notes on any given tactus are
excluded from this rule." 

(ii) Fa super la. To prevent a melodic tritone in
outline, a note extending beyond la is sung fa. A melodic
tritone may be tolerated however when it results from the
application of the subsemitonium modi. "The melodic leading-
note function, with its harmonic implication, is the
strongest melodic reason for inflection and must be honoured
before melodic tritones can be eliminated."

2.  Causa Pulchritudinis

(i) Subsemitonium modi. Sharpened leading-notes are
produced at cadences, or in mid-phrase progressions by
raising the lower note of a returning-note figure when the
upper note is D G or A, or C with one flat in the

22. For a comprehensive summary of musica ficta see N.
24. Routley, op. cit., p.64.
25. ibid., p.65.
(1972), p.91.
signature.\textsuperscript{27} Lowinsky points out that this rule applies to all cadential formulae whether or not they occur on the final of the mode and regardless of where they occur within the phrase.\textsuperscript{28} "A rest that intervenes between the second and third notes of a returning-note figure appears not to affect the rule according to which the lower note is sharpened."\textsuperscript{29}

(ii) Propinquity. Perfect consonances are approached by the nearest imperfect consonance. That is, a harmonic minor third approaching a fifth, or minor sixth approaching an octave becomes major; and a major sixth approaching a fifth, or major third approaching a unison becomes minor. The inflection may be on either the upper or the lower note of the interval, but where one voice leaps, the voice progressing conjunctly should be inflected.\textsuperscript{30} This rule is related to the \textit{subsemitonium modi} which likewise approaches a perfect interval from the nearest imperfect interval.\textsuperscript{31} Like the \textit{subsemitonium modi}, propinquity can produce a cadential leading-note, but it is the application of the latter rule which produces a phrygian cadence. The practice of treating these two rules separately arises from their historical derivation as melodic, and later as harmonic rules. Melodically Jean de Muris "instructs us to sharpen lower returning notes" of F C and G,\textsuperscript{32} and harmonically, "thirds and sixths preceding fifths and octaves [should be] major, where the upper note of the first interval rises a single step to the second one."\textsuperscript{33}

Often it is impossible to classify a \textit{ficta} accidental exclusively by one or the other of these two rules, especially where \textit{passaggi} are involved. The \textit{musica ficta} that applies to \textit{passaggi} and to submetrical notes generally

\textsuperscript{27} Routley, \textit{op.cit.}, p.67.\hfill\textsuperscript{28} Lowinsky, \textit{op.cit.}, p.ix.\hfill\textsuperscript{29} Routley, \textit{op.cit.}, p.67.\hfill\textsuperscript{30} \textit{New Grove}, vol.12, p.808.\hfill\textsuperscript{31} Lowinsky, \textit{op.cit.}, p. ix.\hfill\textsuperscript{32} Bent, \textit{op.cit.}, p. 89.\hfill\textsuperscript{33} \textit{ibid.}, p.95.
is purely decorative and often falls outside the accepted *musica ficta* rules.\(^3\)

(iii) The *Tierce de Picardie* is the raising of the minor third of the last triad in a final cadence. In this position it appears to be obligatory, or at least very common in the sixteenth century, but it is considered by Routley to be optional in intermediate cadences.\(^3\) However, from his article "A practical guide to *musica ficta*", he appears to base his conclusion on the example of a single bar in two intabulations of a Josquin work.\(^3\) The wider selection of examples in this study may be able to confirm or deny the obligatory nature of the *picardie* third in intermediate cadences.

**PRIORITIES IN THE APPLICATION OF RULES.**

*Musica ficta* problems arising in modern interpretations of sixteenth-century polyphony are the same as those faced by medieval and renaissance musicians, namely, how to apply the rules when more than one may be relevant, or when they contradict each other.\(^3\) Some priorities have been clearly indicated by the theorists of the time, and others have been established by modern research. We know for instance that the singer was expected to stay within the system of *musica recta* where possible, so that given a choice between a *ficta* F# and a *recta* Bb, the Bb would have been preferred,\(^3\) and where there is a choice between correcting a melodic tritone or a harmonic tritone, the latter was corrected in preference to the former. Tintorius for one indicated that he would rather tolerate a melodic tritone than a harmonic

---

tritone. Aron too, in his *Aggiunta* to the 1529 edition of his *Toscanello* in *Musica* attached greater importance to the correction of harmonic tritones. Further, Bent argues that the leading-note function has priority over the avoidance of melodic tritones, citing examples from Prodocimus's *Libellus monocordi*.

Routley suggests that it is often helpful to follow the rule that applies to the melodic structure of the passage, rather than to look first at the harmonic structure (apart that is from the occasional necessity of giving the *mi contra fa* rule precedence over *fa super la*). This makes sense when one considers that a group of singers would first of all solmize their own parts, making the necessary hexachord mutations, and on subsequent rehearsal apply further *recta* or *ficta* inflections as required harmonically. That sixteenth-century musicians operated with guidelines, at times contradictory in practice, rather than a set of ready-made all purpose rules, is clear from the written records of various disputes during rehearsal. Such records should warn us that there was no single *musica ficta* practice in the sixteenth century even among the most learned musicians. The most we can expect to discover are workable, flexible principles, rather than hard and fast "rules".

Brown noted that a conflict exists in whether a leading-note should take precedence over a phrygian cadence.

---

42. Routley, *op.cit.*, p.70.
He says that "whether cadences should be Dorian or Phrygian ... can often be deduced from the context, but occasionally either form serves equally well. Perhaps "conflict" is too strong a term to use in this context, for as Brown is careful to point out, since *musica ficta* was a performance technique, "performers could make choices among equally legitimate alternatives." In two-part progressions, Bent notes that "where there is an equal choice between inflecting the top part, and inflecting the tenor or lowest voice, it is the upper added part which should be inflected" and that the tenor takes priority for the application of melodic rules, the lowest voice for harmonic considerations. As these principles do not apply to the more vertically-orientated music after the mid-fifteenth century such guidelines do not apply directly to the music intabulated by Terzi. All the same, preferences for phrygian or leading-note cadences may derive from such prior edicts.

Both Bent and Jacobs agree that simultaneous false relations occur legitimately. "The conflict usually occurs between a leading-note function of the upper voice and tritone avoidance in the lower." Jacobs goes so far as to suggest that "simultaneous cross-relations are by no means to be removed, except possibly if one of the members of the cross-relation forms part of an ascending line and can be sharpened to remove the clash, or forms part of a descending line and can be flattened to the same purpose." He cites many examples of such clashes in Cabezón, and implies that there is a rule whereby ascending notes may be raised, and descending notes may be flattened. Lowinsky warns against accepting this, but as we shall later discover, it does have some application in Terzi's *passaggi ficta*.

45. *ibid.*, p. 484.
46. M. Bent, *op. cit.*, p. 76.
47. *ibid.*, p. 95.
49. Lowinsky, *op. cit.*, p. x.
Another aspect not entirely agreed upon by scholars is whether successive imitative entries or repetitions should be solmized the same way each time. There are indications that to do so was the ideal, but that other voices often prevented it. What has not been established is whether the ideal of uniform solmization takes precedence over the application of other *musica ficta* rules. Routley draws a distinction between degrees of strictness of imitation in the music of Josquin's period and later, depending on the context.

If the imitation takes the form of exact canon, ...
the imitation should be as exact as possible.
...
When imitation is less exact the claims of
ficta become more pressing. It should be emphasised that the desire for strict canon or imitation should not override the rules that call for *musica ficta* where context demands it. 50

Jacobs, in his study of Spanish sources, concludes that differences in interval size resulting from successive statements of a motive in different voices, was not uncommon. 51 However, earlier in his career Lowinsky based many of his readings on a firm belief that imitative entries in music of the Flemish masters should be solmized the same each time, and in many pieces this was possible with far-reaching results. 52 Lowinsky later modified this view somewhat in light of criticism: "My critics have gone to great lengths arguing that identical solmization in ostinato repeats cannot be taken for granted. In this they are right." 53 Just how readily the vocal pieces of a period later than Josquin accept identical solmization of melodic entries, remains to be seen.

In the discussion to follow, the *musicā fictā* in Terzi's intabulations is classified according to the above guidelines. I attempt to establish whether Terzi and his contemporaries display preferences for types of cadences, or for one rule more than another, and whether there is any evidence of identical solmization of imitative entries. Terzi's intabulations will be compared with their vocal models, including where available, modern editions of the models, and other lute intabulations of the particular piece. Where Terzi's *passaggi* or his rearranging of the voice-leading may have forced different interpretations from that which would normally be applied vocally, I have not taken it as evidence applicable to the vocal original. The most pertinent issue is whether Terzi's application of *musicā fictā*, apart from his ornamental *passaggi ficta*, departs significantly from accepted vocal practice sufficiently to recognize an emerging instrumental style.
Part Two. Terzi's Ficta Accidentals

FICTA APPLIED TO NOTES OF THE MODEL.

The following discussion centres on Terzi's application of musica ficta to notes of the original vocal sources. For this analysis I have selected a sample of eight intabulations whose vocal models have not as far as I know been previously published in a modern edition. The vast majority of ficta and recta accidentals in Terzi's tablatures fall under the heading of causa pulchritudinis - alterations for reasons of beauty. In the eight intabulations of the sample, 49 of Terzi's accidentals are for causa pulchritudinis whereas only six fall within the category of causa necessitatis.

1. Ficta before the subsemitonium modi

In the vocal models the varieties of ornamental figures which precede the subsemitonium belong to one of two types - figures in which the seventh degree is anticipated (Examples 4.2b and 4.2d), and those which anticipate the seventh degree but also include the sixth degree (Examples 4.2a, c, e, f & g). In all of the "anticipated leading-note" ornaments of Example 4.2, Terzi raised the seventh degree notes if they were not already so notated in the original, thus avoiding melodic augmented seconds. It is quite common for a polyphonic composer (or printer) to notate a raised leading-note but not its anticipation, leaving such an obvious interpretation to the performer. In fact the need to

54. Sample: Volume II, nos. 2, 6, 7, 8, 13, 16, 18 & 19. The numbering in the examples to follow refer to transcriptions in this dissertation, Volume II. For statistical data see Appendix 1.12
55. See Volume II, no. 1, bl1 (p15).
raise the seventh retrogressively in a cadential ornament continues in music of the seventeenth century.\footnote{56}

Where the seventh but not the sixth degree was raised in a cadential ornament in the model, Terzi invariably inflected the sixth degree also (Example 4.2c), and where the model contained no leading-note accidental, Terzi sharpened both leading-notes and the sixth degree where applicable (Example 4.2 e & f).

EXAMPLE 4.2
Cadences of the models\footnote{57}

(a) \(\text{\textcopyright} \\text{\textcopyright} \) (b) \(\text{\textcopyright} \) (c) \(\text{\textcopyright} \)
(d) \(\text{\textcopyright} \) (e) \(\text{\textcopyright} \) (f) \(\text{\textcopyright} \)
(g) \(\text{\textcopyright} \)

(a) no. 2 b.11 (b) no. 6 b.7 (c) no. 7 b.22 (d) no. 7 b.42 (e) no. 7 b.172
(f) no. 8 b.86 (g) no. 18 b.3

\footnote{56. Fortunately, the time has passed when modern editors fail to apply retrospective accidentals to sixteenth-century music. However, an example of such an omission by Raffaele Casimiri can be seen in an edition of a Palestrina motet. See Volume II, no. 1, b.11 (p.15).

57. The accidentals marked within the staves are those of the vocal original. Those marked above or below the notes are Terzi's.}
2. *Subemission modi, Propinquity and Picardie thirds.*

By applying the rule of *subemission modi*, Terzi often wrote a viib-I cadence (to put it in tonal terms for the sake of convenience) and did so regardless of the prohibition against the resulting harmonic tritone. Long before the end of the sixteenth century, *mi contra fa* was in any case perfectly acceptable as part of a cadential

**EXAMPLE 4.3**

Types of cadences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a)</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="imageA" alt="Music Staff A" /></td>
<td><img src="imageB" alt="Music Staff B" /></td>
<td><img src="imageC" alt="Music Staff C" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>(f)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="imageD" alt="Music Staff D" /></td>
<td><img src="imageE" alt="Music Staff E" /></td>
<td><img src="imageF" alt="Music Staff F" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>(h)</td>
<td>(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="imageG" alt="Music Staff G" /></td>
<td><img src="imageH" alt="Music Staff H" /></td>
<td><img src="imageI" alt="Music Staff I" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(j)</td>
<td>(k)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="imageJ" alt="Music Staff J" /></td>
<td><img src="imageK" alt="Music Staff K" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) no.2 b.25 (b) no.7 b.27 (c) no. 19 b.18 (d) no.7 b.127 (e) no.6 b.7
(f) no.18 b.24 (g) no.16 b.8 (h) no.19 b.116 (i) no.6 b.12 (j) no.7 b.164
(k) no.18 bb.32-33

---

58. The accidentals marked within the staves are of the vocal original. Those marked above or below the notes are Terzi's.
progression (as in Examples 4.3a, b & c). Of these three examples of vii-I cadences, 4.3a is used as an end-of-phrase cadence, and 4.3b as an intermediate cadence. Although the same harmony, Example 4.3c does not act as a cadence, but is the result of the application of the propinquity rule to a sixth-octave progression during the course of a phrase. The position of a progression within the phrase determines whether or not it functions as a cadence, not whether the ficta is the result of propinquity or the subsemitonium modi.

In the cadences of Examples 4.2a and 4.3b one might ask why Terzi has not flattened the lower notes in the penultimate chords to give phrygian cadences. In the case of Example 4.2a the original composer has written the cadence in such a way as to exclude the possibility of a phrygian cadence. Other voices would require Ebs to avoid mi contra fa, which in turn would cause a snowballing of flats. Similarly in Example 4.3b, an Eb in the basso would require an Eb also in the tenore, resulting in an undesired augmented second, Eb-F# progression. In both examples the suspension of the leading-notes makes the subsemitonium cadence the only real musical choice. In the mid-phrase progression of Example 4.3c, instead of forming propinquity with an F#, Terzi could equally have written Eb and Bb, but the simpler solution requiring fewer accidentals, is chosen. Where there is a choice between a phrygian progression involving several flats, or a leading-note cadence with one sharp, the simpler solution is always preferred. Certainly in a vocal performance, a solution requiring musica ficta by the least number of singers is the most likely, especially if such a solution called for any retrospective adjustments.

Other applications of *propinquity* result in perfect cadences, as illustrated in Examples 4.3e, 4.3f, 4.3g and 4.3l. In an end-of-phrase cadence (Example 4.3e) we find an oft-used progression, viib-I immediately followed by a perfect cadence. A similar "double" cadence is shown by Example 4.3g in which a perfect cadence on D is dovetailed on to another perfect cadence a fifth below on G. The ficta F# in Example 4.3f is affected by *passaggi* in Terzi's intabulation. It is however, the *passaggio* which implies the original harmony. Here the application of the *subsemitonium modi* produces a perfect-cadence progression in the middle of the phrase.

Generally, Terzi used only a few phrygian cadences, because the vocal composers had left very few opportunities for him to do so. In the sample of eight intabulations, I have found only one real phrygian cadence (Example 4.3h) resulting from a Terzi accidental. In this intermediate cadence, the returning-note figure D-C#-D is already given in the canto of the model, then the rule of *propinquity* prevails over a possible interpretation A-Bb-A in the basso which would have given a phrygian cadence. Terzi retained the previous C# as a *picardie* third on the final chord of this cadence. Another phrygian-like progression occurring in the model (Example 4.3l) is essentially a "double" cadence in which the progression Eb to D is followed by Terzi's *subsemitonium* F# to G.

By far the most common progression requiring a sharp is the "single" perfect cadence of Example 4.3j. It is this situation more than any other which the vocal composer or

---

60. For another example of this progression see Volume II, no. 13, bb. 20–22 (p. 143).
61. For other examples see Volume II, no. 16, bb. 9, 15, 21, (pp. 157–161); no. 18, b. 6 (p. 191).
62. See also Volume II, no. 6 bb. 23, 28, 31 (pp. 66–70); no. 8, bb. 81, 86 (p. 96); no. 16, bb. 13, 17, 22, 28, 36, 46, 53, 60 (pp. 158–175); no. 18, b. 37 (p. 197).
printer entrusted to the performer, no doubt because it was the least open to misinterpretation. The application of the picardie third was not often entrusted to the performer. Since it was a relatively new fashion of the sixteenth century, the composers of these pieces must have considered it preferable to notate those they wanted, in case performers did not choose to do so. In only a few cases, Terzi added a major third to the final chord of a cadence as in Example 4.3k. It is notable that Terzi did not employ a picardie third at absolutely every opportunity; there are plenty of examples where he left the minor third in the final chord of a phrase, either because it was only an intermediate cadence or because a sharpened third would have caused a further problem such as the formation of a tritone with another part.

3. \textit{Causa necessitatis}

There are few \textit{causa necessitatis} accidentals in Terzi's intabulations, because the vocal composers had notated most of them. In the eight intabulations I can find only four examples of accidentals solely for the purpose of avoiding \textit{mi contra fa} (Example 4.4a & 4.4b) and only one accidental to indicate \textit{fa super la} (Example 4.4c). Terzi's two recta flats in Example 4.4a are clearly needed to avoid in turn an imperfect octave, an imperfect unison, and then a tritone, even though this means eschewing a leading-note E natural to F. The Bb of Example 4.4b avoids harmonic tritones with F, and the Bb of Example 4.4c avoids a melodic tritone in the alto.

---

63. See also Volume II, no. 19, b. 116 (p. 211); no. 18 b. 37 (p. 197).
64. For further examples see Volume II, no. 18, b. 16 (p. 193); no. 7; b. 8 (p. 71), b. 23 (p. 73), b. 69 (p. 77), b. 151 (p. 85), b. 165 (p. 86).
65. See also Volume II, no. 19, b. 11 (p. 201).
4. Beyond the "rules"

Only on rare occasions did Terzi write accidentals which fell outside the known musica ficta rules of the period and which were clearly not typographical errors. The second F# in the quinto of Example 4.5a is not called for by any known musica ficta rule and serves no purpose other than to strengthen the "D major tonality" at this point. Later in the same intabulation (Example 4.5b) Terzi wrote a C# in the tenore where it was not needed, and could only be

66. The flats written above the staves are Terzi's.
justified if he were thinking of the tenore C# as leading to
the alto D, (which of course it does on the lute).

EXAMPLE 4.5

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{(a)} \\
C\\n5\\nA \\
\text{(b)} \quad \text{no. 19 bb. 8-9} \\
A\\nT\\nB \\
\text{no. 19 bb. 67-71}
\end{array}\]

**PASSAGGI FICTA**

Terzi applied *musica ficta* to his *passaggi* with considerably more freedom than he applied it to notes of the original. The most striking departure is in his very frequent sharpening of a note in an ascending passage and the flattening of a note in a descending passage.

The sharpening of a note within an ascending scale as an ornamental device can be justified more often than not as a raised note seven degrees from either the bass of the present harmony, or from the bass of the chord to which it leads. In Example 4.6c the F# is the seventh degree of both the present harmony and the subsequent chord. In Example 4.6d the F# is not only the seventh degree of the following

67. Data in Appendix 1.13
EXAMPLE 4.6
Passaggi ficta
Example 4.6 cont.
chord of G but also it serves two other functions of avoiding *mi contra fa* with B, and forming *propinquity* with the bass A. Whatever the justification, and often there is none in normal *musica ficta* terms, the raising of the seventh turns it into a secondary leading-note, which may even at times be superimposed upon a harmony with a different tonal centre, as in Example 4.6e. In this madrigal, Striggio had notated a *picardie* third F# at the end of one phrase, giving an *inganno* cadence, D major to C major, into the beginning of the next phrase. In the second lute part Terzi added a B natural in a *groppo*, effectively cadencing to C, thus operating under two modal centres. Less
frequent are examples of flattening a note Bb (or Eb in a key signature of one flat) in a descending scale. In eight out of ten cases in the sample, the flattened note avoids a passing harmonic tritone. In the case of Example 4.6i, Terzi's Bb not only avoids mi contra fa but also creates fa super la, whereas the Bb in Example 4.6j serves neither purpose but forms a propinquity minor sixth going to a perfect fifth.

Since it is not required that musica ficta be applied to submetrical notes of ornamentation, Terzi raised and flattened notes in ascending and descending scales simply to strengthen a particular "tonality" or make a passing reference to another "tonality" by way of colouring. This matter of raising in ascent and lowering in descent was at one time accepted by modern scholars as being a musica ficta rule, but has long since been refuted. Lowinsky says:

There are bolder rules of musica ficta ... such as the rule: raise the tones in ascent and lower them in descent. The reason why we do not accept this rule into the canon of musica ficta lies in the sparseness of its occurrence. And we surmise that it occurs so rarely because it is dangerously general and is not derived, as are all the other rules, from specific melodic and harmonic situations.68

In the case of Terzi's passaggi ficta however, such freedom of application does apply.

Another type of accidental frequently seen in Terzi's passaggi flattens the highest note of an upper auxiliary-note figure, usually where an ascending scale turns to descend (Example 4.6a). Almost invariably the flattened B (or transposed Eb) occurs against a background harmony containing F (or transposed Bb) and thus is a result of applying the mi contra fa rule as well as the fa super la rule. Even though the Bb occurs submetrically it assumes an

68. Lowinsky, op. cit., p. x.
aural importance due to its melodic position, so it is logical that it must receive ficta as though it were a tactus note.

In similar fashion Terzi often raised the bottom note of a lower auxiliary (Example 4.6 b), and again this situation is no different from its equivalent in non-passaggi ficta, because the accidentals are applied to conform to the rule of the subsemitonium modi. As in his use of the flattened upper auxiliary, Terzi did not inflect every lower returning-note, as doing so would sometimes produce odd harmony. In Example 4.6j for instance, a G# in the tenore passaggi would not be appropriate. Just as in cadential ornaments given in the model, Terzi retrospectively sharpened the sixth and seventh degrees in passaggi (Example 4.6f and 4.6g), and raised the sixth degree next to the subsemitonium modi (Example 4.6h). He took a great deal of care with his passaggi ficta to avoid harmonic tritones, as illustrated by his use of Bb in Examples 4.6k and 4.6l.

Terzi sometimes allowed false-relations between passaggi and other notes within the tablature to colour his intabulations, as in Examples 4.5o and 4.6p. A different type of false-relation is that which occurs between the intabulation's passaggi and notes of the model (assuming simultaneous performance). There are good examples of this in Striggio's Chi farà fede (Example 4.6m and 4.6n) where F#s of the model clash with submetrical F naturals of the tablature in both cases. Should the lute intabulation be used to accompany a vocal performance of this madrigal, the outline of a D minor triad against D major of Example 4.6m would provide some colour in its passing major/minor clash. Considering the Terzi arrangement on its own, it makes perfect sense to suppress Striggio's perfect cadence in a descending scale. Furthermore this bar provides further evidence of Terzi's tendency to lower in descent those notes previously sharpened. In Example 4.6n Terzi raised the
suspended leading-note (G#), only to lower it again in
descent. He sharpened the G in the following bar in
agreement with the model's accidental, and sharpened the
sixth degree in ascent to the cadential trill. The examples
of the tablatures forming false-relations with the harmony
of the model could imply that Terzi did not intend this
intabulation at least, to be accompaniment. But proof that
this sort of false-relation does not preclude ensemble
performance, is to be found in examples of the same sort of
clash between the two lute parts of Terzi's duets. In
Example 4.6q the Eb of lute II is perfectly acceptable in a
descending scale, and the B natural of lute I is of course
necessary as a subsemitonium accidental. Writing such as
this is effective in its unpredictability, and such false
relations would of course be tolerated, occurring as they do
submetrically. 69

69. For further examples see Volume II, no. 21, b.59
    (p.226), no.17, b.35 (p.185).

VOCAL MODELS

1. *O bella Ninfa mia*, Palestrina.\(^70\)

Terzi's *musica ficta* in his intabulation of Palestrina's *O bella Ninfa mia* agrees in almost every way with that of Espagne and Haberl's edition. Apart from *musica ficta* occurring within *passaggi*, the only different reading is caused by Terzi countering the Eb accidental in the *basso* of bar 12. Of course Terzi may well have been reading from a different source from that used by Espagne and Haberl, but in any case an Eb in the original is needed if a linear tritone is to be avoided. This is an interesting example since the E natural makes better sense in Terzi's reduction to four parts. The only other editorial accidentals needed for the madrigal, which the editors and Terzi provide, are a pair of subsemitonium modi sharps in bars 28 and 47.

2. *Quando i vostri begli occhi*, Marenzio.\(^71\)

In his madrigal of 1580, Marenzio did not leave much *musica ficta* interpretation open to the performer, so Alfred Einstein in his modern edition has not needed to add any new accidentals. Terzi did not deviate from Marenzio's notated accidentals except in a small way in bar 60. On an unaccented quaver, Terzi sharpened an F for the sake of *propinquity*, even though it was on a relatively unimportant note. It is the sort of *ficta* he would use in any similar ornamental figure. This does not mean however that Terzi interpreted similar figures in this same madrigal in exactly the same way. In bar 29 for example, the identical figure within the same harmony is not inflected, F♯-G. Clearly it

---

is the sort of situation where personal taste prevails, and where no obligation exists to apply the rule of *propinquity* in like situations.

3. *Tu es Pastor ovium*, Palestrina.\(^{72}\)

The Palestrina motet needs quite a few editorial *ficta* accidentals. Both the modern editor Raffaele Casimiri and Terzi provided the same *subsemitonium* sharps (bb. 11, 21, 23, 37, 42 & 54) but besides these, the interpretations of Terzi and Casimiri differ considerably.

b. 11 Terzi inflected the seventh within the ornamental figure preceding the leading-note, as was his habit, but Casimiri in his edition decided against the retrospective F#.

b. 19 In the middle of a phrase, Terzi sharpened an F for a *propinquity* sixth, lowering it in descent in the following ornamental figure. Casimiri however left the F as a natural.

bb. 62-64 In contrast with bar 19, in the near-identical progressions of bars 62 and 64, Terzi did not sharpen the Fs, whereas Casimiri did. This looks like an illogical inconsistency on Terzi's behalf except that in these two cases, the Fs are written to sound simultaneously with Cs, whereas in bar 19 the C is sustained against the F. It appears then that to Terzi's ears, the tritone in such a position, that is mid-phrase, was more acceptable as part of sustained harmony than it would have been if struck together. Neither did Terzi allow for identical solmization of "regnī coelōrum" in the *alto* and in the *canto* of the previous bar.

\(^{72}\) Music example in Volume II, pp. 15-21.
Harmonic considerations, then, take precedence, in this intabulation at least, over melodic consistency.

bb. 69-72 The ascending stepwise melodic points of imitation, prolific in the Palestrina motet, provide many further opportunities for an editor to apply the rule of propinquity. From bar 70, every entry D-E-F-G of "regni coelorum" would be capable of retaining the melodic "tone-tone-semitone" structure of the entries starting on G if the rule of propinquity were to be applied. Oddly, from bar 70 until the close of the motet, Terzi did not use a single F# but preferred to further the melodic activity with passaggi, undoubtedly because he was familiar with the monotony which would ensue from such close imitative writing in a lute reduction. By ornamenting the imitative points, Terzi's figuration actually renders an F# reading impossible in bar 71.

b. 78 A few bars later we have the same harmonic and melodic situation as in bar 71 (with an added voice), where Terzi again declined an opportunity to apply the rule of propinquity. Either he wished to avoid the sounded harmonic tritone, even though submetrical, or he was avoiding mixolydian-like progressions. The motet is in the Ionian mode but Terzi allowed it a strong mixolydian flavour with eight F#-G progressions up to bar 55. From there until the final cadence in bar 82 however, he guided the mixolydian modality back towards the Ionian.
For this motet we are able to make a comparison of Terzi's *musica ficta* with two modern editions of the vocal model. Because the earlier edition of the motet was published at the turn of this century, the editor Luigi Torchi did not have at his disposal the information that scholars have since taken for granted. It is not surprising to find then, that James Bastian's 1970 edition is nearer to our present concept of editorial practice, although there is of course some accord between the two editors. In the third bar both editors indicated B♭ to prevent a melodic tritone in the *tenore*, although Torchi wrote the flat on the stave as though it was Merulo's accidental. Both editors and Terzi agreed in raising the leading-note in end-of-phrase cadences in bars 13, 16, 20 and 39. In the following bars the editors and Terzi gave different readings.

b.7 Bastian and Terzi indicated *subsemitonium* sharps in a mid-phrase cadence overlapping two phrases, but Torchi did not cadence here, even though Merulo had written a typical cadential ornament.

b.9 Here the same situation applies, although the progression is a little different in that the *subsemitonium* does not lead to the final in the same voice. In effect the melodic sense crosses from *tenore* to *quinto*, to cadence C♯ to D. This did not deter either Terzi or Bastian from cadencing however.

b.15 Terzi wrote an F♯ for *propinquity* at the end of a crotchet scale ascending to G. Given that this is purely decorative *ficta* within *passaggi*, it is not surprising to find that neither modern editor...
indicated F#, although it would not have been incorrect to do so.

b. 25

Both Bastian and Torchi flattened the quaver passing-note B for no apparent reason other than that there are several Bbs surrounding it. Terzi did not consider it necessary to flatten this note since the surrounding Bbs do not cause false relations.

b. 37

Torch flattened a B in the canto, but neither Terzi nor Bastian agreed with this interpretation since there is no reason for the Bb according to known musica ficta rules. Indeed, if it is left as a natural the entry solmizes the same as "alleluia" in the canto at bar 35.

b. 46

In a double cadence on to a D major then a G minor chord, Torchi alone did not sharpen the leading-note C#, even though Merulo's ornamental figure and the picardie third F# make a cadence obligatory.

b. 48

In contrast to the previous cadence where Torchi eschewed the subsemitonium, in this, the final cadence of the motet, he alone sharpened the F in a cadential ornament. The cadence is plagal, however, and Torchi's F# serves merely as a chromatic ornamentation, a passing dissonance with which neither Terzi or Bastian wished to alter the stark final cadence.

The only instances where Bastian and Terzi differ in their interpretation are in places of decorative musica ficta, that is, on crotchet or quaver passing notes. Where Torchi gave different readings, one could confidently say that in some cases they are plainly wrong (such as bb. 37, 46 and 28) and in others he misguidedly ignored cadential
progressions other than those at the ends of phrases (bb. 7 and 9).

5. *In te Domine speravi*, Merulo.\(^7^4\)

In another Merulo motet, Terzi's *musica ficta* agrees with Bastian's in thirteen cases of either *propinquity* or *subsemitonium modi*\(^7^5\) and in one application of a flat, in bar 29, needed to avoid a melodic tritone in the alto.

In two bars the Bastian and Terzi versions give different readings. Bastian avoided a perfect cadence on to G in bar 49, and similarly shunned a viib-I cadence in bar 55. There does not appear to be any reason for these omissions, especially considering that they mark the ends of phrases in the bass on both occasions.

6. *Beatus Homo*, Rore.\(^7^6\)

Bernard Meier and Terzi usually agree in this Rore motet, but the two places where they do not are of interest. In the sixth bar Terzi wrote a G# in the *canto*, giving a harmonic major third and a melodic tritone which makes good harmonic, if not polyphonic sense. This may be a typographical lapse, but in any case it is, strictly speaking, incorrect as we understand the rules of *musica ficta*. On the other hand, if we regard the G#-C as the end of one phrase and the beginning of another, it is perfectly acceptable. In bar 20 Terzi did not flatten a basso B, whereas Meier did, probably preferring the colour of such a bass progression.

---

75. bb. 7, 14, 15, 19, 23, 30, 34, 36, 38, 47, 52, 54 & 57.
INSTRUMENTAL MODEL

La Martinenga, Maschera.\textsuperscript{77}

In my edition of Maschera's canzona La Martinenga, I used for the instrumental ensemble the facsimile publication of a manuscript copy of Maschera's Libro Primo held in Brussels.\textsuperscript{78} Since then I have been able to consult the edition by William McKee\textsuperscript{79} in which there are a few differences. McKee does not state which source he used\textsuperscript{80} so it is not possible to decide the origin of such differences. In the manuscript facsimile the recta flats are marked on the stave, in front of the notes concerned, whereas the ficta sharps are placed under the stave, beneath the notes to which they refer. One cannot be sure without consulting the original manuscript, but it appears that the sharps beneath the notes are by a different hand, or at least using a different pen. Certainly they give the impression of having been added later. The bars mentioned below show disagreement between the McKee transcription, the Maschera manuscript copy (hereafter referred to as Maschera), and Terzi's intabulation of the canzona.

b.7 Terzi raised the F for a propinquity major sixth to octave on a crotchet passing-note, but neither of the other editions has an F# here. (Identical on repeat b.18).

\textsuperscript{77} Music example in Volume II, pp.232-236.
\textsuperscript{78} Libro Primo de Canzoni da sonare a quatro voci di Florentio Maschera, facs.ed., (Brussels, 1979) fol 1v.
\textsuperscript{79} W. McKee, The Music of Florentio Maschera (1540-1584), PhD.diss., (Texas, 1958) p.141.
\textsuperscript{80} Libro primo de canzoni da sonare, a quattro voci, di Florentio Maschera Organista nel Duomo di Brescia. (Brescia, 1584). According to H.M. Brown, Instrumental Music Printed Before 1600, (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965/R1979), p.339 there are two printed copies in Bologna, one in the Biblioteca comunale annessa al Conservatorio musicale, and the other in the Archivio di S. Petronio.
McKee alone failed to sharpen the leading-note at the end of the first section and at the repeat of the section in bar 22.

Terzi's intabulation lacks the propinquity F# given by McKee and Maschera. In the following chord the subsemitonium B was given by all but Maschera.

At the end of the second section, the F# leading-note was not indicated by either Maschera or McKee. This is clearly a place where editorial musica ficta is needed, just as it is in the cadences in bars 11 and 22.

Terzi alone flattened an E to avoid false relations. In the following bar the McKee and Maschera editions avoid editorial F#s for the cadence on to G. On the repeat of this section, the Eb (of b.47) given by Terzi was also supplied by McKee as an editorial flat (b60), but the following cadence (b.61) remains as it was in b.48, without F# from either Maschera or McKee.

Terzi's passaggi ficta in this intabulation served to avoid false relations as in bars 51, 52 and 60, to flatten the upper note of an auxiliary figure as in bars 53 and 58, or as a passing subsemitonium modi (b.49). Although this is an instrumentally-derived intabulation, Terzi does not appear to apply musica ficta in any significantly different way from his vocally derived intabulations.
Part four. Terzi and Other Lute Intabulations

A COMPARISON OF TWO INTABULATIONS

1. *Fera gentil*, Rore.  

Rore's madrigal *Fera gentil*, first published posthumously in 1565, 82 was intabulated in Terzi's *Libro Primo* of 1593, and in Fallamero's *Il Primo Libro* of 1584. There is also a late sixteenth-century intabulation of the madrigal in an anonymous manuscript held in Genoa. 83 The three versions of *Fera gentil* demonstrate a wide variety in the interpretation of *musica ficta*, even though they all belong to the last two or three decades of the century.

Scotto's 1574 edition of Rore's madrigal provided many accidentals, especially where more than one *musica ficta* rule could have applied, or where an inflection such as a *picardie* third would otherwise have been optional. Most of the *recta* flats that could be applied using known rules were notated; in bar 6 for example the *basso* B clearly needs a flat to avoid *mi contra fa* with the *canto* F as well as to produce *fa super la* with the F from the previous bar. The *tenore* B in bar 6 was also flattened to avoid false relations, both inflections giving a gracefully prepared phrygian cadence. Scotto also sharpened the C of the following bar for a *tierce de picardie* in the end-of-phrase.

83. Ms. Genoa, Biblioteca Universitaria, Ms. F. VII/I. (Hereafter referred to as Ms. Genoa VII/I.) This undated manuscript contains intabulations of compositions by Striggio, Rore, Lassus, D. Ferrabosco and Verdelot, and is therefore probably from the same period as the printed lute intabulations considered here. Further information regarding the manuscripts cited below may be found in chapter 5, pp. 247-278.
cadence, a function which many accidentals serve in this madrigal.\textsuperscript{84} Recta B flats are notated in bar 25 in both the alto and basso to avoid \textit{mi contra fa}. Many of the accidentals of the model raise the leading-note for a cadence,\textsuperscript{85} and others result from \textit{propinquity}.\textsuperscript{86} In other instances where interpretation could be open to doubt, the lower note of an auxiliary figure is sharpened in places that give melodic consistency.\textsuperscript{87} In bar 62 Rore (or Scotto) wrote a B natural to cancel the "una notta super la" rule, thus preventing the \textit{quinto} from attempting a phrygian cadence on A.

The majority of accidentals added by the three lutenists apply to cadential leading-notes where the interpretation of clearcut cases had been entrusted to the singers. Although it seems that Rore (or Scotto) had taken every precaution necessary to avoid conflicting solutions, there are surprisingly many places where the lute tablatures disagree, or where \textit{ficta} is added which one would not normally expect. We would imagine for instance that in both bars 54 and 56, the G-F-G figure would be sharpened to cadence on A. In two intabulations, Terzi's and the anonymous Ms.Genoa VII/I, this figure is sharpened (except where Terzi has simplified the ornament). Fallamerò however avoided cadencing in both instances, leaving the Gs and Fs uninflected. That he did so twice excludes an interpretation of the omission as a mere slip. To ignore such obvious cadential points, further indicated by Rore's C# \textit{picardie} thirds, suggests that Fallamerò was insufficiently versed in contemporary music theory to give anything other than a literal transcription. In a subsequent phrase (bar 62) Fallamerò did not sharpen a G to cadence on A, even though the original's cautionary B natural calls, by default, for a viib-I cadence. Fallamerò made similar omissions in bars 75,

\textsuperscript{84} bb. 15, 17, 19, 39/40, 56, 71/72, 81, 85, 89 and 109.
\textsuperscript{85} bb. 22, 36, 55, 78, 84, 94, 100, 104, and 120.
\textsuperscript{86} bb. 97, 114, 117 and 123.
80, 88, and 126. At an obvious cadence point in bar 80 the author of Ms. Genoa VII/I, for no apparent reason, also neglected the subsemitonium. Such an omission could possibly belong with the many copying errors found in this manuscript, whereas Fallamero's omissions of this type are more consistent. That Fallamero indicated the subsemitonium in one cadence (b. 108), suggests that his failures to do so elsewhere (bb. 39, 90, 101 and 108) were conscious. Given that lute tablature gives exact fingerings it is improbable that Fallamero expected the performer to apply further musica ficta.

Both Fallamero and the anonymous author of Ms. Genoa VII/I give very confused readings at a viib-I cadence in bar 16. In the original madrigal a notated G# cadences to A, thus precluding a Bb-A phrygian cadence. Terzi sharpened the preceding F in the tenore to avoid a linear augmented second—a reading with which Meier agreed in his edition of the madrigal. In an unusual move, Fallamero displaced the unsharpened F upward by an octave for no apparent reason, while Ms. Genoa VII/I is so full of error in this bar that it is hard to know what might have been the scribe's intention. This bar, among many others, undermines these two tablature versions as reliable sources of musica ficta. Terzi on the other hand consistently raised the sixth degree in conjunction with the seventh when cadencing. He similarly avoided a linear augmented second at the end of the prima parte (bar 39) by sharpening the F before the accidental G# picardie third, as did the other two lutenists. Terzi always extrapolated back from the leading-note to the anticipatory cadential ornament, as at bar 22. An interpretation such as this is also given in Ms. Genoa VII/I as well as in Meier's edition. Indeed modern editors now usually inflect within those ornaments preceding a cadential leading-note. Fallamero on the other hand did not sharpen the leading-note within the ornament. In those cadences where a subsemitonium is not given in the model, Terzi and Ms. Genoa VII/I consistently sharpened the anticipatory ornament along with
the *subsemitonium*. Fallamero used no *musica ficta* at all (bb. 55 and 126) and he alone failed to inflect the lower of a returning-note figure at bars 36 and 38 where we would expect applications of the *subsemitonium modi* rule.

The *propinquity* rule when applied at bar 30 produces a "double cadence" on C, an interpretation agreed on by the author of Ms.Genoa VII/I, Terzi and Meier, but not Fallamero. Later, in bars 58 and 60, Terzi alone applied the *propinquity* rule to the phrase "ch'ad ogn'hor". Here he gave precedence to a "major-sixth to octave" progression, rather than retain consistent melodic intervals at successive imitative entries. Consequently "ch'ad ogn'hor" is set on an ascending semitone-tone phrase (b.57 *canto*) as well as tone-semitone (b.58 *quinto* and *tenore*, b.61 *quinto*) and tone-tone (bb.59-60 *basso*). Later in Terzi's intabulation however it seems that an inflection serves to retain imitative consistency: in bar 89 of the model the *picardie* C# is retained after the intervening rest, so that the entry "che solo" begins with an ascending semitone. The subsequent entry of "che solo" in the *canto* retains the identical interval structure with the sharpened G. Only in Ms.Genoa VII/I is the G left as a natural. At the repetition of this material at bar 110, the readings of the three versions remain the same as at bar 90, although here the G# is also evident in the model where it was not previously.

Strengthening the impression of the unreliability of Ms.Genoa VII/I as a *musica ficta* source is the omission, for no apparent reason, of the notated accidental F# (b.32). The many mistakes within this manuscript make it difficult at times to know when a *ficta* accidental is intended and when it is not. Some instances have already been cited, but in further cases it is less clear whether or not they are scribal errors. The C# in bar 45 for instance may be an intentional simultaneous false relation or (more likely), an error. The C# in b.26 is probably a scribal error, and in
bar 70 the chromatic line G-F#-F-E is doubtless unintentional.

Unusual *ficta* interpretations are not the sole prerogative of Fallamero and Ms.Genoa VII/I however. Terzi's G# in bar 33, also present in the manuscript, is not required by any known rule of *musica ficta* unless the G# is regarded as crossing to the canto A. The G# makes perfect harmonic sense in an intabulation as a *subsemitonium* of a perfect cadence, even if it does not actually make polyphonic sense for the vocal original. This is an instance where to use the example of the lute intabulation for a vocal edition would be misguided because the intabulators have allowed harmonic sense to mask the polyphony. Terzi also allowed false relations to occur submetrically within his *passaggi*. In bar 7 for instance, a C in the bass *passaggio* forms a false relation with the C# picardie third. A passing clash such as this is perfectly acceptable in *passaggi* and is one Terzi allows as additional colour in nearly every intabulation.

Some of the *musica ficta* interpretations in the intabulations of *Fera gentil* stem from the personal whim of the intabulators. In bars 12-13, Terzi raised the F for *propinquity* and followed this with a chord of G minor - an application of "una nota super la" in a non-obligatory situation which adds character to that passage. The anonymous intabulator of Ms.Genoa VII/I similarly gave *ficta* interpretations outside the usual rules. Such liberties are taken more by some lutenists than by others. In the manuscript version there are two examples of a minor chord altered to major, even though *propinquity* does not apply (bb.37 and 52). These bars are particularly clear examples of harmonic thinking taking precedence over the preservation of polyphony in lute intabulations.
2. *Nasce la pena mia*, Striggio. 87

Striggio's madrigal, first published in 1560, was intabulated by at least four Italian lutenists — Terzi, Galilei (two versions), Fallamero, and Becchi — in published versions spanning a period of 31 years. 88 We also know of four extant Italian manuscript intabulations of the madrigal compiled in the late sixteenth century. 89 Comparisons among these nine intabulations of *Nasce la pena* show a remarkable variety of *musica ficta* treatment. As in the previous example, most of the *musica ficta* accidentals function as leading-notes at cadences. But in addition, some of the intabulations of *Nasce la pena* contain *musica ficta* that does not conform with any known rule, and there are also omissions where we would normally expect *musica ficta* to be applied.

Like Rore in *Fera Gentil*, Striggio (or his editor Gardano) often did not sharpen leading-notes in end-of-phrase cadences, leaving such inflections to the performer to realize. He did however notate less obvious *recta* flats (bars 8, 10, 14, 22 and 37), *picardie* thirds (bars 8, 9 and 11) and *propinquity* sixths and thirds during the course of a phrase (bars 15, 21 and 38). Rarely do all the lute intabulations raise the leading-note at an important cadence. One or more intabulators usually fail to cadence with a *subsemitonium*, and this raises the question whether such omissions result from personal taste, or incompetence on the part of the intabulator. In bar 5 for example, all versions notated perfect cadences except Ms.Brussels II/275

87. Music example in Volume II pp.154-176
88. For sources see Appendix 3,
89. Ms.Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, II/275 (Cavalcanti lutebook) (hereafter referred to as Ms. Brussels II/275); Ms Genoa VII/I; Ms.Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Ms.C.311, *Arie e canzone in musica di Cosimo Bottegari* (hereafter referred to as Ms.Modena C.311); and Ms.Como, Biblioteca Comunale, Ms.senza segnatura (hereafter referred to as Ms.Como ss.)
and Ms. Genoa VII/I; and in another perfect cadence at bar 10 Fallamero failed to raise the leading-note C while both Cosimo Bottegari (the author of Ms. Modena C.311) and Becchi omitted the leading-note altogether. At an important cadence in bar 13, all the intabulators agreed in supplying the subsemitonium, while in an intermediate perfect cadence (b.15), Fallamero alone failed to sharpen the leading-note. Applying the rule of propinquity in bars 20 and 21 produces two successive G#s, the second of which leads to a mid-phrase cadence on A major, justifiable not only by propinquity, but also by the avoidance of a harmonic tritone with the model's picardie third C#. But not all of the arrangements supplied the earlier G# at bar 20; Cavalcanti (the author of Ms. Brussels II/275) omitted the G altogether, and in the next bar (b.21), Fallamero alone did not cadence G# to A. At the end of this phrase (b.22), a perfect cadence on D is produced by a ficta C#, upon which all intabulations agree. In another end-of-phrase cadence, all intabulators except Becchi supplied the subsemitonium (bar 28), and all raised the leading-note in bar 36. In a further application of subsemitonium modi (bar 8) all the sources except Fallamero sharpened the lower note in the returning-note figure D-C-D in the sesto voice. The final cadence at the end of the madrigal, naturally enough, elicited sharpened leading-notes in all versions. From these examples there is evidence of a greater degree of freedom in the application of the rule of propinquity at intermediate cadences than there is at important end-of-phrase cadences.

A large section of music repeated in Striggio's madrigal (bb. 23-40, 41-58), afforded the intabulators an opportunity to vary the ornamentation. Terzi, Galilei, and Raimondo (author of Ms. Como s.s.), increased their ornamentation on the repeat, whereas Fallamero, Cavalcanti (Ms. Brussels II/275), Ms. Genoa VII/I, Bottegari (Ms. Modena C.311) and Becchi varied their intabulations very little. The repeated section also gives us the chance to compare the musica ficta practices of each intabulation to determine to
what extent the intabulators varied their *musica ficta* interpretations. Inconsistency within an intabulation could demonstrate that the intabulators sought variety in their application of *musica ficta* as well as in their ornamentation, but it is more likely to be the product of a lack of musical and theoretical insight. The first repeated cadence requiring *ficta* is in bar 46, the equivalent of bar 28. In both bars Becchi omitted the *subsemitonium*, whereas in the repeated section only, the author of Ms. Genoa VII/I failed to sharpen the leading-note. The perfect cadence at bar 53 however is the same as its equivalent at bar 37 - all lutenists have sharpened the leading-note (except for Ms. Brussels II/275). Fields *ficta* occurring in both sections, however unusual (such as bars 27/45 and 33/51 in Ms. Brussels II/275), must be regarded as intentional, but those which vary on the repeat, as in Ms. Genoa VII/I (bars 36 and 54) and Ms. Brussels II/275 (bars 31 and 48), are probably unintentional. Judging by consistency, the three most unreliable sources of *musica ficta* are Fallamero, Ms. Brussels II/275, and Ms. Genoa VII/I. We find a further indication of Fallamero's unreliability in a missing half-bar (b.29), which is completed in the repeated section at bar 47. Were this an intentional omission we would expect the same treatment in each section.

Striggio notated many *picardie* thirds, but despite this the intabulators managed to give different readings for the final chords of perfect cadences. The final chord of the cadence at bar 23 for example sees a variety of treatment. Here the third of the final chord is omitted, precluding the *picardie* third altogether from a vocal performance. Nevertheless, Galilei in both of his versions added the minor third, and Raimondo (Ms. Como s.s.) added a major third to the final chord of the cadence, while all the other lutenists left the fifth bare. The application of *picardie*

90. Mistakes in the original give an unclear reading. See the notes to *Nasce la pena mia*, Volume II, pp.154-176.
thirds additional to those of Striggio's madrigal invites further disagreement in bar 14, and in bar 36 and its equivalent, bar 54. The only intabulations to note the picardie third at the cadence into bar 14 are Raimondo (Ms. Como s.s.) and Cavalcanti (Ms. Brussels II/275). As this is an intermediate cadence, a picardie third is not necessary, and it does in any case result in a very chromatic line for the tenore. The cadence on A at bar 36 is more important, occurring as it does at the end of a poetic line, and would invite a picardie third had not Striggio written a bare fifth. All the same, the temptation was hard to resist for Raimondo, the author of Ms. Genoa VII/I, and Cavalcanti, who all added the major third. Both Raimondo and Ms. Genoa VII/I were careful not to extend the C# into the beginning of the new phrase "s'io mir'ho male" of the tenore, but Cavalcanti ignored the polyphony in this bar, preferring a more homophonic reading. At the equivalent bar in the repeat (bar 54), Ms. Genoa VII/I did not notate the picardie third, whereas the other two manuscripts are unchanged.

Musica ficta to avoid mi contra fa is not required in this madrigal on accented beats, but was applied by two lutenists, Galilei and the author of Ms. Genoa VII/I, to an unaccented passing note in bar 4. Terzi did not need to apply ficta here because his ornamentation sidesteps the B-F harmony. Two other intabulators who did not raise the F—Raimondo and Cavalcanti — also omitted the preceding B, thereby obviating the need for an F#. The other sources, Fallamero, Bottegari and Becchi, while retaining the B, did not deem it necessary to avoid the tritone on an unaccented beat.

Two of Striggio's ornaments received a variety of musica ficta in the intabulations. In an ornamental figure in the quinto of bar 28, Terzi alone applied the rule of propinquity, flattening the B so that the interval of the fifth was approached by a minor sixth.
In Striggio's madrigal there is only a single incident of a two-note ornament in anticipation of the leading-note (b.21). Terzi replaced this ornament with another, but Galilei, Raimondo, the author of Ms.Genoa VII/I, and Becchi, all sharpened both the leading-note and the sixth degree in anticipation of the cadence. Fallamero however missed the cadence altogether, sharpening the sixth degree (F#) as a returning-note figure, but not the seventh degree (G) to cadence on A.

The *musica ficta* inconsistencies in Ms.Genoa VII/I's arrangements of both *Nasce la pena mia* and *Fera gentil*, cast doubt on the reliability of this source. Not only does the manuscript miss important cadences, it also omits a Striggio accidental C# in bar 9. Of all the arrangements of this madrigal however, Cavalcanti's interpretation is the most wayward. He also cancels an original accidental (bar 8), and on many occasions the third of a chord (usually in the chord of A), is sharpened for no apparent reason (bars 1, 3, 6, 16, 19, 20, 27, 33, 42, 45, 48, 51 and 58). Clearly these unusual accidentals are not errors, for the repeated bars are treated much the same (except for a C# in bar 48 which is not found in its equivalent bar 31). While Cavalcanti faithfully represented the basso, on several occasions he supplied harmony different from that of the model (bars 9, 35 and 42). This tinkering with the harmony, rare among lute intabulations, also points to the unreliability of the arrangement as a *musica ficta* source. By deviating from contemporary *musica ficta* rules and showing such a strong partiality for the chord of A major this intabulation, which serves as an accompaniment to a bass singer, has altered the model from a six-part polyphonic madrigal to a chordal accompaniment (particularly in bars 48-49).

The other manuscript intabulations, and the Fallamero print, contain *musica ficta* outside the usual rules. Raimondo's and Cavalcanti's manuscript versions also give some harmonically influenced readings: in bar 58 of Ms.Como...
s.s. a C#-D cadence would be possible were the progression conceived chordally but makes no sense polyphonically. In Ms.Genova VII/I the B within a chord of G in bar 7 is flattened by a wide application of the rule of propinquity. This recta sign is not considered necessary by any of the other intabulators. A ficta sign added by Fallamero (bar 35) in an undoubted misapplication of the subsemitonium modi rule does not serve any known purpose whatsoever. Since Fallamero did not keep to this interpretation at the repeat in bar 53 we could assume that it was a typographical error, were it not for Fallamero's unusual musica ficta interpretation in general.

We can conclude from comparison of lute intabulations of Nasce la pena mia and Fera gentil, that of the printed tablatures, Fallamero's is the least reliable, while Terzi's and Galilei's are the most consistent and the most in conformity with contemporary musica ficta practices. Of the manuscript sources, Raimondo's and Bottegari's are the most consistent while Cavalcanti and Ms.Genova VII/I give the least accurate readings. It is also clear that in some tablature sources, particularly those of Fallamero and Ms.Genova VII/I, the standards of musica ficta practice vary considerably from one intabulation to another. Ms.Genova VII/I for instance has many more mistakes in Fera gentil than in Nasce la pena mia, and Fallamero failed to raise the subsemitonium more often in the former than in the latter. Generally speaking one could say that manuscript sources are less reliable than printed sources, but until each is researched thoroughly, the merits of each intabulation and each source must be considered separately.
Part five. Conclusion

Of the musica ficta that Terzi applied to his intabulations, the most frequent inflections were applied to leading-notes in end-of-phrase cadences and, less often, mid-phrase propinquity. In a search for aspects of Terzi's musica ficta style, it may initially appear that he preferred to write leading-note cadences rather than phrygian cadences. However, the rarity of phrygian flats is not so much a statement of preference as it is the result of few such choices being open to the intabulator. In the vocal original it is in the cadence, more than any other situation, that musica ficta is left to the performer's discretion. It is rare though for there to be any real choice between a phrygian or leading-note cadence, as more often than not the phrygian interpretation is not musically viable. Even where it is possible, if a recta flat necessitates the flattening of preceding notes, Terzi prefers the interpretation involving the least number of inflections. Generally, in the vocal models studied, it has been seen that more often than not, most of the possible recta flats have been notated by the composer or publisher. This confirms for late sixteenth-century Italian lute intabulations what Fox found to be true for mid-sixteenth-century vihuela intabulations, namely, that the arrangers added considerably more sharps than flats.91 Similarly, Terzi notated few causa necessitatis accidentals, not out of preference, but because the original composer or publisher had left very few such situations open to the performer.

The picardie third is also frequently notated in the vocal model, but where such interpretation remains open, Terzi did not notate the major third at cadences as a matter of course. Far from being obligatory in lute intabulations,

the *picardie* third is treated with individuality, some intabulators applying it much more than others.

Terzi's *musica ficta* is so close to accepted vocal practice that it does not indicate an independent instrumental style. The stylistic deviation that we do find is mainly within *passaggi*, where Terzi frequently relished false relations between ornamental and non-ornamental elements of the intabulation. But rather than classifying such harmonic colour as unusual or peculiar to lute intabulations, it is reasonable to think that they may also have been perfectly acceptable harmonic clashes in vocal performances resulting from ornamentation of any one part. In fact, given the spontaneous nature of vocal ornamentation this seems inevitable. Especially when one considers Terzi's conservative and consistent *musica ficta* generally, his *passaggi ficta* seems likely to be a true picture, for the 1590's at least, of contemporary vocal practice.

We see little evidence in Terzi's work of the *musica ficta* application which creates conformity in entries of points of imitation. At times it looks as though he may have consciously retained the same solmization for successive melodic entries, but he did not do so consistently, and any such inflections can always be explained by one or other of the *musica ficta* rules.

It is a temptation in research of this kind, based as it is largely on the work of one composer, to hold up that composer's work as exemplary. Nonetheless one could safely say that Terzi's *ficta*, along with Galilei's, is the most consistent and intelligent of all the tablatures considered here, and can be relied upon as an example of good late sixteenth-century *musica ficta* practice in lute intabulations. Whether we decide to apply that practice directly to the vocal models is another matter. To this question the tablatures themselves offer a solution. Some tablatures, such as Cavalcanti's, clearly serve as vocal
accompaniments and little else, with the vocal model adapted accordingly. As a result, in many places the original polyphony has been converted into homophony, merely in support of the voice. In such cases the musica ficta of the lute intabulation would be of little assistance in the formation of a modern vocal interpretation. Likewise, if tablatures are seen to be unreliable and inconsistent, as for instance Fallamero's, such sources should not be consulted for a vocal edition. In Terzi's and Galilei's intabulations, though, it is obvious that the intabulators were thinking polyphonically, and only on rare occasions is there any evidence of homophonic thinking resulting from the instrumental medium. Where a homophonic interpretation is evident the cause is obvious, involving as it usually does the concept of "crossed parts", and such instances can easily be isolated from a modern edition of the model. Similarly, it is obvious when passaggi have forced an interpretation different from what we would otherwise expect.
Many varieties of performance media other than solo lute are indicated in the printed repertoire. Although ensemble intabulations are small in number compared with those apparently intended for solo performance, they represent many varieties of performance, thus giving valuable insight into the performance practices Terzi and others may have intended for their solo intabulations. The few explicit performance instructions found in the printed lute repertoire are augmented by a large variety of performance practices implied by the layout of material. Particularly in manuscripts, the personal notebooks of amateur lutenists, a large variety of performance practice can be observed from the style of the intabulations, their physical place relative to mensural material, and occasional inscriptions within the manuscripts. By drawing comparisons in the late sixteenth-century Italian lute repertoire it is hoped that light may be shed on the following questions about Terzi's intabulations:

1. Were those intabulations lacking in special performance instructions really intended for solo performance, or could they have been performed with vocal and/or instrumental ensembles?
2. What did Terzi intend by the instructions "in concerto" heading many of his intabulations?
3. Were those tablatures underlaid with text intended as song accompaniments, and if so does it follow that the absence of text implies the absence of song?
LUTE ENSEMBLES IN ITALIAN PRINTS

A handful of original music for two lutes was included in Italian tablature prints between 1508 and 1585, the earliest pieces being a "suite" of Saltarello, Piva and Calata in Dalza's lute book of 1508. Nearly four decades passed before the publication of the next duet dances, a Pavane and Saltarello of P. Paulo Borrono. Borrono and Dalza wrote their duet dances in the manner of one lute playing a simple harmonic bass, (or a drone bass in the case of Dalza's Saltarello & Piva) while the other played a single-line ornamentation.

From the mid-sixteenth century, fantasias and ricercari, as well as dances, were set for two lutes. The first composer to do this was Barberiis, who included a fantasia for two lutes, tuned an octave apart, in his 1549 lute book. This fantasia is also notable for the manner in which it breaks away from the Dalza style, for according to Brown, the two lutes "both play the same music, but each ornaments in a slightly different way." Hence, although one lute has a supporting role, and the other an ornamental melodic role, they share the harmonic material. In his Intavolatura de leuto in 1559, Matelart adds second lute parts to six of Francesco da Milano's fantasias (the first five requiring a lute tuned a major second higher) and to one fantasia of Giovanni Maria da Crema. In the rubrics to Matelart's duets we find the first example in printed

4. H. M. Brown, Sixteenth-Century Instrumentation; the Music of the Florentine Intermedii, AIM (Dallas, 1973), p. 34.
Italian lute music of a derivative of the verb "concertare" referring to lutes in instrumental ensemble - "Seguens le Recercate concertate". This anticipates the term "in concerto" which was to become an important feature of Terzi's *Libro Primo*. The style of Matelart's additions is very similar to that of the fantasias they adorn. Only very slightly more ornamental than the original fantasias, they represent a true dialogue of equal partners. In fact, the second lute parts could legimitately stand apart as solos if need be. We have record of only two lute duets attributable to Francesco da Milano. One is a canon in which the two lutes, naturally enough, share an equal role. The other is a setting of the Basse Dance *La Spagna*. Here one lute, labelled *tenore*, plays a simple three-part chordal background while the other, a *contrappunto*, enjoys a virtuosic single-line elaboration. This piece differs so much from Francesco's usual style, that it looks more like a conscious imitation of the Dalza duet style.

The two duets at the end of Galilei's revised edition of *Il Fronimo* are representative of the earlier duet tradition. These simple ricercari are accompanied by single-line elaborations, called *contrapunti* [*sic*], written by B.M., of whom we know nothing other than that he was a "virtuoso Gentil'huomo". Galilei also included a short canon for two lutes - "Fuga a L'unisono, dopo sei tempi". A year after Galilei's *Il Fronimo*, Barbetta included two sets

---

7. Francesco's *La Spagna* is also similar in style to the Spinacino intabulation duets, and perhaps it is no coincidence that both Francesco and Spinacino used the term *tenor* and that the Basse Dance *La Spagna* was a favourite of them both.
8. Galilei (1584), pp.178 & 180. See also an untitled duet Galilei gives on p.30 for didactic purposes.
of passi i mezzi & gagliarde in his *Intavolatura di Liuto*, for lutes tuned a fourth apart. Lute II is considerably the more ornamental of the two, but at the same time each part carries three and four-part harmony. Thus, while maintaining the Dalza dance-duet style of a supporting part and an ornamental part, Barbetta begins to approach equality in his writing for two lutes.  

Intabulations of vocal music set for two lutes received about as much attention in sixteenth-century Italy as the dance and fantasia genres. Spinacino's six duet intabulations allow one lute to play a meandering elaboration over another lute's literal arrangement of two voices of a chanson. Spinacino's and Dalza's duets are very much alike in style in that one lute is assigned a

EXAMPLE 5.1
Spinacino, *Libro Primo* (1507), fol. 23v.

Barberiis's duet arrangement of Verdelot's *Madonna qual certezza*, like his duet fantasia, is the first to depart from the Spinacino style. Here the two lutenists share the polyphony, but lute II alone ornaments the arrangement. It is only in the Spanish vihuela repertoire however that the two players are treated as true equals. Book IV of Valderrábano's *Silva de Sirenas* of 1547 is devoted to duets in which the polyphony of the models is divided between the lutes without ornamentation. Galilei's two duo intabulations in *Il Fronimo* (for lutes tuned a major second apart) double the harmony, but one lute ornaments while the other does not. In *Alle fiorite sponde* and * Questa che la città* the second lutes carry full harmony but also considerable ornamentation, while the first lutes appear (the models are unknown) to be literal intabulations (Example 5.2). The style of these two intabulations is the result of Galilei giving examples of the same piece

**EXAMPLE 5.2**

Galilei, * Questa che la città*

---

12. For discussion of style see Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 185 and this Volume Chapter 3.
13. Brown 1549/2 no. 16.
ornamented and unornamented for didactic reasons. It is not until we come to Terzi's intabulations of two Merulo canzone in Libro Primo and Willaert's Aller m' y faut in Libro Secondo that we find the polyphony of the model divided equally between the players (Example 5.3). It is only in the French repertoire, in a 1563 collection of Pierre Phalèse, (as Brown notes) that we find another pre-Terzi example of two lutes sharing the polyphony. 17

**EXAMPLE 5.3**

Terzi, *Aller m'y faut* b. 7-8

It is perhaps surprising that more polyphonic music was not arranged for duos, given that two lutes could do justice to the polyphony so much more easily than one. Since the tradition of improvisation was still very much alive in the sixteenth century it is probable that one written intabulation would suffice for two lutenists. One player

17. H. M. Brown, *op. cit.*, p. 34 fn. 36.
18 *ibid.*, Music example from p. 218.
could improvise an elaboration based on one or more of the voices, or both could play from the same intabulation while one ornaments it in a different way. As Brown suggests, economic factors may have contributed to the scarcity of printed duets, as "probably publishers felt no need to print two copies of a lute arrangement, when one would suffice for two players."19 It is not until the latter half of the sixteenth century, when the style veered towards the division of the polyphony of the model between both lutes equally, that a single solo tablature would no longer suffice for both players. It would have been very awkward indeed for each player to have attempted to read several polyphonic parts from a solo intabulation. Neither would publications of the vocal models have been conducive to direct readings in the "equal polyphony" duet style, since vocal scores were rare until the seventeenth century. It is reasonable to assume therefore that the absence of this style in print realistically reflects the rarity of its practice, although a lute ensemble where each player reads from a separate vocal part would of course have been possible.

Lute trios and quartets were not a popular performance medium in Italian prints. In Italian printed sources the only known work for four lutes is an original canzona by Terzi,20 and outside Italian sources the only extant sixteenth-century music for four lutes is the two intabulations in French tablature, in Adriaensen's 1584 publication of *Pratum musicum*.21 The increasing popularity of concerted music after the turn of the century is reflected in such publications as Besard's *Novus Partus* of 1617, which includes 12 pieces for three lutes of different

20. Terzi (1599), no. 93; transcription Volume II, no. 35, p. 266.
sizes, to be performed with two other instruments or voices.\textsuperscript{22} Although outside the Italian repertoire, Adriaensen's trios and duets offer considerable insight into the use of lutes in ensemble. His three intabulations for lute trio are particularly interesting for the way the parts of the four-voiced original are divided so that all three lutes carry full harmony, but with a different emphasis for each lute; for lute III the tenore of the original is uppermost, for lute II the alto is uppermost, and lute I ornaments the canto as well as supporting with full harmony.\textsuperscript{23} In Italian tablature however one finds very little trio music. One source in mensural notation calls for three lutes along with three flutes to accompany "nymphs and mermaids and sea monsters", in a six-part song in music composed in honour of Cosimo de Medici's wedding to Leonora da Toledo.\textsuperscript{24} The sole remaining Italian source for lute trio that I am aware of is a collection of Johannes Pacolini's dances for lutes of different sizes, published in 1564.\textsuperscript{25}

\textsuperscript{24} \textit{Chi ne l'atolt'oime a sei voc}! cantata a la fine del secondo atto da tre sirene, et da tre monstri marini sonata con tre traverse, et da tre Ninfe marine con tre liutti insieme. Brown 1539/1, no. 12.
LUTE SONGS IN ITALIAN PUBLICATIONS

1. Solo voice with lute

Lute songs²⁶ have been part of published lute tablatures since the beginning of the century. They manifest themselves however in several different forms of notation, some including mensural notation, some not. In the earlier part of the century it was particularly in the more homophonic popular song-forms such as the villanella, canzonetta and frottola that the lute-song thrived. In these simple arrangements which anticipate the monodic movement of the end of the century, the lute provides simple homophonic accompaniment with occasional cadential ornaments. The earliest publications of frottola for solo voice and lute are Bossinensis's Libro Primo (1509) and Libro Secondo (1511).²⁷ The soprano part is set in mensural notation above the lute tablature, and written instructions for each song indicate on which fret the singer may find the pitch of the first note. In these books and in the later collection, Frottole de Misser Bortolomio [sic] Tromboncino e de Misser Marcheto Carra, [sic]²⁸ the tenore and basso are intabulated for lute, the canto is given for voice, and the alto is omitted altogether.²⁹ Willaert however intabulated all three lower voices in his arrangements of Verdelot's madrigals, and printed the upper voice in mensural notation above the lute tablature.³⁰ Over three decades passed before more solo

²⁶ For a fuller survey of this repertoire see L. Hubbell, Sixteenth Century Italian Songs for Solo Voice and Lute, PhD. diss., (Illinois, 1982).
²⁸ Brown 1527/1.
lute-songs were published in Italy. In Gorzanis's 1570 collection of *napolitane* all of the songs appear to be his original compositions with the exception of the last two pieces. They differ from the earlier publications of *frottola* in that the pitches of the *canto* are often incorporated into the tablature accompaniment, although not necessarily as a complete upper part. The notes of the given mensural soprano part are incorporated into the tablature as the upper part of the arrangement in Antonelli's *Il Turturino Il Primo Libro delle Napolitane*. The intabulation of *Se sciorre se vedrà* illustrates the differences between the two intabulators Antonelli and Gorzanis. The 20 songs in Fallamero's *Il Libro Primo* are written with the voice part in mensural notation above the lute tablature. The pitches of the voice-part are incorporated into the upper line of the tablature, but not often in such a way as to produce a complete melodic line. Some of Fallamero's songs need transposition, but unlike Bossinensis' volumes, no instructions regarding transposition levels are given. If we assume an A tuning for the lute, most of Fallamero's vocal parts fit the accompaniment but others need to be transposed down a fourth and one song needs a downward transposition of a minor third.

33. Brown 1570/5.
34. For transcription see Volume II, no. 36, p. 275.
36. In "A" tuning: nos 19, 22, 25-30, 32-34. Vocal line requiring transposition down a fourth: nos. 17, 20, 21, 23, 24. down a minor third, no.18. In the solo intabulations Fallamero most frequently arranges for a lute tuned in "A", whereas Terzi mostly intabulates for a lute in "G". The most frequent transposition levels used by both intabulators is then up or down a fifth (from A or G). The pitch of the mensural line in a "lute-song" is of course purely notional, to suit modal conventions, and would most likely be adjusted to fit the lute pitch. For examples of Fallamero transcriptions see Volume II, nos. 10, 16 and 39.
Absent from the Italian lute-song repertoire is the space-saving device of colouring the ciphers of the sung melody, or of marking the melodic pitches within the tablature with special signs such as dashes. Such devices were favourites of the Spanish vihuela composers. Pisador's, Valderrábano's and Fuenllana's vihuela books contain accompanied songs with the melody notated either in mensural notation or as red ciphers within the tablatures. Using yet another method, Mudarra included two songs in which the melody was indicated by vertical dashes next to the tablature ciphers, though in other intabulations he placed the melody in mensural notation above the tablature. Daza in El Parnasso also used the dash for the melody. The only vihuelists to use the red cipher exclusively were Milán and Narváez. Most unusual is Valderrábano's addition of the text, for pedagogical reasons, beneath the first vihuela part in three of his duets.

44. Brown 1547/5, nos. 78, 82 & 85.
As Ward points out, "when both the accompaniment and vocal part are notated in cipher, the singer and vihuelist were probably one." 45 Hence the technique, of red ciphers or dashes was ideal for this instrument, where the performer may have been unschooled in the reading of mensural notation. The Italians did not follow suit in their publications, no doubt because of the expensive double printing process involved. 46

2. Lute and several voices.

Much larger than the lute-song repertoire is that of partsongs which include more than one vocal part in mensural notation as well as a lute intabulation. Often a keyboard intabulation is provided as well, but in such cases the keyboard and lute intabulations were never intended to be performed together but are alternative forms of accompaniment. 47 Written in either choirbook or part-book formats, these publications imply a variety of performance options: any voice may sing alone to the accompaniment of the lute (or keyboard); the lute intabulation may be performed as a solo; any two or three voices may sing to lute or keyboard accompaniment; the song may be performed a cappella; or a predominantly vocal performance could involve other instruments in a variety of combinations of voices and instruments.

46. For further information on the vihuela songs see Ward, *ibid.*, pp. 95–100.
There are nine extant Italian books of partsongs in choirbook format including lute and keyboard tablatures published in the sixteenth century (not including reprints). Simone Verovio's four volumes containing villanelle, canzonette and "ghirlande" for three and four voices, include both lute and keyboard arrangements of the songs.\textsuperscript{48} The layouts differ from book to book but it is common to them all that the vocal parts and the keyboard and lute arrangements are set on one opening so that all elements of the music are visible at once (Example 5.4).

\begin{center}
\textbf{EXAMPLE 5.4}  
\textit{Layout of Verovio's Ghirlanda di Fioretti (1589)}
\end{center}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline
\textit{canto} & keyboard score \\
\hline
\textit{alto} & lute tablature \\
\hline
\textit{basso} & other verses \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Other publishers did not include the two intabulations. In Scotto's publication of Fiorino's \textit{La Nobiltà da Roma} for example,\textsuperscript{49} each villanella was written in mensural notation with a lute intabulation on the facing page. Of a similar format are the four volumes of canzonette published by Vincenti between 1591 and 1595 where the mensural vocal parts are printed with the lute intabulation beneath.\textsuperscript{50}

\textsuperscript{48.} Brown 1586/8 (R1591/11), 1589/8, 1592/11, 1595/10.  
\textsuperscript{49.} Brown 1571/4.  
The three books of 1591 include all the songs of Verovio's 1589 print in almost identical arrangements, the only new contribution being five additional songs by Oratio Scaletta.\textsuperscript{51}

There are four publications of light partsongs from the 1590's in part-book format with a lute intabulation included in the first \textit{canto} book. These are two volumes of Vecchi's partsongs\textsuperscript{52} and one of Bellasio's\textsuperscript{53} published by Gardano, and a book of Gastoldi's \textit{balletti} published by Amadino.\textsuperscript{54} The Gastoldi \textit{balletti} are unique for their performance directions "per cantare, sonare, & ballare." The three-voiced "dance-songs", containing intabulations for a lute of up to seven courses, involve in some cases transpositions of the vocal parts as much as a fourth below (assuming a G tuning) in order to coincide with the intabulation pitch level. Vecchi's \textit{Selva di Varia Ricreatione} encourages even further flexibility in performance. Consisting of up to ten part books (S, A, T, B, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10) the collection includes "madrigali, capricci, balli, arie, justiniane, canzonette, fantasie, serenate, ... un lotto ... una battaglia". Twenty-four of these appear to be for a \textit{a cappella} performance, 11 are texted with lute intabulations and two (one of which has a lute accompaniment) are for instrumental ensemble. The first song of the collection to include a lute arrangement has the instruction "per sonare e cantare insieme", and a \textit{saltarello} without text carries the rubric "per Sonare con gli Stromenti da corde a5" and includes a lute part. The final piece is a fantasia a4 without text and without lute tablature, for unspecified instrumental performance. In most of the songs which include a lute intabulation, the lute music is reproduced in all of the part books. Such duplication would be unnecessarily wasteful of valuable printing space were it not specifically intended to

\textsuperscript{51} Brown 1591/14, nos. 2-6.
\textsuperscript{52} Brown 1590/8 & 1597/14.
\textsuperscript{53} Brown 1592/1.
\textsuperscript{54} Brown 1594/7.
encourage the utmost flexibility in performance media, perhaps allowing duplication of accompaniment with the lutenists (or lutenist/singers) interspersed among the singers. In Bellasio's *Villanelle a tre voci* (1592) and Vecchi's *Canzonette a tre voci* (1597) the literal lute intabulations are printed on the page facing the canto and beneath the canto respectively. This seems to suggest that if the lute were to accompany a single voice it would be the highest voice. Alternatively, using more than one part-book any number of singers may have been involved.

A common characteristic of the lute accompaniments in the publications in both part-book and choirbook formats is that they include all the pitches of the accompanying voices, thus allowing them to act either as continuo accompaniments, or as lute-song accompaniments to any one voice. The two different formats do not appear to imply different performance options, but rather, the personal preferences of the composers and publishers; Scotto, Verovio and Vincenti printing in choirbook format, Gardino and Amadino using the part-book format.

An overall pattern worth noting is that the lute-song publications with one part in mensural notation (or a voice part implied by text) are more prevalent in the first half of the century, while those lute intabulations published with part-songs are the product of the last three decades of the sixteenth century. Perhaps it was a point not missed by the printers that the part-song publications actually offered greater economy to the owner of the book in that they could be performed by one singer, or in various combinations. One practical layout overlooked by the Italian printers was to set out the part to face different

55. For full lists of contents see NV no.2831, and Brown 1590/8.
directions on a single opening, so that the various performers could easily read their own parts around the table.56

Outside the lute repertoire, further flexibility in the renaissance musician's attitude to instrumentation is evident in some Italian printed sources which either give no indication of instrumentation, or imply a choice. For instance Il primo libro a note negre a due voci by Lupacchino and Tasso in partbook format, in which some of the pieces are texted and some not, may have been used for a variety of media.57 A volume which may have been used for solmization singing, instrumental performance, or a combination of the two is Ruffo's Capricci in musica a tre voci. These textless partsongs in mensural notation are Ruffo says, "à commodo de virtuosi", meaning that they are "suitable for clever people" who could have been instrumentalists or singers.

Flexibility such as this is still evident in the first few decades of the seventeenth century, for example in two of Kapsberger's books. His villanelle, in four-part score format, have three texted mensural lines with chitarrone accompaniment beneath, as well as guitar alfabeto. The prefaces to both his Libro Primo di Villanelle and his Libro Terzo di Villanelle 58 invite any instrument to play the mensural lines, ("accommodate per qual si voglia strumento con l'intavolatura del Chitarrone et alfabeto per la Chitarra Spagnola").

56. Such a format was used for instance in Robert Dowland's A Musical Banquet (London, 1610), and Valderrábano's duets in his fourth book, (Brown 1547/5).
58. (Rome, 1610) and (Rome, 1619).
TERZI'S ENSEMBLE INDICATIONS

The intabulation styles of the Italian lute publications preceding Terzi are also present in Terzi's two books. New styles, however, did not replace old styles, although there are some subtle developments. The early sixteenth-century duets were built on the principle of elaboration and accompaniment, the elaboration being based on the two upper voices of the model not otherwise accommodated by the accompanying lute. Terzi's single-line elaborations on the other hand, are newly composed melodic lines incorporating pitches of the whole texture, while the other lute part is a literal intabulation of the complete polyphony. While the principle is the same as for the earlier duet style, the texture in Terzi's duets is twice as dense. At the same time Terzi included duets in which the principle of elaboration and accompaniment was replaced by stylistic equality.

Of the total of 72 intabulations in Terzi's two lute books half of them carry instructions indicating performance media other than solo lute, either in the Tavola, or as rubrics in front of the intabulation. Of these 36 pieces, all are intabulations of pre-composed vocal or instrumental works except "Canzone a Otto Voci de l'autore per suonar a 4", an original instrumental canzona for two pairs of lutes tuned a fourth apart, forming as it were a double choir. 59 Aside from the other 36 intabulations, which for the moment at least we may assume are lute solos, we find a wide variety of performance possibilities.

In his Libro Secondo Terzi intabulated 12 "Canzonette a 3, 4 & 5 voci, con le parole", and one motet for which he

59. Terzi (1599), p.117. For a transcription see Volume II, no. 35, p.266. A table of Terzi's intabulations, classified according to performance media, is given in See Appendix 1.2.
underlaid text, to be performed as lute-songs. Three of these carry rubrics such as "Le parole per cantare sono sotto al Basso" and in another three pieces the instructions are even more specific: "le parole sono per Cantar il Basso" and "le parole si ponno cantar sott'al Basso, & nel Canto". Hence, the melody to be sung is in the treble, but the words are placed below the bass. The three texted intabulations transcribed for this dissertation demonstrate that the words are placed conveniently for any of the parts to be sung. The intabulation of Vecchi's Quando mirai might suggest by the position of its text that Terzi was thinking more of the bass. However, in bar 12 the phrase "dammi lo cor" is placed beneath the tenor part while the bass sustains a semibreve. Overall, Terzi's text underlay does not imply, as Ms. Brussels II/275 does, that the bass was the only sung part.

It was for the simpler forms, such as the canzonette, that Terzi supplied a text. He did not add text to any madrigal intabulations, and only one motet, Pietro Vinci's Mandatum novum do vobis received such treatment. Vinci's motet for five voices is not in the usual imitative style but is related to the simpler canzonette. It is notable not only that Terzi chose the less polyphonic style for lute-songs, but also that he kept the accompaniment simple and unornamented (with the exception of one passaggio in Quando mirai). In neither of his books did Terzi include melodies in mensural notation, nor are there any indications such as dashes or coloured ciphers to differentiate the vocal line, such as the Spaniards used.

60. Terzi (1599), nos. 7–10 (pp. 8–9), nos. 39–42 (pp. 52–54), no. 58 (p. 77), no. 59 (p. 78), no. 89 (p. 114). no. 90 (p. 115) & no. 56 (p. 74).
63. Terzi (1599), p. 9.
65. See pp. 272–274.
Just as texted lute-songs are peculiar to Terzi's *Libro Secondo*, so the "in concerto" ensemble indications are, with one exception, exclusive to *Libro Primo*. Both in the *tavola* and on page 57, we find the indication "Segue undeci canzoni del Mascera [sic] per suonar in concerto, & solo". These 11 intabulations are from a collection of 21 canzoni in Florenzo Maschera's *Libro Primo de Canzoni da sonare, a quatro voci* published in Brescia in 1584. Terzi's intabulations are unusual, not only for their unexplained instruction "in concerto", but also for the use of non-vocal models, although there is of course an historical link between vocal and instrumental music through the French chanson. Maschera's canzoni printed in 1584 carry titles such as "La Capirola", "La Martinenga" and "L'Uggiera" by way of paying homage to prominent Brescian families. According to William McKee, Maschera was the first of the Lombard composers to give his works such dedicatory titles, titles which Terzi did not retain. Terzi indicated that the canzoni arrangements could be played solo or within an ensemble, but he gave no further indication of just what the nature of the ensemble could have been. Stylistically they serve very well as lute solos because they retain the four-part writing of the originals as well as adding a considerable amount of ornamentation during the repeated sections of the canzona, but they could serve equally well within an instrumental ensemble as an ornamental "continuo". In this way they differ from the single-line ornamental style of the contrappunti.

68. Other intabulations from instrumental models are in Terzi (1593) nos. 14–16, and Terzi (1599) nos. 11–12 & 48–49.
The intabulations of Maschera's canzoni are marked with only two performance possibilities, but five other pieces marked "in concerto" in Libro Primo include contrapunti second-lute parts and a variety of instructions which imply additional performance possibilities. These intabulations appear in the tavola under two headings: "Madrigali a 5 & a 6 con i suoi cotraponti [sic]" and "Canzoni Francese, & Italiane". When the information in the rubrics preceding each intabulation is combined with instructions in the tavola, several performance possibilities emerge. In the first intabulation of this group, Palestrina's Vestiva i colli, Terzi arranged both parti for two lutes. For the prima parte, the contrapunto (lute II) has the instruction, "per sonar a duo liutti in quarta &/o in concerto", and for the seconda parte, "contraponto sopra il predetto per suonar come di sopra". The highly ornate contrapunto then may be performed with the literal intabulation of the first lute, on instruments tuned a fourth apart, or "in concerto". It is not until we look at the rubrics accompanying the first lute that we see that it has the option of performing either alone or with the second lute - "per suonar a duo liutti, & solo". An option of performing the first-lute part "in concerto" is not stated.

The next intabulation, Striggio's S'ogni mio bene, with its two contrapunti parts offers a slightly different set of performance possibilities. Here Terzi instructs that both contrapunti may be played "come di sopra ma a l'unisono", that is, as in the above piece Vestiva i colli but on lutes of the same pitch. Either contrapunto, then, may be played "in concerto" or with the first lute. The rubrics for lute I - "per suonar solo, & a duo liutti, & in concerti" -

---

71. Terzi used the spelling contraponto in both books except in Libro Primo (p. 39) where he used the more correct spelling contrapunto. The accepted spelling is of course contrapunto.
72. Terzi (1593) nos. 10-14.
indicate that the literal first-lute intabulation may be performed one of three ways: as a solo, in a duet with either contrappunto, or "in concerto". Terzi did not indicate whether lutes II and III may perform together, but it is obvious from the transcription that the two contrappunti cannot possibly be played at the same time. In concerto then clearly does not mean a lute trio in this case, and it is clear also that duet performance and in concerto performance is not one and the same.

For the next intabulation, Anchor ch'io possa dire, the literal first lute part may be played solo or with the highly ornate second-lute version ("per suonar solo, & a duoi liutti"), and the contrappunto (lute II) may be performed at the same pitch with lute I, or in concerto ("... a l'unisono per suonar a doi liutti, & in concerto")

Susanne ung jour has the same indication as Anchor ch'io possa dire, but here the two lutes are tuned a fourth apart. The instruction "suonar come di sopra" for the next intabulation, Petit Jacquet, refers to the same performance media as the preceding intabulation (Susanne ung jour). Here, as in the two Merulo canzoni to follow, the two lutes are at the same pitch.

The intabulations of the Merulo canzoni are different from the previous intabulations in that they do not carry any in concerto instructions, and the second lute parts, instead of being called contrappunti, have the rubrics "Secondo liutto in risposta" and "Secondo Liutto". As the different labels would suggest, the two canzoni are completely different in style from the intabulations marked in concerto. Whereas the previous works (nos. 10 to 14) consist of literal transcriptions accompanied by one or two newly composed elaborations, the two canzoni (nos. 15 and

73. For a transcription see Volume II, no. 6, p. 56.
16) have the original polyphony divided equally between the two lutes.

In total, the following varieties of performance practice are implied in *Libro Primo*: **contrappunti** to be played in a duo but tuned a fourth lower than lute I, **contrappunti** to be played with lute I in the same tuning, and **contrappunti** which may be performed *in concerto*, presumably without the first-lute part. The lute I versions, polyphonically complete in themselves, are legitimate solos as well as parts of duets. Noteworthy is the almost total absence of instructions to play the literal first lute parts *in concerto*. The one intabulation which does refer to lute I as a *in concerto* part is *S'ogni mio bene*. This intabulation is unique also for being the only one with alternative **contrappunti**. There is no stylistic difference between the first-lute parts of this or the previous intabulations which suggests that *S'ogni mio bene* is a special case. We can deduce that either the instruction "*in concerto*" was accidentally put in the wrong place, or that it could be taken for granted that a lutenist would use a literal intabulation in some sort of ensemble without having to be reminded of such an option. It may well have been accepted practice for literal lute intabulations to have been played within vocal ensembles but as yet there is no direct evidence for such practice in Italy. A further possibility is that both lutes I and II could have performed together in the *in concerto* ensemble. The lack of specific instruction to this effect does not exclude such a possibility. In fact, instructions for the first-lute parts to play solo and duo, combined with instructions for the second-lute parts to play *in concerto*, does not exclude the option of both lutes joining a larger ensemble.

Only once did Terzi use the term *in concerto* in *Libro Secondo*. For *Chi farà fede* he wrote "accommodato à modo di
This intabulation is stylistically different from the in concerto pieces in Libro Primo. Here much of the vocal original is preserved while extensive passaggi is added in imitation of the viola bastardara's ability to elaborate flamboyantly throughout the texture. Terzi was imitating an instrument that was highly regarded for its ability to represent vocal music. It is clear that he does this successfully. Praetorius's description of a viola bastardara intabulation would describe perfectly the style of Terzi's arrangement in imitation of this instrument.

A good player can set himself to play madrigals, or whatever else he likes, on this instrument; with great effort he can procure the harmony and counterpoint of all the parts, playing now up in the cantus, now down in the bass, now in the middle on tenor and alto, and decorating the whole piece with divisions - thus nearly all the parts can be distinctly heard at entries and cadences.75

Hence Chi farà fede differs from the intabulations of the Maschera canzoni where the ornamentation is more modestly related to the formal structure of the model. However, just precisely what Terzi meant for the performance of this piece is a mystery. If this is to be played with a "liutto grande", he did not supply the part, nor any further indication of how the piece could be performed within an ensemble. There are several possibilities here. One interpretation could be that a normal seven-course lute combines with a liutto grande, playing perhaps the basso, and that together they form the concerto. Alternatively these two instruments could combine with voices or other instruments of the non-plucked string family. It is unlikely that Terzi used con to mean that the intabulated music was

74. Terzi (1599), p. 70. For a transcription see Volume II, no. 18, p. 191.
to be played on a large lute. The writing is too complex for this to have been likely, involving as it does, considerable left-hand stretches and fast passage-work. If the concerto is a larger ensemble, the question arises as to whether that ensemble is vocal or instrumental. The latter seems more likely. Given the highly elaborate nature of Chi fara fede it is hard to imagine a lutenist attempting to be audible within a five-part vocal texture. The lutenist's efforts would be lost, and besides, such competition would not be tolerated by the singers, who would be vying with each other for the right to ornament their own parts. Since the models are instrumentally conceived, the intabulations of Maschera's canzioni which are also without second-lute parts, may point towards an interpretation of in concerto as "in ensemble with other instruments". It is likely that other "imperfect" melodic instruments could have played directly from a copy of Maschera's canzioni, in ensemble with the lute which by virtue of its "perfect" chordal nature, would alone require its own written part. In the case of the Maschera canzioni and Chi fara fede, to supply the other part or parts would be redundant if they are available in their original published form.

Of the three other lute duets in Libro Secondo, one, Aller m'y fault, is different in nature from the in concerto intabulations in that the two lutes share equally the original polyphony and added passaggi. This is a significant break from the Spinacino duet style and anticipates instrumental developments of the seventeenth century. The two lutenists alternately ornament and provide the harmony in a conversational manner not seen before in the Italian lute repertoire. Indeed, it is the only example Terzi offered in this style. The other two duets in Libro Secondo

---

76. Even though the absence of a text in sixteenth-century music does not exclude the possibility of vocal performance, or vice versa, it is unlikely that singers would go to the trouble of fitting poetry to Maschera's canzioni which are clearly instrumental in character.
- *Liquide perle* and *Non mi toglia* - although not so described, are written in the same style as the *concerto* duets; that is, with literal first-lute parts and newly composed *contrappunti*. The rubrics before *Liquide perle* merely read "per sonare insieme", but with rare prolixity Terzi (or perhaps his publisher Vincenti) preceded the *contrapunto* to *Non mi toglia* with the words "Segue il suo contraponto dell'Autore come sono anco tutti li altri contraponti di questo Libro, & del primo contraponto sopra l'antecedente Madrigale." He wants there to be no doubt regarding the authorship of the newly composed elaborations serving as second-lute parts, but to what he is referring by "the preceding madrigal" (which is without a second lute part) is anyone's guess.

To summarize then, Terzi uses the term *in concerto* to mean the inclusion of a lute or lutes within an instrumental or vocal ensemble. Clearly, he wrote them in such a way as to provide the maximum number of performance possibilities for the minimum tablature space. However, there is neither enough consistency in the performance instructions, nor enough written evidence generally in the Italian lute repertoire to be sure of exactly what this unusual group of intabulations represents. It is clear that the first-lute parts may be played solo, that both lutes may play as a duo and that the second-lute part may play in an ensemble. What we cannot be sure of is whether lute I could be also a part of this *in concerto* performance, whether lute I (and literal intabulations generally) may have been included in vocal ensembles, and whether the lute II *contrappunti* parts were included in vocal or instrumental groups. Much remains conjectural until such time as concrete evidence of performance practice of lute intabulations within instrumental or vocal ensembles emerges from other sources. The discussion to follow explores the question from other perspectives such as other uses of *in concerto* and similar terms, and ensemble performance practice as it is implied in some lute manuscripts.
Part Two. Performance Implications

MUSICA IN CONCERTO

1. Etymology

It has been convincingly argued by Robert Hall that "the Italian noun concerto is a sixteenth-century derivative of the Italian verb concertare 'work out, plan, arrange'" and not a derivative of the "Classical Latin verb concertăre 'skirmish, contend, dispute.'" Identifying the sixteenth-century Italian concerto with the Latin concertāre has been the mistake of modern scholars and Renaissance theorists alike. David Boyden, citing Ercole Bottrigari's 1594 treatise, erroneously suggested that concerto linguistically belongs not only to the Latin concertāre but also to the Spanish concierto through the use of Tuscan conserto. Both Bottrigari (Il Desiderio, 1594) and Praetorius used concerto to mean dispute (contending). Bottrigari prefers not to use concerto, which he took to mean "conflict" or "contention", saying that when instruments play beautifully and well together, they are not "in concerti" but "in concerti". He did however use the word as a noun to mean "a concert" as in the following extract:

"Sometimes the Duke [of Ferrara], His Highness, commands Fiorino, his M. di cappella and head of all the music ... to give a Concerto grande, for thus it is called, this famous concert to which you refer." 81

2. Ensembles - vocal versus instrumental

Until at least the middle of the sixteenth century, "the musical usage of the word concerto seems to have conveyed merely the idea of an ensemble of voices or instruments." 82 In the first known musical application of the term, "un concerto di voci in musica" in the intermedio of 1519, meant a "getting together" in a vocal ensemble. 83 As an instrumental ensemble concerto was also used in 1542 to indicate a quartet comprising violone, two lutes, and a flute - "quattro degli stromenti cominciarono il lor concerto". 84 By mid-century however, the meaning had changed to apply to a mixed ensemble of voices and instruments as for example in the 1565 intermedii: "La musica di questo primo intermedio era concertato da ..." A long list of instruments follows, including four double harpsichords, four violas da gamba, two trombones, two tenor recorders, one mute cornett, one transverse flute, and two lutes. 85 Boyden argues that from about 1565 onwards, concerto applied to ensembles of voices and instruments where previously it referred to ensembles of voices or instruments. 86 Distinctly different uses of the term between one half of the sixteenth century and the other are not however as definite as Boyden would like us to believe, for after 1565 concerto was used at least once to mean a vocal ensemble (the concerto di

82. Boyden, op. cit., p. 221.
84. Boyden, op. cit., p. 222.
85. Brown, op. cit., p. 97; New Grove, Concerto, vol. 3, p. 627. For other Examples of concerto meaning a mixed ensemble, see Boyden, op. cit., p. 222.
*donne at the court of Ferrara*, and at least once to mean an instrumental ensemble (*Ricercar per sonar in the Concerti di Andrea et di Gio. Gabrieli Organisti)*. Until comprehensive research is undertaken in this particular area we cannot say for sure whether *concerto* indicates any one specific type of ensemble at any given time.

3. **Contending versus concerting**

Despite mistaking the etymology of *concerto*, Boyden nevertheless points out that for much of the sixteenth century, the Italian use of the word in music acquired the meaning of adjusting, working, or joining together. Boyden goes on to agree with Einstein's thesis that by the end of the century it became increasingly prominent in Italian ensemble music for one vocal or instrumental part within an ensemble to "contend" with the larger body of sound. Einstein would have us believe that the process of contention (if not the use of the term *concerto*) started with Josquin.

... In the course of the century the tension of the voices with respect to one another undergoes a change: two or more voices stand out, begin to compete, and force the rest to accept a subordinate and menial role.... when two pairs of voices begin to oppose one another in a four-voiced context, the first step towards the *concerto*-like treatment has already begun.

Although Josquin often set pairs of voices against each other, the process of "contention" was not fully realized until the appearance of Monteverdi's *stile concertato* madrigals. Tracing the gradual evolution toward the modern concept of *concerto* is a twofold task: it involves

90. *ibid.*, p. 821.
investigating the changes in compositional technique, and also observing changes in literary interpretations of the term *concerto*. What is significant with respect to Terzi is not so much when composers began to include opposing forces within their music, as when *concerto* took on the meaning of "contention". The transition to "contention" was clearly a gradual and overlapping one, for by 1628 Giustiniani in his *Discorso Sopra la Musica* still used the term in the old sense of "consorting". Schütz used the term *concerten* in this sense in the titles of two publications in the 1630's, and in fact the two uses of the term existed side by side as late as the middle of the eighteenth century. J.S. Bach for instance, used the word *concerto* as the title for a cantata, in the sense of "ensemble".

4. Instructions in lute and related books

The use of *concerto* is rare in lute or vihuela books and other publications which refer to either instrument. Dalla Casa, however, included five ornamented madrigals in *Il Vero Modo di Diminuir* headed "Madrigali da cantar in compagnia, & anco co'l Liuto solo" in which the texted elaborations for voice may be performed with a solo lute arrangement of the madrigal. (*In compagnia* appears to be synonymous with *in concerto*). What Dalla Casa says gives the impression that it was common practice for lutenists to accompany the sung canto of a madrigal: "I have ornamented the soprano since it is the part most frequently ornamented,

92. *Erster Theil Kleine geistlichen Concerten*, (Dresden, 1636), and *Anderer Theil Kleiner geistlichen Concerten*, (Dresden, 1639).
94. Brown 1584/2, p.30. Giovanni Bassano also gives the choice of solo instrumental, vocal or *in concerto* performance for his single-line embellishments. (Brown 1591/2, p.5)
and also for those who delight in singing with the lute."

The lute part is not provided, but any competent lutenist would expect to intabulate his or her own part from the vocal score. The only other mention of concerto I have seen in Italian lute books is in Matelart's 1559 *Intavolatura de Leuto... Libro Primo*, in which he adds the rubrics "Sequens le Recercate concertate" before the second lute version to accompany Francesco da Milano's ricercari.

In the vihuela repertoire, the Spanish equivalent *en concierto* appears at least twice. Bermudo in *Declaración* (1549) used *en concierto* to mean ensembles of vihuela, guitar and bandurria, and Diego Ortiz in *Tratado de Glosas* used phrases such as "nel primer libro que es tñer en concierto con quatro o cinco vihuelas" where he recommended that viols perform the music of Book One with a consort of vihuelas. In another Spanish source we find an example of the same phrase Terzi used in *Libro Primo*, giving the performer the choice of performing solo or in an ensemble: Scipione Cerreto in *Della Prattica Musica*, vocale et strumentale Naples 1601, writes "Il conserto delle viole da gamba ... sola o in conserto".


96. Brown 1584/2, in the preface, reads: *Ho diminuito il Soprano per esser parte più frequentata nel diminuir, & anco per quelli, che si dilettano di cantar nel Liuto.*


5. Contrappunti, Concerti and Tempo.

The above short survey of the uses of the term *concerto* in other sources indicates that the term was by no means unique to Terzi, but it does not clarify whether the 1590's *concerto* implied vocal, instrumental, or mixed ensemble. Neither does it indicate whether Terzi had in mind the concept of "contention" or merely of "playing in ensemble". We do know, however, from his indications in *Libro Primo* that *in concerto* does not mean that the lute duets themselves formed the ensemble, but rather that one or both lutes joined another ensemble. It is from the nature of Terzi’s *contrappunti* themselves that we find the strongest clue to the probable type of ensemble – they could only have been performed with instruments, not with voices, for reasons outlined below.

One feature common to all of Terzi’s *in concerto* intabulations is that at least one of the lute parts is highly ornate and virtuoso. As mentioned above, a singer in an ensemble would hardly have wanted to contend with a lutenist stealing the show with technical display. There is evidence to suggest that at times at least, instrumentalists ornamented while singers did not,¹⁰⁰ but the unrelenting semiquavers and demisemiquavers of the *contrappunti* would be merely an irritating small sound in a choir. Even in Monteverdi’s *Concertato* works it is only where the voices are silent that the instrumental accompaniment is allowed the luxury of fast passage work.¹⁰¹

---

Perhaps more pertinent to the problem of ensemble performance, is tempo. Could a lutenist playing a contrapunto part have possibly kept in tempo with a vocal ensemble? We cannot be absolutely sure what the tempo of any one madrigal or motet was, of course, but we have a few guidelines from the theorists. In the fifteenth century, Ramis de Pareja and Franchino Gafori likened the basic tactus to the pulse of a man at rest.\textsuperscript{102} With an average resting pulse-rate taken to be 70 pulses per minute and the semibreve as the tactus, semiquavers would have to be performed at a rate of eight notes to the metronome marking 140, or in other words over 18 notes per second, and demisemiquavers would of course be twice that speed. While the thumb and finger lute technique facilitates very fast passage work indeed, such speeds are impossible to sustain. Whether such tempo indications were taken literally at the time is doubtful, and in any case, by the sixteenth century the minim had replaced the semibreve as the normal time-unit.\textsuperscript{103} Even half of the velocity estimated above, while not impossible to an excellent lutenist (and there are some around today who play very fast indeed) could certainly not be sustained for any period without considerable rubato. It would be easier to believe in Terzi's ornate intabulations accompanying vocal performances if the fast passaggi were restricted to places of repose within the model, but this is not the case. Looking at any bar of \textit{Chi farà fede} or \textit{Non mi toglia}\textsuperscript{104} it is hard enough to imagine a lutenist coping with the technical demands at all, without believing that it could be done at a constant breakneck speed.

\textsuperscript{102} Ramis de Pareja, \textit{Musica practica}, 1482. Modern edition by J. Wolf (Leipzig, 1901); Gafori, \textit{Practica Musicae}, (Milan, 1495), Liber III, Capitolo. 4.
\textsuperscript{104} Volume II, no.18, p.191; no.21, p.218.
There is plenty of evidence in Spanish sources to suggest that an instrumentalist could take considerable licence with tempo. For solo instrumental performance Luis Milán indicated that the performer was entitled to choose the tempo that suited the music: "... [The fantasias] are to be played with the compás fast or slow as the performer wishes."\(^\text{105}\) Not only that, the player could change speed between unornamented sections (consonancias) in a fantasia and passaggi (redobles) sections. The speed changes Milán recommended however are not what we would expect were they designed merely for the comfort of the vihuelist – that is, slowing down during the redobles. Rather, Milán suggested speeding up the redobles for dramatic effect:

... play all that is [made up of] consonances with the compás slow and all that is made up of redobles with the compás fast, and pause a little in playing [parar de toñer] each high point [coronado].\(^\text{106}\)

The vihuela literature is important in that it gives for the first time specific tempo indications for each piece. "Four of the vihuelists – Milán, Narváez, Mudarra and Valderrábano – give tiempo (tempo) indications for most of the pieces in their tablatures. Since these constitute the main evidence for the tempo of sixteenth-century music they must deserve careful consideration."\(^\text{107}\) Ward also informs us that a practical musician was free to choose a tempo that suited the character of the text. Both Mudarra and Phalèse have stated that music of a sad or joyful character should be played at a relatively slow or fast tempo accordingly.\(^\text{108}\)

---

108. *ibid.*, p. 76.
It is likely that the Italians were equally flexible in their instrumental tempi, if Claudio Sebastiani's comments are representative:

Likewise, they [keyboard players] will bring much sweetness to the ears of the hearers if, when playing some *Cantio*, they play those notes called minims or semiminims occasionally in slow measure and also occasionally render them in the fashion of dancing, in such a way that in the same *Cantio* they play ... in slow and dance manner. 109

Conversely, at least three other Italian theorists, (Dalla Casa, Rognioni and Zacconi) advocated the maintenance of strict tempo during *passaggi*, but maybe they considered it necessary to call for strictly applied rhythms in order to counteract an otherwise too undisciplined practice. 110 Certainly such phrases of Galilei's as "esprimere gli affetti humani" in relation to the lute, lead one to expect that sixteenth-century instrumentalists were rhythmically flexible and applied rubato. 111 It is from Vicentino that we have the strongest advocation of a rubato and expressive approach to the singing of madrigals:

... One should not sing happy or popular things sadly ... [but] ... should sing the words as the composer intended, singing the words expressively - now happy, now sad, now sweet, now cruel - and keeping to the proper stress and pronunciation of the words. Sometimes one uses a style of performance in the compositions which cannot be written down, like quiet, loud, fast or slow speech, changing speed to show the meaning of the words and the effect of the harmony. Nobody will find this strange, and there will be no mistakes.

110. See p. 144, fn. 181.
111. Brown 1584/5, p. 48.
as long as all the singers agree where there should be a change of speed."

Vincentino made it particularly clear that *rubato* was expected of madrigal performance, but it must be remembered that he was recommending rubato only in so far as it assisted the expression of the words. Therefore it would be entirely out of period as well as unmusical to expect singers to effect *rubato* for the sake of a technically difficult instrumental accompaniment. Surely Terzi's *in concerto* intabulations and *contrappunti* would better suit an instrumental ensemble, where the expression of the text is no longer a concern. There is no reason to believe that two performances of the same work, one instrumental and the other vocal, need to conform in tempo. Then, as now, factors such as melodic activity, harmonic rate of change, size of venue, size of ensemble, musical character, and personal taste of the performer(s), all contribute to variations in speed from one performance to another. Thurston Dart needlessly concluded that vocal performances must be slower than is commonly assumed, to maintain a common tempo between instrumental and vocal performances of the same piece:

112. ... non si dè cantare mesto, nelle cose allegre così volgari ... si dè cantare le parole conformi all'opinione del Compositor; & con la voce esprimere, quelle intonazioni accompagnate dalle parole, con quelle passioni. Hora allegre, hora meste, & quando soavi, & quando crudeli & con gli accenti aderire alla pronuntia delle parole & delle note, & qualche volta si usa un certo ordine di procedere, nelle compositioni, che non si può scrivere come sono, il dir piano, & forte, & il dir presto, & tardo, & secondo le parole, muovere l Misura, per dimostrare gli effetti delle passioni delle parole, & dell'armonia, ad alcuno non li parrà cosa strana tal modo di mutar misura, tutti à un tratto cantando mentre che nel concerto s'intendino, ove si habbi da mutar misura che non sarà errore alcuno, ... Nicola Vicentino, *L'Antica Musica ridotta alla Moderna Pratica* (Rome, 1555), facs.ed., (Basel, 1959), p.88 (recte, 94)-94v.
... The embellished versions of polyphonic compositions found in books for the lute or keyboard music confirm this universal preference for a fairly slow speed."

John Ward, likewise, assumed a sixteenth-century preference for conformity in performances when he says,

"... It is unlikely that ... a motet by Morales was performed by ensemble in a stolid "normal tempo" and by a vihuelist, attached to the same court musical establishment, in a tempo fast, slow, or moderate, as he wished and the text dictated.""

However, it is more likely that the sort of tolerance of diversity that allowed apparent contradictions in sixteenth-century treatises regarding relative strictness and freedom of tempos within a work would also have been afforded to instrumental and vocal performance of the same work, according to need. In any case it is clear that the musical nature of many intabulations demands different speeds from those which would feel natural to singers.

In addition, Terzi's contrappunti lute parts are written in a style so suggestive of soloistic flamboyance, that the concept of concerto as "contention" must surely apply to these works at the same time as having the meaning "in ensemble". It is significant that there is no real stylistic difference between Terzi's intabulations intended for concerto performance, and the ornamental "contending" lute parts in Thomas Morley's The First Booke of Consort Lessons. The main difference is of course that Morley

114. Ward, op. cit., p. 75.
115. See discussion above, and Ward, op. cit., p. 76.
provided the other instrumental parts whereas Terzi did not. Perhaps Terzi did not consider it necessary to publish individual parts for pandoras, citterns, viols, flutes or whatever, since a copy of the model would have been sufficient for other instrumentalists to have worked from. Of course printing space, not being cheap, was used as economically as possible. Terzi's intabulations offering a variety of possible performance media in the space required by a single intabulation, are born from the same need as space-saving choirbook and partbook formats for vocal music.

What is perhaps more surprising than anything about Terzi's ensemble intabulations, is that they are marked with special instructions such as in concerto at all. Given that Italian music with performance instructions, such as the part-songs, are usually just marked per cantare et suonare and do not give further instructions about all possible combinations, we are fortunate to have as much explicit information as we do.
THIRTEEN MANUSCRIPTS IN ITALIAN TABLATURE

Manuscript sources could well be the subject of several research projects in their own right. Indeed in the special category of personal jottings of amateur lutenists, there is a wealth of information about dances, absolute music and intabulations, which up til now has only been touched on by modern scholars. The following study does not attempt to redress the situation, but merely uses some of the evidence from manuscripts as they directly pertain to performance practice in lute intabulations. I am indebted to Boetticher's catalogue in RISM B/VII and other works cited below, for initial information of the manuscripts held in European libraries. The following is a brief survey of thirteen manuscripts which I consider to be the most relevant to the question of performance practice in intabulations.


Dated by François Lesure as being from around 1510, Ms.Paris R.V.27 is the earliest known Italian lute tablature manuscript. The first section of the volume contains solo lute pieces, and the second section (from folio 36) headed "Tenore da sonar e cantar sopra il lauto" contains 89 intabulations, many of which are also contained in the nine books of frottola published by Petrucci between 1504 and 1509. The tablatures are clearly accompaniments, but the mensural vocal lines are not given. Neither are the texts supplied beyond their incipits, which as Lesure points out, implies that "this tablature [is] the work of a professional musician, experienced enough to memorize the sung superius"

118. F. Lesure, ibid., p.10.
EXAMPLE 5.5
Tromboncino, Deh per dio

parts".  

If, then, the superius part is sung from memory the intabulations employ the same simple technique as that Bossinensis used, of leaving the alto out of the arrangement (Example 5.5). Most of the intabulations lack rhythm signs, confirming that the tablatures functioned as an aide memoire for a skilled musician. The scribe does however use a long "S" sign to indicate held notes, and vertical dashes between some ciphers to indicate the simultaneous plucking of two notes.


Perhaps the most revealing manuscript, and certainly the most unusual in its layout, is Ms. Verona 223. Dated 1548, it is the only known Italian lute manuscript source in partbook format: each book - Soprano, Alto, Tenore, and Basso - is entitled "Intavolatura da Liuto". Of the four books, most of the Alto volume is missing and what few pages remain are now included with the Basso volume. The Soprano volume is the most nearly complete of the volumes. All the others have large sections of folios on which five-line and six-line staves are drawn alternatively. Space was left for completion of each volume in order that they all contain music for the same pieces. There are several inscriptions to the effect that the collection is intended for lutes and voices.  

This performance medium is in any case obvious from the layout of the pieces, all of which (with the exception of one ricercare) are intabulations of vocal works. The models of most of these have yet to be identified and would require an extensive search. Indeed, the manuscript is worthy of a separate study in itself. All the intabulations up to folio 25v (numbering from the Soprano) are of secular vocal works. Folios 26v to 31 are blank and

---

120. ibid. p.12.  
123. Soprano fol. iv.
from 31v follows a setting of an anonymous Mass. The beginning of the Kyrie on folio 31v of the Soprano book deviates from the prevalent format of the manuscript in that it is set in score, in a single volume, for three lutes and three high voices.

EXAMPLE 5.6
Anon, Chi non conosco amore

---

124. Ms. Verona 223, fol. iv (CTB). The alto part is missing and has been reconstructed here from the tablatures.
EXAMPLE 5.6 cont.

Two examples from Ms. Verona 223, *Chi non conosce amore* (Example 5.6) from an unknown vocal source, and Rore's *Ben qui si mostra il ciel* (Example 5.7), demonstrate that there are few significant differences among the three extant tablature arrangements. All three tablatures for Rore's madrigal are the same for each voice they accompany, and the few differences among the three tablature arrangements for *Chi non conosce amore* are not systematic. The lute intabulations in both examples are essentially composites of the lower three voices of the model, reduced mainly to two parts. They do not omit the part with which they are paired except for the *Soprano* tablature which is the only one not to double the notated voice part. If each of the intabulations was intended to accompany a single voice part, we would expect to find the lute arrangements individually
adapted to accommodate the other three parts of the model. Since this is not the case, and since the intabulations other than those in the Soprano volume do not alone make suitable lute-song accompaniments, the four voices must each have been supported by a lute "continuo", possibly played by the singers themselves. The reason why each lute part is written out four times is less obvious. Perhaps the

EXAMPLE 5.7
Rore, *Ben qui si mostra il cielo*

duplication enabled a spatial arrangement of singers and instrumentalists around a table. Such duplication of a lute tablature in partbooks is in any case not without precedence in printed sources, as we have already seen in the case of Vecchi's Selva di Varia Ricreazione. 126

126. See discussion p. 223.
3. **Ms. Turin IV. 43/2.**

This manuscript of Don Annibal Caro written in a single hand (with some additions in a different ink), is undated but appears to be from the late sixteenth century. It contains a mixture of dances, untitled pieces and 12 intabulations of vocal works. The most striking aspect of the intabulations is that most of them contain dashes to distinguish the canto part from others within the tablature. This volume is the only example that I am aware of in Italian sources, printed or manuscript, that uses the dash in this way. That such visual aids were deemed necessary seems to indicate that the scribe was not very familiar with the music, or was not a very skilled musician. The addition of underlaid text, either partially or for a whole verse, is indicative of the same lack of familiarity. Four of the intabulations also include other verses of the song on the same or facing pages. Two of Lassus's works, the madrigal *Appariran per me* and the chanson *Quand mon mary vient* are intabulated with dashes and full text underlay as illustrated in Example 5.8.

4. **Ms. Lucca 774.**

Ms. Lucca 774 is an untidy and at first an unyielding manuscript, but it holds valuable information regarding intabulations. The volume, titled "Intavolatura di Leuto da

128. Ms. Turin IV. 43/2, fols.33v-34. Mod. ed. in Orlando di Lassus, Sämtliche Werke, ed. F.X. Haberl and S. Sandberger (Leipzig, 1894-), vol.8, p.25. See other lute intabulations: Brown (1568/2), no.22; Brown (1574/6), no.5; Brown (1584/3), no.2; Brown (1584/6), no.11.
EXAMPLE 5.8
Lassus, Quand mon mary vient

Ma rente est de'être battue, Ma rente est de'être battue, Ma rente est de'être battue, Ma rente est de'être battue, Ma rente est de'être battue, Ma rente est de'être battue, Ma rente est de'être battue, Ma rente est de'être battue, Ma...
Sonare e Cantare", contains a mixture of dances, intabulations, contrappunti to accompany "tenors of the Abbot" (the tenors are unfortunately not included) and untitled pieces. The book is actually three manuscripts of slightly different sizes bound together, in which two hands are apparent. In several places there are instructions to play a particular dance in the company of others, such as "Questo passo in mezo no[n] si puo suonare se no si suona in compagnia". Whether the "others" are dancers or musicians is not made clear. Another performance instruction is given in an inscription on folio 38v, informing us that a particular Corrente ballo francese is to be played, not danced to - "... sonarla, ma ballando non occorre".

Although the book is undated, the earliest model dates from 1574, and many originate from Giovanelli's Il Primo Libro delle Villanelle et Arie alla Napoletana, a tre voci, (1588). Two of the pieces, Quando mirai, and Non vedo hogg'il mio solo are also intabulated by Terzi. The fifteen intabulations of Ms.Lucca 774 are contained in the second and third manuscripts of the volume, and are all written by hand II. The most interesting aspect of this collection is that three distinctly different styles of notation are apparent within the intabulations:

(1) The first group of intabulations is written in lute tablature with the title written alongside or above the tablature, but without further text. It is apparent

---

131. fol.16. Another similar inscription appears on fol.13v.
131a One finds other interesting personal asides such as the inscription at the end of a bariera on folio 21 - "Questo e quel' loco dove il mio cor perduto quista [sic] colei", and on folio 14, a passamezzo carries the inscription, "Questo passo in mezo si suona quando uno va mia veglia con Christo!".
132. Terzi (1599) p.8 & p.52.
133. Bagn'a'Asciatto (fol.9v), (Tu) Ti parti cor mio caro (fol.9v), All'arme all'arme (fol.23v), L'amor e fatto (fol.31) and Occhi d'alma (fol.32).
that these pieces are intended to be lute solos because two of them — All'arme all’arme and Ti parte cor mio — are such loose paraphrases that they cannot possibly be song accompaniments (Example 5.9).

EXAMPLE 5.9

Azzaiolo, Ti parti cor mio caro

---

134. Ms. Lucca 774, fol. 9v. The Azzaiolo transcription is from C. V. Palisca, "Vincenzo Galilei and some links between 'Pseudo-monody' and Monody", MQ, vol. XLVI (1960), pp. 344-360. It could be of course that there is another source for this lute piece.
(2) Other intabulations are texted to varying degrees. Ancora che tu m'odii, for example, has only half a line of text underlaid, but the first verse and three others are given on the same page (Example 5.10b). Tutta gentile e bella however has no underlaid text, but the three verses are given on the same page (Example 5.10c). Of a different format again, Mi ha punto Amore has the first verse set beneath the tablature, while the remaining verses are presented below on the same page (Example 5.10a). Since the text is readily available to the singer in each case, these slightly different styles of presenting the text do not represent different performance practices, but are simply differences in notational style. Incidentally, the tablatures of both Ancora che tu m'odii and Tutta gentile e bella are so similar to the tablatures in Verovio's Ghirlanda di fioretti and Vincenti's Canzonette per cantare et sonar di liuto that they could well have been copied from either source.

(3) The third notational style of Ms.Lucca 774 is very similar to Galilei's "pseudo-mony" of Ms.Florence L.F.mus.2 (see below) in that mensural vocal lines and the tablature of the same piece are located in different sections of the manuscript. The mensural and tablature parts of Quando mirai are located on folios 42 & 44v and agree precisely, although a transposition level of a fifth is needed for either the lute or voice. Similarly, a vocal part of Occhi occhi dell'alma mia in mensural notation is located separately from the tablature (Example 5.10d). The mensural part in this case however is not the canto but the basso. It seems odd to find mensural parts for both canto and basso by the same hand within one manuscript.

EXAMPLE 5.10
Ms. Lucca 774 incipits.

(a) Giovanelli, *Mi ha punto Amore*

(b) Quagliato, *Ancora che tu m’odii*


Example 5.10 cont.

(c) Nanino, *Tutta gentile e bella* 140

(d) Giovanelli, *Occhi occhi dell’alma mia* 141

---


by William Porter. MacClintock has edited the whole manuscript in a "homophonic" style of transcription. \(^{143}\) The manuscript is signed and dated 1574 by the Florentine court musician Cosimo Bottegari and is estimated to have been continued until at least 1600. \(^{144}\) It contains intabulations almost exclusively (some of the *canzonette* being original), and each page of the manuscript is set out in the same way: the *canto* of each piece is given in mensural notation with the tablature arrangement of the work, and often there are additional directions to the soprano to pitch the first note of the song from a particular fret on the lute.

Bottegari's usual method of intabulating was to arrange the voices other than the *canto* into tablature, leaving out one or two of the parts where this was necessary to keep the lute arrangement simple. Most of *Nasce la pena mia* \(^{145}\) for example is reduced from the original six voices to three or four in the tablature. The arrangement is accurate, devoid of ornamentation, and consistent in its application of *musica ficta*. Two distinctly different intabulation styles are apparent in Bottegari's book: whereas in the intabulation of *Nasce la pena mia* the *canto* pitches are not duplicated, in *Anchor che col partire* \(^{146}\) the lute fully represents all four voices of the model, including the vocal line and adding a few cadential ornaments. We see the same doubling of the vocal line in *Se sciorre se vedrà* \(^{147}\) and *Giunto m'ha amor*. \(^{148}\) MacClintock does not recognize Bottegari's two intabulation styles, in spite of having copied and transcribed all of his intabulations. She wrongly

---

144. *ibid.*, p. 117.
145. Volume II, no. 16, p. 154. For a different transcription see MacClintock *op. cit.*, p. 120.
146. Volume II, no. 37, p. 279.
claims that Bottegari "gives the canto part to the voice and intabulates the other three or four parts ...". Bottegari's more polyphonically complete intabulations could easily serve as lute solos as well as song accompaniments, whereas the incomplete intabulations could be useful only as accompaniments.

6. Ms. Florence L.F. mus. 2. \(^{150}\)

The Florentine manuscript inserted into the back of a copy of Galilei's *Il Fronimo* is well documented by Claude Palisca who has also published a table of contents and incipits for the manuscript. \(^{51}\) He identifies this collection of "pseudo-monodies" as being mostly in Galilei's hand. All of the pieces are intabulations of vocal music, and most of them include a lute tablature arrangement on one page with the bass part in mensural notation facing it. The simple alignment in the manuscript of voice and tablature are not immediately apparent however, for as Palisca points out, the folios have been incorrectly bound into the book. \(^{52}\) This manuscript is an important link in the study of the intabulation genre in the extent to which the arrangements differ from Galilei's own printed intabulations. The manuscript version shows how Galilei performed these pieces, singing to his own lute accompaniment, whereas the printed versions are how he


151. See the two Palisca articles listed immediately above.
EXAMPLE 5.11
Palestrina, *Vestiva i colli seu*

Example 5.11 cont.
Example 5.11 cont.

1. wo. F#' for e'  
2. wls d' F#' a' in 1568 corrected to a c#' e' in 1584
preferred to present the music to his public. Two obvious
differences emerge from comparisons: first, in his printed
intabulations Galilei provided neither a mensural vocal part
nor text. Second, while Galilei's printed versions adhere
strictly to the original polyphony, the manuscript versions
do not. In the manuscript intabulation of Lassus's *Fiera
stella* and Palestrina's *Vestiva i colli* (Example 5.11),
the *canto* is largely omitted. In *Vestiva i colli* Galilei
included the *canto* line for three bars only and thereafter
excluded any *canto* pitch above $b'$. The 1568 and 1584
intabulations of this madrigal require the use of lutes
pitched in D to retain the pitch of the model (or
alternatively, a mental transposition of the model down a
fourth to accommodate an A lute). In the manuscript version
of this madrigal however, with an A lute no transposition
would be required to bring it into the same *basso* range as
the other manuscript pieces. In fact all of the songs in
Ms.Florence L.F.mus.2 are written to be accompanied by a
lute either in A or G (or, alternatively, using one lute
only, the vocal parts of some pieces could transpose up or
down a tone). In short, the manuscript intabulations clearly
accommodate the bass voice, whereas the printed versions do
not so readily.

7. **Ms.Florence Mag.XIX.109.**

Written in three different hands (not two as
MacClintock states,) the first section (fol.1-9v) of
*Ms.Florence Mag.XIX.109* contains 17 intabulations in
hand 1. These include lute tablature and a text on the

---

155. Ms.Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Fondo
Magliabechiano, XIX.109 (hereafter Ms.Florence
Mag.XIX.109). Literature: *RISM* E/VII, p.111; Becherini,
*op.cit.*, pp.44-45; C. MacClintock, "Notes on Four
Sixteenth-Century Tuscan Lutebooks", *JLSA*, vol.4,
pp.1-8.
156. MacClintock, *ibid.*, p.3.
Hand III: fols.15v-16v, 19-27, 53v-56, Hands II & III,
27v-35v.
same page (but not beneath the tablature as MacClintock implies). The arrangements, all for six-course lute, are very simple, and never venture beyond third position in the left hand. The second section of the manuscript, in a different hand (folios 10 to 35v), consists of dances and fantasias. The third and final section is a group of untitled solo lute pieces written in hand II and a third hand as well. The sectional compilation of the manuscript and the three hands suggest that the manuscript may have changed ownership several times, perhaps from one generation to another. The first section must have been started some time after 1570, since that is the date of publication of the earliest known models, with the following sections compiled later. An example given here, Se sciorre se vedră illustrates the literal nature of the intabulations. Since the text is not underlaid, but given separately on the same page, the intabulation could be used to accompany one of the voices, or the complete vocal ensemble. The tablature represents the polyphony in full, so there is no further clue as to its function.


Written in a single hand, Ms. Florence Mag. XIX.168 is dated 1582, though it may well have been started before this since the inscription occurs towards the end of the written part of the volume (folio 18v). Three of the intabulations of anonymous villanelle are presented with text beneath the tablature (Occhi leggiad’r’e, Vola vola pensier and Del crud’amor), and the other two intabulations, Rore’s Anchor che col partire and Cascarda’s Giunto m’ha amor, are without

158. MacClintock, op. cit., p. 3.
159. Volume II, no. 36, p. 275. For sources and concordances see Volume II, no. p.V.
text. The latter two arrangements represent the full polyphony very simply with no added ornamentation; indeed at times the original cadential ornaments are omitted. The opening of *Del crud'amor* (Example 5.12), is representative of the texted intabulations which are also literal and unornamented. The author of Ms.Florence Mag.XIX.168 treated the texted and untexted intabulations alike in a simple unornamented style, which was of course most suited to their unpretentious vocal models.

**EXAMPLE 5.12**

Anon, *Del crud'amor*

161. Ms.Florence, Mag.XIX, 168: *Occhi leggiad're cari*, fol.1v. (Other intabulations with this title are in Brown 1584/3, no.25 & Brown 1581/1, no.11). *Vola vola pensier*, fol.10v-11. (Other Italian lute intabulations in Brown 1584/6, no.54 & Ms.Brussels II/275, fol.51). *Del crud'amor*, fol.17v-18. (Other Italian lute intabulations in Brown 1584/6, no.47 (CTB only)). *Anchor che col partire*, fol.19v-20. (See Volume II, no.37, p.279 for transcription). *Giunto m'ha amor*, fol.15v-16. (Model is RISM 1583/15, other Italian lute intabulations in Brown 1563/7, no.22; Brown 1581/1, no.55; Ms.Modena C.311, fol.25 (mod.ed., C. MacClintock *The Bottrigari Lutebook*, (Massachusetts, 1965), pp.75-76.))

162. The vocal model of this simple *napolitana* is from Adriaensen's *Pratum Musicum* (Brown 1584/6) fol.54v. There is a German lute tablature arrangement by Krenkbel (Brown 1584/8) fol.B2v which is attributed to Jacob Regnart, but I have not had the opportunity to compare the two.
9. **Ms. Genoa VII/I.**

Ms. Genoa VII/I, a large undated manuscript, contains a repertoire very similar to those of Terzis's two books and Fallamero's *Primo Libro* of 1584. Dances and intabulations of vocal works are interspersed with each other throughout the book's 38 large folios. All of the intabulations are literal, and without text or other performance indications. We are informed on the front cover that the Marchese of San Sorlino (who was the brother of the Duke of Nemours), had kindly allowed the author of the manuscript to copy from his rarest tablatures:

Giardino da Intavolatura [sic] per il leuto delle più rare Madrigali et Vilanelle [sic] et Capriccio Brandi volte et Corante, Gagiarde, pas et mezzo che il Principe Il Sigr Marchese di San Sorlino fratello del Sigr Duca de Nemours mi ha fatto favore di lasciarmeli copiare sopra tutte le Sue più rare Intavolature.

The intabulations and dances of Ms. Genoa VII/I which were copied from these unknown sources are full of inaccuracies. Some of the copyist's mistakes have been corrected by hand, but many have not.

Joel Newman suggests that since the intabulations agree with many of those in Fallamero's *Libro Primo*, they may have been copied from that source. Although there are similarities, Ms. Genoa VII/I is clearly not a copy of the Fallamero book since there are important differences in musica ficta and details of ornamentation. Even more

---


conclusive is the evidence of Fallamero's missing half bars\textsuperscript{165} which are complete in Ms. Genoa VII/I. If further evidence should be needed to show that these two volumes are not directly related, the intabulations of Rore's \textit{Fera gentil} would provide it, for here Fallamero's lute is pitched to A (relatively speaking) and Ms. Genoa VII/I lute is in G.\textsuperscript{166} Surely a copyist would not bother to transpose, for if he or she had those skills there would have been no need to copy from another tablature in the first place.

10. \textit{Ms. London Add. 29247}.\textsuperscript{167}

Five lutebooks in Italian tablature belonging to the musician and collector Edward Paston (1550-1630), besides being an important source of Byrd's music, contain a large number of textless intabulations, in which the highest voice is generally omitted.\textsuperscript{168} McCoy argues convincingly that the presence of a text does not necessarily preclude instrumental performance, or vice versa. The absence of one or more of the upper voices, furthermore, is likely to indicate that at least one of the parts would have been sung. However, I disagree with McCoy's conclusion that the textless intabulations "suggest the existence of a hitherto undefined genre: the textless lutesong."\textsuperscript{169} The lutesong is one genre within the larger genre of intabulations of pre-existing vocal works. Whether the lutesongs carry a text or

\textsuperscript{165} See Volume II, no.16, b.10 (p.157) & b.29 (p.164).
\textsuperscript{166} Volume II, no.10, p.104.
\textsuperscript{168} McCoy, \textit{op.cit.}, p.221.
\textsuperscript{169} \textit{ibid.}, p.227.
not places them in different categories of notational practice, not of genre.\textsuperscript{170}

The intabulation of \textit{Vestiva i colli} in this manuscript (Example 5.11) starts with a bar's rest, which indicates that the role of the lute is to accompany the soprano from a set of partbooks. Furthermore, the \textit{canto} part is entirely absent from the tablature. The other voices are accommodated on a lute pitched in D, or alternatively the voice could transpose down a third or fourth to a lute in A or G.

11. Ms.Brussels II/275.\textsuperscript{171}

This is one of the largest and most easily deciphered manuscripts in Italian tablature. The first half of the collection contains dances and \textit{arie da cantare} such as the \textit{ruggiero} (fols 1-49) while the remainder of the book is devoted mainly to texted intabulations of vocal polyphonic music. The manuscript is so tidily arranged into sections of \textit{arie da cantare} and \textit{madrigali e napolitane} that one gains a strong impression of a well planned compilation copied from another source or sources over a relatively short period of time. Ms.Brussels II/275 stands in contrast with other manuscripts whose mostly haphazard arrangements result from a gradual compilation process over many years.\textsuperscript{172}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{170} C. MacClintock in "Notes on Four Tuscan Lutebooks", \textit{JLSA}, vol. 4 (1971), p. 5, makes a similar erroneous distinction between "songs" and "intabulations" within Ms. Florence Mag. XIX. 168. The pieces are in fact all intabulations, the so-called songs merely being texted intabulations.
\item \textsuperscript{171} Ms.Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique Ms. II/275 (Cavalcanti Lutebook) (hereafter, Ms.Brussels II/275). Literature: \textit{RISM} B/VII, p. 57-58.
\item \textsuperscript{172} Another notable exception to the usual haphazard process of manuscript compilation is the Capirola lute book, (c. 1517, facs.ed., Florence, 1981), compiled solely for the purposes of preserving the music of one composer.
\end{itemize}
The manuscript is dated and identified on folio 1 by the inscription, "Questo libro è di Raffaello Cavalcanti, Genaio 1590." The intabulations appear to be lute-song accompaniments rather than solos because the vast majority of the arrangements are texted, and carry a minimum of ornamentation. The texts are in each case set beneath the basso in such a way as to suggest that Raffaello Cavalcanti sang the bass part while accompanying himself on the lute.\(^{173}\) The lute tablature does not always preserve every voice of the original. Cavalcanti sometimes altered the voicing altogether, as in the introduction to Striggio's Nasce la pena mia, and from time to time he omitted the canto if those pitches were too high or too difficult to execute, or if their inclusion would detract from the bass part.\(^{174}\) It is clear that simplicity and the preservation of the bass was of the utmost importance in Cavalcanti's lute arrangements. Similarly, some original cadential ornaments are omitted in the tablature.\(^{175}\) On the other hand, if the bass needed support during a period of polyphonic inactivity in the other voices, Cavalcanti was not averse to adding an appropriate simple passaggio.\(^{175}\) However, the overall impression is one of simple accompaniment, for just as often he allowed periods of repose between phrases of the basso.\(^{177}\) (This is not to say of course that the lutenist may not have improvised at such points in the intabulation.)

No two intabulations in the manuscript are exactly alike technically. In the intabulation of Quando mirai\(^{178}\) for example, Cavalcanti took liberties not apparent in the

---

173. For examples see Volume II nos. 14 (p. 148), 16 (p. 154) & 37 (p. 279).
174. Volume II no. 16, b. 9 (p. 157).
175. See for example, Volume II, no. 37, b. 15 (p. 282), b. 17 (p. 283); no. 16, b. 21 (p. 161).
176. See for example, Volume II, no. 16, bb. 23-24 (p. 162) & b. 41 (p. 168).
177. ibid., bb. 29-30 (p. 164), b. 32 (p. 165), bb. 46-47 (p. 170), bb. 49-50 (p. 171).
above mentioned pieces, adding chords to the opening, altering the part-writing by octave transposition, and exchanging the relative positions of polyphonic voices. Thus the original polyphony is relegated to mere homophonic support for the voice, and sometimes in a way that makes nonsense of the part-writing. Terzi, in his intabulation of the same canzonetta, on the other hand, faithfully preserved the polyphony of the model even though the text was similarly set beneath the bass.

12. Ms. Como s.s.

We also know the name of the original owner of Ms. Como s.s from his inscription on the inside of the cover. Raimondo entitled his manuscript "Libro de Sonate Diverse di Pietro Paolo Raymondo Comasco, Luglio 1601". Little is known of Raimondo other than that he was nominated a Decurion in the city of Como in 1608, and died in 1647. Among the 58 dances and fantasias that make up the bulk of the collection are three intabulations of popular polyphonic works - Lassus's Susanne un jour, Striggio's Nasce la pena mia, and Palestrina's Vestiva i colli. Stylistically the intabulations of this manuscript sit apart from most manuscript intabulations in that they contain more passaggi than usual. The ornamentation however, is never as technically demanding as it is in a Terzi intabulation. In Nasce la pena mia for example, Terzi's ornamentation moves mostly in semiquavers, while Raimondo's is confined predominantly to quavers. He did not limited himself

179. ibid., b. 11, (p. 150).
182. Susanna del Cavaglierie (fol. 58v); Madrigale/Mai la pena mia (fol. 67v); Vestiva i colli (fol. 82v).
to Terzi's practice of including every voice of the model, but frequently simplified by omitting one or two voices. But unlike the texted intabulations of Ms. Brussels II/275, here the upper voice in the model remains the highest part in the lute tablature. Played on the lute the three above-mentioned intabulations give the impression of being solo lute works, tastefully ornamented. (See Vestiva i colli, Example 5.11). Raimondo took the opportunity to inject variety by adding further ornamentation into the repeated section in the model, in a style that is reminiscent of free fantasia. Furthermore, in both Nasce la pena mia and Susanne ung jour an ornate coda extends both intabulations in a postponement of the final cadence. If these works had been conceived of as vocal accompaniments, the instrumentalist would not have taken such liberties which would have been in direct competition with the singer (or singers). In the latter half of Susanne ung jour particularly, Raimondo clearly indicated his preference for retaining the pitches of the upper voice over the preservation of the whole polyphonic complex.

13. Ms. Naples 7664.\(^{184}\)

We know from inscriptions that this volume was begun in January 1607, and that one of the three contributors was Francesco Quartirone [Quartirone] from Lodi. Most of the tablatures are dances, but the few intabulations of the volume display yet further variety from those manuscripts discussed thus far. Along with one piece for guitar are eight pieces for the cittern (marked cetra in the manuscript) which as Dinko Fabris points out, is an instrument rarely catered for in Italian manuscripts.\(^{185}\)


185. Fabris, ibid., p.115.
EXAMPLE 5.13
Caccini, *Fillide mia.*

Example 5.13 cont.
Fabris numbers the contents by folio, but page numbers have been added to the volume some time after he published his findings, and so both numberings are given here.

In the second section of the manuscript are two different versions in Quartirone's hand of Caccini's *Fillide mia* from *Le Nuove Musiche* (Example 5.13). In both intabulations the placing of rhythm signs is often inaccurate. The version on folio 82v (p.164) is marked "Cetra" [cittern] but it is obvious from the tablature that it must be for lute. This textless intabulation concords reasonably closely with the model and except for the root position chord in bar 20 is an accurate continuo realisation of Caccini's bass. The vocal pitches are not incorporated into the tablature except where Quartirone considered it necessary for the sake of full harmony (bars 13-15 and 17-18). The other, more scanty version of Caccini's song found four pages further on (folio 84v/p.168) is underlaid with text. Here the scribe was less careful to keep the upper pitches of the tablature away from those of the canto, often sharing the melodic notes, but inconsistently. This version intabulates only the first half of the model, but at the beginning of bar 5 there is a mark of a circle and a line combined which could well signal a repeat of that section. The harmony of the second half of the song is very similar to bars 5-12, so the earlier section could easily serve as an *aide mémoire*, although the final cadence would need alteration. But why are there two similar versions of the same piece occurring so close to each other?\(^{187}\) The two versions are intabulated at the same pitch, so it is not in order to employ lutes of different sizes, or to accompany different voices that we have the two versions. Their existence is even more odd when it can be seen that the first version on folio 82v is superior to the later version on folio 84v.

---

187. Both versions share the same mistake in the first chord of bar 5, which suggests that the model was itself a manuscript copy.
Part Three. Conclusion

In a period when music printing was a new and rather expensive process, publishers devised ingenious ways of making the best available use of space. For this reason, part-book and choirbook formats were preferred to vocal score formats. Similar space-saving devices such as dashes within lute tablature to indicate vocal parts, and underlaid text without mensural vocal parts, spring from the same spirit of economy. It is for this reason too that Terzi's duets are not set out in score. One lutenist would have had to copy out one of the parts by hand (or buy another book), but successive presentation of the lute parts saves considerable space. Terzi's publishers did not make the choice, as some did, of setting the two parts out on facing pages, because the contrappunti parts invariably required twice the space of the other lute part. The enormous variety of formats and notational methods in lute music springs from the spirit of economy, but in addition, indicates a climate of the utmost versatility in performance practice. Clearly, if publishing houses could produce lute books containing music to be performed in a number of ways, and for lutenists of different abilities with a variety of musical tastes, then those publications stood more chance of being financially successful.

Returning to the questions posed at the beginning of this chapter, it seems reasonable to conclude that Terzi's intabulations headed in concerto signify inclusion within a predominantly instrumental ensemble. Because of likely conflict in the interpretation of tempo and ornamentation, it is most unlikely that the contrappunti intabulations would have been included within vocal ensembles. Where Terzi has written in concerto before "solo" intabulations such as the Maschera canzoni, the lute would be providing a rather ornate continuo accompaniment for "imperfect" melodic instruments working directly from the model. In the case of
the "duet" in concerto intabulations however, Terzi's rubrics do not seem to indicate inclusion of the more literal first-lute parts in a supporting continuo role within an instrumental ensemble. However, it is possible that both lutes may have played in the larger ensemble. Furthermore, the absence of directions for the literal intabulations generally, should not lead us to assume that they were always performed solo. There are reasons to believe that sixteenth-century instrumentalists treated tablature with the utmost flexibility and could have used them in a variety of situations. Similarly, other Terzi highly ornamented lute intabulations which did not carry specific performance instructions and which hitherto we have assumed to be "solos", may have been played in instrumental ensembles. Paintings of the period overwhelmingly demonstrate preference for the lute in ensembles of all kinds over solo performance, and we know from many sources, musical and non-musical, that renaissance music-making was in the main a group activity.188

188 The iconography of renaissance "concerts", could contribute significantly to this line of enquiry. I initially intended to include the results of such research begun in Italy in 1985, but it is too specialised and too vast a field to be dealt with in this dissertation. It is however an inviting and rewarding area for further research. For useful information see R. Leppert, "Concert in a House: Musical iconography and musical thought", EM vol. 7 (1979), pp.3-17; J. McKinnon, "Iconography", Musicology in the 1980s, Methods, Goals, Opportunities, eds. D.K. Holoman and C.V. Palisca, (New York, 1982), pp.79-93; H.M.Brown, "Instruments and Voices in the Fifteenth-Century Chanson" Current Thought in Musicology, (Texas, 1975), pp.89-138; H. M. Brown and J. Lascelle, Musical Iconography: A manual for cataloguing musical subjects in Western Art before 1800, (Harvard, 1972); P. Egan, "'Concert' Scenes in Musical Paintings of the Italian Renaissance", JAMS vol.14 (1961), pp.184-195; M. Southard, Sixteenth-Century Lute Technique, MA.diss.,
The *contrappunto* lute parts that Terzi gave with most of his *in concerto* intabulations do of course also allow the pieces to be played as duets. From the above survey of the style of lute duets throughout the century, it is clear that the most dominant duet style is that of one lute playing a supporting literal intabulation with another elaborating one or more polyphonic lines. This style is one that could lend itself readily to "partially-improvised" duets in which one lutenist reads from a literal intabulation while another improvises from the same tablature, or from one part of the vocal original or from memory. Even in those few arrangements where the two lutes duplicate the polyphony and alternate between ornamenting and giving harmonic support, one literal intabulation would suffice. Such suppositions can be made from the knowledge that the art of improvisation continued throughout the sixteenth century. Furthermore, it seems odd that the written duet repertoire is so small in a period when ensemble performance was the norm. It is perhaps pertinent that we are left with only a few examples in tablature of duets which divide the polyphony equally between the two players, since such a style is (in the absence of models in score) reliant upon written tablature parts for each player.

From the texted intabulations in lute prints, and from the wide variety of notational styles in manuscripts implying lute-song performance, it is clear that intabulations were often used to support a solo singer (who could of course have been the lutenist). That lute-song performances of intabulations are implicit more often in manuscripts than in printed lute books, points to the probability that lute-songs were more widely practised than has been hitherto thought. Whether the part to be sung was indicated by the underlay of text, by text on the same opening of the page, dashes within the tablature, or by mensural notation, the common factor in all of these arrangements is their simple, unornamented nature. Some intabulations, clearly intended to be song accompaniments, omit from the tablature the part to be sung or in some way simplify the original polyphony. A great many accompaniments however, include all the polyphony. Therefore we can assume that polyphonically incomplete intabulations must have accompanied a singer, whether the vocal part was supplied or not, but equally we can say that any literal intabulation is capable of accompanying a singer taking any one part of the model. By concluding therefore that Terzi's literal intabulations could have been played solo or as vocal accompaniments, and that highly ornate intabulations (apart from the contrapunti parts) could have been

189. An unusual intabulation, unlike any other discussed here, has been kindly drawn to my attention by H.M. Brown: Barberiis included an intabulation of Antoine Brumel's Vray dieu d'amors in his Intabolatura di Lauto, Libro Nono (1549) [fol.4], in which he transposed the tenor up an octave, above the other voices. It does not appear that this transformation was for the purpose of vocal accompaniment, rather, Brown writes, Barberiis "presents the tune [tenor] in its simplest form .... to give it a more prominent position in the polyphony, to make it sound, even on a chordal instrument, like the principal melody." (From a paper soon to be published; "The Importance of Sixteenth-Century Intabulations").
performed either solo or within an instrumental ensemble, we are provided with an explanation for the wide variety of style of Terzi's output.

From evidence in the part-book repertoire in general and from Ms. Verona 223 and Adriaensen in particular, it is evident that lutes were used to accompany more than one singer, and that several lutes could provide accompaniment for a vocal ensemble. It was of course in such a "continuo" role that the lute family was to excel from the beginning of the seventeenth century. But just as monody did not suddenly spring from intellectual inquiry in the Florentine Camerata of the 1580s alone, but had its forebears in the frottole arrangements of Bossinensis and in the lute-song intabulations, so too seventeenth-century chitarrone and theorbo continuo technique had its beginnings in sixteenth-century intabulations.

Those intabulations which in some way depart from the original structure are unlikely to have been performed in either vocal nor instrumental ensembles. However, the highly ornamented intabulations of Ms. Como s.s., in which the final cadence is extended in an "improvisation", or a paraphrase (Ms. Lucca 774) in which the structure of the model and the intabulation do not directly correspond, are surprisingly rare in the Italian lute repertoire. This small group of pieces is representative of the relatively slight emphasis the renaissance musician placed on solo performance, compared with group performance. Those intabulations which do agree structurally with their sources could have been performed in concerto. Otherwise, if flexibility of performance practice were not the aim, why would so many pieces have been printed in which the tablature and the model agree perfectly bar by bar (apart from mistakes by less competent intabulators)? As we have seen in chapter 4, Terzi, for one, made considerable effort to give musica ficta interpretations that would stand up to any
contemporary polyphonic analysis, and would therefore fit within a vocal ensemble.

It would be wrong to assume that intabulations were not played solo for the purpose of private amusement, for clearly there was plenty of material available for just that purpose, and the variety from simple to highly ornate intabulations would have assisted such private study. If the emphasis in this chapter has been on the ensemble possibilities of the genre, this was simply to counteract an assumption hitherto made by many present-day lutenists, that the genre is a largely redundant collection of solos of little interest to the performer.
CHAPTER SIX

THE CONCEPT OF IMITAZIONE

Part one. Imitazione in the Arts

The following discussion of the renaissance philosophy of imitazione attempts to place intabulation, as an imitative art, within an intellectual environment which fostered the practice. Consideration of the place of imitation in the visual, literary and musical arts goes some way towards placing the function of intabulation in perspective. In turn, intabulations offer a wealth of perspective on the use of borrowed material in other genres such as the fantasia.

USE OF CLASSICAL MODELS

The concept of imitation (imitazione, mimesis, imitatio) in the arts is central to renaissance philosophy and traditions and is inextricably linked with renaissance man's view of his culture and his self-conscious awareness of a modern art movement. Along with the renaissance artist's veneration of the classical arts grew a disregard by many for works of the immediately preceding centuries. A belief that studying the arts of antiquity would lift sixteenth-century man out of centuries of artistic and

1. In the discussion to follow, the Italian term imitazione is usually used in preference to the Latin imitatio, or "imitation" which has other musical connotations.
intellectual unenlightenment was expressed by Vincenzo Galilei when he wrote that he "would like to aid the world not a little to escape from the darkness in which it has been enveloped" since the passing of antiquity. Much earlier, Francesco Petrarca (1304-1374), acutely aware of differences between his age and that of the ancients, voiced a similar hope that "this slumber of forgetfulness" would soon be dispelled and that man would be able "to walk forward in the pure radiance of the [ancient] past". The sixteenth-century art historian Giorgio Vasari (1511-1574), similarly derided artistic endeavours before 1250, after which time, he said, "heaven took pity on the talented men who were being born in Tuscany and led them back to pristine forms." Helped by "some subtle influence in the very air of Italy" artists were able "once again to imitate the works of antiquity as skilfully and carefully as they could".

Renaissance renewal of interest in the ancient arts and philosophy unearthed Aristotle's theory of *mimesis*, which in turn lead to the justification and nurturing of *imitazione* practices in all the arts. From the middle of the sixteenth century, after the dissemination of translations of the *Poetics*, Aristotle's theories had such an impact on the arts that not only did it become desirable to relate new works to those of the ancients, it actually became obligatory to do so.

5. *Poetics* was published by Giorgio Valla in 1498 but did not have an impact on the renaissance intellect until the publication of mid-sixteenth-century commentaries by Vettori (1560), F. Robertello (1548), B. Segni (1549), and V. Maggi (1550). See C. Palisca, *Girolamo Mai; Letters to Vincenzo Galilei and Giovanni Bardi*, AIM (Rome, 1960), pp. 40-48.
In the plastic arts, while every artist was concerned with the imitation of nature, some also placed great importance on the imitation of specific details from classical antiquity. Imitating the art of antiquity had not been universal in the fifteenth century, even though the influence of Aristotle's philosophy had begun some two hundred years previously. The novelty of imitazione is illustrated by one of the better documented early research expeditions into ancient architecture and sculpture, undertaken in Rome by Donatello (1386-1466) and Filippo Brunelleschi (1377-1446). Their studies were so unusual for the early years of the fifteenth century that the Roman citizens, who were only interested, according to Vasari, in the fashionable "barbarous German style", thought that Donatello and Brunelleschi "studied geomancy in order to discover buried treasure". By the late sixteenth century, classicism was accepted as the final authority. By this time the mannerist painters were ideologically opposed to the influence of classical antiquity in theory, but in practice the ancients were still quoted as authorities whose example must be followed.

Where renaissance musicians differed from visual and literary artists was of course that they did not have classical models from which to work, apart from the three hymns of Mesomedes. It is not surprising therefore to find that music theorists disagreed on speculative details of ancient music. What they all had in common however was a desire to express, through various means, the effects [effetti] of Greek music. Music theorists had shown interest in classical antiquity from the thirteenth century onwards,

6. Vasari, op. cit., pp.139-140.
but it was predominantly through Boethius's *De Institutione Musica* (c.500) that knowledge of the ancients was gained. Most allusions to ancient authors were actually culled from Boethius, and it was not until the writings of Franchino Gafori (1451-1522) that the virtual monopoly of Boethius was broken. In his constant search for truths of the past Gafori revealed previously unknown Greek writings on music. In *De harmonia musicorum instrumentorum* (1508) he mentions that he had Latin translations made from the treatises of Aristotle, Quintilianus, Ptolemy, and other Greek theorists. D.P. Walker in his articles on musical humanism thoroughly documented the varying degrees to which humanists sought truth from ancient writings. He points out that besides Vincenzo Galilei, scholars such as Pontus de Tyard, Girolamo Mei and Giovanni Battista Doni were disillusioned with the political and intellectual climate of the end of the sixteenth century and wished to revive the ancient artistic values which they considered to be vastly superior. Other humanists - Franchino Gafori, Giovanni Artusi, Francesco Salinas and Pietro Cerone - took a scholarly interest in ancient music but did not consider reforming their music, while a third group - Heinrich Glareanus, Nicola Vicentino, Gioseffo Zarlino and Marin Mersenne - admitted to the need for some reform, yet considered modern music to be in many ways superior to earlier music. Along with prolific (and often fruitless) argument among sixteenth century theorists on the possible interpretations of the Greek modes and the diatonic, chromatic and enharmonic genera, went enquiry into the best manner in which to attain the "effect" of Greek music. It was in this enquiry particularly that Galilei made such a lasting contribution to the history of music.


It was, as Galilei saw, the spirit of classicism, rather than the attempt to copy literally (an example of which was Vicentino's misguided attempt to revive the ancient genera), which was the main source of inspiration in humanist thought. It was rare for a sixteenth-century visual artist to be as literal as the architect Giovanni Lomazzo (1538-1600), for whom the mere copying of details of Roman architecture replaced the use of the imagination.11 Generally it was believed, though, that mere copying would produce a dead replica, as Castiglione's argument for the use of Latin in literature illustrates:

And when we refer to the language of the ancient world all we mean is the usage of the ancient world in its language. It would be foolish to love the language of the classical world for no other reason than to want to speak as was the custom then rather than as we do now.12

IMITATION OF CONTEMPORARIES

As the practice of imitating the ancients became more accepted during the course of the Renaissance, it also became acceptable to extend the concept of imitazione to include the imitation of contemporary masters. In the visual arts this was in part an inevitable product of the guild apprenticeship system which was further justified by citing the imitation practices of the ancients themselves. There was no shame attached to imitating contemporary artists; the Venetian painter Giorgione da Castelfranco (1476/8-1510) for instance was so attracted by Leonardo's colour and tone techniques that according to Vasari, he "based his own work on it and imitated it above all in his oil paintings", unashamedly admitting to doing so.13 The next generation of

artists in fact declared that they learned more from other painters than they did from nature.\textsuperscript{14} Imitation of contemporaries was a justifiable practice in the literary arts too. Bernardino Daniello in \textit{La Poetica} (1536) for instance emphasised the classical concept that the matter of all literature was common property as much in his day as in that of Homer and that anyone had the right to use what he wanted of it.\textsuperscript{15} In music the belief was the same. Brown cites a fascinating example of a sixteenth-century composition student’s efforts to build a new work on a model of \textit{Vivent vivent en payx tous loyaux pastoureaux} as evidence that "composers as well as poets and painters learned their craft by imitating older masters."\textsuperscript{16}

Learning artistic skills through imitation of contemporary art is a method not at all foreign to today’s teaching methods. Music students are still given models of Palestrina, Bach and Mozart to emulate, and the aims then as now remain the same, namely to assimilate the model’s techniques, to reinterpret the material by means of the fruits of one’s experience, and develop an individual style. To improve on the model was the ultimate aim in the use of \textit{imitazione} in the arts and it is in these terms that Vasari praises Michelangelo highly. He tells the story of how Michelangelo, apprenticed to Domenico Ghirlandaio, took an ink drawn copy of the master’s work, and using a thicker pen, "went over the contours of one of the figures and brought it to perfection."\textsuperscript{17}

The incorporation of the best of the work of contemporaries was easily rationalised by the precedent of

\textsuperscript{14} Blunt, \textit{op. cit.}, p. 138.
\textsuperscript{17} Vasari, \textit{op. cit.}, p.328.
Classical practice. It was suggested by the authors Bernardo, Parthenio, Giraldi, Quintilian, Isocrates, Daniello, and Minturno that to learn the art of writing, the student must choose models from Greek authors, but also the best from contemporary Latin authors. Quintilian said that "from the study of these [contemporary] authors, and of others worth reading, one should acquire a copious vocabulary, a variety of metaphors, and a method of composition, then attention should further be given to the copying of all their good qualities."18 The identical philosophy is echoed by the sixteenth-century writer Bernardino Parthenio in *Della Imitazione Poetica* (1560):

> By assiduously studying the works of the perfect writer, and by practice in imitating him, we can gradually through our efforts reach a stage at which the right words with beautiful conceits will come of themselves to our pen from memory, so that we eventually become involuntary and conscious imitators.19

The idea that Parthenio is expressing is essentially the three-fold classical ideal of "following, reinterpretation and emulation".20 The first stage of learning involves gathering together the best features of a model, borrowing phrases, sentences and paragraphs without seeking to improve on the model but with the aim of assimilating techniques and elements of the language of the particular art. In the second stage the aim is to express an old idea in the spirit of the day, supplementing the material with the fruits of one's experience.21 Here it is not sufficient to copy the masters unceasingly.

---

20 Other terminology in use is "following, imitatio and aemulatio" or "transformative, dissimulative and eristic" classes (G. W. Pigman III, "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance", *RQ*, vol. 33 (1980), pp. 1-32), and "selection, reinterpretation, improvement" (White, *op. cit.*, pp. 9-11).
Rather, the aim is to invest the work with enough originality to make it one's own and to make it at least as good a work of art as the model. Finally, in the third stage of artistic progress, with an injection of artistic rivalry, the model is alluded to, but with the hope of surpassing it gloriously. The work must display originality, but the relationship between the new work and the model must not be disguised so much that the "audience" does not recognise the victory over the model.  

For composers a healthy spirit of emulation is particularly evident in the parody mass, well established by the beginning of the sixteenth century, but in addition we have documentation of emulation in examples of pupils seeking to out-rival their masters. One such rivalry was between Zarlino the teacher and Galilei the pupil which began with Galilei writing a compendium to Zarlino's *Le Istitutioni Harmoniche* (1558). Galilei's subsequent theories in *Dialogo della Musica Antica et della Moderna* (1581) surpassed Zarlino's and sparked the famous heated argument between the two theorists. Furthermore, Haar notes that "Costanzo Porta set out to rival his great master Willaert; that Baccusi during his years at Mantua did all he could to perfect himself in emulation of his colleague Wert; and that Tiburtio Massaino, having met Baccusi in Venice, modelled his compositional activities on the latter's work." We need only look at one of the most popular Italian madrigals, Rore's *Anchor che col partire*, to find examples of emulation in practice. As well as numerous lute and keyboard intabulations and didactic elaborations, several composers wrote vocal parodies on Rore's madrigal. For example Perissone Cambio, a singer at San Marco used the
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madrigal as a model for his four-voiced madrigals dedicated to the printer Gaspara Stampa, and in a famous parody Andrea Gabrieli (1570) rearranged it as a three-voiced "Giustiniana" to be sung by three trembling and stuttering men. The parody, which is not confined to the poetic text only, is according to Einstein "hardly less artistic than its serious model". Other vocal parodies were written by Orazio Vecchi in his Amfiparnasso (1597), in Fiorino's Nobilità di Roma (1571), and in Caimo's Il Primo Libro de Madrigali a quatro voci (1564). We cannot know for sure, Brown suggests, whether such imitation paid homage to a composer, or whether it was intended to demonstrate superior expertise. Nonetheless the two impulses are closely related.

The concept of plagiarism, although it existed for renaissance artists, was rarely applied to those who openly practised imitazione. The attitude then was very different from today when greater importance is attached to individuality. Well into the sixteenth century, translations from Greek or Latin were considered to be new works of art. This interpretation of originality finds a precedent in Roman writers who considered a Latin translation from the Greek to be worthy of the same honour as that awarded to the original author. That is not to say that there were no instances in the Renaissance of an artist claiming borrowed material as his own. Indeed, to put one's name to someone else's work or to incorporate large sections of a work without attempting to rework the material was liable to receive the label plagio from contemporary artists. However,

26. ibid., p. 374.
29. White, op. cit., cites examples of this in Roman literature, p. 12.
there was a thin dividing line between emulation and plagiarism which then as now compounded the difficulty of discerning between the two. Sometimes the sheer skill displayed in the act of copying a work, in the visual arts at least, was regarded highly enough to transcend the concept of plagiarism. This is illustrated by an incident in which Michelangelo purposely sold his new sculpture "Sleeping Cupid" as a genuine antique. When the mistake was discovered, rather than receive derision for his deception, Michelangelo was highly praised for his skill.  

We need to take care therefore that we do not impose our concept of plagiarism upon behaviour that may have been perfectly acceptable, or indeed cherished, in the Renaissance. The work of music theorist Pietro Cerone for example has received much derision from scholars from the nineteenth century onwards, because he barely acknowledged that a great deal of his material was borrowed from Zarlino. To call his work plagiaristic though would be historically inaccurate, since it would have been perfectly acceptable within the intellectual environment of the period to summarize and represent ideas, even of one's contemporaries. Galilei provides a further example of apparent plagiarism which has inspired differing responses from modern scholars. For the Dialogo della musica antica et della moderna (1581), Galilei relied very heavily on the letters he received from Girolamo Mei, to whom Galilei gave very little credit for his original research - a behavior which Walker interprets as entirely dishonest.

the other hand points out that "there is no better tribute a
disciple could pay his teacher than to publish his master's
doctrines" and that Mei was "aware that Galilei was using
the material in his letters for a book" and undoubtedly
approved of him doing so.  

IMITATION OF NATURE

A philosophy of imitazione central to the visual arts,
and one which influenced the other arts, was the imitation
of nature (imitazione del soggetto della Natura). To imitate
nature was of course a natural impulse and a necessary
practice in the visual arts, so it is not surprising to find
the practice rationalised. Springing not from expediency
alone, but from a guiding force of the time - naturalism -
imitation of nature assumed an importance even higher than
that of other forms of imitation and was intended to replace
imitation of the ancients during the course of an apprentice
artist's training. There is of course little that nature
offers the composer for direct imitation. Nonetheless, music
theorists such as Zarlino attempted to place music within
the general philosophy of imitazione del soggetto della
Natura through such ideas as the "senario", and equating the
four voices CATB with the four elements and four seasons.
Just as the painters of the period strived to learn from
nature, so music theorists attempted to explain the laws of
music in terms of natural laws as they understood them, and
to place music alongside painting as an art imitating
nature. Of course ideas of numerology, number-mysticism, and
the ideal of a mathematical universe are not unique to the
Renaissance, but were already evident in the works of Plato.
The adoption of such ideas in the sixteenth century must be

33. Palisca, op. cit., pp. 75-76.
34. A. Hauser, The Social History of Art, Renaissance,
seen therefore as a manifestation of *imitazione* of ancient philosophy.\(^{35}\)

The musical conception of the imitation of nature was seen from three viewpoints. One saw nature as the sum total of objects, another as an organisation that acted according to a system of laws and yet another as an expression of the simple emotions and passions of life.\(^{36}\) But as Carapetyan suggests, it was only in the imitation of the words (*imitazione delle parole*) that the composer had a compositional equivalent of the natural objects available to the painter.\(^{37}\) Galilei and Vicentino upheld the ideal of imitating the text as a whole rather than that of figural representation of individual words. Galilei in particular deplored attempts to imitate single words or images "literally", and in monody was able to imitate the text by basing the rhythms on those of poetry and speech, and by illustrating the affections by the use of low, middle or high registers within a narrow range.\(^{38}\) By subjugating music to the text Galilei aimed to attain the emotional effects reported in the Greek writings. This theory was to have a direct influence on musical expression and was probably, as Carapetyan suggests, the first time that the search for expressiveness combined with neo-classical ideas of music and drama had become a force in the development of a new style.\(^{39}\)

---


For Vicentino too, music should imitate the mood of a text in terms of tempo and expression:

... Because music is made on words it is made only in order to express the concept, the feelings and the effects of these by means of harmony. If the words speak of modesty then the composition will proceed modestly and not furiously, and when they speak of joy the music must not to be made sad, and if [the words speak] of sadness, joyful music must not to be composed.40

He also suggested that composers consider the pronunciation of the words in the language of the text, placing long notes on long syllables, and short notes on short syllables, a practice which was the speciality of the Pléiade group in France:

Many composers in their compositions tend to use a certain idiosyncratic method of composition without considering the nature of the words, nor their accents, nor which syllables are long and which short, both in the vernacular and in Latin. According to the practice and rules of the Latins and Tuscans the long and short pronunciations are to be observed, since if in French or Spanish or German, (for example), their long syllables were pronounced short, and the short long, their respective nation would laugh at such a pronunciation.41

40. ... perché la musica fatta sopra parole, non è fatta per altro se non per esprimere il concetto & le passioni & gli effetti di quelle con l'armonia; & se le parole parleranno di modestia, nella composizione si procederà modestamente, & non infuriato; & d'alegrezza, non si facci la musica mesta, e se di mestitìa, non si componga allegra. Nicola Vicentino, L'Antica Musica ridotta alla Moderna prattica (Rome, 1555), facs.ed. (Basel, 1959), Chapter p.29, fol.86.

41. Molti Compositori che nelle loro compositioni attendono à far un certo procedere di compositione à suo modo, senza considerare la natura delle parole, ne i loro accenti, ne quali sillabe siano lunghe ne brevi, così nella lingua volgare come nella latina: & secondo l'uso & le regole de i Latini & de Toscani se dè osservare le pronuntie lunghe e brevi, (in esempio) come se nella lingua Francese, & Spagnuola, et Tedesca, le sillabe loro lunghe fussero pronuntiate brevi, & le brevi lunghe, la natione loro riderebbe di tal pronunzia. ibid., fol.85v.
Not only did *imitazione* pertaining to the text pervade the composer's art, the performer too was expected to practice *imitazione* in the execution of a piece - the more extreme humanists being in favour of histrionic performance. Vicentino advised that the singer should imitate the nature of the composition with his or her voice, modifying the tempo and tone according to the mood of the text.

**DISEGNO INTERNO**

The eventual realization that *musica theorica* had failed to imitate nature through number symbolism, corresponded with the late sixteenth-century painter's gradual shift away from the imitation of nature toward *disegno interno* - the imperfect reflection of *Natura* within the artist. The term *disegno interno* was first used by the painter Federico Zuccaro (1540-1609) who argued that everything derived ultimately from an imperfect reflection of the divine within an individual. He attacked the belief that painting copies nature but held that the idea was in the artist's mind - the proper object, he said, of imitation. Holding a similar view earlier in the century, the writer Gian Francesco Pipo wrote in a letter (1512) to Pietro Bembo that artistic creation consisted of two elements in equilibrium - *imitazione* and the inspiration and instincts of the soul - thus admitting to the contribution of the artist's imagination. Vasari too admitted that in choosing from nature according to personal judgement rather than rational measurement, the artist may have been improving upon nature. "In talking of the artists of the Quattrocento he says: 'In proportion there was wanting a

43. See this volume, Chapter 5, fn. 112.
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certain correctness of judgement, by means of which their figures, without having been measured, might have, in due relation to their dimensions, a grace exceeding measurement'.\footnote{46} Zarlino, in the course of arguing against an idea of Galilei's that the voice can be corrected (in terms of intonation) by instruments, also mentions in passing the painter's predilection for improving upon nature's design of the human form.

And if indeed (as the Philosopher remarks) the Artist sometimes corrects the defects of Nature in many details and [if] that imperfection and that defect observed in the natural object is simply found or extracted from Nature rather than Art, he then simply corrects such defects in the manner shown him by his Mistress [Natura] on which art depends and of which Art is, so to speak, the instrument.... [But] that person would be considered mad and deprived of wisdom who wanted to think of correcting the instrument of the voice, made by stupendous Nature, by means of the instrument made by artisans.\footnote{47}

\footnote{46. Blunt, \textit{op.cit.}, p.91.}
\footnote{47. Et se ben l'Artefice spesse fiate (come auisa il Filosofo) sopplisse in molte cose à i diffetti di essa Natura; tuttavia quella imperfettione & quel diffetto, ch'ei stima esser nella cosa Naturale, non lo imparò, ne cavò semplicemente dall'Arte, ma dalla Natura; onde corregge semplicemente cotali diffetti; aiutato da i modi mostratogli come da sua Maestra, dalla quale L'Arte dipende, & è quasi come suo Istrumento .... così sarebbe riptato pazzo & fuor di senno colui, che volesse pensare col mezo de gli Istrumenti fatti da gli Artefici, di corregger l'Istrumento della Voce. fabricato dalla stupenda Natura; Gioseffo Zarlino \textit{Supplimenti musicali} (Venice, 1588), facs. ed., (Ridgewood, 1966), p.23-24. This differs from James Haar's interpretation of Capitolo VI that Zarlino is suggesting that musicians can correct the natural sound of the voice through the use of instruments, just as painters can correct defects in the human form. In fact the exact opposite would seem to be the case; See J. Haar, "A Sixteenth-Century Attempt at Music Criticism" \textit{JAMS}, vol.36, (1983), p.201}
Disegno interno was essentially a corruption of the philosophy of imitazione della Natura rationalised by Neoplatonic metaphysics and resulting in, or at least justifying, the distortions associated with mannerist art.  

A seemingly dissimilar interpretation of "imitation", meaning the imitation of one musical point by another in a composition can be embraced by the concept of imitazione del soggetto della Natura, given that the soggetto has its origin in "nature-given" musical instincts. Certainly this is what Zarlino had in mind when he said:

It is true that we should imitate Nature in this and in all things, in whose workings one can see much orderliness. Thus if we observe motion in Nature, we shall see that it is somewhat slower in its start than in mid-course or at the end; as one can see in a stone, the motion of which when dropped is without doubt faster at the end than at the beginning. Let us therefore imitate Nature by proceeding in such a manner that the movement made by the contrapuntal voices is not very fast at the outset. We should also observe this in the middle and end of each [contrapuntal] part, whenever that part begins to sing after some rests.

---

49. ibid., p.186.
50. Et veramente in ciò & in ogn'altra cosa dobbiamo imitar la Natura, il cui procedere si vede esser molto regolato; conciosia che se noi haveremo riguardo alli Movimenti naturali, ritrovaremos, che sono ne i loro principj alquanto più tardi, di quello, che non sono nel mezo & nel fine; come si può vedere in una Pietra, che sia lasciata cadere dall'alto al basso; della quale il Movimento è più veloce, senza dubio, nel fine, che non è nel principio. Imitaremos adunque la Natura & procederemo in tal maniera, che li Movimenti, che faranno le parti dellì Contrapunti non siano molto veloci nel principio; il che osservaremos etiando [sic] nel mezo & nel fine di ciascuna parte, quando dopo le Pause incomincieranno à cantare ... G. Zarlino, Istitutioni Harmoniche, (Venice, 1558), facs. ed. (Ridgewood, 1966), Terza Parte, Cap.46, p.238. This passage of Zarlino was first brought to my attention by J. Haar, "Zarlino's definition of Fugue and Imitation", JAMS (1971), p.240.
Part two. *Imitazione* and the lute.

PEDAGOGY

At least seven writers for the lute or vihuela recommended intabulation for the purpose of learning the art of fantasia, diminution, and improvisation.\(^5\) This was an age when players of the harmonic instruments increasingly required a training in the techniques of contrapuntal writing, and when the increasing complexity of music placed more demands on a lutenist's technique. For the purpose of learning the art of improvising or composing fantasias, nothing it seems could teach the required skills better than making and playing intabulations of good polyphonic music.

Bermudo recommended that the vihuela student intabulate villancicos, not for their musical value, for he wrote that they "do not have a very good basis in music", but rather for "developing and acquiring a good style of fantasia". He warned players against starting their training by learning fantasias, as this would result in a bad style.\(^5\) Five years later the Spaniard Sancta Maria in *Arte de Tañer Fantasia* gave five reasons why musical benefit can be derived from the setting of vocal pieces:

---


1. to understand the imitation of voices,
2. to note whether a voice enters before, after, or during a cadence,
3. to note and remember the types of cadences,
4. to note the types of consonances and dissonances,
5. to note all the variations (diferencias) made in imitations.  

The German theorist Sebastiani recommended that the young instrumentalist play a mass or motet, and toward its conclusion improvise a fantasia using the same points of imitation. Fuenllana too credited the practice of intabulation with teaching him the skills of composition:

... he who does not enjoy studying transcriptions will find fantasias with which to satisfy his ear and better to train his hands. Although in this, my opinion is that whoever wishes truly to learn music always trains himself in studying and transcribing composed works since true profit is to be obtained from them. And if the fantasias I present in this book have some fragrance of composition, I confess the cause to be [my] having seen and transcribed [for vihuela] many works of excellent authors.  

In contrast with Fuenllana, the theorists Ortiz and Ganassi were less concerned with learning the art of fantasia but recommended the study of vocal music for learning the art of ornamentation. Hence their aims may seem to be at variance with writers concerned with the lute and vihuela, but in fact Ganassi and Ortiz were concerned with the training of those very skills necessary for the invention of fantasia, namely, ornamentation, diminution,

and counterpoint. Ortiz, at least, equates original composition with ornamentation, for he refers to the ricercare as a series of florid counterpoints over a cantus firmus, or as the playing of diminutions on a single voice of a vocal work. While Sebastiani, Fuenllana, Sancta Maria and Bermudo all expected improvised fantasia to come after the study or performance of intabulation, Ortiz's treatise was devoted, not to fantasia, but to the art of either adding voices to a polyphonic composition or ornamenting an existing melodic line. It is clear that the purpose of using polyphonic compositions in such ways is didactic. The few theorists who do discuss intabulation, unanimously recommend that the student absorb the storehouse of motives, cadences and turns of phrase of polyphonic music, which can subsequently be used in creative composition.

INTABULATION, FANTASIA AND IMITAZIONE

Clearly, the treatises attest to the fantasia's debt to intabulation, but how close a connection can we see between the two genres, and in turn with the theory of imitazione? It seems feasible to regard the three main varieties of intabulation and fantasia composition as expressions of the three-fold process of *imitazione*. It must be more than coincidence that the concepts of "following, reinterpretation, and emulation" so aptly represent the techniques of "literal intabulation, glosa, and parody-fantasia" respectively. The making of literal intabulations, apart from their musical value, was clearly regarded as a useful didactic exercise in the assimilation of the techniques of musical language without attempting to improve on the model. In the *glosa* an "old idea" is supplemented with new material from the intabulator's experience, and in the parody-fantasia an essentially original work alludes to

56. Brown 1553/3; Brown 1542/2; Slim, op. cit., p. 417.
a model with the aim of either paying homage to a composer
or of attempting to surpass the model.

1. Highly Ornamented Intabulations

Some intabulations are enlivened with so much new
ornamental figuration that they fall midway between mere
arrangements and new compositions. Indeed, some very ornate
intabulations may be considered to be fantasias upon
borrowed harmonic structures. A category from the Spanish
repertoire which serves as a comparison with the elaborate
Italian lute intabulation is the **glosa**. Ward's definition of
the **glosa** as a "free enlivening, by means of diminution, of
borrowed vocal music" aptly describes many of Terzi's
intabulations. In an earlier publication Ward spoke more
specifically of the **glosa** as a "transformation of the
borrowed music by means of continuous diminution, changing
not only the character of the original, but also sacrificing
the discant melody to the abstract figuration". This would
describe Terzi's highly ornamental intabulations, were it
not that in a sense the discant melody is preserved. As we
have seen in Chapter 3 the basic outline of the discant is
usually kept intact, for even when it carries ornamental
figuration, the original pitches remain in a prominent
audible position within the ornament. This is true even in
the two intabulations marked **con passaggi** and **à modo di
viola bastarda**. Ward thinks of Terzi's **contrapunti** not as
being like **glosas** (although they are quite similar in style
to Ortiz's **glosas** on Arcadelt's *O felici occhi miei* and
Sandrin's *Doulce memoire*) but as figural variations where

---

57. Ward, *op. cit.*, p. 86. Unfortunately, the Italians did
not have a specialized term like **glosa** for highly
ornate arrangements of borrowed vocal music.
58. J.M. Ward, "The Use of Borrowed Material in 16th-Century
59. For example, Volume II, nos. 1, 4, 8, 11, 12.
60. Volume II, nos. 16 & 18.
61. D. Ortiz *Tratado de glosas sobre clausulas* (Rome,
1553), partial facs. ed (Basel, 1967), pp. 73-75 & 90-93
Terzi weaves ornamental figuration around harmonic structures without attempting to preserve the original melodic structure. The contrappunti really are in a category of their own since they are paired with another lute (or other instruments) which preserves the original structure to a large extent. If one was to add to Ward's first-quoted definition of the glosa as a "free enlivening, by means of diminution, of borrowed vocal music", that the melodic structure of the model is preserved, we would have a working definition of Terzi's highly ornamented intabulations.

It is clear in the very ornate intabulations that the borrowed music is transformed, and the character of the original changed. Just as a translation of a literary work from the Latin was considered to be a new work, in the same cultural environment the highly ornamented intabulation would surely have been thought of as an original work. Certainly Terzi's contain so much new figuration that they may be considered reinterpretations of the original. In an intabulation such as that of Striggio's Nasce la pena mia in which the model merely acts as a harmonic structure on to which endless passaggi are grafted, Terzi has most definitely imposed his individuality upon an old idea. To borrow the words of Isocrates, he is setting forth "events of recent date in a new fashion." Furthermore, Terzi's contrappunti elaborations have so thoroughly transformed the original vocal works into virtuosic instrumental pieces that one could grant that he has surpassed the original concept. In these pieces, though, one lute performs the original madrigal in its unadorned state, and so, the relationship with the vocal work remains clear. In other words, in the

---

64. Quoted from Panegyricus in White, op. cit., p. 10.
creation of a new work the relationship between it and the model is not so disguised that the victory cannot be recognised.

2. The parody-fantasia

The parody-fantasia in which short sections or particular melodic features of a vocal model are interwoven with original material is less common in the lute repertoire than the highly ornate intabulation. Terzi did not admit to parroting works of other composers in his fantasias, and no parodies have so far been identified. Nonetheless a short discussion of the genre usefully illustrates the philosophy of imitazione in practice. Ward's research in this field has provided scholars with an often quoted definition of parody technique as "free (often random) variation of an autonomous thematic complex." He adds that this definition does not embrace monophonic themes in cantus firmus arrangements (such as La Spagna), nor the "great skeletal patterns of the 16th century". He also points

65. Of course there may be more lute parodies than we think: our current assumption that most seemingly original fantasias are not parodies, may be proved wrong in many cases; indeed, previously unknown examples of parody have been discovered. Ward for one mentions a discovery by Lowinsky that the opening section of Master Newman's Fancy draws on Marco Antonio (Cavazzoni) da Bologna's Salve Virgo. Ward further identifies other borrowing in the fantasias of Albert da Ripa, Mudarra, Cabezón and Narváez. ("Parody Technique in Sixteenth-Century Instrumental Music", The Commonwealth of Music in honor of Curt Sachs, ed. Gustave Reese and Rose Brandel, (New York, 1965), p.222.)

66. "Parody" is a term that has come under attack in recent years because the factual historical basis for its use is slight. However, until an acceptable substitute is generally agreed upon it is too convenient a term to abandon. It should not of course be confused with a composition of humorous or satirical intent.

out that parody may include the quotation of "vertical slices of the thematic complex" as well as melodic quotation.68

Apart from random borrowings of thematic elements from other works, which are allusion rather than parody,69 two broad categories of parody style are evident in the lute repertoire. "Quotation parody" is essentially the technique Cerone recommended in Melopeo y maestro (1613) for so-called parody masses, namely, to quote sections of the model at the beginnings and endings of movements while varying the contrapuntal treatment, as well as borrowing some of its melodic motifs. "Paraphrase parody" combines thematic elements with new counterpoint in a reworking of the model. The former is essentially a scissors-and-paste process with the insertion of new material, the amount of which may vary from one piece to another; the latter is the reworking of melodic, rhythmic, and harmonic ideas.70

An important feature of printed Italian lute parody-fantasias, is that the composer usually cites the model with rubrics such as fantasia sopra ... or fantasia de ... followed by the title of the model. Clearly such imitation is seen as matter for pride, not a factor to be hidden.

The earliest printed parody-fantasias of the Italian lute repertoire are included in Spinacino's Libro Primo as Recercare de tous biens (Hayne von Ghiseghem) and Recercare a Juli amours (Ghiselin) the models of which were published by Petrucci in the Odhecaton (1501) and in Canti B (1504).

68. ibid., p. 209.
Earlier in the same volume Spinacino intabulated both models for two lutes,\(^{71}\) which has led some scholars to argue that the *ricercari* may have been performed as preludes to the intabulations.\(^{72}\) However, there is no real basis for this argument, especially considering their physical separation within the volume and the fact that the intabulations are for two lutes while the *ricercari* are for solo lutes. Ward has demonstrated that, rather, they are free paraphrases, a point upon which Slim agrees.\(^{73}\)

Barberiis's parody-fantasia *sopra Se mai provasti donna* on a Verdelot madrigal, like the Spinacino parodies, is published in the same volume as an intabulation of the model but unlike Spinacino, Barberiis places the intabulation directly before the parody-fantasia.\(^{74}\) Whether this indicates that one was expected to be performed after the other, or that the intabulator wished his "art of fantasia" to be compared with the model, can at this stage be conjecture only. Paladino's *Premier Livre* (1560) published in Lyon, contains four parody-fantasias which are similarly preceded by intabulations on the same model, entitled, *fantasia sopra al detto*.\(^{75}\)

Francesco da Milano's fantasia paraphrasing Richafort's *De mon triste* is also preceded by its intabulation.\(^{76}\) (Another fantasia-parody of *De mon triste* is attributed to

---

71. Brown 1507/2 nos. 8 & 9 (intabulations) and nos. 22 & 23 (parodies). Mod. ed. of the parodies are in Slim, *op.cit.*, vol. II, pp. 601 & 602.
73. Ward, *op.cit.*, p. 219. This is a different position from that of a decade earlier in "The Use of Borrowed Material in 16th-Century Instrumental Music", *JAMS*, vol. 5 (1952), p. 98, where he referred to them as "artless little preludes"; Slim, *op.cit.*, p. 228.
74. Brown, 1549/2, no. 15.
Perino Fiorentino in the "Siena Lute Book". Fantasia de mon triste is the only identified parody by Francesco, but as Ness points out, others undoubtedly await detection, and he goes so far as to cite three other Francesco fantasias which quote material from works by La Fage, Josquin des Pres, and an anonymous chanson writer.

Two known parodies in lute manuscripts further to that in the Siena Lute Book mentioned above are found in manuscripts: fantasia sopra le canzone degli uccelli in the Bottegari lutebook and Anchor che col partire in Ms. Genoa VII/I which although a parody fantasia is not differentiated by rubrics from the other 26 literal intabulations. This appears to be an artless, loosely paraphrased parody of Rore’s madrigal but it could prove to be an intabulation of a yet to be identified vocal parody (one of the many) of the original madrigal.

The two remaining known Italian sources of fantasia parody are volumes by Galilei and Molinaro. Included in Simone Molinaro’s Libro Primo are two works based on Lassus’s Susanne ung jour. The first is a glosa intabulated by Giovanni Battista dalla Gostena (Molinaro’s uncle) and the second is a parody by Giulio Severino. The Severino parody quotes the model extensively while at the same time reworking the counterpoint and adding small sections of new material. In contrast, Galilei’s fantasias on Rore’s

77. The Hague, gemeentemuseum, Music Department Ms. 20.850 "Siena Lute Book", fol.7; facs.ed. of the manuscript is in preparation (Minkoff); mod. ed. of the work cited is in Nesse, op.cit., p.471.
EXAMPLE 6.1

Striggio, Nasce la pena mia

(i) Striggio bb.1-4, Galilei bb.1-4, (ii) St.6-8, Gal.6-8
(iii) St.8-10, Gal.11-12, (iv) St.10, Gal.8,11,14,15,17
(v) St.36-38, Gal.61-62.
Anchor che col partire and Striggio's Nasce la pena mia are typical examples of paraphrase parody technique in that borrowed melodic and harmonic fragments are combined with new material. The complex reworkings and subtle allusions to the original material are demonstrated in Example 6.1. Galilei has considerably reworked the material, reducing Striggio's six-part madrigal to a more manageable four-part texture. The opening three bars are recognizably Striggio's, since the point of imitation is identical, but thereafter Galilei freely develops the fantasia with motives derived from the model. At times the melodic references are obvious and at other times they are subtle to the point of obscurity. Galilei preserves enough melodic motives and short sections from the model to guarantee that those listeners already familiar with Striggio's madrigal would recognise it. Galilei's skilful manipulation and reworking would not have gone unnoticed.

3. Casual borrowing in the lute fantasia.

A less overt imitazione practice is seen in those fantasias which owe some or all of their material to other sources but which fail to ascribe it to them. Unattributed borrowings in the lute fantasia may take the form of casual melodic quotations from familiar vocal works, or of the uplifting of small or large sections from a fantasia of another composer, or even of blatant misattribution of a complete fantasia. Casual allusions to vocal melodies do not really constitute plagiarism since such melodic elements taken from one voice of a model were considered common property. Most sixteenth-century instrumental music owes its existence to vocal music in any case. Dance music was of course indebted to vocal music, both directly and

82. Brown 1568/2 p92 & p.94. For a transcription of Nasce la pena mia, see Volume II, no. 40, p.347. This may be compared with no.16, p.154.
83. Striggio bb.36-38 = Galilei bb.61-62; Striggio b.58 = Galilei b.89.
indirectly. Many dances from the *folia*, *romanesca*, *bergamasca*, *villotta*, *bel fiore* and *ruggiero* families are modelled directly upon popular vocal pieces.\(^8^4\) Similarly, as Ward notes, there are many instances in the vihuela fantasy repertoire of quotations from *villancico* and other *cantus firmus* melodies used as the basis for free fantasy.\(^8^5\) In these cases the vihuelists acknowledged their sources, but there are undoubtedly further fantasies in both the vihuela and the lute repertoires based on casual *cantus firmus* borrowings. Ward wrote in 1953 that "the assumption that all music not otherwise labelled was composed by the vihuelists cannot be supported"\(^8^6\) He confirmed this a decade later in his discovery of casual borrowings in lute and keyboard fantasias.\(^8^7\) Of particular interest to the present discussion is Ward's citing of an "inexplicable appearance midway through one of Albert de Rippe's [Albert da Ripa] fantasias of the Josquin *Cum Sancto Spiritu*.\(^8^8\) Furthermore Ward draws attention to another Albert da Ripa fantasy which parodies two vocal works, one by Josquin, the other by Gombert.\(^8^9\) This is undoubtedly more widely practised in the lute fantasy than research has so far revealed.\(^9^0\)

---

84. For a survey of these forms see L.H. Moe, *Dance Music in Printed Italian Lute Tablatures 1507 to 1611* (Harvard, 1956), pp.154-189.
86. *ibid.*, p.151.
89. *ibid.*, p.222.
90. It is not the task of this dissertation to undertake a search for casual borrowings in the lute fantasy from a common pool of vocally derived melodic material but it would be a fascinating, if problematic, topic for further research. For examples of casual quotations in the chanson, see Brown, *op. cit.*, p.163.
Very similar to cantus firmus borrowing is the practice of quoting a section, without ascription, from a lute fantasia of another composer. An interesting example of this can be seen between the Vincenzo Capriola lutebook and Spinacino's first lute book. A piece entitled Recercar primo contains a literal quotation of 25 bars of a Spinacino ricercare embedded within it. Although the borrowed section constitutes only about one sixth of Capriola's ricercare, the piece may be regarded properly as a parody since the surrounding (presumably original) material is thematically related to it. The quotation is cleverly inserted in a way that does not appear out of character with the rest of the ricercare, and in fact the whole work is superior to the original Spinacino ricercare in the way that the thematic material is worked. By comparison, Spinacino's ricercare is an aimless exercise in scale passages. I am assuming of course that the quotation is from Spinacino to Capriola and not vice versa. It could be proved otherwise as more information comes to light, but for now it looks as though Capriola parodied Spinacino. This is deduced not from the dates of Spinacino's publication (1507) and the estimated date of compilation of the Capriola manuscript (1517), which anyway may not truly indicate the date of composition. Rather, it is the missing bar in the middle of an otherwise literal quotation in the Capriola version which implies that it is the copy. But why would a composer insert a small quotation like this in an otherwise original work? Capriola could not have been attempting to learn the art of fantasia from such a meagre exercise; he was an accomplished composer as it was. Possibly he was attempting to demonstrate his patently superior skill by reworking material of another composer. He may even have been paying homage to Spinacino as a composer or lutenist. Even if it may be discovered in the future that Spinacino borrowed from

91. Spinacino, Libro Primo, fol.52, (Brown 1507/1, no.37), and Composizione di Messer Vincenzo Capriola (c.1517), fol.5v; facs. ed., (Genèве, 1978), p.10.
Capirola, or perhaps that the quotation comes from a third source, the two *ricercari* remain a good example of a literal quotation.\(^92\)

Altogether different are those works where large sections of a fantasia are taken over by another composer. Furthermore there are cases of misattribution of whole fantasias. Sometimes the misattributions may be unintentional - the author's name may merely have been lost in the process of recopying from one source to another - but in the rare cases where a composer actively signs his name to a fantasia that is patently not his (or where his publisher does so on his behalf), the accusation of plagiarism must surely apply. Thanks to recent research by scholars and performers of the lute we are becoming increasingly aware of examples of plagiarism in the lute fantasia. James Meadors for one has discovered many misattributions, the most dramatic being in the fantasias of Fabritio Dentice. He reveals that all four fantasias in *Thesaurus Harmonicus* of 1603 attributed to Dentice come from Melchior Newsidler's first and second books of 1566. Furthermore, in *Thesaurus Harmonicus* two fantasias attributed to Jacobi Reys are from Newsidler's first and second books. Meadors mentions a further piece attributed to Dentice in the Hainhofer lute manuscript which was also originally Newsidler's.\(^93\) In misattributions like this, the fantasias are often reproduced exactly (except for added scribal mistakes). Where there are alterations from the original they are usually random and unsystematic, and certainly not of the type one could call "reworking".

\(^{92}\) This borrowing was discovered accidentally while playing through fantasias. There may yet prove to be many more references to other works in the Capirola and Spinacino lute books.

\(^{93}\) James Meadors, *Mis-attribution, Borrowing and Plagiarism in 16th Century Lute Fantasia*, from the microfilm catalogue #7 (Additional Seminar Lecture Tapes) of the *Lute Society of America*, T-16.
Howard Mayer Brown's bibliography Instrumental Music printed before 1600, catalogues a great many fantasias (and other pieces) printed in several sources. It was common for the original author not to be cited in the cases where fantasias were reproduced in different publications. Becchi's Libro Primo of 1568 for example includes three Spinacino ricercari and one by Francesco da Milano, but there is nothing in the Tavola or the body of the book to indicate the original authorship. Publication of unattributed fantasias is more common in the French printed repertoire than the Italian. There are no extant Italian equivalents of the French tablature anthologies such as Luculentum Theatrum published by Phalèse, or Theatrum musicum published by Phalèse and Bellère. The 21 fantasias in Luculentum Theatrum are by a variety of composers: Francesco da Milano, Raphael Viola, Rotta, Ginzler, Borrono, Paladino, Morlaye, Bakfark, Narváez and Giovanni Maria da Crema. Of these only four are attributed to a particular composer. That there are attributions at all seems to imply that, rather than being plagiaristic, Phalèse simply did not hold consistent attribution in particularly high regard. It is unlikely that the original composers' names would have been unknown to Phalèse, since all but two of the fantasias had been published in various lute books prior to 1568, and these undoubtedly served as his sources. Similarly, the 11 fantasias by Francesco da Milano printed in Borrono's lute book of 1548 are not acknowledged.


95. Theatrum musicum (Brown 1571/5); Luculentum Theatrum (Brown 1568/7). Pierre Phalèse published three other anthologies between 1552 and 1571 (Brown 1552/11, 1553/10, 1563/12), and numerous collections published jointly with Jean Bellère.

96. Brown 1548/2.
Hans Gerle's German tablature anthology *Eyn Newes sehr Künstlichs Lautenbuch* of 1552 is unusual for its consistent attribution. This collection of pieces formerly in Italian tablature retains the names of the original composers in the table of contents. The numerous preambel are also cited in the preface:

A new and very artful lutebook containing many preambel and foreign dances for four voices, and by the most famous lutenists, Francesco Milaneso, Anthoni Rotta, Joan Maria [da Crema], Rosseto [Rotta], Simon Gintzler and by others, collected together. And the tablature has been altered from the foreign into the German...

Erratic citation practices like these, frequent in printed sixteenth-century instrumental volumes, seem to indicate mere laxity on behalf of the publishers. Apart from actual cases of misattribution such as that by Fabritio Dentice or his publisher (a clear case of deception), absence of attribution does not signify plagiarism as it would today. Rather, the practice exemplifies the renaissance conviction of mutual ownership of music in the public domain. At the same time there are many examples of sixteenth-century composers artists and writers signing their work to ensure public recognition of their labours. This apparent contradiction simply points to a changing attitude in a period of artistic development midway between the restrictions of guild and ecclesiastical patronage, and the elevation of the artist to the rank of genius. It was partly this change in attitude toward the originator of

---

97. Brown 1552/1.
98. ibid.
99. Giorgio Vasari's *Life of the Artists*, English translation by George Bull (Bungay, Suffolk, 1965/R1984), chronicles this attitude in the visual arts. For an illuminating article on "genius" see E.E. Lowinsky, "Musical Genius - Evolution and Origins of a Concept" *MQ* no. 50, 1964, pp. 321-340 and 476-495, particularly pp. 338-339 and p. 479: "At the very time when the composer began to emancipate himself from the double dominion of mathematics and theology,
works of art that inspired Bottrigari to claim the discourse *Il Desiderio* as his own. The preface to the revised 1599 edition outlines the quaint story of how Cavaliere Ercole Bottrigari allowed his discourse with M. Annibale Melone to be published in 1594 under the name Alemanno Benelli, an anagram of Annibale Melone. This, Bottrigari explains, he did out of diffidence "so that he might remain in the background and hear what the world would say about it."\(^{100}\) He offered the printer the fictitious name, because "nowadays it is not permissible to publish anything, or to print any book without the name of the author."\(^{101}\) Hence he makes a token gesture to the growing propensity to acknowledge authorship, but some months after the publication of *Il Desiderio*, when "the world" had formed a favourable opinion of the work, Bottrigari wished to claim credit, particularly since people were learning the secret of the anagram and attributing the work to Melone. Thus after Melone's death in 1598 he declared himself to be the true author of the book. The story of *Il Desiderio* does not stop there, for Artusi (Bottrigari's arch rival), possessing the Melone manuscript after Melone's death, used the material in his *Imperfezzioni della Moderna musica* (1600). Bottrigari accused Artusi of plagiarism and subsequently Artusi scornfully republished *Il Desiderio* in Milan in 1601 under the name of Annibale Melone.\(^{102}\)

and to acknowledge as his new masters human emotion and free imagination, at the time when composition based on a pre-existing cantus firmus gave way to free musical conception kindled by the poetic text, we encounter the idea of musical genius in the writings on music". (p.479).


101. ... in questi nostri tempi non si concede il far pubblicazione, né stampar libro senza nome d'autore, ... ibid.

Part three. Terzi's Fantasias.

In the light of the above discussion two questions arise concerning Terzi's fantasias. First one may ask whether Terzi composed all of the fantasias of Libro Primo and Libro Secondo himself, and whether some of them may be parodies. Second, whether Terzi's fantasias are stylistically related to his intabulations in anyway suggesting that the process of intabulation served partly as a method for learning the art of fantasia writing.

ATTRIBUTION IN TERZI'S LUTE BOOKS

In his Libro Primo Terzi clearly claims the six fantasias as his own with the rubrics segue sei fantasie del'Autore in both the Tavola and on page 95. In Libro Secondo Terzi signs fantasias [Prima, Seconda and Terza (pp.2, 39 and 93), as well as, of the related forms, two Toccate (pp. 26 and 38) and one Preludio (p.1). Furthermore he includes in this volume, two Fantasie in modo di Canzon Francese de l'autore (pp.61 and 89). All other fantasias, toccatas, and canzonas are clearly attributed to other composers. These include in Libro Secondo, two Fantasie in modo di Canzon Francese by Francesco [Gioseffo] Guami, a fantasia by Giovanni Gabrieli, a fantasia by Paulo Justi [Tusti or Giusti], and another by Vicenzo Bell'haver [Vincenzo Bellaverel]. In the Tavola of Libro Secondo Terzi clearly distinguishes between fantasias in the style of the canzona, and intabulations of vocal canzonas (Example 6.2), that is, between the instrumentally derived canzona and the vocally derived chanson intabulation. In Libro Primo however such a distinction is not made; the Tavola lists chansons such as Lassus' Susanne ung jour with Maschera's canzonas under the single heading "Canzoni Francese & Italiane".

103. On attribution, refer also to pp.x-xiii, and pp.4-5.
103a. See Appendix 3.
There is little doubt that Terzi (or his publishers Amadino and Vincenti) placed more importance on giving full attribution than did most Italian publishers or composers of preceding decades of the century. Molinaro in his lute book, also of the last decade of the sixteenth-century, was equally careful to cite Battista dalla Gostina and Giulio Severino as authors of half of his fantasias.\footnote{Brown, 1599/7, nos. 35–63.} These printed volumes of the last decade of the century contrast with the earlier lute books cited above, in which attributions are inconsistent.

As far as I know, the fantasias Terzi claims as his own are indeed his original compositions. Neither am I
aware of any of the fantasias parodying vocal or instrumental works, nor that they contain casual references to existing vocal or instrumental works. Such an investigation is not within the scope of this dissertation, and borrowings like this are more likely to come to light accidentally, than to be revealed by systematic searching.

ATTRIBUTED FANTASIAS AND CANZONAS

The models of three of the five fantasias attributed to four other composers in Terzi's Libro Secondo, are available for direct comparison. The original fantasia of Paolo Tusti is lost, if indeed it was ever published. Similarly, nothing is known of Vincenzo Bellavere's fantasia. Bellavere was well known as a madrigalist and organist, but unfortunately there is no record of his canzonas. The Giovanni Gabrieli fantasia is published in an edition by Sandro dalla Libera, but this is merely a transcription of Terzi's intabulation, not the Gabrieli original. However, Gabrieli's canzona is available in a manuscript in Verona. Both of the Giosefo Guami (cited Francesco Guami by Terzi) fantasias however are available in various original sources and in a modern edition by Fuser and Mischiati. The Guami fantasia on page ten of Terzi's Libro Secondo is entitled La Diodatina in original sources, but Terzi does not retain this title. The model is printed in two sources, 1601 and 1612, although obviously there must

105. He is cited as Paolo Justi in the Tavola of Libro Secondo, which could perhaps be an alternative spelling for Giusti. If so, it does not seem to be the Conte Agostino Giusti mentioned in dedications to three printed volumes of sixteenth-century secular vocal music, cited in NV 289, 1346 & 1484.
have been an earlier source (possibly in a manuscript) for Terzi to have used it in his 1599 publication. There are earlier sources of these two pieces in Vincenti’s *Canzon di diversi per sonar ... Libro Primo* (1588) but these versions differ sufficiently from Terzi's to exclude the possibility that they may have been the models.\(^{109}\) Terzi's arrangements of *La Diodatina* and the other Guami canzona (*Libro Secondo* p.12) are both *glosas*. The intabulation of *La Diodatina* opens with very little ornamentation, but from bar 10 it becomes increasingly complex. Terzi's fantasia on an instrumental canzona is essentially the same as his treatment of an intabulation on a canzona such as Maschera's *La Martinenga*.\(^{110}\) That is to say, a fantasia on a canzona preserves the structural fabric; Terzi reworks it through ornamentation, rather than write a free variation on the model.

**TERZI'S FANTASIA STYLE**

Luis Milán in *El Maestro* described the fantasia as a work that "proceeds only from the fancy and industry of the one who has created it",\(^{111}\) and Thomas Morley\(^{112}\) in his oft-quoted definition of fantasia describes the compositional process as one of manipulation of a musical point in free imitation. Rather than attempt to survey the historical development of fantasia and ricercare (or the other instrumental forms toccata and preludio), Terzi's "absolute" music is discussed here in relation to his style of

---

109. A transcription of the Terzi fantasia on *La Diodatina* is given in Volume II, no. 34, p.257. For full bibliographical citations for the two Guami fantasias see Appendix 3.
111. Brown 1536/5, fol.B.
For this discussion, Ward yet again gives us a well tested description:

The 16th-century fantasia, if it can be characterized in any summary fashion, was a relatively free, monothematic or polythematic, more or less polyphonic, two or more voiced, sometimes highly ornamented or toccata-like music of greatly varying length occasionally based on borrowed music but more often newly invented.\footnote{113}

Terzi's pieces of "absolute" music (fantasia, preludio, toccata, and fantasia in modo di canzona) are all polyphonic to varying degrees, and are without exception for four voices. There are some stylistic differences among the pieces bearing these titles but one can only be very general about generic differences since the sample is too small. The toccatas and preludes are polyphonically freer than the fantasias and begin with four-part harmony rather than a point of imitation. \textit{Toccata del'autore}\footnote{115} for example is loosely written around a rising figure "minor third, tone, tone" and is rather shorter than the fantasias. \textit{Toccata Seconda} on the other hand is as long as most of the fantasias and is a freely polyphonic, polythematic work. The fantasias in the style of canzonas contain the sort of stylistic characteristics we would expect of canzonas: sectional structure including sections in triple time, homophonic sections, repetition of opening material at the end, and the characteristic \( \text{\textit{\textbf{J}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{J}}} \text{\textit{\textbf{J}}} \) opening rhythm.

\footnote{113. Slim, Ward and Griffiths among them have thoroughly surveyed the fantasia and related genres both in their historical development and terminology: H.C. Slim, \textit{The Keyboard Ricercare and Fantasia in Italy c1500-1550}, PhD.diss., (Harvard, 1960); see particularly pp.392-421 for a survey of terminology; Ward, \textit{The Vihuela de mano and its music (1536-1576)}, PhD.diss., (New York, 1953), pp.210-284; J.A. Griffiths, \textit{The Vihuela Fantasia - a comparative study of forms and styles}, PhD.diss., (Melbourne, 1983), passim.}

\footnote{114. Ward, \textit{op.cit.}, p.211.}

\footnote{115. Volume II, no.27, p.242.}
EXAMPLE 6.3

Toccata Seconda

imitazione 323
1. Polythematic works

The toccata-like nature of *Toccata Seconda* (Example 6.3) is particularly evident in bars 16-28 and 38-44, where free rhapsodic semiquaver passages prevail. In the first of these sections Terzi introduces motivic imitation of the type we have seen in his *contrapunti* elaborations (bb. 20-21). The rest of the *Toccata* is a free polyphonic working out of different themes which are all related, if at times loosely, to motivic elements of the opening theme (that is to figures a, b, c, and d of Example 6.3). The work does not open with a solo thematic statement as his fantasias do but the opening theme is accompanied by three other voices, producing together a D minor chord. The first statement in the treble is echoed in bar 2 by a bass entry which, were it not for the second and third notes, would be the same as the first entry an octave and a fourth lower. The third entry in the treble in bar 4 quotes the middle part of the initial theme, a fourth higher. From then on, as Example 6.3 illustrates, the various themes incorporate one or more element from the opening theme. By the time the piece reaches bar 29 the successive entries are essentially figural variations on (b), and from bar 35 the focal point is the interval of a fourth, the contour of figure (b). Finally, the last thematic statement from bar 45 is an inversion in the treble, of the ascending scale of figure (c) against an angular bass line containing fourths. *Toccata Seconda* is somewhat more varied harmonically than the fantasias discussed below. It is in the Dorian mode and cadences twice onto the fifth degree, A, as well as to C and D.

*Fantasia Sesta* is polythematic, or more properly, bi-thematic (Example 6.4). It is in the Lydian mode, with all cadences on the first and fifth degrees of the mode, as are all thematic entries. Like *Fantasia del'Autore* discussed below, the note values become progressively smaller so that the fantasia is at its most active in the middle. In
Fantasia Sesta the two themes are stated in diminution at times from bar 19 onwards, and further quaver activity is produced in counterthematic material from bars 26 to 31. Terzi uses both themes, the second of which is an inversion of the first, from the outset. Theme I is first stated in the treble, followed by theme II in the alto. At bar 6, theme I appears in the tenor range, and at the cadence on F at bar 8 theme II is stated in the bass. The two themes then continue to be stated in alternation with the various rhythmic mutations illustrated in Example 6.4.
Fantasia in modo di Canzon Francese is a polythematic work in which the themes are not particularly related to each other (Example 6.5). From the beginning, theme (a1) enters once in each of the four voice registers, followed by four statements of the theme with a truncated first note (a2). From bar 20, themes (b) (c) and (d) are stated twice each, followed by a new theme (e) set homophonically in a triple time section. From bar 50 much is made of the theme (f) in close imitation, after which the fantasia closes with a polyphonic section employing material from the beginning (a2), while counterthematic material provides quaver and semiquaver passaggi. Fantasia in modo di Canzon Francese is in the once-transposed Ionian mode, and all thematic entries, with one exception (bar 25) are on the first and fifth degrees. It is a little more adventurous tonally than the other fantasias though in that it modulates more often.

EXAMPLE 6.5

*Fantasia in modo di Canzon Francese*

(a1) \[ ... \]

(a2) \[ ... \]

(b) \[ ... \]

(c) \[ ... \]

(d) \[ ... \]

(e) \[ ... \]

(f) \[ ... \]

2. Monothematic themes

*Fantasia Prima* (Example 6.6) is similar to *Toccata Seconda* in its free thematic development, but is essentially monothematic. The theme mutates gradually, rhythmically and motivically, providing thematic variety. Sometimes it is clear that the variations result from contrapuntal expediency. The opening theme is stated four times in the first six bars, entering in the treble, alto, tenor and bass registers on the pitches g', d', g, D, that is on the first and fifth degrees of the twice-transposed Aeolian mode. The theme is stated in augmentation in the alto simultaneously with the third entry in the tenor at bar 4, but this is an isolated case of augmentation. Two other statements of the theme in bars 8 and 10 are followed by a phrygian cadence at bar 11. Then a new theme appears in the treble which is a modified inversion of the first five notes of the initial theme. This mutation is also an isolated case. From here on the theme enters on G or D in its various mutations. From bar 27 the version with three crotchets at its head is systematically presented five times in the various registers, and then from bar 35 four entries with the first note omitted are stated in quick succession in the four registers from treble through to bass. Example 6.6 illustrates the way three motivic elements (a, b & c) of the first theme are used throughout.
EXAMPLE 6.6
*Fantasia prima*^{199}

b. 1

b. 4

b. 11

b. 15

b. 17

b. 18

b. 20

b. 21

b. 27

b. 28

b. 34

b. 35

 Fantasia del'Autore (Example 6.7) is also monothematic, but the theme mutates rhythmically in successive entries in a far more adventurous way than the previous fantasia. Typical of Terzi, the first four entries of the theme (which is canzona-like in its opening rhythm), are stated in the order treble, alto, tenor and bass, on the pitches $c'' f' c' f$. The four entries up to bar 15 are identical, and the next five entries from bars 22 to 43 which also enter on C and F pitches, differ from the opening theme only in that the initial note is omitted. (There is an entry in two voices simultaneously at bar 30 on $c'$). From bar 48, after a complete entry in the bass, the theme is subjected to successive rhythmic mutations. At first the rhythmic differences are slight and confined to the head of the theme, but by bar 73 the original minims of the theme's second and third bars have now become crotchets, then from bar 95 the whole theme is stated in diminution. The fantasia is very conservative harmonically, in that every thematic entry is on either C or F, that is, the first and fifth degrees of the once-transposed Ionian mode, and all important cadences are on the final F, or (once) on the fifth degree, C. Interest is maintained in what would be an otherwise harmonically and thematically monotonous piece, by a sense of motion created by introducing progressively smaller rhythmic values. The motion increases from minim and crotchet values of the opening, to quavers from bar 25, and then to semiquavers in bars 45-54 and 78-104. The final phrase of the fantasia begins in bar 104 with a full statement in the alto of the theme in its original note values. This is given in counterpoint against the theme in diminution in the treble. Then another three entries appear in various note values, but with quavers at the head. The fantasia ends in the predominantly crotchet note values of the opening.
EXAMPLE 6.7
Fantasia del'Autore

b.1

b.22

b.30

b.45

b.55

b.59

b.60

b.65

b.73

b.82

b.88

b.93

b.95

b.104

b.105

b.106

b.110
Terzi creates melodic interest in the monothematic Fantasia Seconda from Libro Primo\textsuperscript{121} by giving the theme in diminution from one third of the way through the fantasia (illustrated below). From bar 15 the theme first appears in diminution. At first it is in counterpoint with the theme in its original values, but from bar 23 the note values are freely varied. From bar 26 halved note values remain the norm, until two false entries in original note values in the bass of the last 5 bars.

Note values in Fantasia seconda, Libro Primo

\begin{align*}
\text{b. 1} & \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \\
\text{b. 15} & \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \\
\text{b. 23} & \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \\
\text{b. 24} & \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \\
\text{b. 25} & \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \\
\text{b. 26} & \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \\
\text{b. 28} & \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \\
\text{b. 37} & \quad \cdot \quad \cdot \quad \cdot 
\end{align*}

Diminution is used to greater effect in Fantasia Seconda from Libro Seconde.\textsuperscript{122} This is a monothematic piece with the appearance of being polythematic (Example 6.8). Terzi presents the opening theme 17 times in counterpoint in all registers up to bar 69. From there a new theme (b1), which is really an inversion of theme (a), is polyphonically stated in each of the four registers. Subsequently he introduces both (a) and (b) themes in diminution. From bar 99 the rate of activity of the theme is increased even further so that it becomes four times greater than at the outset, that is, the minims of the opening are now quavers. In the last 16 bars of the fantasia Terzi slows the pace by reintroducing theme (a) in halved note values, followed by

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{121} See Volume II, no. 25, p. 239.
  \item \textsuperscript{122} Volume II, no. 31, p. 249.
\end{itemize}
the inversion (b) in halved note values. Finally in bars 111 and 113 the theme reappears in its original note values.

Preludio del’Autore\textsuperscript{123} is a purely monothematic piece in which the theme is worked without any systematic variation, either rhythmic or melodic. The only thing that distinguishes this prelude from the fantasias is that it opens with a homophonic 9 bar introduction before the first statement of the theme in the alto range. The theme is subsequently treated polyphonically.

3. An ensemble canzona

In Libro Secondo Terzi includes the only known ensemble canzona for four lutes.\textsuperscript{124} He gives explicit instructions regarding the tuning and the roles of each lute, defining lutes I and II as the first choir (coro) and lutes III and IV as the second choir. The two treble lutes (pitched to G) lead each choir\textsuperscript{125} and the two tenor lutes are tuned a

\textsuperscript{123} See Volume II, no. 29, p. 245.
\textsuperscript{124} Terzi (1599), p.117; See Volume II, no. 35, p.266.
\textsuperscript{125} Terzi (1599), Liuto Corista del Primo Coro, p.117; and Liuto Corista del Secondo Coro, p.120.
fourth below the treble lutes. The canzona opens with the first choir playing a two-bar homophonic phrase, which is repeated antiphonally, with a few added passaggi, by the second choir, and then again by the first choir. A second two-bar chordal phrase is similarly played antiphonally three times. From bar 13 short themes are worked polyphonically among the four instruments until bar 21 where the whole ensemble plays repeated chords as a single choir. From there until its close some 64 bars later the canzona combines all previous elements: antiphonal homophonic material, homophony in a single body of sound, and four-part polyphony in a manner characteristic of late renaissance ensemble canzonas.

CONCLUSION

Terzi's fantasies are so consistently four-part polyphonic works that it would be possible to take any one of them and with very little adjustment write it in four parts to be played on four instruments. Indeed, the addition of a text would render the fantasies suitable for vocal performance, except for a few places where the ornamentation blurs the part writing. The construction of Terzi's melodies is entirely consistent with vocal melodic style. Of all Terzi's "absolute" pieces the only one where an instrumental melodic style prevails is Toccata Seconda. All other pieces differ in no significant way from Terzi's intabulations of motets and madrigals. As regards form, Terzi's style differs little from motet style except that the fantasies, preludes and toccatas are conceived on a smaller scale, keep more conservatively to the first and fifth degrees of the mode, and are often restricted to the working out of one theme.

126. Terzi (1599), p.119, Segue il Liutto Tenore del Primo Coro cioè accordato una quarta più basso del Corista.
Hallmarks of Terzi's fantasia style are his invariable presentation of the first theme in the four voice-registers followed by polyphonic working of that theme or new material; conservative organisation of his material within the mode; and an absence of homophony, except in canzonas. Considering the stylistic similarities to many of the vocal models he intabulated, it is not inconceivable that Terzi modelled his "absolute" music on his lightly ornamented intabulations. If he did not do so consciously, certainly the elements of style with which he was dealing most of the time filtered through at an unconscious level. The only indication in Terzi's fantasia, prelude, or toccata styles to suggest that he conceived of original music for the lute as distinct from vocally derived arrangements is his
treatment of dissonance. Here we see isolated examples—usually only one or two in each piece—of sounded discords on a relatively strong beat. This would seem to point to the beginnings of an instrumental style, since he does not allow himself such freedom in his intabulations of vocal music. However, the examples of dissonance are few (Example 6.9) and all but one of the discords are produced by notes of small rhythmic value. The only example of a sounded discord in minim values is that of Example 6.9f, which is in any case a prepared suspension, and it is the sort of sounded discord Terzi creates most often in the intabulations. To summarize, only in the passaggi does Terzi's music suggest a difference in style which could be interpreted as instrumental, and that is so slight that it does not detract from the impression that essentially his intabulations and fantasias are written in the same style.

Common to all the pieces mentioned above is an increase in rhythmic activity towards the middle or end of the work, followed by a return to original note values in the last few bars. Thus Terzi's fantasias conform to Zarlino's suggestion that music should imitate nature by being slower at its outset and increasing the rate of activity toward the middle. 127 Today this manner of organising the rhythmic activity of a fantasia seems only natural, which of course it is in the sense that it imitates a law of nature.

127. Refer to p. 300.
EPILOGUE

If, like Galilei, Terzi had written about the art of intabulation and his attitude toward his work, he might have written something similar to the following extract from Galilei's *Il Fronimo*:

Each time that you observe what I have done, not only in these but in any of the cantilena I may have intabulated, you will find it to be correct; that is, that the addition of passages and diminutions or other things have been accommodated with such art that they have never prevented all the notes of any part whatever from being heard, even the smallest values. And where this has been impossible because of the great number of them, I have tried with great diligence to make the most necessary ones heard. Further, I have never (if I remember correctly) committed any of the abovementioned errors or other kinds of errors in any of the parts; nor have I spoiled or impeded the order of fugues [voices] so that they could not be heard entirely. Rather have I proceeded to help them (if I can use that word in such a connotation) by making the voices clear and by augmenting the parts and the whole with sonority, beauty and grace in the best possible way that I knew how and was able to do, in order to completely delight the sense of hearing — which is indeed the proper aim of Music in our times — without any regard to inducing in the souls of the hearers one virtuous habit rather than another, as formerly the ancient Greek writers had it, and which they wished to be their duty in order that those things which had been given to reasonable men should be used for the purposes for which they had been introduced.

1. Galilei is referring to those errors which violate rules of *musica ficta* and counterpoint as discussed in Chapter 3, pp.111-128.
The analyses of this dissertation reveal that like Galilei, Terzi respected the polyphony of the model, never allowing the ornamentation to "spoil or impede the order of the fugues". Similarly, he preserved the original harmony and applied *musica ficta* that was consistent with contemporary vocal practice. Terzi applied more extensive ornamentation than did Galilei but never in a manner which destroyed the original structure. In fact, he "augmented the parts and the whole with sonority, beauty, and grace", highlighting the polyphonic entries with imitative ornamentation.

From the beginning of the practice of intabulation as we know it from extant manuscripts and prints, it is clear that modifications have been necessary in the adaptation of the music to the new medium of the lute. Sprunging from such necessity, but also becoming an end in itself, Terzi often took considerable liberties in the degree to which he ornamented. At times he produced music which transformed the model, particularly in the *in concerto* intabulations, but never to the point where the original work was unrecognizable. Despite modifications to the music of the models, it is remarkable that late sixteenth-century lute intabulations nonetheless strictly retained the form of the model, paraphrases being more rare than intabulations which preserve the bar-by-bar form of the original. Clearly, lutenists played intabulations to enjoy the music as nearly as possible as it was originally conceived.

Terzi encapsulates two principles in his intabulations: he adheres strictly to original polyphonic structures while at the same time imbuing the works with lively filigree inspired by the technical peculiarities of the lute.
APPENDIX 1.1
THE GENRES WITHIN TERZI'S TWO BOOKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SINGLE DANCES</th>
<th>LIBRO PRIMO</th>
<th>LIBRO SECONDO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gagliarda</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courante/Courante Francese</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balletto Francese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balletto/Ballo Alemano</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padouana/Padoana</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bariera Balletto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branle/Branle Francese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballo Polaco</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balletto Italiano</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volta Francese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preambulo</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAIRED DANCES</th>
<th>LIBRO PRIMO</th>
<th>LIBRO SECONDO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pass'e mezzo &amp; Gagliarda</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass'e mezzo &amp; Saltarello</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballo Tedesco &amp; Saltarello</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ballo Tedesco &amp; Gagliarda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTABULATIONS</th>
<th>LIBRO PRIMO</th>
<th>LIBRO SECONDO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madrigali</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzonette Francese, &amp; Italiane</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mottetti</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzonette (con parole)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ABSTRACT MUSIC</th>
<th>LIBRO PRIMO</th>
<th>LIBRO SECONDO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fantasie</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toccate</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preludio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasie/canzone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Not all original Terzi fantasias.
2. Fantasie in modo di Canzon Francese de ...
3. Includes an original Canzona à 8 for four lutes.
APPENDIX 1.2

PERFORMANCE MEDIA WITHIN TERZI'S TWO BOOKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LIBRO PRIMO</th>
<th></th>
<th>LIBRO SECONDO</th>
<th></th>
<th>TOTALS COMBINED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single tablatures</td>
<td>1-9, 28-61</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1-6, 31-37, 43-54, 60-86, 91-92</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texted intabulations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7-10, 39-42, 56, 58-59, 89, 90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tablatures with one or two contrapunti marked &quot;in concerto&quot;</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lute duets</td>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30, 38, 87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single tablatures marked &quot;in concerto&quot;</td>
<td>17-27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Lutes</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The numbers of columns 1 and 3 refer to pieces in Terzi's lute books as they are numbered in H.M. Brown, *Instrumental Music Printed Before 1600*, (Cambridge, Massachusetts 1965/R1979), 1593/7 and 1599/11.
### APPENDIX 1.3

**FOUR GENRES IN PRINTED LUTE BOOKS IN ITALIAN TABLATURE**

( ) indicates name of publisher rather than author. Reprints of whole books are not included. The contents of sources are classified according to Brown, *op.cit.* Those items marked † indicate suites of dances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABSTRACT</th>
<th>DANCES</th>
<th>INTABS</th>
<th>LUTE</th>
<th>SONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1507/1</td>
<td>SPINACINO</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1507/2</td>
<td>SPINACINO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1508/2</td>
<td>DALZA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1509/1</td>
<td>BOSSINENSIS</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511/1</td>
<td>BOSSINENSIS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>152/1</td>
<td>TROMBONCINO/CARA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536/1</td>
<td>FRANCESCO da M.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536/3</td>
<td>FRANCESCO da M.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536/8</td>
<td>(VERDELOT)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1536/9</td>
<td>(CASTELIONO)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6†</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546/1</td>
<td>ABONDANTE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546/2</td>
<td>BARBERIIS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6≠</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546/3</td>
<td>BARBERIIS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546/4</td>
<td>BARBERIIS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546/5</td>
<td>BIANCHINI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546/6</td>
<td>FRANCESCO da M.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546/7</td>
<td>FRANCESCO da M.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546/8</td>
<td>FRANCESCO da M.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8†</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546/10</td>
<td>G. M. DA CREMA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546/13</td>
<td>PIFARO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546/15</td>
<td>ROTTA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1546/17</td>
<td>(VINDELLA)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547/2</td>
<td>FRANCESCO da M.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547/3</td>
<td>GINTZLER</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548/1</td>
<td>ABONDANTE</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548/2</td>
<td>BORONO</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1548/4</td>
<td>FRANCESCO da M.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549/1</td>
<td>BARBERIIS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1549/2</td>
<td>BARBERIIS</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547/1</td>
<td>BIANCHINI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1547/5</td>
<td>PALADIN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553/1</td>
<td>BAKFARK</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1554/1</td>
<td>BALLETTI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559/7</td>
<td>MATELART</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1560/3</td>
<td>PALADIN</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561/2</td>
<td>GORZANIS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563/4</td>
<td>FRANCESCO da M.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563/7</td>
<td>GALILEI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563/8</td>
<td>GORZANIS</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1563/11</td>
<td>(SCOTTO)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1564/4</td>
<td>GORZANIS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1565/1</td>
<td>BAKFARK</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566/1</td>
<td>FRANCESCO</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566/2</td>
<td>NEWSIDLER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1566/3</td>
<td>NEWSIDLER</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1.3 cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Music</th>
<th>Dances</th>
<th>Intabs</th>
<th>Lute Song</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1568/1</td>
<td>BECHI</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1568/2</td>
<td>GALILEI</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569/2</td>
<td>BARBETTA</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567/3</td>
<td>GORZANIS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570/1</td>
<td>GORZANIS</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1570/5</td>
<td>ANTONELLI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571/4</td>
<td>FIORINO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1574/1</td>
<td>KARGEL</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581/1</td>
<td>CAROSO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1582/1</td>
<td>BARBETTA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584/3</td>
<td>FALLAMERO</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1584/5</td>
<td>GALILEI</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1585/1</td>
<td>BARBETTA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1586/8</td>
<td>VEROVIO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1587/1</td>
<td>ABONDANTE</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1589/8</td>
<td>VEROVIO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591/14</td>
<td>VINCENZI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591/15</td>
<td>VINCENZI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591/16</td>
<td>VINCENZI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592/1</td>
<td>BELLASIO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1592/9</td>
<td>RADNO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593/7</td>
<td>TERZI</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1594/7</td>
<td>GASTOLDI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595/10</td>
<td>VEROVIO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596*</td>
<td>OROLOGIO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597/14</td>
<td>VECHI</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599/7</td>
<td>MOLINARO</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599/11</td>
<td>TERZI</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. *Intavolatura de viola o vero leuto ... Libro Primo/Libro Secondo* (Naples, 1536).
2. Includes a whole Févin mass
3. Reprint of Brown 1546/6 with 4 additional *ricercari*
4. *Canzonette a tre voci di Alessandro Orologio intavolate per sonar di liuto & novamente stampate*, (Venice: Vicenti, 1596)
### Appendix 1.3 cont.

SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25 YEAR PERIODS</th>
<th>ABSTRACT MUSIC</th>
<th>DANCES</th>
<th>INTABS</th>
<th>LUTE SONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500-1524</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1525-1549</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550-1574</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1575-1599</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50 YEAR PERIODS</th>
<th>ABSTRACT MUSIC</th>
<th>DANCES</th>
<th>INTABS</th>
<th>LUTE SONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500-1549</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1550-1599</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>100 YEAR PERIOD</th>
<th>ABSTRACT MUSIC</th>
<th>DANCES</th>
<th>INTABS</th>
<th>LUTE SONG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500-1599</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% OF TOTAL</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1.4

**TRANSPOSITION LEVELS IN TERZI’S INTABULATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUNINGS</th>
<th>PIECES(^1)</th>
<th>COURSES(^2)</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>untransposed G</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593: 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593: 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593: 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593: 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593: 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593: 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>untransposed D</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593: 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593: 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593: 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593: 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593: 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593: 28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593: 30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599: 68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>untransposed A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1599: 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) PIECES
\(^2\) COURSES

The table shows the transposition levels for different tunings in Terzi’s tabulations, with specific pieces and courses indicated.

---

To complete your question, the table above provides a clear and organized representation of transposition levels for various tunings in Terzi’s intabulations. Each row represents a piece, with columns indicating the presence or absence of a transposition level at certain courses, leading to totals at the end of each tuning's section.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUNINGS</th>
<th>PIECES</th>
<th>COURSES</th>
<th>TOTALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transposed C</td>
<td>1593: 7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1593: 13</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1593: 17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1593: 18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1593: 26</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1593: 27</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1599: 12</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1599: 66</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1599: 83</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1599: 87</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transposed G</td>
<td>1593: 8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1593: 11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1593: 19</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1593: 21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1593: 34</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1599: 5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1599: 6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1599: 11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1599: 28</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1599: 38</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1599: 80</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1599: 90</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transposed D</td>
<td>1599: 9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The numbering is as in Brown 1593/7 & 1599/11
2. 6 = up to six courses; 7a = up to seven courses, with seventh tuned a tone below the sixth; 7b = up to seven courses with the seventh tuned a fourth below the sixth course.
### APPENDIX 1.5

**TERZI'S SINGLE ORNAMENTAL UNITS OCCURRING MORE THAN ONCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>unit</th>
<th>Nos: 16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C36</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 1230

* Stepwise ornamental units = 70% of total occurrences
## APPENDIX 1.6

**TERZI'S PAIRS OF ORNAMENTAL UNITS OCCURRING MORE THAN ONCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nos: 16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1/C1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1/C1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2/C2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2/A1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4/C1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1/C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3/C3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1/C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4/C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6/C1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4/C6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7/C1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5/C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1/C2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2/C3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5/C3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3/C10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3/C2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4/C2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7/C3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5/C3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2/C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B3/C2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B6/C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4/C2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6/C8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4/C8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1/C3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3/C11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2/C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4/C3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1/C11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2/C3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1/C5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B5/C1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1/C4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2/C4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4/C13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2/C21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3/C4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4/A1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10/C10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13/C13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C37/C10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1/A2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C38/C11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18/C5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30/C2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9/C10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15/C16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8/C2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX 1.7
#### Rhythmic Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nos.</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>23</th>
<th>total % of group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>group A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* all numbers represent the percentage distribution of a rhythmic unit within a group.

![Diagram of rhythm groups A, B, and C]
### APPENDIX 1.8a
**ORNAMENTED INTERVALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>treble</th>
<th>inner</th>
<th>bass</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>cross</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unison</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascending 2nd</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descending 2nd</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascending 3rd</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descending 3rd</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascending 4th</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descending 4th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascending 5th</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descending 5th</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascending 6th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descending 6th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascending 7th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descending 7th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascending 8th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descending 8th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascending 9th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descending 9th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascending 10th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descending 10th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascending 13th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descending 13th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ascending 20th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|        | 23   | 25   | 18   | 66   | 34   |

### APPENDIX 8b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>treble</th>
<th>inner</th>
<th>bass</th>
<th>total</th>
<th>cross</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ascending intervals</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>descending intervals</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*data are from Volume II, numbers 1, 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 13, 16, 23, and 34*
APPENDIX 1.9a
DISTRIBUTION OF PASSAGGI
No. 8, Caro Dolce
APPENDIX 1.9b
DISTRIBUTION OF PASSAGGI
No. 19, Erano i capel
APPENDIX 1.9c
DISTRIBUTION OF PASSAGGI
No. 16, Nasce la pena mia
APPENDIX 1.9d
DISTRIBUTION OF PASSAGGI
No. 3, In Te Domine Speravi
APPENDIX 1.9e
DISTRIBUTION OF PASSAGGI
No. 23, La Martinenga

[A]

[A2]

[B]

[C]

[C2]

5
10
15
20
25
30
35
40
45
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55
60
65
APPENDIX 1.10
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ORNAMENTED MINIMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume II number</th>
<th>% of minims ornamented 2/2 time</th>
<th>4/2 time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total as %</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Numbers 6, 16, 17, 18 and 21 are unusual in that they are for more than one lute, or marked "con passaggi" or "à modo di viola bastarda" and are therefore not included.)
APPENDIX 1.11

Appendices 355

BOLLETTINI IN TERZI'S LIBRO PRIMO

A. Bollettini in the Florence edition

B. Bollettini in the Bologna edition

C. Bollettini common to both editions
Appendix 1.11 cont.

p.59, 1.7, b.1  
(hand cor. Pl. ed.)

p.70, 1.1, b.3/4

p.81, 1.5, b.3

p.93, 1.4, b.3

p.97, 1.4, b.4

p.106, 1.4, b.3

p.122, 1.7, b.4  
(hand cor.)

p.124, 1.7, b.7  
(p.131, 1.5, b.3  
(p.132, 1.2, b.2  
(p.132, 1.7, b.8

(hand cor.)

p.131, 1.5, b.3  
(p.132, 1.2, b.2  
(p.132, 1.7, b.8

(hand cor.)
APPENDIX 1.12
MUSICA FICTA IN EIGHT TERZI INTABULATIONS

SAMPLE: Volume II, nos. 2, 6, 7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 19. (numbered according to Volume II)

A. CAUSA PULCHRITUDINIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subsemitonium modi</th>
<th>no. 2, b. 11</th>
<th>no. 2, b. 25</th>
<th>no. 6, b. 7</th>
<th>no. 6, b. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 6, b. 12</td>
<td>no. 6, b. 22</td>
<td>no. 6, b. 28</td>
<td>no. 6, b. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7, b. 18</td>
<td>no. 7, b. 22</td>
<td>no. 7, b. 27</td>
<td>no. 7, b. 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7, b. 86</td>
<td>no. 7, b. 95</td>
<td>no. 7, b. 102</td>
<td>no. 7, b. 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 7, b. 164</td>
<td>no. 7, b. 172</td>
<td>no. 8, b. 81</td>
<td>no. 8, b. 86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 13, b. 20</td>
<td>no. 16, b. 5</td>
<td>no. 16, b. 8</td>
<td>no. 16, b. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 16, b. 10</td>
<td>no. 16, b. 13</td>
<td>no. 16, b. 15</td>
<td>no. 16, b. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 16, b. 20</td>
<td>no. 16, b. 22</td>
<td>no. 16, b. 28</td>
<td>no. 16, b. 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 16, b. 46</td>
<td>no. 16, b. 53</td>
<td>no. 16, b. 60</td>
<td>no. 18, b. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 18, b. 6</td>
<td>no. 18, b. 17</td>
<td>no. 18, b. 19</td>
<td>no. 18, b. 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 18, b. 24</td>
<td>no. 18, b. 32</td>
<td>no. 18, b. 37</td>
<td>no. 19, b. 18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tierce di picardie
no. 19, b. 116 no. 18, b. 33

Propinquity
no. 19, b. 116 (phrygian cadence)

B. CAUSA NECESSITATIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mi contra fa</th>
<th>no. 2, b. 40</th>
<th>no. 2, b. 40</th>
<th>no. 2, b. 16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fa super la</td>
<td>no. 19, b. 95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 1.13
PASSAGGI FICTA IN EIGHT TERZI INTABULATIONS

SAMPLE: Volume II, nos. 2, 6, 7, 8, 13, 16, 18, 19

Upper auxiliary note flattened
no. 2, b. 11 no. 2, b. 12 no. 2, b. 14 no. 6, b. 6
no. 6, b. 24 no. 8, b. 16 no. 8, b. 20 no. 13, b. 18
no. 16, b. 55 no. 18, b. 23 no. 19, b. 54 no. 19, b. 85
no. 19, b. 114

Lower auxiliary note sharpened
no. 6, b. 1 no. 18, b. 22 no. 18, b. 23 no. 18, b. 24
no. 18, b. 27 no. 18, b. 56

Countered accidental
no. 18, b. 13

Contradictory ficta
no. 18, b. 32

Sharp in ascending scale
no. 2, b. 24 no. 6, b. 6 no. 6, b. 14 no. 6, b. 21
no. 6, b. 22 no. 6, b. 23 no. 6, b. 28 no. 6, b. 31
no. 13, b. 36 no. 16, b. 15 no. 16, b. 17 no. 16, b. 30
no. 16, b. 32 no. 16, b. 42 no. 16, b. 47 no. 16, b. 55
no. 18, b. 3 no. 18, b. 4 no. 18, b. 9 no. 18, b. 27
no. 18, b. 29 no. 18, b. 36 no. 18, b. 40 no. 18, b. 43
no. 18, b. 49 no. 18, b. 56

Flat in descending scale
no. 2, b. 12 no. 6, b. 1 no. 6, b. 2 no. 6, b. 5
no. 6, b. 11 no. 6, b. 29 no. 8, b. 7 no. 13, b. 47
no. 16, b. 28 no. 18, b. 27

Anticipatory ornament before subsemitonium
no. 8, b. 21 no. 8, b. 81 no. 13, b. 34 no. 16, b. 15
no. 16, b. 36 no. 18, b. 40 no. 19, b. 59

Raised sixth before subsemitonium
no. 19, b. 92 no. 19, b. 116

Mi contra fa
no. 18, b. 17 no. 19, b. 17 no. 19, b. 116
APPENDIX 2.1
INCIPITS: TERZI DANCES FROM OTHER SOURCES

Examples a, b, c and d, are from London, British Library, MS Additional 31389. Example e is from G.L. Fuhrmann, *Testudo gallo-germanica* (Nuremberg, 1615).

(a) Pavana 'ala Ferresa' di Jo. Anto da Bergamo

(b) El Saltarello di la stessa Padoano
Appendix 2.1 cont.

(c) La Tintorella di Jo Ant° da Bergamo

(d) El Saltarello di la stessa Tintorella
Appendix 2.1 cont.

(e)

Passemezo in F flat b mol.  Antoni del Pergamasco, variatio a

P. 97
APPENDIX 3

TERZI'S INTABULATIONS - CONCORDANCES AND SOURCES

The capoversi of intabulations are entered after the name of the vocal author, where known. Doubtful or erroneous authorship is discussed in footnotes. The abbreviations used for the citation of Terzi's intabulations are "1593" for Libro Primo and "1599" for Libro Secondo. In the citation of other Italian lute intabulations the surname of the author under which the volume is printed is given followed by, in parentheses, the date and number according to the catalogue numbering of H.M. Brown's Instrumental Music Printed Before 1600 (Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1965). Manuscript abbreviations conform to the numbering in the key below. Other abbreviations used are "nk", indicating that the particular source is not known, and RISM and NV, consistent with use throughout this dissertation. (Refer to abbreviations at the beginning of this volume). The vocal sources cited give the first known publication only of the work and not subsequent reissues. Modern editions are given in footnotes. The entries in the column "Italian lute tablatures" include known extant intabulations, in Italian tablature, in both printed and manuscript sources. Sources in French and German Lute tablature as well as keyboard sources are listed in Brown, ibid., but are not listed here. The works marked with * include a seconda parte.

Key to manuscript abbreviations

<p>| Ms. 1 | Ms. Brussels, Bibliothèque Royale de Belgique, II 275; Lutebook of Rafaello Cavalcanti. |
| Ms. 2 | Ms. Como, Biblioteca Comunale, Ms. Senza Segnatura, Pietro Paulo Raimondo: Libro de sonate diverse, 1601. |
| Ms. 3 | Ms. Florence, Biblioteca Nazionale, Ms Fondo Landau-Finaly, Ms. Mus. 2 [appendix to Galilei's IL Fronimo 1568]. |
| Ms. 4 | Ms. Genoa, Biblioteca Universitaria, Ms. F.VII/1. |
| Ms. 5 | Ms. London, British Library, Add. 29247. |
| Ms. 6 | Ms. Lucca, Biblioteca Statale, Ms. 774, Intavolatura di leuto da sonare e cantare. |
| Ms. 7 | Ms. Modena, Biblioteca Estense, Ms. C. 311, Arie e canzone in musica di Cosimo Bottegari. |
| Ms. 8 | Ms. Verona, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS 1128, no. 39 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUTHOR</th>
<th>WORK</th>
<th>TERZI SOURCE</th>
<th>VOCAL SOURCES</th>
<th>ITALIAN LUTE TABLATURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anonymous</td>
<td>Gofred. Canzon Francese</td>
<td>1599, p. 100</td>
<td>nk</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>Non hebbe tante foglie'</td>
<td>1599, p. 52</td>
<td>nk</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arcangelo da Bergamo</td>
<td>Donna la bella mano</td>
<td>1599, p. 85</td>
<td>RISM 1582/4, p. 19</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbato, Angelo</td>
<td>Un giorno passeggiando</td>
<td>1599, p. 114</td>
<td>RISM 1587/7</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellavere (Bell'haver) Vincenzo</td>
<td>Fantasia</td>
<td>1599, p. 91</td>
<td>nk</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicci, Antonio</td>
<td>Candide perle</td>
<td>1599, p. 7</td>
<td>NV 1665, p. 4</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavaccio, Gio. Maria</td>
<td>Amorosa Fenice</td>
<td>1599, p. 83</td>
<td>nk</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_______</td>
<td>Ad dominum cum tribularer</td>
<td>1593, p. 17</td>
<td>nk</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragone, Gio. Andrea</td>
<td>Se dal soave, e amoroso sguardo</td>
<td>1599, p. 86</td>
<td>RISM 1582/4, p. 12</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieli, Andrea</td>
<td>Caro dolce ben mio</td>
<td>1593, p. 87</td>
<td>RISM 1576/5, p. 28</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Possibly by Alessandro Orologio (1593) NV 2062, p. 16.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year, Page</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diligam te Domine</td>
<td>1593, p. 1</td>
<td>Ecclesiasticarum cantionum (Venice, 1576)</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ego rogabo patrem</td>
<td>1593, p. 3</td>
<td>Ecclesiasticarum cantionum (Venice, 1576)</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasia in modo canzon francese</td>
<td>1599, p. 48²</td>
<td>Ms. 8, no. 39</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodie completi sunt</td>
<td>1599, p. 56</td>
<td>nk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastoldi, Gio. Giacomo</td>
<td></td>
<td>NV 1102, p. 22</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giovanelli, Ruggiero</td>
<td>1599, p. 9</td>
<td>NV 1241, p. 29</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mi parto ahi sorte</td>
<td>1599, p. 53</td>
<td>NV 1241, p. 4</td>
<td>Ms. 6, fol. 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non ved'hoggi'l mio sola</td>
<td>1599, p. 52</td>
<td>nv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantasia in modo di Canzona Francesa (La Diodatina)</td>
<td>1599, p. 10</td>
<td>Partidura per sonare delle canzonette ... (Venice, 1601), p. 7</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


3. This is clearly a later source than the one Terzi used. The only known earlier source is Vincenti's Canzon di diversi per sonar (Venice, 1588), p. 4, but this differs considerably from Terzi's intabulation. A modern edition of the 1601 source is available in I. Fuser and O. Mischiati, eds., Canzoni da suonare di Giuseppe Guami (Florence, 1968), p. 89.
Like the preceding work it appears in Vincenti, op. cit., p. 2. Another source is Raverij's Canzoni per sonare con ogni sorte di stromenti ... Libro Primo (Venice, 1608), no. 17. Modern editions of the manuscript source and Raverij are available in Fuser and Mischiati, op. cit., p. 101 & p. 104.


Attributed to Aemilius in Vincenti, op. cit., p. 215.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
<th>Edition</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lassus, Susanne ung jour</td>
<td>1593, p. 38</td>
<td>NV 1389, p. 26</td>
<td>Barbetta (1582/1)</td>
<td>fol. 13v</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orlando di Lassus</td>
<td>1593, p. 14</td>
<td>Sacrae cantiones</td>
<td>nk</td>
<td>(Nuremberg, 1562)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marenzio, Luca</td>
<td>Leggiadre Ninfe</td>
<td>1599, p. 6</td>
<td>NV 1665, p. 31</td>
<td>nk</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Modern edition in Haberl and Sandberger, *op. cit.* , vol. 5, p. 120.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liquide perle amor</strong></td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>p.30</td>
<td>NV 1597, p.17</td>
<td>Barbetta (1582/1)¹⁰ fol.E3 Fallamero (1584/3) p.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quando i vostri begli occhi</strong></td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>p.88</td>
<td>NV 1597, p.5¹⁸</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maschera,²⁰ Fiorenzo</strong></td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>p.78</td>
<td>Maschera (1584/10) p.18</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canzon la Villachiara, over fantasia</strong></td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>p.78</td>
<td>Maschera (1584/10) p.18</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canzon Prima, La Capirola</strong></td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>p.57²¹</td>
<td>Maschera (1584/10) p.1</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canzon Seconda, La Martinengha</strong></td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>p.59²²</td>
<td>Maschera (1584/10) p.2</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canzon Terza</strong></td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>p.51</td>
<td>Maschera (1584/10) p.4</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canzon Quarta, La Maggia</strong></td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>p.63</td>
<td>Maschera (1584/10) p.5</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canzon Quinta</strong></td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>p.65²³</td>
<td>Maschera (1584/10) p.6</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Page References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canzon Sesta</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Mascherana (1584/10) p. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzon Settima</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Mascherana (1584/10) p. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Rosa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzon Ottava</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Mascherana (1584/10) p. 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L'Averolda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzon Nona</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Mascherana (1584/10) p. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Girella</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzon Decima</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Mascherana (1584/10) p. 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzon Undecima &amp; Ultima</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Mascherana (1584/10) p. 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merulo, Claudio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzon</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merulo, Claudio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzon</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Deo speravit</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>IL primo libro de mottetti, (Venice, 1583)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cor meum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In te Domine speravi</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>IL primo libro de mottetti, (Venice, 1583)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Petit Jacquet</td>
<td>Canzon francese</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qui me confessus</td>
<td></td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monti, Philippe de</td>
<td>Ahi chi mi rompe il sonno*</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortaro, Antonio</td>
<td>Come faro cor mio</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nanino, Gio. Maria</td>
<td>L'amata Ninfa mia</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erano i capei d'oro*</td>
<td></td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quando fra bianche</td>
<td>Perle*</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padovano, Annibale</td>
<td>Domine Deus*</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestrina</td>
<td>Angelus ad pastores</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Terzi's intabulation of Palestrina's madrigal appears to be the sole extant source.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Editions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Galilei (1568/2)</td>
<td>RISM 1566/3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galilei (1584/5)</td>
<td>Galilei, (1568/2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.3, fols. 1 &amp; 12v</td>
<td>Ms.5, fol. 43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms.7, fol. 41</td>
<td>Ms.7, fol. 41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obella Ninfamia</td>
<td>O bella Ninfamia</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>p. 86</td>
<td>RISM 1582/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu es Pastor ovium</td>
<td>Tu es Pastor ovium</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>p. 7</td>
<td>Motecta Festorum (Rome, 1563)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paratico, Juliano</td>
<td>Paratico, Juliano</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>p. 9</td>
<td>NV 2138, p. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Porta, Costanzo</td>
<td>Porta, Costanzo</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>p. 90</td>
<td>RISM 1576/5, p. 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaldi, Giulio</td>
<td>Renaldi, Giulio</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>p. 53</td>
<td>NV 2333, p. 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgo prudentissima</td>
<td>Virgo prudentissima</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>p. 4</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31. Transcription in Eriq and Gutman, op.cit., p. 347
33. Transcriptions: Chilesotti, op.cit., p. 58; F. Fano, La Camerata Fiorentina, Vincenzo Galilei, 1520 (?)-1591); la sua opera d'artista e teorico espressione di nuove idealità musicale IMAMI IV (Milan, 1934), p. 33.
34. Transcription: Fano, op cit., p. 33.
35. Transcription in MacClintock, op.cit., p. 126
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rore, Cipriano da</td>
<td><em>Beatus homo qui inventit sapientiam</em></td>
<td>1599, p.102</td>
<td>Motetta, 5vv (Venice, 1545)</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Fera gentil</em></td>
<td>1593, p.32</td>
<td>NV 2422, p.99</td>
<td>Fallamero (1584/3) p.18 Ms.4, fol.3v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Non mi toglia il ben mio</em></td>
<td>1599, p.106</td>
<td>NV 2422, p.7 Galilei (1568/2) p.68 Galilei (1584/5) p.170</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scaletta, Oratio</td>
<td><em>La velenosa vista</em></td>
<td>1599, p.77</td>
<td>nk</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Qual più crudel martire</em></td>
<td>1599, p.78</td>
<td>nk</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Striggio, Alessandro</td>
<td><em>Anchor ch'io possa dire</em></td>
<td>1593, p.34</td>
<td>NV 2672, p.4</td>
<td>Fallamero (1584/3) p.75 Galilei (1568/2) p.153 Ms.3, fol.14v Ms.4, fol.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Chi farà fede</em></td>
<td>1599, p.70</td>
<td>RISM 1583/15, fol.20v</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. Also attributed to Ingegneri. See fn.5.
Nasce la pena mia 1599, p. 18  NV 2672, p. 34

S’ogni mio ben’avete 1593, p. 28  NV 2676, p. 15

Vecchi, Orazio
Quando mirai sa bella faccia 1599, p. 8  NV 2796, p. 19

Vinci, Pietro Mandatum novum do vobis 1599, p. 74  nk

Becchi (1568/1) p. 66
Fallamero (1584/3) p. 77
Galilei (1568/2) p. 24
Galilei (1568/2) p. 92 (fantasia)
Galilei (1584/5) p. 44
Ms. 1, fol. 55v
Ms. 2, fol. 67v
Ms. 4, fol. 16v
Ms. 7, fol. 39v

Galilei (1568/2), p. 153
Ms. 4, fol. 17v
Ms. 6, fol. 44v
Ms. 1, fol. 60

Ms. 7, fol. 20

42. Philippe de Monte wrote a parody mass on Striggio’s madrigal which is published by Borren and Nuffel, op.cit., vol 10, passim.
44. Transcription in MacClintock, op.cit., p. 120
45. Transcription in O. Chilesotti, op.cit, p. 98
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Work Description</th>
<th>Year, Page</th>
<th>Edition/Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wert, Giaches</td>
<td>Cara la vita mia</td>
<td>1599, p. 97</td>
<td>NV 2967, p. 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D'un si bel foco</td>
<td>1593, p. 84</td>
<td>RISM 1576/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willaert,</td>
<td>Aller m'y fault sur la verdure</td>
<td>1599, p. 46</td>
<td>RISM 1529/3, no. 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adriano</td>
<td>Jouissance vous donneray</td>
<td>1599, p. 14</td>
<td>RISM 1545/14, fol. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Newsidler (1566/3), p. 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

47. *ibid*, vol. 14, p. 68.
48. Also attributed to Janequin. See fn. 6
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