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Part One of this study seeks to define the nature of Spanish and Italian printed keyboard sources in the 16th and 17th centuries. In Chapter two, seven Spanish keyboard prints or theoretical works are examined, dating from 1546 to 1626. These works clearly state a conception of the ideals of keyboard playing; they also show the beginnings of a shift in orientation for the keyboard player towards learning to play the instrument more quickly, but with less understanding of composition.

The conclusions from Spanish sources are applicable to Italian printed keyboard music, c. 1500-1700 (Chapter three). About 250 Italian volumes are surveyed for their comments and notational evidence to determine for whom the music was written, the purpose of the music, the needs of its users, the preconceptions and opinions of its creators, and the motives for publishing or copying the works. A summary of this material is presented in classified form; all the volumes are chronologically indexed in appendices, where a number of extracts from prefatory or theoretical writings are given and translated.

In Part Two, four manuscript sources which contain music by Claudio Merulo (1533-1604) are surveyed and analysed. Two originated in north Italy (The Bourdeney Codex, open score; Bagnacavallo MS CMB 1, Italian keyboard score); one in south Germany (Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, MS
Giordano 2, New German Tablature); one in Liège (Liège, Bibliothèque de l'Université, MS 153, French keyboard score). The purposes of the manuscripts, their origins, scribal methodology, users, and possible exemplars are examined.

Taken as a whole, these studies show that the tradition of unnotated fantasia lay behind the origins and use of keyboard sources of the period, that notated keyboard music was used for particular purposes, and that the rise of virtuoso performers who could not play fantasia was intimately related to the notational experiments and developments of the period.
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ABBREVIATIONS AND TERMINOLOGY

Pitch: c\textprime{} is 'middle C'.

Clefs: pitch letter name and line of stave (bottom line is one, top line is five), e.g. clc3c4f4 for standard 'low clef' pieces.

Specific partbooks are abbreviated in the usual manner: e.g. 'CATQBBc' for 'Canto — Alto — Tenore — Quinto — Basso — Basso continuo'.

Libraries are abbreviated by their RISM sigla.

Manuscripts are referred to by short title consisting of location and number, e.g. 'Oxford 89', short for GB-Och, Ms. 89. Full references are given in the Bibliography.

Appendices A and B are chronological bibliographies of primary sources printed in Italy c. 1500-1700; they are referred to by composer (or author) and date. In the case of Appendix A, upper case is employed, e.g. 'BATTIFERRI 1669'. If two volumes by the same composer appeared in the same year, they are numbered (i, ii, iii) in alphabetical order. If the volume is a reprint the letter 'R' follows the date. References to lost volumes are enclosed in square brackets. Question marks precede dates that are probable but uncertain. 'Before' and 'after' are abbreviated 'b.' and 'a.' Full references for modern editions of these volumes are listed in the Bibliography ('Primary Sources') under the composer's name, or in the case of anthologies or manuscripts under the editor's name.

In Appendix A itself, the last date (year) which is discussed on a given page is centred in the heading of the page for ease in finding references.
References to Appendix B are given in lower case and date, preceded by 'Pb-' (short for 'Partbooks'): e.g. 'Pb-Merulo 1574'. Square brackets indicate a lost volume that is attested in the literature.

Short titles are employed throughout for reference to primary literature not indexed in Chapter two or Appendices A and B, and all secondary literature; full references are given in the Bibliography. The two most important bibliographical works for this study, Howard Brown, Instrumental Music Printed before 1600: a Bibliography, and Claudio Sartori, Bibliografia della musica strumentale italiana stampata in Italia fino al 1700, are abbreviated Brown and Sartori respectively.

Notational formats are abbreviated following the definitions in Chapter one, I:9-13. Specific layout is abbreviated according to number of systems per page, number of staves per system, and number of lines per stave; e.g., '2 x 5/8' denotes two systems per page, two staves per system, the top stave consisting of five lines, the bottom of eight. 'Cross-opening' indicates that the music is to be read across an opening, i.e. from line one of the verso to line one of the recto to line two of the verso, etc.

For comparison of different versions of works in Chapters four to seven, abbreviations for the location of variants are used. They consist of bar number — beat in bar (from one to four, minim equals one beat unless otherwise stated) — voice (s,a,t,b stand for soprano, alto, tenor, bass); e.g., '13.4,s' stands for bar 13, beat 4, soprano.

Tonal types are calculated and abbreviated according to the theory established in Powers, 'Tonal Types'. The abbreviation scheme in each case is 'system' (natural or transposed; B natural (+) or flat (b)) — 'ambitus' (range according to clefs: high or low) — 'final' (final of the piece).
THE USE OF NOTATIONAL FORMATS AT THE KEYBOARD
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

The orthodox starting point for studies of early keyboard music is the music itself; after discovery and identification the sources are transcribed, analysed and placed within a stylistic historical continuum as far as possible. Notation, the means by which the music is transmitted, is subservient to stylistic assessment of the music, although since all early keyboard music is reliant upon notation for transmission, understanding the notation is a fundamental prerequisite to attempting to understand the music. Paradoxically, the notation often proves to be the defining characteristic of the field of inquiry; a largely unconscious overdependence on notation results in the neglect of extra-notational evidence regarding keyboard music and its performance. The distinction between music and notation is all too often ignored:

Music written in part-arrangement is ensemble music, and music written in score-arrangement is soloist music. Apel's equation of music and notation is confusing. The fault may be traced to an assumed dichotomy of ensemble and solo music: since the same piece was often performed by both ensembles and soloists, one of Apel's fundamental notational distinctions is rendered meaningless.  

---

1 For example Apel, Keyboard Music; Frotscher, Geschichte; Ritter, Geschichte.

2 Apel, Notation, p. xxii; see also Chapter three, note 32.

Chapter one: Introduction

While this is not crucial for a study of notation, which does not depend upon performance medium for practical organization, studies of keyboard music must account for the notational formats used by keyboard musicians.

Performance medium is commonly delineated according to notational format in an almost arbitrary way, and arbitrary categorizations are impossible to avoid when facing the musical output of the 16th and 17th centuries. Brown, in Bibliography of Instrumental Music Printed Before 1600, based inclusion upon the presence or absence of text, yet he freely acknowledged that that division did not entirely reflect the performance practice of the 16th century:

No hard and fast distinctions between instrumental and vocal music exist . . . Throughout the century publishers added on the title pages of vocal anthologies notes stating that the music was fit to be played on instruments as well as sung . . . There is scarcely any vocal music at all that cannot be played on instruments and that was not so performed. 4

Text is arguably a valid delineating factor for distinguishing vocal and instrumental music. For keyboard music, where no such distinctive trait exists, notation has been heavily relied upon for definition. The present study moves beyond dependence upon musical notation itself for the exposition, analysis and exegesis of keyboard music, and considers why certain notational formats developed, and how they were used, or intended to be used. It seeks in part to draw a clearer definition of a keyboard source than the arbitrary notational distinction largely adopted at present. There is little dispute in classifying the majority of music from the 16th and 17th centuries according to whether it is or is not keyboard music, and much of the music under discussion here is unambiguously intended for keyboard. The limits of classification are addressed in this study; they are established in part by examining the

4Brown, p. 3.
canon of keyboard literature of the period, along with works used by keyboard players. But rather than depending exclusively upon the notated music itself for a starting point, the writings of contemporaries are examined and analysed. Through treatises and prefaces to volumes of music the characteristics of keyboard players may be identified and examined. In this study the description of music and placement within a historical framework is avoided; rather, the music is viewed from the perspective of those who created and performed it.

This study examines how keyboard players learned, what they used for pedagogy, why they prepared the manuscripts and prints that have come down as 'early keyboard sources', and how these sources were used. Put simply, the question 'why was a given source published or written down in the first place?' is addressed. In the course of answering it, the even more fundamental question 'what constitutes a keyboard source?' is taken up. A large amount of quotation and translation is given here in order to show the development of the ideas of 16th- and 17th-century musicians regarding the performance of music at the keyboard. Alongside this, the sources themselves are critically evaluated for how they relate to, confirm or deny the stated goals of musicians of the period.

The period 1500 to 1700 is historically the first important era in the development of keyboard music. About 1500, the printing industry began to produce music in bulk. Although keyboard music was a minor field of printing, the majority of extant keyboard sources were printed, and the invention of music printing is an important milestone in the history of keyboard music. Most printed keyboard music appeared in Italy, the main region of this study. The production is arch-like, rising to a high point in the years 1590-1610. Chronologically earlier than most Italian keyboard sources is the Spanish output. This material is considerably less in quantity, but correspondingly more explicit in
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stating the authors' intentions and purposes. Comparison between the two countries reveals a large degree of analogy in terms of the origin and development of written keyboard music.

Spanish keyboard sources virtually cease to be produced after 1626; the Italian production is slow but steady throughout the century. The cut-off date of 1700 is somewhat arbitrary, convenient because of Sartori's documentation of the printed sources (Bibliografia della musica strumentale italiana 1500-1700); but it is an appropriate point to stop, since it marks the earliest appearance of keyboard music consciously written in the stile antico (see FONTANA 1677). A sense of tradition absent in the manuscript period (before 1500) developed with the beginning of music printing, so that by the time of PENNA 1672 keyboard theoreticians had the benefit of 150 years of music publishing to form and support their theories.

A survey of printed sources from Italy (Chapter three, Appendices A and B) forms the bulk of this study, preceded by Spanish sources (Chapter two). Prints and quotations by themselves do not, however, reflect the full picture of the performance and use of notational formats at the keyboard. A large proportion of sources are in manuscript form, and their testimony is ignored at the scholar's peril if a general theory of the use of keyboard sources is to be established. On the other hand, the already large amount of source material from two hundred years of music printing in Spain and Italy threatens to become utterly unmanageable if the entire manuscript corpus of the region and period is taken on as well. This study has adopted (again, somewhat arbitrarily) the approach of sampling representatively the manuscript sources of keyboard music (tentatively and loosely defined). Four manuscripts, linked primarily by their inclusion of music composed by Claudio Merulo (1533-1604), are surveyed in detail. Merulo is a
significant composer of keyboard music in his own right (see MERULO 1598 and 1604); in addition, he was very much aware of and concerned with the use of notational formats. This is not an obvious trait—he did not write on the subject in the detail of some (e.g. Banchieri)—but his early activity as music printer (1567 to 1571) was important and unprecedented from the hand of a practising keyboard player.

Merulo source-study lags behind the major figure of the period, Frescobaldi. There is, to be sure, less material to consider, but virtually the only work done in the field has been Debès's thematic catalogue (1964),\(^5\) necessarily wide in scope and lacking in detail and accuracy regarding the keyboard music. This survey of four important Merulo manuscripts thus goes some way towards redressing the imbalance. The studies (Chapters four to seven) are not primarily intended to be surveys of the music of Merulo, however. They are representative in that they stem from different periods and regions of Europe, and are notated in different formats. They include a small source unambiguously for keyboard originating near Faenza c. 1620, a manuscript in open score from Parma and Ravenna c. 1585, a source in German tablature copied near Augsburg c. 1640, and a source from Liège, c. 1620. The balance of origin (two from within Italy, two from without) is intended to indicate the importance of the transmission of Italian music across the continent in the 17th century. The four chapters are introduced more specifically in the introductory note to Part Two.

The ideas developed in this study are not new. Kinkeldey's Orgel und Klavier in der Musik des XVI. Jahrhunderts was probably the first monograph to take up the question of notational formats and their use; the work is still important, and much of the present study is built upon

\(^5\)Debes, 'Merulo'.
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Kinkeldey’s foundation. The examination of notational formats primarily for accompanimental purposes is rendered redundant to a large extent by Kinkeldey and the exhaustive work by Arnold, *Thorough-bass*. Riedel’s important study of keyboard music in the latter part of the 17th century *Quellenkundliche Beiträge* provides an essential foundation. His analysis of notational and other problems regarding keyboard music, which also relies on Kinkeldey, is excellent. Earlier studies of related subjects, Slim, ‘Keyboard Ricercar’, Silbiger, *Manuscript Sources* and Ester-Sala, *Ornamentación*, have been indispensable, having referred to or brought up many of the themes developed here. Finally, the analogies between keyboard and vihuela or lute music are significant, and previous studies of plucked-instrument music have been important sources of example and reference: Ward, ‘The Vihuela’, Vaccaro, *La musique de luth*, and Griffiths, ‘Vihuela Fantasia’.

The essential conclusion from examining printed and manuscript notational formats, and how, when and why they were used, is that the notation, and therefore the extant music itself, does not fully reflect keyboard music in Spain and Italy in this period as actually practised. Although the material for examination is the physical documentation found in sources which contain written keyboard music, when examined critically a whole range of purposes and intents become evident; the music must be placed within the context of an unwritten tradition of keyboard performance. In the period under examination the unwritten tradition gave way to written, primarily through the dissemination of printed sources, but the unwritten aspects of keyboard playing have never been entirely eradicated from performance tradition. In all the sources examined here, whether printed or manuscript, the artistic goals of keyboard players towards an unwritten art affect the written music.
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In this study the unwritten tradition is termed fantasia. This term is regularly used in Spanish and Italian literature to signify a technique of performance whose most salient characteristic is the lack of use of notated music. To equate fantasia and 'improvisation' is not far off the mark, but improvisation is misleading, since fantasia was an art that was studied and practised, quite different to another performance technique beginning to appear at the end of the 16th century, playing 'all'improviso', or on the spur of the moment. That technique, sightreading, is a significant theme in this study, since it relies on notation and its use, but playing 'all'improviso' and playing fantasia were two relatively independent facets of keyboard playing.

Fantasia is a complex technique expounded most fully in SANCTA RIA 1565 (Chapter two), but most Spanish sources touch upon it in one or another. In Italy, the meaning of the word is the same, but it is used less explicitly. For this reason, examining the Spanish tradition is an essential prelude to examining the Italian. Fantasia is clarified in most of Banchieri’s writings, and in DIRUTA 1609-10. Although the term began to be applied generically to specific pieces quite early in its history (especially in the lute repertoire), its first meaning is as a technique. This has become quite distorted in modern times, but a conscious effort has been made here to avoid using the word other than in the sense of a technique of performance.6

The fleeting image of this keyboard music— it was experienced once in performance and immediately lost— can be imitated and even reconstructed to some extent, but the notated music of the period does not necessarily reflect it. This is made clear early in the literature: Bermudo observed in 1555 that the written-down music of some masters

6For further terminological considerations, see below, I:83.
little resembled their real artistic ability (see I: 23). Similar statements occur or are implied in much of the music and commentary examined here.

The growing divergence of those musicians who played fantasia and those who performed notated music only is another important development of the period. This is closely connected to the use of notations. Performers who played from 'difficult' notations were rivalled by those who played from 'easy' notations; the latter imitated the former, and more than one critic of the period complained that uneducated performers could sound as if they were experts at the art of fantasia without really understanding the skill at all. This is an indication of the incipient divergence of keyboard composers and performers. The former were expert professional musicians who 'composed' their fantasia at the keyboard, and the latter were less ambitious, but developed a high degree of technical proficiency in performing and interpreting the music of others. This development was dependent upon reading music in a certain way and for certain purposes. The examination of notational formats sheds new light on the origins of musicians who relied primarily on others' music, not their own, for performance.

Notational formats

The use of notational formats by early keyboard musicians is the central theme of this study; the different types of formats are referred to in a technical sense, the fuller meaning of which is given here. The ten different formats fall broadly into two categories: those employing letters or numerals (tablature), and those employing mensural notation. There is a pedagogical distinction between the two in the literature:

---

7 See Chapter two, I: 52.
tablatures are more rudimentary and intended for the uneducated or novices, whereas mensural formats are for those with at least some acquaintance with music theory, usually expressed as 'knowledge of the Guidonian hand'.

Tablature

The word derives from the Latin _tabula_ (table) and in its earliest usage simply indicated that notes were placed one above the other in tabular form. This definition has been refined and tablature is now generally accepted to be a notation which requires two separate sets of signs to indicate pitch and rhythm. This study refers to three types of tablature, although additional systems were present in the period.

Lute tablature. This is historically the predecessor of Spanish tablature. It consists of letters or numerals placed on lines. The lines represent courses of the instrument, the letters (numerals) represent frets. Rhythm is indicated above the group of lines using a system of stems and flags, and it includes bar lines.

Spanish tablature. This notation was developed in Spain for use at the keyboard, and outwardly resembles Lute tablature. It consists of lines representing the parts of a musical texture: most common is four-part. Numerals are placed on the lines to represent pitch, according to various systems. The most common uses the numerals one to seven for the pitches A to G, with diacritical marks to indicate octave differences. Rhythm is represented the same as Lute tablature. The three major sources of Spanish keyboard music examined in Chapter two all use this notation. One kind is illustrated in Example 2.2 (I: 29). A variant of Spanish tablature occurs once in the Italian literature: VALENTE 1576. It numbers the white keys only, and shows hand division by a horizontal line. Rhythmic notation is the same as Spanish tablature.
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New German Tablature. This notation is similar to Spanish tablature but uses letters (A to H) instead of numerals, and lines (or upper/lower case) to indicate octave placement. Rhythm is given according to a system of stems and flags similar to Lute tablature; each part is given rhythm symbols for every note. There are no bar lines, but the letters are always grouped in units, usually the value of a semibreve. Nor are there horizontal lines to indicate the parts of the texture; this is usually made clear through the context. One manuscript examined here employs this notation throughout: the Turin tablatures (Chapter six).

Mensural notational formats

Intavolatura. This is the term applied throughout this study to refer to the common Italian keyboard notation of the 16th and 17th centuries. It is outwardly similar to modern keyboard notation, employing two staves of five or more lines each, with mensural notation. It shows hand-division (not voice-leading) by placing the appropriate notes on the upper or lower stave; it includes bar lines, and relatively good vertical alignment (see Ex. A.9, II:110). DIRUTA 1609-10 provides instructions for making an intavolatura. Abbreviated references to intavolatura in this study include number of systems per page and number of lines per stave, when known: '5 x 6/8' means five two-stave systems per page, the upper stave consisting of six lines, the lower eight. The sources were mostly printed with type, which was technologically limiting and did not use beams for short note-values, but a significant amount of keyboard music (beginning with MERULO 1593) was engraved in copper plates. Engraved intavolatura shows beaming and layout of music
in a precise way, as if it were a carefully prepared manuscript. Many of the sources in Appendix A employ some form of intavolatura, as does the Bagnacavallo manuscript (Chapter four).

**Short score.** This term denotes the notational format where upper and lower parts of a multi-part texture are set on a system of two five-line staves. Bar lines are included, but the performer is usually left to fill in the texture without figures. A significant variant occurs late in the period, when figures are added to both upper and lower staves to represent a more specific and full texture (see DEGLI ANTONII 1687(ii).

**Figured bass (organ bass, basso continuo, basso sequente, thorough bass).** Used primarily within the context of accompaniment, these terms refer to a single bass line with or without figures above or below.

**Open score.** One part per stave and three or more staves per system. The Bourdeney codex employs this notational format (Chapter five). The printed form is illustrated in Example A.7 (II: 76).

**Bass score.** An accompanimental notational format which consists of two or more bass parts from a polychoral texture vertically aligned in open score.

**Choirbook.** Single parts notated mensurally on five-line staves in one book, but not in score. Usually each part is allotted one quadrant of an opening. Bermudo’s choirbook format is illustrated in Example 2.3 (I: 35).

---

The term 'partitura' is often used synonymously with open score, but is deliberately avoided in this study due to the ambiguity of meaning to the word in 17th-century Italy. Writers around 1600 refer to partitura meaning figured bass, short score, open score, or simply any organ accompanimental part. The specific meaning of the term can usually be determined through the context.
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Partbooks. Single parts notated mensurally on five-line staves in separate books. This is the most common format of the period, as well as the most controversial for use at the keyboard.

This study is organized in two parts: prints and manuscripts. For prints, the limited Spanish output is surveyed chronologically in Chapter two (where Spanish keyboard manuscripts are also briefly reviewed). The Italian output is surveyed chronologically in Appendices A and B; the latter tabulates partbook-volumes in summary form, and the former individually examines the remainder in more detail. The data in the appendices is reviewed and classified according to important themes in Chapter three. In Chapters four to seven, four manuscripts are examined and surveyed for their contents.

Quotation and translation make up a large part of Chapter two and Appendix A. In Chapter three, cross-reference to Appendix A is continually made, where quotation supports and develops points made more briefly in the chapter. If the quotation has been translated before, acknowledgement is made; if acknowledgement is absent, the translation is by the present author.
PART ONE

PRINTS
CHAPTER TWO

SOURCES OF SPANISH KEYBOARD MUSIC

16th- and early 17th-century Spanish printed keyboard music and related theoretical volumes offer a wealth of information regarding keyboard notation, its genesis and its users. Their discussions of keyboard music offer a fundamental agreement over the role of notated music in the performer’s life. They describe the various notations in use at the time, how they should be used by most or least experienced performers, who might make use of various keyboard works, the significance of the music for keyboard, and what the aims of keyboard pedagogues were. By surveying the extant Spanish keyboard literature and bringing the relevant passages together, a fairly accurate picture of the musicians’ attitude towards the art of keyboard playing may be drawn. In this chapter seven printed and eight manuscript sources are surveyed: three large collections in Spanish Tablature (VENEGAS 1557, CABEZON 1578, CORREA 1626), intended primarily for use at the keyboard and containing extensive prefatory writings; two treatises which include expositions of the contemporary issues of playing the keyboard and a small number of music examples (BERMUDO 1555 and SANCTA MARIA 1565); one vihuela tablature which includes a sample keyboard notation and prefatory comments on it (MUDARRA 1546); the first Portuguese printed keyboard volume (COELHO 1620), which although its prefatory material is limited, is of significance due to its proximity to Spain; and finally
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eight manuscript sources, which offer corroborative evidence to the printed volumes.¹

As will be seen through the words of the writers, there were specific conceptions regarding how a keyboard player was to play or acquire skills and learn music. The development and use of Spanish Tablature brought forth new ideas about the role of notation in the performer's art, and caused a difference of opinion about the merits of the notation and its implications for performance. The keyboard player's art was changing as a result of the notation: more and more people were able to learn to play the keyboard, and a secretive guild-like attitude towards the art was directly challenged. The level of artistry was perceived by many conservatives to fall as a result of easy and wide dissemination of a previously restricted art. But the advantages of the new expedient notations led to a revision of the conceptions regarding keyboard music and performers in the 16th century; a distinction between composer and performer was in effect being formulated. The developments seen here reflect the confrontation of tradition with innovation manifest in many ways throughout Europe at the time; the influence of book production and printing which permeated society had its effect on keyboard music as well, since the new keyboard sources were able to be mass-produced relatively easily.

The survey proceeds chronologically through Spanish printed works which establish the nature of opinion regarding keyboard music, after which the remainder of sources are adduced; quotations alternate with commentary throughout. The first printed 'keyboard music' of the

¹The seven prints discussed here constitute the total output of the period; six further prints are cited as lost in Caldwell, 'Sources', but must be treated with caution and are considered in more detail below. The eight manuscripts are representative of a larger body which is yet to be fully evaluated in the musicological literature.
peninsula is found in Alonso Mudarra's Vihuela tablature. It will be seen that the new keyboard notation was a direct descendant of vihuela tablature.

MUDARRA 1546

Alonso Mudarra, Tres libros de musica en cifras para vihuela (Seville: Juan de León, 1546). ²

Format: vihuela tablature (including mensural notation for songs); harp/keyboard tablature.

Contents: 4 + 24 + 27 + 61 folios., 77 pieces, the last entitled 'ciphers for harp and organ (cifras para harpa y organo)'.

The volume includes introductory matter, dedication, an explanation of the vihuela notation, fantasias, settings of Mass movements, dances, songs, and motets, many with texts; composers include Josquin, Willaert and Gombert. Intended for vihuelists, it does not give a general musical instruction, but concentrates on technical aspects of setting the hands on the instrument. The vihuela tablature is graphic: the six lines of the tablature represent the six strings of the vihuela. Mudarra's emphasis on the mechanistic or prescriptive technique indicates that he was more concerned for the user to place the fingers properly than understand the compositional or theoretical subtleties of the pieces to be played. Ward put the implications of the notation aptly: 'It is the special grace of [vihuela] tablature that the utter amateur can perform the most intricate music without, in any technical sense, understanding it; the ability to read tablature is a substitute

²Brown 1546 ⁴; ed. Pujol.
for theoretical knowledge. The volume is not addressed to professional musicians, but rather to amateurs who wished to play the instrument, yet did not understand the rudiments of music.

Although Mudarra's title names only vihuela and guitar, there is one piece in the collection for harp or keyboard. A facsimile of the piece is given below, Example 2.1. It is given at the end of the volume, after the corrigenda and several woodcuts, with a short preface:

De esta otra parte se pone vn principio de vn Libro que tenia hecho para Imprimir, en el qual auia muchas, Fantasias, Y Composturas en vną nueva manera de cifras para Harpa, y Organo el qual acorde poner aqui (Pues mis ocupaciones no me dieron lugar a que imprimiese el dicho libro) para que si a alguno le pareciere bien la invencion destas cifras se pueda aprovechar della, sacando en ellas composturas como se sacan en las de la Vihuela porque en todo lleuan la mesma orden, saluo que estas cifras no tienen numero de vno, ni de dos, ni de nada todas son de vNA manera no hazen mas de señalar las cuerdas en que an de tocar.

In this other part is given the beginning of a book which I have prepared to be printed, in which there are many fantasias and compositions in a new manner of ciphers for harp and organ which I agreed to place here (since my work has not yet given me occasion to print the said book), so that if the invention of these ciphers seems good to anyone, he may make use of it, drawing compositions from it as is done from vihuela notation, since they both have the same principle, except that these ciphers do not have the number one, nor two, nor any; all are of one type, and they do no more than indicate the strings to be plucked.

---

3 Ward, 'The Vihuela', p. 65. Kinkeldey, Orgel, drew a distinction between mechanistic and mensural notation: the former shows a graphic representation of the music, whereas the latter is more abstract and hence universal. Mechanistic notation's primary function is to show how to place the hand upon the instrument. The implications of such a notation are significant: players could sound as if they understood the music, by 'merely' placing their fingers in the right place at the right time. For a fuller consideration of prescriptive notations see Vaccaro, La musique de luth, pp. 121-2. Interestingly, Vaccaro used a similar metaphor to Bermudo: the musician who plays 'by numbers' without understanding is like a person who can pronounce the words of a language correctly without understanding their meaning; the speaker can say something understandable to others without understanding it himself. See below, note 29.

4 Repr. p. [249].

Example 2.1. MUDARRA 1546, 'Cifras para harpa y organo.'
The piece, entitled tiento, is merely a sample of the type of notation Mudarra had developed for use by harp or organ. He suggested that users may wish to employ it for notating works in an expedient way, a function which the remainder of the volume fulfills for vihuelists. The book he cited was apparently never printed. The tablature itself is more suited to the harp than organ, as Mudarra implied by commenting on 'strings to be plucked'. He also indicated this in the instructions printed beneath the music, which primarily discuss playing or tuning the strings of a harp. The graphic layout of the notation is more suited to the harp than keyboard, as Mudarra implicitly noted: 'The lines and spaces [represent] the strings of the harp and the playing of the organ (Las rayas y los espacios son las cuerdas de la Harpa: y el Iuego del Organo)'. This graphic harp notation is analogous to the graphic vihuela tablature of the remainder of the volume.

Since the volume would be of little interest to professional keyboard players (it is highly unlikely that the vihuela notation would be used at the keyboard, due to its idiomatic form so well suited to the former instrument), the placement of this sample notation at the end suggests Mudarra's desire to cater for amateurs in a small way by showing how they might begin to intabulate works using a notation expedient for other instruments if they wished. The lack of distinction between harp and keyboard indicates that Mudarra promoted the work as widely as he could; the preferred instrument, however, would have been harp. But it is unlikely that professionals of either instrument would have used the new tablature. Their art was learned in other ways than studying an elementary example appended to a vihuela tablature. If, however, amateurs wished to try their hand at either the keyboard or harp, they might have found the piece useful. The piece gives by
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analogy with the vihuela a means of notation for the keyboard which could have been used by amateurs.

This is the earliest notation which specifically names the keyboard extant from the Iberian peninsula, and there is a strong probability that only a small number of keyboard sources per se even existed at this time. Amateurs probably did not play the keyboard as much as the vihuela, if the published volumes of each are any indication. Professionals, as will be seen more explicitly from BERMUDO 1555, did not generally use a specifically keyboard-orientated notation either. Thus Mudarra's slight harp/keyboard piece represents the beginning of a trend towards more accessibility to the keyboard on the part of amateurs. Although there are no other sources extant which use the notation, the very existence of it among various types indicates the novelty of the idea and its unsettled nature and purpose.

Mudarra's notation has a direct relation to vihuela tablature; the benefits of vihuela notation were seen, and attempts were made to apply them in a similar way to the keyboard. The volume is an example of the trend towards expediency in performance to the detriment of musical understanding for vihuela music, a development directly paralleled in later keyboard volumes.

Furthermore, the vihuela would have suited the courtier's image better than the keyboard, which was associated with the organ and music for the liturgy. The courtier as musical amateur is considered in Vaccaro, La Musique de luth, pp. 25-30.

Jambou, Tiento, p. 143. Bermudo noted the existence of the notational format used by Mudarra (Declaracion, fol. 112v; cited by Jambou, p. 145, and Ward, 'The Vihuela', p. 378).
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BERMUDO 1555

Fray Juan Bermudo, *Declaracion de instrumentos musicales* (Osuna: Juan de León, 1555). 8

Format (music): choirbook, open score, Spanish tablature, vihuela tablature.

Contents: 8 unn. + 142 fols., theoretical treatise with numerous music examples and 14 complete pieces (1 in Spanish tablature, 2 in vihuela tablature, 11 in choirbook format).

Bermudo’s third and most important theoretical work has been examined in detail elsewhere; 9 his comments on notation and playing keyboard music, made chiefly in Book IV, in which he gave instructions for playing the keyboard, 10 vihuela and harp, are some of the clearest and most significant in the literature. But the tone of the treatise and its primary goals are given in two prologues, where several important insights into the use of tablature ('cifras') and the treatise at large may be found. In the first prologue, Bermudo clarified some of

---

8 Brown 1555. Two earlier theoretical works of Bermudo have varying degrees of material incorporated into this volume, and hence are not listed independently in this survey: *El Libro primero de la declaracion de instrumentos* (Brown 1549; no music) and *El Arte triphario* (Brown 1550; one music example which shows how to use Spanish tablature). Their contents are discussed more fully in Brown and Stevenson, Bermudo, where comparison of the different versions of repeated material is given.


10 The term *monachordio* (here translated as 'keyboard' or 'clavichord') is potentially confusing. Bermudo (Book IV Chapter 16, 'Del origen del monachordio') discussed the term, pointing out that it may be applied to organs or clavichords in addition to its earlier meaning in Boethius and Ornithoparcus. In most cases the generic 'keyboard' is intended (fol. 69v). The section of Book IV which deals with the keyboard is headed (on each folio) 'De tañer el organo'. See also Jambou, *Tiento*, p. 46 n82.
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the common practices among musicians of the day, showing that there was a significant tendency for some teachers to be selective regarding their work:

No performer can enjoy the excellent music of this time without understanding the instruments, and how to arrange it for them. Commonly, those who sell or give away their ciphers [do not give] the best music they know; that which they judge to be good, they save for themselves. Some of the ciphers I have seen do not deserve to be called music. The performer who knows how to set his hands on the organ, vihuela and other instruments, should he understand these books [of mine] and cipher good music, will recognize in a short time the usefulness and profit that comes from them, and from understanding them.

Some deceive themselves, saying that music in ciphers, or that given by the performers, is of good style and grace, and that [these qualities] are lacking in pointed [mensural music]. Believe the experienced, that the good music of today does not lack good style, and [whether] ciphered or set on the keyboard as it stands, however it may be, does not lose it. I am convinced that if beginning performers had ears in tune with the music of today, they would consider the money spent on ciphers as wasted, and even that which they spend on barbarous teachers; and they should take the trouble to understand these [my] books, to be able to play good music.

The point is that the notation itself is neutral— it is possible for both good and bad music to be notated in ciphers. But apparently some

---

11 First prologue, unn. fols. 5v-6.
cipher manuscripts and prints circulating in his time reflected only a portion of the art, and Bermudo tried to stress that it is necessary to learn to cipher music one's self in order to play good music. Ciphering was thus an important and common technique for this purpose in 1555.12 But those who taught using ciphers only were teaching by rote without offering true understanding to pupils (who by implication would receive the understanding from Bermudo's treatise). The theme of secrecy and hoarding is present, but only in a limited sense, since if the musician learns to transfer polyphonic music (in partbooks) to cipher notation himself he has unrestricted access to high-quality music, according to Bermudo. He argued for a more enlightened and open pedagogical technique.

The theme of secrecy is taken up more forcefully in the second prologue, where Bermudo made a powerful rhetorical statement about the usefulness of his five-book treatise and confuted critics who claimed he was too long-winded ('prolixo'): it is better to be free with information than inscrutable:

Antes quieren algunos trabajar diez y veinte años sin saber lo que hazen, y estar a las migajuelas de los que algo saben, y no lo quieren enseñar: que gastar vn mes en leer estos libros. 13

Before [students] try to work for ten or twenty years without knowing what they are doing, picking up the [mere] crumbs of those who know something but do not want to teach it, they should take a month to read these books.

12 Ward, 'Editorial Methods', p. 105, also cited a portion of this passage to show that cipher notation was common at the time. In further support of this, it may be noted that in the second prologue (unn. fols. 6v-8v), Bermudo lists the twelve most significant innovations of his treatise, none of which are related to inventing cipher notation.

The passage probably does not refer to keyboard but vihuela number tablature, however; see below for vihuela tablatures printed before 1555. This hypothesis accounts for the otherwise puzzling wording above which refers to both cifras and poner en el monachordio (see note 20).

13 Second prologue, unn. fol. 6v.
Some teachers were so protective of their art or technique that an innocent beginner might take years to discover some of the 'trade secrets'. The benefits of the treatise are therefore obvious to the prospective student. The teacher ought not be regarded with quite so much awe when there is so much of the art that can be taught forthrightly and clearly without holding back information.

Bermudo also confuted the opposite criticism: obscurity. Treading the fine line between saying too much and too little, he agreed that 'everything is not for everyone (todo no es para todos)'. He continued:

Digo verdad, que no escreui [sic] en algunas cosas: como yo quisiera, y pudiera. Si en algun tiempo estos mis libros convirtieren en latin, o en alguna otra lengua estrania: quando los musicos sabios de otras naciones vienen auiar de algunas poquedades, y reprehender cosas que no ay musico entre ellos que en las tales cayga: entiendan ser los auisos dados para principiantes en Musica, y los errores que seio no son de los musicos que en este tiempo ay en España: los quales son muchos y excelentes . . . 15

I say indeed, that I have not written about some things as I would have liked or been able. If at some point these books of mine are translated into Latin or some other foreign language, when learned musicians of other countries point up some trifles, and criticize things, [saying] there is no musician among them who would make such errors; they should understand that these are instructions given for beginners in music, and the errors that I indicate are not those of musicians in present-day Spain, who are many and excellent . . .

This is a salutary reminder that the reader (in any age) needs to place the writing in the context it was intended. Bermudo wrote for beginners, and the things he said do not always reflect the high points of the art in contemporary Spain.

Bermudo approached the playing of the keyboard from the perspective of singing and composing. The imagery of the singer is frequently used

---

14 Ibid., unn. fol. 7.
15 Ibid.
in his writing, and vocal techniques are clearly a major factor in understanding how to play musically at the keyboard, yet he also declared that thorough knowledge of solmization and vocal technique is not essential to the keyboard player. He emphasized the importance of a personal teacher in learning the art: merely reading his work would not in itself have been sufficient.\textsuperscript{16}

In introductions for both keyboard and vihuela players Bermudo discussed the pedagogical approach that should be taken, and commented on the prime goal of both instrumentalists: to play fantasia.\textsuperscript{17} This is attained through examining the music of good musicians. For keyboard players he said,

\begin{quote}
El auido que do[y] a los tañedores de vihuela es bueno para los de organo. Digo, que no tañessen fantasía hasta que supiessen muchas obras: y despues sacarian fantasía.
\end{quote}

The advice I give to vihuela players is valid for organists. I say that they should not play fantasia until they know many pieces; and afterward they may take up fantasia. \textsuperscript{18}

For vihuelists he had said,

\begin{quote}
Tome el principiante por ultimo auido de no tañer fantasía: hasta que aya puesto mucha y buena musica en la vihuela. Despues de auer puesto esta musica, y tañería liberalmente: puede della sacar excelente fantasía. Sera tan buena la fantasía sacada desta maneras quanto fuere la musica que vuie re puesto. No poco yerran los principiantes: que en comenzando a tañer: quieren salir con su fantasía.
\end{quote}

Lastly, the beginner should not play fantasia until he has set much good music on the vihuela. After having set this music, and played it freely, he may draw excellent fantasia from it. The fantasía made in this way will be as good as if it were the music that had

\textsuperscript{16} This contrasts significantly with a number of works for lute and vihuela: see Vaccaro, \textit{La Musique de luth}, p. 32, and Ward, \textit{The Vihuela}, p. 64: 'All of the printed vihuela tablatures are self-instructors'.

\textsuperscript{17} The material from Bermudo on fantasía has been considered in varying degrees of detail and emphasis by all the writers cited in note 9.

\textsuperscript{18} Book IV, fol. 60v. Transl. with a slightly different interpretation in Slim, \textit{'Keyboard Ricercar'}, p. 404.
been set. They err not a little, those beginners who, when beginning to play, wish to come forth with their fantasia. 19

If the prime goal was fantasia, which could be reached only by learning music by past masters of vocal polyphony, it is clear that the means of learning the vocal music was vitally important. Bermudo considered the notational implications of learning to play this vocal music at the keyboard in Book IV, Chapter 41. 'Keyboard sources', music notated in a specifically keyboard-oriented format, are the evidence of this goal, a step towards playing fantasia. He described three ways in which vocal music may be notated for the keyboard: 20

Como se pora en el monachordio. Todo quinto auemos dicho hasta ahora es para venir a este fin, de poner canto de organo en el monachordio. No se puede vno llamar tañedor: sino sabe poner musica suya, o agena. Tres manera de poner se ofrecen al presente: y todas las demas se reduzen a estas tres. La primera es teniendo el libro de canto de organo delante. El que tañedor quisiere ser, si es buen cantor, que sabe de composicion: con estudiar lo ya dicho en este libro, y entender el monachordio: puede poner en el obras, con solamente tener delante el libro.

Esta manera de poner es muy trabajosa, porquue lleuan mucha cuenta mirando todas las bozes: pero es gananciosa. Hazen con ella gran caudel de Musica. Si le composicion no sabe, y no esta excercitado en poner, sino que comienza, o no quiere trabaxar tanto: ha primer de virgular el canto de organo, a la forma de lo que yo dexo encima de las cifras, en el capitulo siguiente: y assi repartido por sus compases, puesto delante sobre el monachordio, de manera que no impida las cuerdas, lo puede poner. Estas do formas de poner en el monachordio son comunes, y buenas para los ya señalados. La tercera manera es poner por cifras . . . 21

---

19 Book II, fol. 29v. The advice is reiterated in Book IV, fol. 99v; see Ward, 'The Vihuela', pp. 95, 214, and Slim, 'Keyboard Ricercar', p. 404.

20 'Poner en el monachordio' (literally, 'to place on the keyboard') is the regular phrase encountered for the process of playing vocal music at the keyboard. The meaning of the phrase is akin to arranging, intabulating or transcribing, and always refers to playing mensurally notated vocal music at the keyboard; but it is not specific regarding notation employed. See Ester-Sala, Ornamentación, pp. 29-43.

21 Book IV, fol. 82v.
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How one sets [polyphonic works] on the keyboard. All that we have said up to this point is to this end, to set polyphony on the keyboard. One may not be called a performer without knowing how to set music both by himself and by others. Three ways of playing may be offered here; all other ways may be reduced to these three. The first is to use the choirbook. He who wishes to be a performer, if he is a good singer and understands the principles of composition, with study of all that I have said in this work, and understanding of the keyboard, may play works by merely reading from the choirbook.

This way of playing is very laborious, because keeping all the voices in view costs great effort; but it is profitable. One makes with this method a great wealth of music. If one does not know about composition and has not had much practice in playing, but is a beginner, or does not wish to take too much effort, he should first bar the music in the manner I show above the ciphers in the following chapter [see Ex. 2.2]. And thus divided into bars, and placed upon the clavichord in such a way as to avoid disturbing the strings, one may play from it. These two types of playing on the clavichord are common, and good for those already mentioned. The third way is to play from ciphers . . .

The three notational formats are the means for playing vocal works, and they accord with three levels of musicians. Presumably, only the best organists could play from separate parts of a choirbook; they, together with the less accomplished, could play from open score; but the least skilled would have been restricted to music set in cipher notation.22 Bermudo’s example of how to notate in Spanish Tablature is given in Example 2.2. He emphasized the great skill of those who could read from choirbooks, but had little to say about open score; since he considered at some length the advantages of ciphering, it is probable that open score was more common than the latter method and required little discussion.23 Bermudo cited three advantages to ciphering:

---

22 Bermudo’s three-fold notational distinction of Chapter 41 is reminiscent of Chapter 5, where he distinguishes between three classes of musicians: ‘cantante (tañante), cantor, musico’. The cantante/tañante played or sang with no musical comprehension, the cantor was a composer, and the musico a theoretician. He concluded the chapter thus: ‘In our country there are an infinity of cantantes, many good cantores, and few musicos (En nuestra España ay infinidad de cantantes, muchos buenos cantores, y pocos musicos)’ (Declaracion, fol. 5v).

23 Open score is the predominant format of keyboard manuscripts of the period; see below, I: 62.
Example 2.2. BERMUDO 1555, fol. 83: Open score, Spanish tablature. The first ten semibreves of this piece are transcribed in four-part open score with a Spanish tablature reduction beneath. The remainder is given in Spanish tablature only (it continues on fol. 83v).
This art of ciphering has three uses. First, if any good performer wishes to perform a motet on the spur of the moment (as the good vihuelists do), ciphering it first will enable him to play it without fault. It will be no small feat to play polyphony at the clavichord at the spur of the moment, even if it were by means of ciphers. Second, if one wishes to put a large amount of music on little paper, one should use ciphers. Notated polyphony takes up four times as much space as ciphered. [Third,] the ciphers are most useful for beginners. If a master who teaches how to play has pupils who do not know how to sing, he may teach them by using ciphers. I would say that just as there are vihuelists (without knowledge of note-names) who play only by means of ciphers, so it can be for those [who play] the keyboard, if they give them the ciphers.

Bermudo sheds light on the current practices of organists and notation. It must have been possible, if not easy, to play from choirbooks. As Kinkeldey noted, this may explain Bermudo’s earlier comment that a good organist might spend twenty years learning his art; nevertheless, the technique was practised. To play ‘on the spur of the moment’ was an

---

24 Book IV, fol. 83.

25 Ibid., fol. 60; cited by Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 12 (Kinkeldey did not refer to Bermudo’s ‘twenty years’ in the second prologue cited above).

26 Stevenson, Spanish Cathedral Music, documented two examples of playing from choirbooks or partbooks: Bernardo Cavijo del Castillo was required to sing and play a motet from partbooks as part of his examination for the professorship of music at Salamanca University in 1593 (p. 308); and organists who were examined for the post at Málaga Cathedral (1552) were given a choirbook from which they were tested on their sight- and score-reading ability (p. 123 n196). Owens noted (‘Milan Partbooks’) that Rore was accustomed to working without a score of any kind. Bermudo noted elsewhere that the best vihuelists and harpists could read from the choirbook (Declaracion, fol. 98v, 112v),
important requirement, apparently, and suggests accompanimental purposes for the technique. Open score, the second method, is useful for those who know how to sing and read mensural notation (but not how to compose); and the third method is stressed as the most advantageous. In doing so, Bermudo showed that he is an advocate of the extension of the art of keyboard playing to a broader public. Skilled organists could play polyphony with little preparation with this new notation. Furthermore, novices who learned from ciphers would not even need to understand the solmization system, yet they could do the things that previously only a master could manage.

The notion that knowledge of the solmization system was unnecessary for playing the organ to a high technical level is striking, and directly contradicts the ultimate goal, fantasia, which required compositional expertise. Bermudo indicated that such an approach was already common among vihuelists, as established in the first prologues. Keyboard tablature was a direct imitation of vihuela tablature, six of which were printed before 1555: Milán (1536), Narvaez (1538), Mudarra (1546), Valderrábano (1547), Pisador (1552) and Fuenllana (1554). As a modern-thinking theorist, Bermuda could not have failed to see the advantages of those works and how they could be applied to keyboard music. But in the process, understanding the music itself (i.e., the vocal theory) fell by the wayside. He had already said as much in Book IV Chapter 1:

Algunos dizien ser menester contrapunto para que uno pueda alcanzar a ser buen tañedor. Al que de mi libro se uviere de aprovechar, le

and that composing in open score was 'barbarous' (fol. 134; cited in Riedel, Quellenkundliche Beiträge, p. 34).

27 See Ward, 'The Vihuela', and Griffiths, 'Vihuela Fantasia'.

28 "Avoid old-fashioned music," was Bermuda's constant theme' (Stevenson, Spanish Cathedral Music, p. 36).
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suplico, que no lo deprienda para este efecto: y si lo supiere, que del no se aproveche: sino fuere muy profundo, y de buen ayre. El que posibilidad tuviere de aprender contrapunto: bien lo puede hazer, que para otras cosas aprovechara, conviene a saber para mas facilmente poner en el monachordio, para enmendar algun yerro de puntante, y para otras cosas: pero no se aprovecha para tañerlo. En teniendo buenas manos, y en entendiendo este libro: podeys comenzar a poner obras en el monachordio. 29

Some say counterpoint is necessary in order to become a good performer. To those who wish to profit from my book, I bid that they do not study it for that reason; and should they know (counterpoint) already, they will not profit from it, unless it were very deep and of good style. He who has the opportunity to learn counterpoint would do well to do so, since it would be useful for other things: for knowing how to set music on the keyboard more easily, for correcting errors in the music, etc.; but one need not avail oneself of it in order to perform at the keyboard. Having good hands and understanding this book, you can begin to set pieces on the keyboard.

By denying the importance of solmization theory and counterpoint for playing the organ, Bermudo in effect drew a distinction between performer and composer. 30 Heretofore in the instrumental tradition, the two were integrally linked in the art of fantasia. Bermudo pointed out that one can play 'de improviso' without needing the skill to play fantasia, through use of the new notation system. 'De improviso' is Bermudo's way of referring to playing without having to prepare, or sightreading. The reference is significant; the concept of sightreading was probably unknown, if previous organists relied solely on choirbook notation. The concept of quickly apprehending a pre-composed work,

29 Book IV, fol. 60; Cited by Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 12. A little later, Bermudo declared (fol. 60v) that those who play the organ without proper understanding of the keyboard ('no saben qual es tono, semitono mayor, o menor, y otras subtilezas que en el monachordio ay') were comparable to those who read Latin without understanding the meaning of the language.

30 The same distinction has been made regarding French lute music of the period; see Vaccaro, La musique de luth, p. 263. Ester-Sala also noted the rise of this distinction as evidenced by the works of Venegas, Cabezón and Ortiz; Ornamentación, p. 23. If 'the 19th-century virtuosi brought about the divorce of composer and performer' (Ward, 'The Vihuela', p. 225), their estrangement began with the development of expedient notations in the 16th century.
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implicit in all keyboard-oriented notations, is actually made explicit by Bermudo. The expediency of sightreading is self-evident; but the benefits are offset by the loss of understanding of musical principles which those who played fantasia would have had. So although Bermudo’s stated aim at the beginning of Chapter 41 is merely to show how works can be notated in order to learn vocal music, a step towards the ultimate goal of fantasia, he did not remain faithful to the goal but showed how an expedient notation can enable the performer to play as if playing fantasia.

It follows that when performance and composition were more closely linked through fantasia, there was little need for keyboard players to write down their music.\(^{31}\) The exceptions, keyboard sources from 1325 to 1555, prove the rule, as it were; keyboard playing was essentially an unwritten art, and the extant sources must be considered circumspectly, since sources at Bermudo’s time only begin to take on significance for performance, as opposed to merely a means of learning an unwritten goal. Extant sources therefore by definition could not reflect the true art of keyboard players until the separation of performer and composer became more firmly established.\(^{32}\) Bermudo was at the beginning of a trend which led to a full separation of the two, although for organ music, improvisation holds a high place even today. Performance and composition were closely intertwined in the mid-16th century; competent organists were assumed to be competent ‘composers’, in that they were regularly required to play polyphonic music that was never written down.\(^{33}\)

\(^{31}\) As Kinkeldey noted, Orgel, p. 99.

\(^{32}\) A conclusion which CABEZON 1578 confirms.

\(^{33}\) The role of improvised embellishment of pre-existent compositions
The apparent contradiction in Chapter 41 is matched by Bermudo’s actual usage of different notations in the volume. The music reflects more the old style than the new, in spite of his advocacy of cipher notation. Example 2.2 shows the only appearance of Spanish tablature; he gave a series of pieces at the end of Book IV in choirbook format (see Ex. 2.3). Whether the reason for using choirbook format was custom or expediency cannot be determined unequivocally, but it is more likely the former. The printing technology was well enough developed, as the six vihuela tablatures demonstrate; Bermudo himself pointed out the (not unimportant) lower paper costs resulting from the cipher tablature.\(^{34}\) His choice of notation was intended and customary for organists, and avoided the necessity of transcribing the music in different tablatures for keyboard, vihuela and harp. Bermudo’s duality of approach is perhaps indicative of the novelty of performance-practice developments regarding the new notations; the notion of expediency was still quite new in 1555, and as Bermudo himself showed in the prologue, ciphers could not be trusted as the best music. But his testimony is important for coming to understand the nature of keyboard music in sixteenth-century Spain. His writings help to clarify the changing status of keyboard players, a change made even greater with the flourishing of the cipher system.

As with Mudarra’s, Bermudo’s notation system is not known to have been used elsewhere.\(^{35}\) It assigns a number for every key of the

---

\(^{34}\) One of the reasons Bermudo cited (fol. 142) for not printing the sixth and seventh books of his treatise was the scarcity and cost of the paper; Sancta Maria’s book was delayed in printing for six years due in part to lack of paper (Hultberg, ‘Sancta Maria’, p. 187).

\(^{35}\) See Apel, Notation, p. 47, for a fuller discussion of the system.
Example 2.3. BERMUDO 1555, fol. 114: choirbook format. Three staves per voice, no bar lines.
instrument; he noted that there were many cipher systems in use at the
time, and referred (without example) to one which assigns a number to
each white key and employs flat and sharp signs, as well as to two types
of letter notation: the first (for singers), uses letter names A-G and
octave differentiation (similar to New German Tablature), the second the
full alphabet (similar to German Lute Tablature). It is noteworthy,
however, that none of these is as prescriptive as vihuela notation.
Assigning a number for every key is the closest, and it is conceivable
that beginners might have actually written numbers on the keyboard to
facilitate use of the notation; but apparently the system was rejected
by later performers, who adopted one which was closely related to open
score mensural notation, used less paper, but which was less
rhythmically precise. The imperfections of Bermudo’s system, coupled
with his discussion of various other notations, is a further indication
of the novelty of such notations and the experimental stage of their
development.

36 ‘Muchas cifras se han vsado para el monachordio’. Book IV, fol. 82v.
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VENEGAS 1557

Luys Venegas de Henestrosa, *Libro de cifra nueva para tecla, harpa y vihuela, en el qual se enseña breuemente cantar canto llano, y canto de organo, y algunos avisos para contrapunto* (Alcalá de Henares: Joan de Brocar, 1557). 37

Format: Spanish tablature.

Contents: 2 unn. + 76 fols., 138 pieces: tientos, fantasias, motets, Kyries, diferencias, hymns, chansons, villancicos, etc.

This volume, the first to employ Spanish tablature throughout, 38 was advertised in its title as appropriate for a number of instruments. But the title is perhaps too broad, to judge from the introduction to the work; it is largely aimed towards keyboard players. Its format suggests this as well: the six previous vihuela tablatures all used graphic notation, and to break from the precedent and use a more idealized notation is not to encourage use by vihuelists. 39 The use of Spanish tablature is significant; what to Bermudo was a matter of expediency disdained in actual use becomes the sole mode of notation. Venegas's introduction to the volume sheds light on the question of its purpose, and suggests that he was well aware of the significance of the new notation; he began the work with an apology:

Al lector. Aunque por ser cosa nueva esta cifra, será agradable (muy amado lector), no dexo de temer que la gran facilidad que tiene, será causa, para que los mejores músicos la calumnien y

37 Brown 1557; ed. Anglés, *La Música*.

38 In a form related to, but different from Bermudo's system: the four lines of the tablature are retained, representing four polyphonic voices, but the pitches are represented by the numbers 1 to 7 with additional octave differentiations. See Apel, *Notation*, p. 50.

39 Griffiths, 'Vihuela Fantasia', p. 9, observed that Spanish tablature is significantly more difficult for vihuelists to play from than vihuela tablature.
tengan en poco, porque como ellos gastaron tanto tiempo, y pasaron tanto trabajo en alcanzar lo que saben, y vean que por esta vía, se ataja mucho camino: ser [sic] les ha desabrido la manera de este guisado, especialmente a los que están faltos de charidad del aprovechamiento de sus próximos: lo cual, además de ser contra la ley de Dios, es contrario a lo que ellos pretenden, que es asustarse de los otros músicos, porque mucho más sabrá en poco tiempo con ayuda de esta cifra, el que más adelante está en el instrumento, que el que queda atrás en mucho.

Mas podríame dezir alguno, que es cosa rezia que haya muchos de su oficio: porque será tenido en menos. Respóndese, que si esta scienza tuviéra suelo, o término, que no pudiera pasar de allí, quisiera alguna razón de recelarse que otros le auían de alcanzar: mas si el más encumbrado, entiende que es imposible poder llegar a lo que se puede tañer, no ay porque tema el buen músico, que por esta cifra ha de perder algo de su reputación (si quiere estudiar y yr siempre adelante) ni porque aya muchos músicos serán tenidos en menos, antes en más, pues aura más que le entiendan. Assi que los señores músicos, menores, y medianos y mayores, tengan por entendido que si los dexa cansados poner una obra por el canto de órgano, por la cifra, quedarán con apetito de poner luego otra. Y assí para ser uno letrado, e necesario que vea mucho, assí en la música. 40

To the reader. Notwithstanding that these ciphers are an innovation, they will be pleasing (dear reader). I never cease to fear that the great facility which it holds will be the reason why the best musicians slander and hold it of little worth, since they spent so much time and took great effort in order to attain their present knowledge; and they see that this way makes many other paths shorter. The 'flavour of this stew' has disgusted them, especially those who are lacking in charity for the improvement of their fellow-man. But this, in addition to being against the law of God, is contrary to that which they claim (which is to surpass other musicians), because he who is more advanced on the instrument will know much more in a short time, with the aid of these ciphers, than he who remains far behind.

But suppose someone says that it is hard for him if there are many who follow his calling, because he will be held in less esteem. The response is that if this science should have a foundation or end which he may not be able to pass on to them, he may have some reason to be afraid that others might attain his level, but if the more advanced understands that it is not possible to be able to reach what he can play, there is no reason why the good musician should fear that through these ciphers he has to lose some of his reputation (if he wishes to study and continually progress); nor reason why many musicians will be less esteemed; rather more, since there will be more who understand him. Thus it is, that musicians, whether they be beginning, intermediate, or advanced, may take it as understood that if playing a polyphonic work wears them out, with these ciphers they will remain with appetite for playing.
another immediately; and just as in order to be a man of letters it is necessary to observe a great deal, so it is with music.

Venegas’s tone suggests that the use of Spanish tablature was met with scorn from his peers, whom he accused of calumnies and slander. It is understandable that those who had spent a long time learning the ‘true art’ would scorn those who sought a more expedient way. He went to some trouble to justify the cipher notation on musical and pragmatic grounds, thereby placing himself firmly on the side of those in favour of performing without understanding composition. He rightly pointed out that there is a lack of charity in a jealous attitude towards the craft of performance, and that those who disdain ciphers often do so for purely selfish reasons. There need not be fear and jealousy for this innovation, which could benefit both beginners and the advanced. The conclusion to the introduction confirms this:

Y pues la vida es breve, será cordura buscar maneras, para que en poco tiempo, se vea, y se sepa mucho (lo cual se hace por esta cifra). Y porque hemos dicho, que para los que mas saben es mas proueDos esta cifra, no desmaye el principiante, porque le certifico que tengo experiencia de algunos, que en pocos dias tañen medianamente su fantasia, y casi de improviso esta cifra.

And since life is short, it will be prudent to seek ways for which, in little time, much may be observed and known (which is obtained by [means of] these ciphers). And since we have said that these ciphers are most profitable for those who know the most, let not the beginner be dismayed; for I can attest that I know of some who played fantasia fairly well in a matter of days, and were able to play the ciphers nearly on the spur of the moment. 42

Venegas developed ideas initiated by Bermudo: fantasia is still a goal, but playing from the ciphers at sight (‘de improviso’) takes on greater importance. The expediency of such a technique would be great for those who lacked the time or talent for playing high-quality fantasia, as well as for beginners who could learn relatively quickly. Venegas

41 Ibid.
established a category of performers distinct from players of fantasia, who are enabled to play satisfactorily by means of the notation.

In the Prólogo y argumento deste libro which follows, Venegas gave various background comments to music in general and his work. He noted in passing that some works in three-part counterpoint are based on 'elementary plainchant, so that they may be played and sung on the spur of the moment in the Mass, with a good voice pronouncing the words of the plainchant (tres vozes de contrapunto sobre el canto llano fáciles, para que se tañessen y cantassen de impropuesto en la misa, diziendo la letra por el canto llano una buena voz). He also discussed the full extent of his music collection: he planned to publish an additional volume, should the first meet with success:

El repartimiento que lleua agora, es siete libros en dos cuerpos. Lo que se contiene en el primero (que es el que sale agora a luz) en su tabla se verá. Los otros seis, son de obras muy escogidas y excelentes, que aunque están hechos, no salarán, hasta ver el prouecho que haze el primero. Van los que quedan en este orden. El segundo lleua entradas de versos, y himnos, y tientos. El tercero contiene himnos de maytines, y ensaladas, y villancicos, y chansonetas. El quarto missas. El quinto es de obras a siete ya diez, ya doze, y a catorze de Criquillon y Fhino, y de otros graues compñadores. El sesto es de canciones, a quatro, y a cinco, y a seis. El séptimo, es de diferentes obras glosadas y cosas para discantar.

The distribution which is currently held is seven books in two volumes. That which is contained in the first (that which is now published) will be seen in the table [of contents]. The other six consist of very diverse and excellent works, which, although they are ready, will not be published until it is seen how profitable the first is. Those that remain will follow this order: the second contains entradas of verses, hymns, and tientos. The third contains hymns for matins, ensaladas, villancicos, and canzonettas. The fourth Masses. The fifth is [made up of] works à 7, à 8, à 10, à 12, and à 14 by Crecquillon and Phinot, and other serious composers. The sixth is [made up] of chansons à 4, à 5, and à 6. The seventh is [made up] of various embellished works and things for discanting.

---

43 Edn. p. 152.

44 Ibid.
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If Venegas ever published the second volume, it is now lost.\footnote{The implication of Venegas's list is that the first book was published in the first volume, the remaining six intended for the second. It is misleading to suggest that the six unpublished books were each the same size as the first.} This may be the reason why he did not sell the printing type of the first volume to Cabezón in 1576;\footnote{Ward, 'Editorial Methods', p. 107.} perhaps he still had visions of printing the second volume.\footnote{The list of forthcoming works is reminiscent of the list in \textit{MERULO} 1567 (Appendix A), which was also never published.} Ward noted an apparent reluctance by Spanish printers to take on musical works of any kind;\footnote{Editorial Methods', p. 106.} this suggests that Venegas's volume was not a financially lucrative undertaking.

Perhaps his introductory apology failed to convince the critics that such books were really beneficial.

A short musical treatise follows the introduction, in which general musical rudiments are briefly explained: \textit{canto llano} (including a summary of the solmization system, 'without taking up the confusion and prolixities of the [Guidonian] hand'), \textit{mutanças}, \textit{canto de órgano}, \textit{las figuras ligados}, \textit{las proporciones}, \textit{para medir el canto de órgano, para el contrapunto}. The cipher system is then explained: a nine-bar example is given in open score, then reduced to the cipher system. Venegas explained how to sing from the ciphers, and fingering technique;\footnote{Transl. Sachs and Ife, \textit{Anthology}, p. 68.} the harp and vihuela are only briefly mentioned. After instructions for tuning the three instruments, several chapters are given over to explaining a few principles of mode and plainchant.

The volume presents pieces of varying styles; twenty-one works were drawn from contemporary lute or vihuela books, most of which are
entitled 'fantasia'.

It is curious that he treated the term differently for vihuela and keyboard; the equivalent keyboard works are entitled 'tiento' without exception. Venegas did not, however, suggest that the volume is an anthology for the purpose of learning to play fantasia in its compositional sense. Nor did he stress the need for beginning users to have a teacher (unlike Bermudo and Cabezón). Given the length and detail of the introduction, the work seems aimed for beginning (or more advanced) performers who might like some of the details of what is involved in the music; the principles (but not actual instructions in composition), not just the mechanistic tablature of the vihuelists. He expressly stated that it would be beneficial for those playing in divine services. The volume contains pieces of high quality, and reflects some of the common repertoire of the time. Most likely, it was intended to help the uninitiated to play like the masters, but that was not its only purpose. If the better musicians heeded Venegas's preface, they would have found much useful material here, as he pointed out. After all, Venegas freely acknowledged that there were some parts of the art which could not be passed on all. But the very best organists would still have found the work unnecessary and redundant.

Venegas said little about keyboard notation other than Spanish tablature, and little enough about that, but it speaks for itself. He was the first to print high-quality music in a specifically keyboard

---

50 In the table of contents Venegas equated tiento with fantasia for the vihuela pieces.

51 Edn. p. 152. Though no doubt true to some extent, this may reflect the climate of the Inquisition, where a published work would benefit from showing its usefulness to the Church.

52 Although Ward, 'Editorial Methods', showed that Venegas sometimes edited the music to its detriment.
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notation in Spain, and was heavily influenced by the earlier vihuela tablatures. Keyboard performers were thus enabled to perform the *canto de órgano* without fully understanding how it was composed. As if to emphasize this, he went so far as to show how the volume might be transcribed into mensural notation and used by singers. Vocal polyphony is a significant basis for Venegas's work, and 'translating' it to its original form is a natural concomitant. The defensive tone of the introduction provides an insight to the secretive conservative organists, jealous of ciphers and the relative ease with which their art was imitated by amateurs. The tension between the two groups is evident in most Spanish keyboard sources of the period.

SANCTA MARIA 1565

Thomas de Sancta Maria, *Libro llamado: Arte de tañer fantasia, assi para tecla como para vihuela, y todo instrumento, en que se pudiere tañer a tres, y a quatro vozes, y a mas. Por el qual en breue tiempo y con poco trabajo, facilmente se podria tañer fantasia* (Valladolid: Francisco Fernandez de Córdoba, 1565). 53

Format (music): choirbook, barred short score.

Contents: 94 + 124 fols., treatise with music examples.

Sancta Maria's treatise is a detailed study of fantasia extending to two books of over twenty-five chapters each. The first book treats the rudiments of music, while the second gives more detailed instructions for playing fantasia at the keyboard. The stated aim of
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the work is to produce players who play fantasia. This is clear from the full title:

The Book called the art of playing fantasia, for keyboard as well as for vihuela, and all instruments upon which three or four parts or more can be played. By means of which in a short time and with a minimum of effort one will be able to play fantasia. 54

Sancta Maria stood in the ranks of the 'old guard' whom Venegas addressed, and shunned Spanish tablature and its expediency throughout most of his work; only once did he mention the ciphers commonly used in vihuela tablatures, and even then without a full explanation; 55 he ignored keyboard cipher notation completely.

Sancta Maria stated in the prologue that he had worked on the treatise for sixteen years; this attests to its emphasis on careful and extended study rather than expediency. 56 Towards the end of Book I, he discussed issues important to this study. Chapters 20, 21, and 22 deal respectively with how to set pieces for the monachordio, how to master a piece, and what method one must observe in order to profit from a piece.

54 Transl. Hultberg, 'Sancta Maria', p. 185.

55 Ibid., pp. 16, 159. The vihuela is considered in only two pages of Book I, and a half page in Book II.

56 Although both the title and prologue state that the technique can be learned easily and with little effort. See Hultberg, 'Sancta Maria', pp. 194-5. Given the nature of the volume, this should be regarded as formulaic.
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Para poner cualquiera obra en el Monacordio, dos cosas se han de guardar con todo rigor, las quales rigen y guíean al que las pone, para que nunca hierre, que son quenta y medida ... 57

Short and easy advice for setting polyphonic works on the keyboard. Chapter 20.

Since playing polyphonic works on the keyboard is the origin and fount from which proceed all profits and fruits, and the whole art of performing for the performer, it seems useful and profitable to give here some rules and short notes for those who are inexperienced, in order that they may play works with ease, and profit from their playing.

Regarding playing mensurally notated works, one should note that in any work of this style all the voices interact and are linked with one another, so that no particular voice moves without taking into account the other voices ...

In order to play any piece on the keyboard, two things must be regarded with utmost caution, which rule and govern that which is played so that there are no mistakes: counting and dividing ...

Although the title of this chapter and Bermuda's Book IV Chapter 41 (Como se ponen en el monachordio) are similar, the approaches of the two are entirely different. Sancta Maria, like Bermudo, believed there was nothing more important than playing polyphonic works, and this is prerequisite to fantasia-style playing. He noted the importance of following the parts correctly, making sure that the player follows each part 'bar by bar and beat by beat'. Yet Sancta Maria left notational issues unconsidered. His entire discussion presupposed the use of part- or choirbooks which are not barred. He went to some length to stress the importance of counting and following each individual part, without reference to open score or tablature, either of which would render such a technique obsolete. Sancta Maria's regular format throughout the volume is choirbook, and as seen in Example 2.4 he was correct to emphasize the importance of counting through each part, for the music is difficult to follow at sight. The lack of detailed consideration of how

57 Fols. 52-52v.
Example 2.4. SANCTA MARIA 1565, fol. 120v: choirbook format. Two staves per voice, no bar lines.
a beginner could actually notate a work in order to play it at the keyboard suggests that Sancta Maria simply did not see it as an important issue. Since the end was (unwritten) fantasia, the (written) means were immaterial.

In Chapter 21, Sancta Maria drew attention to three important elements in understanding a piece:

De auisos breues para que los nuevos subieten presto qualquier obra. Capitulo. xxi.

Tres cosas son necessarias para sugetar presto qualquier obra, y assi la tañer con mas perfection. La primera, es tañer a Compas, lleuandole siempre con vna mesma ygualdad de tiempo, esto es, no mudando de mayor en menor, ni de menor en mayor, para lo qual es necesario llevar el Compas con el pie, y assi mesmo tener gran cuenta con el medio Compas, sin el qual diuicultosamente se podria tañer a Compas, porque (como antes fue notado) por experiencia vemos, que todos los que no tañen a compas pecan en el medio compas. De mas desto, es necesario entender todas las figuras, y dar a cada vna su entero valor.

La segunda cosa, es cantar cada boz por si, entendiendola Solfa de rayz.

La tercera cosa, es entender todas las Consonancias y Disonancias que lleuare la obra, assi las que fueren a duo, como los que fuere a tres y a quatro. 58

Short advice for novices to quickly master a piece. Chapter 21.

Three things are necessary in order to quickly master a piece, and thus to play it with great perfection. The first is to play in time, always keeping the same equality of tempo, that is, not changing greater to lesser, or vice versa; and to do this it is necessary to keep time with one's foot, and likewise keep careful count of the half-bar, without which it is difficult to play in time, since (as noted before), all those who do not play in time make mistakes at the half-bar. It is enough to say that it is necessary to understand all the notes, and to give each its full value.

The second thing is to sing each voice by itself, understanding the solmization at root.

The third thing is to understand all the consonances and dissonances that are contained in the work, those which are à 2 as well as those à 3 and à 4.

58 Fols. 57-57v.
Sancta Maria emphasized the importance of singing, thus repeating the stresses of Bermudo and Venegas, which clearly reflects the importance of vocal polyphony in the keyboard player’s art. He reaffirmed the importance of understanding the hexachords.

In chapter 22, ‘on the course to take in order to profit from pieces’, he considered the nature of fantasia. It is clear that Sancta Maria’s prime goal was playing fantasia, not written music. The chapter consists of advice for ‘improvising’, giving five different techniques to help the novice: 1) Understand the artifice of polyphonic works, and the imitative technique; 2) note the entries of the voices; 3) note the types of cadences, and remember them for use when playing fantasia; 4) note the consonances and dissonances, and attractive melodies, in order to use them when playing fantasy; 5) when a section is repeated, note the differences in the repeat. He goes on to advise novices to practise continually the works they know, and experiment or alter a work to aid in learning different clefs and transposing. The art of fantasia was closely related to vocal music, and practitioners regularly relied on ideas found in vocal works for their ‘improvisatory’ playing.

His work is a compendium of the traditional art of fantasia. Although he defended the older precepts, he did not stop the trend towards the popularization of keyboard performance, nor the polarization

59. This important passage (fols. 57v–58) has been quoted or paraphrased a number of times, rendering its full inclusion here redundant. See Kinkeldey, Orgel, pp. 47–8; Ward, ‘The Vihuela’, pp. 223–5 (full translation); Slim, ‘Keyboard Ricercar’, pp. 406–7; and Jambou, Tiento, pp. 172–3.

60. Jambou, Tiento, p. 172, observed that Sancta Maria makes no distinction between composition and fantasia in the course of his work.

61. Ward, ‘The Vihuela’, pp. 224–5, noted the similarity of this passage with Sebastiani’s Bellum Musicale (Strasbourg, 1563), suggesting that Sancta Maria’s techniques were in common use in Europe at the time.
of performers and composers. Sancta Maria was the lone spokesman of an otherwise silent tradition of careful and extended study in a society which was beginning to aim more towards expediency in keyboard performance, distinct from playing fantasia. The lack of reference to notation, considered in light of Bermudo, Venegas, and the vihuelists, suggests an almost anachronistic disregard of the current trends in music performance.

CABEZON 1578

Antonio de Cabezón, Obras de Música para tecla arpa y vihuela ... recopiladas y puestas en cifra por Hernando de Cabezón su hijo (Madrid: Francisco Sanchez, 1578). 62

Format: Spanish tablature.

Contents: 213 fols., 129 pieces.

This volume, arguably the most important keyboard source of the Iberian peninsula in the 16th century, was printed twelve years after Cabezón’s death and edited by his son Hernando, who included several of his own compositions as well. It contains an introduction of 26 pages. The beginning ‘Proemio al lector en loor de la musica’, is a lengthy essay on the aesthetics of music and its origins and purpose. It includes a discussion of Antonio’s musical gifts, followed by a caveat regarding the contents of the book:

... Lo que en este libro va, más se pueden tener por migajas que cayan de su mesa, que por cosa que él huviese hecho de propósito ni de asiento; porque no son más que les lecciones que él dava a sus discípulos, las cuales no eran conforme a lo que sabía el Maestro, sino a la medida de lo que ellos podían alcanzar y entender. 63

62 Brown 1578; ed. Anglés, Ester-Sala.
63 Edn. (Anglés) p. 22.
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... That which is published in this book should rather be considered as crumbs which fell from [Antonio's] table than as something that he had made intentionally or with his consent; because they are no more than the lessons that he gave to his students, which were not in conformity with the master's knowledge, rather at the level that they were able to achieve and understand.

Since many of the works contained in the volume are regarded as masterpieces, Hernando's comment should perhaps be read as hyperbole, following on as it does from the description and praise of his father's art. Yet there is probably some truth to it. The unwritten art of the blind master must have been even more impressive than what is found in the book, which merely contains works copied by students. This explicit statement that what is transmitted is but a dim reflection of 16th-century musical reality is noteworthy and probably applicable to most keyboard music of the period. 64

After four laudatory poems, the notation system is explained, beginning with the following note:

Para inteligencia y uso de la cifra deste libro se ha de presuponer que el que quisiera poner las obras de él en tecla, harpa o vihuela, ha de saber cantar y tener muy conocidos, y en la memoria los signos de la música ...

For understanding and using the ciphers of this book, it has been assumed that he who wishes to play these works on the keyboard, harp or vihuela must know how to sing, and have the signs of music very well memorized.

In explaining the ciphers, the equivalent solmization syllables are given, and the user instructed to memorize them; a considerable amount of previous knowledge is thus assumed, and the work appears less intended for beginners than the earlier vihuela or keyboard prints.

Although the title states that harp or vihuela could also be used to play the works, there is no doubt that the keyboard is the preferred

64 Similar comments are found, for example, in the prologue to Narvaez's vihuela book (edn. p. 13).
65 Edn. (Anglés) p. 25.
instrument. Within the introduction is an extended section extolling the virtues of the organ (pp. 20-2); Cabezón himself was a famed organist; and notes for playing the works on harp and vihuela are given almost as an afterthought in two sentences towards the end of the introduction (pp. 27-8). Like Venegas, Cabezón explains how the works may be set in canto de órgano (mensural notation). It seems likely that he was interested in reaching a wide market by doing this, not excluding anyone who might use the volume, whether it be singers, instrumental ensembles, or performers of other plucked instruments. It also shows that his keyboard music is related to vocal music, and the two were in some sense interchangeable, at least according to Hernando.

Cabezón acknowledged that beginners might wish to use the book:

Los que quisieren aprovecharse deste libro y no supieren tañer nada, han de comenzar a tañer los primeros dúos que son fáciles y entender el compás, y así, poco a poco, poner obras a tres y a cuatro, que vean no lleven mucha glosa, hasta que tengan las manos sueltas. Aunque de mi parecer, los que quisieren pasar en esta arte muy adelante, tomen licencia de quien sepan tener lindo ayre de tañer, algunos días, porque, solo, esto no se puede enseñar por estenso con la perfección necesaria; que en lo demás que toca a perfeccionarse, hallarán tantas lindezas en este libro que no tengan que tener embidia lo que los podría enseñar ningún maestro del mundo. 66

Those who wish to make use of this book and do not know how to play anything should begin with the first duos, which are simple, and understand the beat; and thus, little by little, to play works à 3 and 4, which do not have much ornamentation, until the hands are loose. Notwithstanding, it seems to me that those who would take this craft much further should take lessons from someone who knows how to play with good style for a number of days, since this [book] alone cannot teach to the necessary extent to attain perfection; that whoever else tries to perform himself will find much beauty in this book, and cannot fail to envy that which no master in the world can teach.

Unlike Venegas, he explicitly recommended that beginners work with a teacher; and although there is not an express order of difficulty, he

66 Ibid., p. 28.
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acknowledges the varying degrees to some extent, a regular characteristic of earlier vihuela publications. 67

To complete the work, Cabezón made the following comments, indicating the importance of memory in the keyboard music of the day. Obviously, his blind father worked solely in memory.

Aunque conozco aver hecho grandissimo agravio a mi padre—Dios le dé gloria—en aver querido juntar en este libro algunas cosas que él dio de lición a sus discípulos, por no aver sido cosa que él uviese hecho de propósito para esta fin, mas viendo el provecho que en ellos han obrado cosas dadas de tales manes, me ha movido a sacarlas a luz, con no poco trabajo mío que, hasta ponellas en la perfección que he podido, he pasado. Si algunas faltas uvie, pido que se suplan y resciva mi voluntad, que es deseosa de que todos se aprovechen, especialmente los religiosos y religiosas, los quales no ternán escusa para no travajar en este arte para loar a nuestro Señor. 68

However, I am sure to have done very grave injustice to my father—may God give him glory—because I wished to gather in this book some things which he gave to his pupils in lessons, but which he might not have written specifically for this book; but observing the benefits which they gave to those who used them, I have been moved to publish them, with no little effort on my part, and I have laboured with all my ability before presenting them. If some errors are still present, I beg that they be altered with my full approval; I desire that everyone finds this work useful, especially members of communities, who have no excuse for not using this art in order to offer praise to our Lord.

Aside from the repetition of his earlier comments, the pedagogical aspect of having to recover pieces given to students in lessons is clear; the works are examples of how to play fantasia which the students would learn and imitate. The edition of Hernando de Cabezón attempted to reflect the artistry of his father, and thus provided means for players to imitate him. Instructions for composing music or playing fantasia are absent, although the tientos of the collection are manifestly transcriptions of Cabezón’s fantasia technique. The volume indicates a change in perspective, not necessarily dominant at the time,

67 CORREA 1626 gives five levels of difficulty; see below, note 71.
68 Edn. (Anglés) p. 29.
but nevertheless important: compositional qualities of the organist were passed over in giving an edition in expedient notation of music for performance. Despite Hernando's comment that they are mere crumbs, the works can be considered the first virtuoso Spanish keyboard music. 69 Publication in the format disdained by Sancta Maria and the omission of fantasia indicate that the works were not solely intended to provide examples for the higher goal but were ends in themselves, justified by their quality. They filled the need that Bermudo articulated: high-quality music which could be used without the great effort of learning from part- or choirbooks, or even of learning to play fantasia. In the final analysis, the volume is practical and not self-consciously artistic, because Cabezón's art ultimately had little to do with notation at all: he acquired and practised his skill through ear alone. Worthy as these 'crumbs' are, Cabezón's true (and unwritten) art remains inaccessible.

69 There were two other volumes of manuscript music in Spanish tablature that Hernando de Cabezón wanted, but was unable, to publish, according to his testament; they may have contained music by his father as well, suggesting that the 'crumbs' of 1578 were selected from a larger body of work. Kastner, Cabezón, p. 266.
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CORREA 1626

Francisco Correa de Arauxo, Libro de tientos y discursos de música practica, y teórica de organo intitulado facultad organica (Alcalá de Henares: Antonio Arnao, 1626). 70

Format: Spanish tablature.

Contents: 234 fols., introduction, 62 tientos, 2 chanson intabulations, 3 diferencias sets, 2 plainchant settings.

Correa's Facultad is the third and last major volume printed in Spanish tablature. The 26-folio introduction gives an extended theoretical treatise on various points of interest to Correa which are found in the pieces which follow. Perhaps the most noteworthy feature of the volume is its regular classification of works according to difficulty; this occurs to some extent in the work of Cabezón and the vihuelists Milán, Mudarra, Fuenllana, Pisador, Valderrábano and Daza. 71 But Correa elaborated the idea according to five grades, regularly commenting on the difficulty or ease of pieces individually in the preambles which precede each. The self-consciousness with which Correa did this is indicative of an attitude towards his readers quite different from Venegas and Cabezón. The pedagogical nature of grades of difficulty is self-evident, and indeed Correa made it clear in the introduction that he is writing for students or beginners, but the systematic consideration of the ease or difficulty of pieces also reflects a changed perception of the use of written music per se. The technique of fantasia is mentioned only twice, and Correa placed

---

70 Ed. Kastner; transl. Holland, 'Correa'.

71 Ward, 'The Vihuela', pp. 132-6; Griffiths, 'Vihuela Fantasia', p. 50. Milán and Mudarra have only a general pedagogical order; Fuenllana, Pisador and Daza indicate two grades (easy and difficult); Valderrábano gives three grades.
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considerable emphasis on the benefits and ease of Spanish tablature, never mentioning the use of open score (although he once referred to RODRIGUES COELHO 1620), and contrasting ciphers only with reading from choirbooks. He wrote to users of written music without suggesting that they could go beyond notation to fantasia, and in that sense he abandoned the values expressed by Sancta Maria.

The most significant remarks on the notation are found in the prologue, 'in praise of ciphers':

La cifra, en la musica fue vna grande humanidad, y misericordia que los maestros en ella vsaron con los pequeños y que poco pueden: porque, viendo la necesidad que los tales tenían de conservar en la memoria sus lecciones, y de aumentar las que más les faltavan para perfeccionarse; y viendo assimismo la dificultad tan grande (no solo para estos, sino para los muy provechos en la musica) que auia en poner cualquier obra, de canto de organo en la tecla, por pequeña y facil que fuese: proveyendo del remedio necesario; acordaron diuinamente de inventar vn nuevo modo de señales, que causando los mismos efectos (en tanta perfeccion y primor como los de canto de organo, y sin que la musica perdiese vn punto de sus quilates) reduxesse aquella dificultad y desabrimiento, a grande facilidad y dulzura, haciendo camino llano y facil, el que antes era en extreme dificltoso y agro. Este nuevo modo de caracteres llamado cifra, se vsó al principio de algunas diferentes maneras: ya con letras de el A B C, ya con numeros de guarismo y castellano, con diversos accidentes y señales, el cual por no tener facilidad y certeza que se pretendia, fue totalmente desamparado, hasta tanto que el ingenio de nuestros Españoles inventó este genero de cifra que oy tenemos, y en que va puntada la musica practica de este libro, tan facil, y juntamente tan perfecto, que no puede auer otro que le exceda. Este a sido tan utile y provechoso al culto divine, y servicio de la santa Iglesia catolica, que en donde quiera que se a vsado a obrado maravillosos efectos: haciendo que personas tiernas y de poca edad, alcancen en breve tiempo, lo que en otros siglos, aun no se conseguia con largos años de estudio...
easy road one which before was extremely difficult and bitter. This new type of notation, called cipher, was first used in several different ways: sometimes with letters of the alphabet, sometimes with numbers and Castilian [words] with different accidentals and signs; but since it did not have the ease and certainty which was intended, it was totally abandoned, until the ingenuity of our Spaniards invented the type of cipher which we have today; in which the present practical music of this book is notated, [which is] so easy and also so perfect that there cannot be another which surpasses it. This has been so useful and advantageous for the divine worship and service of the Holy Catholic Church, that wherever it has been utilized, it has produced marvellous results, making it possible for tender young people, in a short period of time, to be able to attain that which, in other centuries, was not attained by long years of study... 72

The echoes of Bermudo, Venegas and Cabezón are clear: the ease of playing and learning are stressed, as well as quickness, compared to the long period of study formerly required. Correa also emphasized that the results sound the same. Like Bermudo, he was familiar with letter notations as well, although he did not hint that he knew of their current usage elsewhere in Europe. He suggested that the notation was first developed for learners, then taken up by the more proficient when it was realized how useful it was. This has a certain amount of validity: Correa’s volume is the most virtuosic of the Spanish sources, clearly intended for use by the skilled as well as novices.

Correa continued by explaining the benefits of easily reading the polyphonic lines of the music in a format which enables the parts to be seen together, but never referred to open score, only stressing the advantage of ciphers to partbooks or choirbooks. The benefits of the music thus gained, he said,

Todo lo cual con grande dificultad, y al cabo de muchos años de estudio alcanzamos a hazer en canto de organo los maestros, auiendo muchos, que ni aun en toda su vida pueden alcanzar a comprender quatro vozes llanas de repente; alcançando a verlas y entenderlas (no solo llanas, pero lo que mas es) glosadas, discípulos de muy poco tiempo de estudio... 72
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All of which we masters reach with great difficulty and at the end of many years of study of polyphony (there being many who never in all their lives could manage to comprehend four plain voices at once); disciples manage to see and understand (not only the plain voices, but what is more) in ornamented voices in a very short period of study. . . 73

Correa strongly believed in relieving the amount of time and effort it took to learn the art. The concept of sightreading is noteworthy here: a concept which would have little purpose within a tradition wholly devoted to playing fantasia without the need to read music at all. The shift in thinking towards the use of notation has become well-established. The prologue concludes with a note to those who would criticize the use of ciphers:

Estos bienes y otros muchos, emos recibido y reciben los discipulos, de la cifra: y con todo esso no falta quien no sienta bien de ella; consuelo grande para mi, si le sucediere lo mismo a mi libro; pero verguença, y confusion para los mordazes, si auendo derramado su veneno, permaneciere la cifra y mi libro en perpetua-memoria de los bien intencionados . . .

These benefits, and many others, we and the students have received from the ciphers; and even with all this, there is no lack of those who do not feel well about it. It would be a great consolation for me if the critical were to happen upon my book. But may there be embarrassment and confusion for those who are critical if, having spilled their venom, the ciphers and my book were to be remembered eternally by the well-intentioned . . . 74

It would be unfair to judge Correa unfavourably simply on the grounds that Spanish tablature fell out of use shortly after his volume was published; there were a number of factors behind its decline. But his valedictory warning indicates that the usefulness of ciphers was by no means universally acknowledged; unfortunately, little of the anti-cipher argument has come to light. Correa himself cited and confuted one criticism in the preamble to Tiento LI:

. . . Algunos tañedores dizan mucho mal de la cifra, y vna de las razones que dan es: que trae figuras que no se pueden cantar, v.

74 Ibid.
Some players are very critical about the ciphers. One of the reasons that they give is that it uses figures that one is not able to sing; for example, figures worth five, seven, or nine minims, crotchets, or quavers. They are not aware that when they play their own fantasia, they do the same thing... To me it seems this is not a good reason to criticize ciphers, because they show very obviously what is good and bad in music, whereas polyphony [notation] does not; it largely conceals the bad, and it is the cloak of sinners who hide under it. In polyphony one can find licenses that in ciphers would be the cause of amazement. 75

This criticism reflects a conservative stance towards keyboard music, and presupposes a strictly vocally-orientated art. Other criticisms of cipher notation might have been its code-like appearance, so unlike mensural notation; its lack of precision in note-values; the open and free transmission of an inherently secret skill; its elementary intentions which might have been beneath better organists' dignity; its undermining of the art of fantasia; or the sheer novelty of an unfamiliar system. But whatever the criticisms were, they were apparently sufficient to lead to the disuse of Spanish tablature, and open score became the dominant format in Spain. Furthermore, unwritten fantasia was surely still a highly regarded art; Correa's lack of concern for open score and fantasia suggests orientation towards expediency at the expense of the organist's art.

The eleven introductory chapters following the prologue dwell on various (sometimes idiosyncratic) aspects of Correa's music. In the first, he explained the use throughout the volume of little pointers (in the shape of hands) which show what he considers noteworthy spots in the

---

75Edn. II:86; Holland, 'Correa', p. 290.
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music. He continued with such topics as modes and 'genera' (an attempt to reconcile the music with Greek modes), use of dissonance, the *punto intenso contra remisso*, the fourth, fingering, rhythm, mensuration, etc. The final chapter contains a summation of how to play perfectly. Correa primarily stressed the importance of singing: 'one must be a capable singer of polyphony, from which is born the knowledge to give the legitimate duration and value of all passages (sea diestro cantante de canto de organo, de lo qual nace el saber dar el legitimo ayre y valor a todas las glosas'). He listed seven other things to remember, and concluded with a proviso warning the user of difficulties in reading the work due to poor type or ink, problems of printing also found in Italy.

At only two points did Correa mention fantasia; first, when considering genera: one should know them

por sus intervalos, para que quando seas maestro y tañas buena fantasia sepas ordenar curiosos tientos y discursos, valiendote destos intervalos en buenas ocasiones.

by their intervals, so that when you are a master and play good fantasia, you will know how to form interesting tientos and discourses, utilizing these intervals in the best way. 78

Jacobs pointed out that no sixteenth-century writers discuss the tiento, and suggested that they are written-down fantasias. 79 Obviously, Correa indicated that it required a master to play good fantasia. The second reference to fantasia is in the preamble to Tiento LI cited above, where

76 Kastner’s edition omits the pointers; they frequently indicate unusual dissonances, and are similar to the long list of noteworthy passages in TRABACI 1615 (Appendix A).


79 Ward, Slim, Jacobs, Jambou, and Vaccaro have all considered the relationships among the terms tiento, ricercar, and fantasia.
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the conservative critics are cited as players of fantasia. The goal of Sancta Maria is little stressed. In Correa's work, the written music takes on a more important status than in earlier Spanish works, and amounts to significant virtuosic keyboard music.\textsuperscript{80} If Sancta Maria's point of view regarding fantasia is taken at face value, the conservative nature of the art is in direct contradiction to the various innovations of Correa. The new style warranted a suitably novel notation.\textsuperscript{81}

RODRIGUES COELHO 1620

Manuel Rodrigues Coelho, Flores de musica pera o instrumento de tecla & harpa (Lisbon: Pedro Craesbeeck, 1620).\textsuperscript{82}

Format: open score (3 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 233 fols., 24 tentos, 93 versets, 4 hymns, 4 chanson intabulations.

Rodrigues Coelho's Flores, the first Portuguese keyboard volume,\textsuperscript{83} stands in contrast to the Spanish tradition. It is printed in open score; its style is reminiscent of Sweelinck and other European musicians;\textsuperscript{84} and its prefatory matter is in quite a different style to Venegas, Cabezón and Correa. The four-page introduction gives

\textsuperscript{80}The neo-baroque qualities of Correa's music are discussed in Kastner, introduction to edn.

\textsuperscript{81}Kastner (ibid., p. 29) noted that Correa stretched the notation to its limits.

\textsuperscript{82}Ed. Kastner.

\textsuperscript{83}Kastner (ibid., p. xxii) observed that the license given to Gonzalo de Baena in 1536 to print a keyboard volume was almost certainly never fulfilled.

\textsuperscript{84}Ibid., pp. xxiii-xxvii.
elementary aspects of the rudiments of music and a few notes for beginning players, but no specific comments on the nature of the notation or fantasia. The majority of the volume is given over to the music, which in its virtuosity is anomalous with the introduction. The invocation of the harp in the title, as with Cabezón and Venegas, is more an appeal to a wider users' market than a presentation of idiomatic harp music. The volume is an important keyboard source aimed primarily for practical use of church musicians, but also for amateurs. It is in line with the growing trends of separation between performer and composer begun in the sixteenth century. Its open score notation was to become established as the predominant format of the peninsula.

**Lost works or ghosts**

Eight keyboard sources which have been cited as lost or unprinted are listed here. The following three volumes are 'ghosts', unlikely to have ever been printed.

1. Baena's 1536 application for a license to print a keyboard volume was probably never fulfilled (Brown [1536]; see note 83).

2. Mudarra's 1546 announcement of a forthcoming harp/keyboard tablature was probably never realized (see MUDARRA 1546).

---

85 The lack of a reference to the vihuela may be a sign that the instrument had passed its prime; the last vihuela tablature to have been published was Daza's 1576 volume. See Griffiths, 'Vihuela Fantasia'.

86 There is only one extant source after CORREA 1626 in Spanish tablature (see below, I:65).

87 Primarily in Brown, and Caldwell, 'Sources'.
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3. Venegas's 1557 announcement of a second volume to accompany his first was probably never realized (see VENEGAS 1557).

   Three volumes of keyboard music are listed as having been a part of John IV of Portugal's library, but are not now extant (the library was destroyed in 1755). The possibility that they were manuscript volumes cannot be ruled out.

4. Pere Alberch Vila, Tentos de organo (Brown [155?]1).

5. João de Arratia et al, Tentos para Orgao (Brown [159?]1).

6. Francisco de Peraza, Tentos de tecla (Brown [159?]4).

   Two other volumes cited in earlier literature may have been manuscripts as well:

7. Gregorio Rodriguez de Mesa, Libro de cifra para tecla (Brown [156?]5).


Manuscripts

Iberian keyboard manuscripts offer considerable confirmation of the points which Spanish writers raised regarding keyboard music. Although a full survey of them is beyond the scope of this study, eight may be briefly considered. The earliest two, the only ones known to date from
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the 16th century, are Coimbra 48 and 242.\(^{88}\) Apparently they were conceived as didactic material. Their provenance (the monastery of Santa Cruz) and format (open score) are identical. Ms. 48 (128 fols., dated 1559) consists largely of transcriptions of polyphonic works (omitting the texts) that have been traced to partbooks.\(^{89}\) Particularly noteworthy are the copies of Buus ricercars from his 1547 print,\(^{90}\) the only manuscript evidence that they were played at the keyboard. Ms. 242 (184 fols., c. 1570) contains 230 compositions. Many are copies from vocal prints, but there are a number of unica judged by some to be idiomatic keyboard music.\(^{91}\) The second manuscript also alternates ornamented and unornamented pieces side by side, suggesting ornamental experimentation with the pieces. The emphasis is clearly on vocal technique in these manuscripts, and they confirm the importance of vocal music to the keyboard player's art.

The format of both volumes is open score (4 x 5/5/5/5). Bar lines are ruled through the systems.\(^{92}\) Ms. 242, the only extant manuscript which contains works printed in BERMUDO 1555, alters the format of the original, not to the easy way recommended by Bermudo, but to the intermediate way, open score.

\(^{88}\)Kastner, 'Los manuscritos', is the prime secondary source for the manuscripts. They are also discussed in Fernandes and Kastner, eds., Antologia, preface.

\(^{89}\)Kastner, 'Los manuscritos', p. 84. Works were copied from printed volumes from publishers such as Phalèse, Susato, Salbliger, and Gardano.


\(^{91}\)Fernandez and Kastner admit that it is difficult to make a distinction between motet and tento, although they are still bound to an arbitrary formula for keyboard music: authentic keyboard music is ornamented, vocal polyphony is unornamented. Antologia, p. xlv.

\(^{92}\)Facsimiles in ibid., pp. lxv-lxx.
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The ornaments table at the end of Ms. 242 is taken from ORTIZ 1553 (Appendix A), and is the only extant manuscript reference to that volume. That the manuscript contains copies from a work for viol players is indicative of the interchange between instruments concerning ornamentation: it is clearly for keyboard; the ornamentation of Ortiz is flexible enough to be used for a variety of instruments. At the end of Ms. 242 is one work à 2, some counterpoint exercises, and the ornaments, thus indicating its didactic nature. The absence of Spanish tablature is probably a sign of the more advanced degree of skill held by the user(s) of the manuscripts or their teachers. All the evidence points towards these volumes being used (at least in part) as beginning music books, though. They consist of models for developing the art of fantasia in vocal style, as propagated by Sancta Maria.

Chronologically nearest to the Coimbra manuscripts are appendices to copies of CORREA 1626 in Lisbon and Madrid. Both manuscripts' format is Spanish tablature, as would be expected in appendices to a volume in that format. They are both only a few pages long. The Madrid copy contains only small pieces inserted within the book, making use of blank space. These manuscripts are best regarded as extensions of the Facultad.

There are two manuscripts at El Escorial in open score, apparently used for liturgical purposes. They are important sources for keyboard music of the period 1580-1620, despite their late dates (after 1650). Their format is evidence of its continuing popularity among keyboard players of the time. Although details of these manuscripts are not

93 See Kastner, introduction to Correa (edn.), vol. II.
94 Kastner, ed., Silva Iberica, introduction.
95 Apel, ed., Spanish Organ Masters (with facs.), Anglés, ed., Antologia, and Bruna, Obras, are editions of some of the contents.
readily available, it may be noted that at least the second was used partially for instruction: it contains a series of contrapuntal studies. 96

The manuscripts Oporto 1576 and 1577 may be cited as the last important sources of the 17th century. The first of the two 97 contains 78 folios of music, with a set of sermons following; the music itself is clearly sacred in all but two pieces. 98 It appears to be a book of sacred versets, not unlike many found elsewhere in Europe at this time. 99 This volume also was apparently didactic in nature; it contains a large number of exercises as well as versets. Its format is open score, two or three systems per page. It is evidence of a pragmatic use for keyboard music in the church at mid-century, and also of the continuing prevalence of open score.

The second of the two is of a later date; it is one of the latest manuscripts which use Spanish tablature format. 100 Its 211 fols. contain music of the school of Cabanilles, late in the 17th century, yet it refers back to Cabezón and Correa in its use of Spanish tablature. It contains an explanation of the figures and notes on fingering and transposition (to twelve pitch-levels) again suggesting a didactic use. 101 That it exists at all is evidence of the continuing use of

96 Apel, Spanish organ masters, p. xiii.
97 Costa de Lisboa, Tencão, is a partial edition of the manuscript, with commentary and facsimiles.
98 Ibid., p. xviii.
99 See Riedel, Quellenkundliche Beiträge, p. 28.
100 See Kastner, 'Tres libros'; Hudson, 'A Portuguese Source' (transcription and commentary).
101 Some of the manuscript's introductory instructions confirm this: 'There is no doubt that no explanation can substitute for the simple doctrine of a master . . .' (Transl. Hudson, 'A Portuguese Source', II:6).
Chapter two: Spain

Spanish tablature in the late 17th century, and possibly beyond. Open score was prevalent, but both formats were in use at this time.102

Conclusions

The seven printed volumes which refer to the use of written music at the keyboard, supplemented by extant manuscripts, present a clear picture of the variety of opinion on the subject at the time. Five major themes emerge from the present survey.

1. A keyboard music-printing trend arose from a background deeply rooted in vocal polyphony, reliant on the transfer of vocal polyphony to the keyboard for didactic and recreational purposes. Fantasia, the main goal of keyboard players, was learned through the study of vocal music.

2. Notational formats specific to the keyboard were first developed to enable the student to learn the art of fantasia. Open score apparently predated and outlived Spanish tablature for use at the keyboard. Both, however, served a similar purpose: ease in learning vocal transcriptions and playing them at the keyboard. The best keyboard players did not need these conveniences but could perform either by aural imitation or by using music in a vocal format (choirbook). The use of these formats was didactic to a large extent.

A significant aspect of the printed volumes is the development of their use for those beyond the period of instruction; although all sources suggest use by beginners, Venegas, Cabezón and Correa all were at least partly aimed towards advanced keyboard players, as Venegas

102 For other manuscripts of the late 17th century, almost all of which are in open score, see Kastner, 'Tres libros', pp. 148-51; Anglés, 'Manuscritos desconocidos'; Anglés, Antología, introduction; and Bruna, Obras.
explicitly stated in his prologue, and as Cabezón and Correa implied in their virtuosic music. The least didactic work is by Rodrigues Coelho, who barely acknowledged the difficulties encountered in playing his music, quite apart from having to read it in open score; he alone made no mention of facility or ease of his works. Ease of learning as stated in most of the other works often belies the difficulties encountered within. Sancta Maria’s is most clearly deceptive, and its users must have read with foreboding his statement that it had taken him sixteen years to develop the work, despite his claim that it was easy material. All of the works present technical difficulties to challenge any beginner, no matter how easy the author said his work was. The relative ease of one notational format over another is still valid, however, and Bermudo’s and Correa’s comments on the differences between choirbook, open score and Spanish tablature can be appreciated today.

3. Users of keyboard music may be divided into two groups: beginners ‘apprenticed to the trade’, and amateurs who learned as a pastime or recreational activity.

Would-be professionals were better able to reach the goal of fantasia than amateurs. They would have been employed by either the Church or wealthy patrons. The printed collections were well-suited to church use, for expediency in case there was not an aspiring organist and a less able musician was required to perform; they also provided music to learn and imitate. Serious beginners would have studied with a teacher, and used printed works under direct supervision. The teachers would have supplemented the printed works with their own ‘trade secrets’.

Amateurs had more modest requirements. The use of keyboard sources by amateurs appears to have been a direct imitation of the use of
vihuela sources; the courtly performance of the keyboard arose as emulation. For the less serious, ease of presentation and quickness of results were important. The notion of expediency in learning to play is sometimes emphasized, and the use of a teacher not always a prerequisite. The didactic needs of amateurs were different from those of serious students, but they were not negligible. The polarity of opinion regarding the use of Spanish tablature may have arisen due to its inherent expediency (so suited to amateurs) breaking the implicit restriction of amateur use.

4. The printing and publishing industry addressed both groups with the books surveyed here. The dissemination of volumes was more orientated towards amateurs, however, due to their greater ability to afford the cost of buying the volumes. Printers supported the 'modern' free transmission of information, sometimes causing the exposure of teachers' 'trade secrets'.

The technological development of printing in tablature, open score or choirbooks arose soon after the development of printing itself. Ward noted the small number of Spanish music books (seventeen) printed in the 16th century, and suggested various reasons for this; it is well-known that Morales, Guerrero and Victoria had most of their works published outside Spain. The disproportionately large number of theoretical works dealing with composition published in the century (ten) suggests that there was no dearth of musical interest, and perhaps the continuation of a tradition of music-making which did not

103 'Editorial Methods', p. 106.

104 Durán (c. 1504), Tovar (1510), Bermudo (1549, 1550, 1555), Sancta Maria (1565), Tapia (1570), Salinas (1577, 1592), and Montanos (1592). See Stevenson, Spanish Cathedral Music.
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rely on written music.\textsuperscript{105} The seven vihuela tablatures printed from 1536 to 1576 and the three keyboard tablatures from 1557 to 1626 constitute the majority of music, each of these ten volumes containing an extensive repertoire. The unprinted works of Mudarra, Bermudo, Venegas, and Cabezón suggest problems with printing which worked to the detriment of music publishing, despite the musical interest of the time.

The number of keyboard volumes is small and indicates no general pattern of development;\textsuperscript{106} it is evident from Mudarra and Bermudo that the development of their notation stems from earlier work for the vihuela, and Venegas, Cabezón and Correa may have produced their books by direct analogy with the printed vihuela tablatures.\textsuperscript{107} The works are significant when the attitude towards their format is taken into account. They represent one side of the polarity of opinion regarding Spanish tablature; Sancta Maria (and other theorists who do not mention keyboard music) represent the other; and Bermudo may be placed in both camps. Without the development of printing, however, there would have been no such clash of opinion: the press enabled the expedient method books to be disseminated, the vihuela books first and keyboard versions to follow. The inevitable popularization of the technique of playing the vihuela which resulted from the widespread dissemination of the

\textsuperscript{105} Bermudo claimed there was 'an infinity' of cantantes in his day (see note 22).

\textsuperscript{106} The relative structural organization of preface materials in Venegas, Cabezón and Correa is, however, noteworthy: Cabezón did not emphasize the new notation, whereas the other two began their works with lengthy justifications and explanations of Spanish tablature.

\textsuperscript{107} Riedel, Quellenkundliche Beiträge, p. 40, rhetorically asked whether Italian lute tablature was the forerunner to all other letter and number tablatures; Spanish sources confirm the precedence of plucked instrument tablatures over keyboard.
seven volumes was only possible by means of mass-production.\textsuperscript{108} The rise of the keyboard performer may be a direct result of the publishing industry.\textsuperscript{109} The publishing of keyboard music in Spain declined after Correa;\textsuperscript{110} a complex sociological upheaval was taking place along with Spain's decline in the sphere of world politics, which must have been reflected in the areas of music-making and printing. But the work of Venegas, Cabezón and Correa presents evidence of the power of music printing, given a financially viable economic situation.

5. Since amateurs did not necessarily need or wish to develop fantasia, a category of performer distinct from composer arose. Performers eventually became more numerous, but only a small percentage of them reached the goal of mastering fantasia. The development of new notations and their expedient use resulted in the rise of performance at

\textsuperscript{108}1225 copies of CABEZON 1578 were printed (Ward, "Editorial Methods", p. 107); 1100 copies of Fuenllana's Orphenica lyra; 1500 copies of Sancta Maria's treatise; and 1500 copies of Daza's Parnasso. I am grateful to John Griffiths for sharing his archival findings regarding the printing of these works.

\textsuperscript{109}This presupposes detailed consideration of the costs of both the printing and purchasing of volumes, beyond the scope of this study; for further consideration of these issues, see Riedel, Quellenkundliche Beiträge, pp. 45-72, and Vaccaro, La Musique de luth, pp. 62-89. Ward, "The Vihuela", p. 359, noted that Sancta Maria's treatise cost the equivalent of 22 chickens, 30 lbs. of olive oil, or 110 lbs. of wine.

\textsuperscript{110}Although beyond the bounds of this study, Lucas Ruiz de Ribayaz's Luz y norte musical (Madrid: Melchor Alvarez, 1677) should be mentioned. The work uses harp and guitar number tablature, and is one of the few volumes for these instruments published in Spain in the 17th century. On p. 37 Ruiz de Ribayaz claims that the harp tablature could easily be used by keyboard players; otherwise, the keyboard is unmentioned. The roles of harp and keyboard are inversely analogous to Venegas and Cabezón. The volume contains no sacred music, but is a collection of dances. Like the earlier tablatures, the introduction emphasizes the facility of the cipher system, and a large amount of space is devoted to explaining it. Ruiz de Ribayaz also cited the extreme difficulty of printing the tablature notation ("Prologo", unn. p. 2), implying that printing problems may have impeded the output of cipher-notation volumes in the 17th century.
the expense of deep musical understanding. It was no longer necessary to be a composer in order to perform.

Bermudo, Venegas and Correa show that not all musicians felt this need for expediency, and there was a strong polarity of opinion on the matter, although critics of cipher notation did not express their views in published form. Sancta Maria represents the opposite approach to the expediency offered in the volumes of Spanish tablature. The secretive aspects of the keyboard player's art are significant, and expressly stated by Bermudo and Venegas.\footnote{Secretiveness is an important theme in the study of lute music of the period as well. See Vaccaro, La Musique de luth, p. 32.} The breaking of such secretiveness was surely a significant criticism of Spanish tablature.

There appears to have been at least some professional stigma attached to using published keyboard works, linked with the important place of fantasia in the art of the keyboard player: Venegas perceived that it would somehow reduce the reputation of a professional keyboard player to use his work. The burgeoning performer-composer distinction evident in works for vihuela amateurs was only partially analogous to keyboard players. There must have been a strong, well-established tradition of organ-playing and fantasia which worked against the innovations of expediency and Spanish tablature.\footnote{A large amount of circumstantial evidence could be adduced to support this notion: the regular appearance of blind organists (notably Cabezón and Salinas), the requisites of organists as found in trials and examinations (see note 26), and the apparently low compositional output of most Spanish organists of the period. See Stevenson, Spanish Cathedral Music.} Although Bermudo made the performer-composer distinction clear, the element of deception (sounding as if one were playing fantasia by reading the notation) must have been another strong criticism of the new notation. The relatively
small number of sources printed in Spanish tablature suggests that the conservatives ultimately held sway.

With so much contention between those favouring expediency and those favouring traditional methods, more searching questions of musical style seem to have been overlooked; tastes, almost unanimously conservative, favoured a traditional style of vocal polyphony to be transferred to the keyboard. Yet the distinction between performer and composer ultimately led to Correa’s and Coelho’s idiomatic keyboard works. The earlier keyboard music of the period must represent only a dim reflection of the art as it was practised, as Cabezón suggested. The circumstances indicate the development of written notation of the aural art while the art itself declined.
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PRINTED SOURCES OF ITALIAN KEYBOARD MUSIC

Italian writers and musicians of the 16th century regarded keyboard music in a similar way to the Spaniards, but this cannot be shown by a simple chronological survey of the sources like Chapter two. Spanish writers gave the basic themes in prefatory or theoretical commentary, but Italian writers rarely wrote at length about the issues. Furthermore, in Italy the subject is complicated considerably by the quantity of music printing taking place. Music specifically intended to be used at the keyboard amounted to over one hundred printed volumes (see Table 3.3), thirty times more than the printed sources from Spain or Portugal.

Facets of keyboard playing which have no direct analogy in Spain receive attention in Italian sources, but also obscure an examination of the use of notational formats. First, volumes for accompaniment are numerous and important, unlike in Spain, where there were none. Second, volumes in partbook format, although not solely intended for keyboard players, were often used by them, to judge from assorted comments and title-pages. There is little parallel evidence in Spain, although similar practices may be inferred. Third, the reprinting of keyboard music and related volumes took up a not inconsiderable percentage of the music publishing industry, unlike Spain, where no keyboard music was reprinted.

Nevertheless, the Italian viewpoint regarding the purpose and use of music notation at the keyboard is directly analogous to the Spanish.
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The differences between the Italy and Spain do not vitiate their important unanimity in outlook on many issues. This chapter presents the issues regarding the use of notational formats at the keyboard in Italy in the 16th and 17th centuries, taking the conclusions of Chapter two as a point of departure: the ultimate derivation of keyboard music from vocal; the importance of fantasia; the uses of the printed sources; the trends in music printing evinced by the sources; and the dichotomy of users which emerged as a result of various trends. In addition, Italian sources call for consideration of keyboard accompaniment, especially how it was viewed in the period; the use of partbooks at the keyboard; and the significance of printing or performing trends with respect to six individuals or printing firms: the Gardanos, Claudio Merulo, Giacomo Vincenti, Adriano Banchieri, Simone Verovio, and Girolamo Frescobaldi.

Material to support these issues is compiled in two ways. Although not as consistent as Spanish sources, a significant number of Italian sources present quotations regarding these issues; second, a statistically-orientated approach is helpful in clarifying trends inferred from quotations.¹ This material is presented in volume-by-volume chronological form in Appendices A and B, which divide the printed sources according to format: A for non-partbooks (169 volumes), B for partbooks (70 volumes).

Appendix A is roughly analogous to Chapter two and chronologically considers each known keyboard source printed in Italy, beginning with the first print and its ghost predecessor (ANTICO 1517), ending with two

¹Statistics alone are potentially useful, but have been purposely avoided in the present study. Pomplio, 'Editoria musicale' and Carter, 'Music Publishing' offer valuable insights into the statistical side of music publishing in this period; but for the issues examined here, verbal discussion by writers of the period provides the prime evidential basis.
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volumes which aptly demonstrate the end of the era: ARRESTI 1697, a 'modern' collection of keyboard sonatas, and ARRESTI a. 1701, a volume for sacred use in an antiquated style. The majority of volumes elicit detailed commentary as appropriate, to clarify or call attention to the ways in which they support one or more of the aspects of this examination of the use of notational formats. Since reprints indicate the popularity of a volume and contribute to the statistical tabulation of its use, they are included in the appendix, although they receive little or no comment. Furthermore, not all of the unreprinted volumes require comment (e.g. A GABRIELI 1605(i) and (ii)). They are included to make this survey comprehensive, and they either demonstrate the use of a particular format and genre, or their publication supports discussion of specific publishing trends. This comprehensiveness enables a fuller view of the development and use of keyboard sources to be seen.

Appendix B, tabular in form, lists the partbook-prints which would have been most suitable for transcription and use at the keyboard. This material is pertinent to discussion of the use of notational formats at the keyboard, but secondary in that the partbooks can only infrequently be justified by quotations from authors or composers. Although partbooks constitute the largest single format of the present survey (seventy volumes), their numerical significance is less than their actual usefulness for determining the use of formats in Italy (see below).

The appendices thus serve two functions. They provide a body of material for support to the present chapter, and as such are continually referred to, but they also present a more complete 'annotated bibliography' of Italian keyboard sources of the period than has hitherto been available. Given this approach towards comprehensiveness,
statistical support for issues discussed may be marshalled when appropriate. But the prime intention of this summary is to present the actual quotations which support the theses; reliance upon non-specific references to the issues and statistical implications is secondary. The summary begins with the two important influences upon keyboard music: vocal and lute music. Three basic groups of users are considered, and the development and use of keyboard formats follows. Printing considerations played an important part in the use of notational formats; finally, the rise of a new class of performers is put forward. Related topics—the use of accompanimental keyboard formats and the use of partbooks—conclude this chapter.

The ideas and trends put forward here are by no means entirely new; a great deal of the scholarly work of others lies behind this summary. Reference to the secondary literature is kept to a minimum here, however; full reference and more detailed acknowledgement, analysis, and critique of the secondary literature may be found in Appendix A within the discussion of individual volumes.

Vocal music

The roots of keyboard music in vocal styles is commonly accepted. A number of scholars have considered the issues and present clear descriptions of the concept.\(^2\) Six volumes specifically cite the vocal basis of keyboard music: ORTIZ 1553, AGAZZARI 1607, DIRUTA 1609-10, TRABACI 1615, FRESCOBALDI 1615-16, and BATTIFERRI 1669. In ORTIZ 1553, the user is told to perform in a manner similar to ‘singing concerted counterpoint’, and the third way of playing he described involves the arranging technique poner en el cimbalo (see Chapter two, note 20) for

\(^2\)Kinkeldey, Orgel; Ward, ‘Borrowed Material’; Slim, ‘Keyboard Ricercar’.
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intabulating a chanson or madrigal for accompanying a solo line.
AGAZZARI 1607 gives instructions for accompaniment with the proviso that they do not apply to playing the work alone, thus showing that it was actually quite common to play vocal works as solo keyboard music.
DIRUTA 1609-10 gives detailed instructions for transcribing music from partbooks to intavolatura in order to play it at the keyboard; Diruta states that memorizing and playing vocal music (madrigals, motets and Masses) at the keyboard is necessary to develop fantasia. BOTTazzi 1614, a theoretical work for keyboard players, was explicitly written according to vocal techniques. ORTIZ 1553, AGGAZARRI 1607, BANCHIERI 1609, and BIANCIARDI 1607 stress that it is important for keyboard players to know how to sing well.

TRABACI 1615 shows an important distinction between instrumental and vocal style, calling the latter the prima scuola and equating keyboard ricercars with motets and madrigals. For his instrumental style, however, he was willing to expand the pitch range of the music as far as necessary. BATTIFERRI 1669 also divides music into vocally orientated or non-vocally orientated styles, where ricercars and sacred vocal music are equated. This supports the conclusion drawn from stylistic studies that ricercars are based on vocal compositional techniques. 3 FRESCOBALDI 1615-16 draws attention to 'affetti cantabili' in his music; furthermore, the metaphor of the modern madrigal is employed to attempt an explanation of the new style of the toccatas within, revealing the overwhelming vocal orientation of music of the period.

3 Swenson, 'Ricercar', and Sutherland, 'Ricercari', demonstrate the inadequacy of classifying ricercars as 'instrumental motets', but the vocal stylistic basis of the imitative ricercar is undeniable.
Chapter three: Italian prints

The relationship of vocal genres and keyboard music

In MERULO 1567, a prospective list of publications is given which demonstrates a vocally founded art: ricercars, canzonas, alternatim settings of Magnificats, hymns and Masses, and intabulations of madrigals and motets. Similar references to playing vocal genres at the keyboard are found in VALENTE 1576, DIRUTA 1609-10, and ANGLERIA 1622. BANCHIERI 1605, as well as citing vocal works in tables for Mass and Vespers organ performance, gives imitative vocal-style versets for alternatim use which include text, although they were to be played on the organ.

Non-specific reference to vocal music by reference to genre is commonly found; almost every volume in Appendix A includes a work with some connection to vocal styles. They include the first and last volumes: ANTICO 1517 consists of embellished frottolas, and ARRESTI 1701 relies on interaction between voices and keyboard. Explicit intabulations of vocal models appear in fourteen volumes as outlined in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1. Volumes which include intabulations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Madrigals</th>
<th>Chansons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANTICO 1517 [frottolas]</td>
<td>M A CAZZONI 1523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORTIZ 1553</td>
<td>G CAZZONI 1543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RORE 1577</td>
<td>ORTIZ 1553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GABRIELI 1596</td>
<td>GARDANO 1577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYONE 1603</td>
<td>Motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRABACI 1603</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A GABRIELI 1605ii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRABACI 1615</td>
<td>M A CAZZONI 1523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BONIZZI 1626</td>
<td>VALENTE 1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESCOBALDI 1627</td>
<td>GABRIELI 1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STROZZI 1687</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other keyboard genres have origins in vocal music: canzonas are stylized versions of chansons and took over from direct intabulation soon after the publication of the pivotal volume GARDANO 1577, and imitative ricercars have vocal bases, as noted above. In Appendix A forty-seven volumes (not including reprints) contain canzonas, thirty-eight contain ricercars.

Volumes for liturgical performance refer more obliquely to vocal technique. They usually contain settings of plainchant for *alternatim* use, and thus originate in plainchant and alternate with voice, although their full texture does not always derive from vocal music. All told, only nineteen volumes do not refer to vocal styles in one form or another; these, which consist of dances or toccatas, are considered separately below.

**Vocal music and format**

The usual format for vocal music in the period was partbooks. The use of music transcribed from partbooks by keyboard players is generally acknowledged, and the sharing of this format by keyboard and vocal ensemble further demonstrates the vocal roots for keyboard music. The use of open score does not stem from vocal music, but still betrays a linear point of departure consistent with vocal style. Open scores for use by vocal forces are rare; when they occur, study is often the stated reason for the format (see I:98). Monodic vocal music which appeared in short score is related to short score for use by solo keyboard, although stylistically the use of short score at the keyboard originated not from monody but from an abbreviated process of intabulation of full-texture vocal or instrumental works (see DIRUTA 1609-10).

A survey of keyboard music of the period could easily highlight the distinctions and differences between these genres and vocal music; even
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Overt intabulations are invariably altered from vocal originals. But the fundamental truth remains that all of these works build upon vocal technique in some form, and would be inconceivable if removed from this context. The frequent transcription and performance of vocal music at the keyboard for pedagogical reasons supports this; there are regular references to the use of accompanimental volumes by solo keyboard; and the debate at the beginning of the 17th century regarding whether or not to double voices when accompanying (see I:131) reflects a fundamentally vocal orientation to performance practice, whichever side of the debate a particular writer favoured.

Lute music

Although the strongest stylistic influences in the development of keyboard music were vocal, lute music was an important secondary force, analogous to vihuela music in Spain. Vocal music was an important force behind lute music as well, so the interactions among the three are not entirely distinct. Vocal music had primacy over both keyboard and lute music; it influenced keyboard more than lute music; lute music was a secondary influence upon keyboard.

Specific references to the influence of lute upon keyboard music are not common, consisting mainly of pieces in two formats. Many of Verovio's volumes presented accompanimental parts in both intavolatura and lute tablature (see I:112). RADINO 1592 specifies in the dedication that it was intended for both keyboard and lute, and may have been a direct imitation of Verovio's work, since it appeared simultaneously in lute and keyboard format. ANERIO 1600 was published as a single volume with both formats, obviously for the use of both instruments. FRESCOBALDI 1628(iii) was printed in open score so that it could be used by a variety of instruments if desired; the editor Grassi wrote that
other of Frescobaldi's works needed to be transcribed into other tablatures for some performance, implying lute above all. Lute is named as a performance alternative in the title, and theorbo within the volume. Spinet and lute (or theorbo) are also suggested performance instruments in the title of Cazzati 1662.

Format references implying lute performance include Gardano 1577 and Rore 1577, both printed by Gardano in the same year. They were intended for 'strumento perfetto', i.e. any instrument capable of playing a full texture. Open score for use by lute is not commonly encountered; these, the first two open scores to be printed in Venice, are thus somewhat exceptional, and their relationship to the influence of lute music is not strong. Trabaci 1603 and 1615 state that the music may be played on any instrument, implying harp and lute, but harpsichord is stated as most suitable. Mayone 1603 and 1609 may be cited by association. 'Altri stromenti' is a performance suggestion for most of Pesenti's works (see Pesenti 1630); lute would have been especially suitable.

The first keyboard intavolatura to be printed in a single impression to appear in Italy, Buus 1549, was the work of Antonio Gardane, who had already printed a large quantity of lute music. The volume may have originated as the expansion of a business already well-developed in vocal and lute music to a third market. The transfer of lute genres to the keyboard is also common: keyboard dance music is direct imitation of similar lute volumes, especially evident in Gardane 1551 and Facoli 1588.

More significant links could be made on stylistic and publishing bases beyond the scope of this study. Vaccaro examined social issues regarding amateurs performing the lute and showed the significance of this class of players, who favoured the lute more than keyboard; he also
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showed the relation of printing to the rise of lute music. Table 3.2 extracts the figures for lute music printing in Italy in the 16th century.

Table 3.2. Music for lute printed in Italy in the 16th century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECADE</th>
<th>number of volumes printed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1500-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541-</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561-</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591-1600</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Vaccaro, La musique de luth, p. 64.

Although the limitations of this table are apparent (Vaccaro did not consider multi-purpose formats (volumes in open score or Verovio's volumes with several formats) and they appear to be omitted), the general primacy of lute music publishing over keyboard (see the breakdown in Table 3.3) is obvious.

Coelho observed several stylistic and more general interactions between lute and keyboard music in the early 17th century; perhaps most noteworthy is that DIRUTA 1609-10 held great interest among lutenists. Coelho highlighted a number of examples of the influence of keyboard on lute music, rather than the opposite approach adopted here; the

4 La musique de luth, pp. 25-32, 62-5, where a statistical breakdown of Brown is given: lute collections = 65%; keyboard = 22%; guitar, citern, etc., 11%; viols: 2% (it is not clear whether partbooks are included in these percentages).

5 Coelho, 'Frescobaldi and "Il Tedesco"', p. 140 and passim.
difference in perspective may be due to the later period in which Coelho worked. Further investigation of interrelations between the two is required to classify them more precisely.

Three users of keyboard music

Three general groups of users may be articulated: serious students 'apprenticed' to playing the instrument; players whose musical talents were limited but who were required to play of necessity, usually organists for religious establishments; and wealthy amateurs who took up the instrument for various reasons. For the first group, the prime goal of learning to play was fantasia; for the second and third, notational considerations were more important.

Professionals and fantasia

The goal of fantasia as expounded in Chapter two is stated most clearly in BANCHIERI 1609, which presents a detailed description of the use of notational formats with fantasia in perspective. Banchieri listed four ways of playing, three of which are really notational formats: fantasia, the first way, does not involve actually reading music, unlike intavolatura, open score and figured bass. This should be underscored as the dominant 'orthodox' opinion regarding notational formats in the period around the beginning of the 17th century. DIRUTA 1609-10 shows similar ideas to Banchieri. Composition and counterpoint are prerequisites for fantasia, and Diruta complained about organists who did not perform fantasia adequately due to lack of these skills. The second book of the volume is dedicated to learning counterpoint in order to play fantasia. This should be seen in context: the instructions for intabulation in Book I precede instruction in fantasia; the former is a logical preparation to the latter. Memorization of
vocal works in order to play fantasia is suggested in Diruta’s conclusion.

Other noteworthy references to fantasia include the earliest reference to it in this literature, in ORTIZ 1553, where it is described as the first, most difficult and advanced method of accompanimental performance. The ricercars in Pb-Padovano 1556 are named fantasias by Bottrigari, who thus supports the conclusion that a ricercar is a written-down fantasia. Similar considerations apply to Pb-Pallavicino 1610, entitled *Ricercari overo fantasie*. Finally, ANTEGNATI 1608 refers to players of fantasia who have eschewed the old-style values of the art, and draws a distinction between written and unwritten fantasia. This distinction does not fit the definition of fantasia as an improvisatory technique, and the comment indicates that meaning of the term itself was becoming restricted at this time: there are no references to fantasia as an unwritten art after BANCHIERI 1609 and DIRUTA 1609-10 (and their reprints). Bottrigari called ricercars fantasias; Antegnati does virtually the same. The blur between the two terms may have come about through the frequent publication of these written-down fantasias under the term ricercar. The lack of reference to fantasia in BATTIFERRI 1659 is significant, considering his traditional views. Given the similarity of Antegnati and Battiferri, the omission is understandable, since the volume consists of ricercars; as with Antegnati, Battiferri relied on the only available evidence of the mastery of former composers, which was necessarily written down.

---

6 Ward, 'Borrowed Material', Slim, 'Keyboard Ricercar', pp. 392-426, Vaccaro, *La musique de luth*, pp. 357-66, and Wolff, 'Ricercar', are the most thorough terminological considerations of the distinction between fantasia and ricercar to appear in recent years. Ward (p. 94 n43) concludes that 'fantasia, ricercar, praeambulum, tiento are terms usually employed synonymously in 16th-century sources'; this is echoed by Slim, Vaccaro and Wolff. One of the purposes of the present study is
The blur in meaning between ricercar and fantasia is evident in published pieces entitled fantasia found in VALENTE 1576, RODIO 1575, CIMA 1606, FRESCOBALDI 1608, and BANCHIERI 1612. The similarity of style between ricercar and fantasia is most evident with Frescobaldi; the meaning of fantasia in these works seems to be written pieces in the style of the unwritten art.

Despite the lack of reference to the actual term in its Spanish sense after Diruta, the technique survived throughout the 17th century; several writers describe fantasia techniques without using the actual term. Regarding liturgical performance, organists would have been required to improvise in order to use ASOLA 1592, the most important volume in this survey for alternatim playing (reprinted at least six times between 1592 and 1625). The organ-bass of BANCHIERI 1605 gives examples which show how an imitative texture should be formed, using the cantus firmus of various liturgical verses. This unique notation may be regarded as a half-way step for those unable to use Asola. In BOTTAZZI 1614 the user is given instructions for performing fantasia alternatim versets, although the term fantasia is not explicitly used. Again, the work is for those lacking the skill required to use Asola.

Trabaci (1615) did not explicitly mention fantasia, but described his ricercars as 'written down' or 'notated', suggesting implicitly that unnotated ricercars, i.e. fantasias, were known and understood. In FRESCOBALDI 1628(iii) the pupil-editor Grassi observed that Frescobaldi had achieved considerable notoriety in improvising, which can be equated with playing fantasia. PENNA 1672 shows that the technique of fantasia was still important in the late seventeenth century; the goal of studying keyboard music by the composers he cited was to perform various pieces ('versets, toccatas, etc.') independently of the written music.

to clarify the meaning of fantasia by placing the various references to the term within a larger context.
Evidence for fantasia in Italy which falls outside the bounds of this study includes references in organ trials. Two well-known trials were held at St Mark’s Venice and St Anthony’s Padua. In the former the applicant is required, among other things, to ‘improvise in an orderly manner, not confusing the parts, as if four singers were singing (sonare alla fantasia regolatamente, non confondendo le parti, come che quattro cantori cantassero)’. Performance ‘all’improviso’ was a significant requirement (see I:125). At St Anthony’s, ‘every contestant shall briefly improvise whatever he likes (ciascuno soni di fantasia con brevità quello che gli pare)’, and playing ‘all’improviso’ is again stressed. The test from St Mark’s is thought to have been in force from at least the time of Jacques Buus’s appointment in 1541; that of St. Anthony’s from at least 1579, when Diruta himself applied for the post.

Elementary liturgical performers

The second and least ambitious goal of keyboard players is evinced in volumes for liturgical use. Ideally church organists would fall into the first category and take the profession seriously enough to learn to play fantasia, but the reality was different for many religious establishments, to judge from the sources. To use a modern analogy, there were volumes printed for ‘the reluctant organist’ early in the history of keyboard music printing. The three clearest examples are BANCHIERI 1605, BOTTAZZI 1614 and CROCI 1642. Banchieri wrote for ‘those who do not have much understanding of the inner parts’, Bottazzi for those who were unable to perform alternatim versets properly, and

---

8 Quoted and transl. in McDermott, ‘Canzoni’, p. 5.
9 Ibid.
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Croci for children who could not reach an octave. A fourth example, VINCENTI 1598, gives ‘facilissima’ versets for multi-purpose liturgical use, clearly intended for the less able. MASSAINO 1607 wanted to give an accompaniment volume in intavolatura for ‘elementary players and monks’, but was unable.

All published liturgical versets suggest use by those unable to improvise; but some are more orientated for ease of performance than others. The organ Masses in MERULO 1568 are explicitly meant to encourage other organists to emulate Merulo, with the hint that they are for those unable to form fantasia-versedets. The same implications are present in G CAVAZZONI 1543, G CAVAZZONI b. 1549, VALENTE 1580, [GABRIELI ?1604], TRABACI 1615, DEGLI ANTONII 1687(ii), DEGLI ANTONII 1696, and ARRESTI a. 1701.

Amateurs

The third major reason for playing the keyboard was simply the desire of amateurs to play music for its own sake. The social implications of this were considered by Vaccaro, and the intimate connection between lute music and amateur use is apparent. There are no specific references to amateurs per se in the literature; obliquely, later references to virtuosi suggest amateur use more than anything else. These volumes are considered below (I:126).

The Development and Use of Formats

Keyboard-orientated notational formats were employed for these three primary classes of users. The different formats for keyboard and their deployment in the period are given in Table 3.3. This classifies the volumes in Appendices A and B, demarcated by decade. The two broad classifications of intavolatura and open score serve to guide the following discussion.
Table 3.3. The format of Italian keyboard prints.

In addition to format, author and date, this table includes the city of publication and reference for additional notes (given at the end of the table). Abbreviations for cities: B = Bologna; BR = Brescia; M = Milan; N = Naples; PA = Palermo; PR = Parma; PE = Perugia; R = Rome; S = Siena; V = Venice; ? = unknown.

Volumes cited in Appendices A and B but not included in this table are listed at its end.
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Table 3.3 (cont.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ENGRAVED INTAVOLATURA</th>
<th>TYPESET INTAVOLATURA</th>
<th>SHORT SCORE</th>
<th>NUMBER TABLATURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1511-</td>
<td>Antico 1517 R (e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521-</td>
<td></td>
<td>M A Cavazzoni 1523 V (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541-</td>
<td>G Cavazzoni 1543 V (a)</td>
<td>G Cavazzoni b1549 V (a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Busc 1549 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[Segni 1550 ?]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551-</td>
<td>Gardane 1551 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561-</td>
<td>G Cavazzoni 1556-59 R V (b)</td>
<td>Merulo 1567 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merulo 1568 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Valente 1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-</td>
<td>[Facoli 1586 Vr]</td>
<td>Facoli 1588 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591-</td>
<td>Merulo 1598 R</td>
<td>Bertoldo 1591(i) V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Banchieri 1595 V (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anerio c1600 R (f)</td>
<td>Bertoldo 1591(ii) V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merulo 1592 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Radino 1592 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diruta 1593 V (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A &amp; G Gabrieli 1593 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Gabrieli 1595 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Gabrieli 1596 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diruta 1597 R V (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vincenti 1598 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pellegrini 1599 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHORT SCORE</td>
<td>NUMBER TABLATURE</td>
<td>OPEN SCORE</td>
<td>ACCOMPANIMENT VOLUMES</td>
<td>PARTBOOKS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrivabene 1540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane 1543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buus 1547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiluntino 1549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane 1551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforti 1558</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane 1559R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffo 1564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane 1569R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valente 1576 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodio 1575 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rore 1577 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardano 1577 V (k)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valente 1580 N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Maschera 1590 V]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verovio 1586 R (t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verovio 1589 R (t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verovio 1590R R (t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verovio 1591 R (t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verovio 1592R R (t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croce 1594 V (u)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raval 1593</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verovio 1595 R (t)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallus 1598 M (v)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Metallo 1594]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Stivori 1594]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponza 1595</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banchieri 1596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascher 1596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassano 1585</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassano 1588</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascher 15881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padovano 15881</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincemiz 15886</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieli 1589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stivori 1589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieli 15901</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Antegnati b1591]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banchieri 1595 V (s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banchieri 1596 V (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banchieri 1598 V (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banchieri 1599 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardano 15931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascher 15931</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mascher 15961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massi 1596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raval 1596</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavaccio 1597</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellandi 1599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bori 1599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stivori 1599</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Bargnani b1600]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canale 1600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortari 1600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 3.3 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ENGRAVED INTAVOLATURA</th>
<th>TYPESET INTAVOLATURA</th>
<th>SHORT SCORE</th>
<th>NUMBER TABLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1601-</td>
<td>Merulo 1604 R</td>
<td>Padovano 1604 V</td>
<td>Guasi 1601 V (s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agazzari 1607 S (g)</td>
<td>[A Gabrieli 1604 V]</td>
<td>Calestani 1603 PR (s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bianciardi 1607 S (g)</td>
<td>Merullo 1605 R V</td>
<td>Massaino 1607 V (s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Gabrieli 1605(i) V</td>
<td>Giacobi 1609 V (s)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A Gabrieli 1605(ii) V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Merulo 1606 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Antegnati 1608 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diruta 1609-10 V (d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-</td>
<td>Frescobaldi 1615(i) R</td>
<td>Merulo 1611 V</td>
<td>[Pesenti b1621 V7]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frescobaldi 1615-16 R (b)</td>
<td>Bottarzi 1614 V (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frescobaldi 1616-7R R</td>
<td>[Picchi b1621 V7]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-</td>
<td>Frescobaldi 1627 R</td>
<td>Picchi 1621R V</td>
<td>Bonizzi 1625 V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frescobaldi 1628(ii)R R</td>
<td>Diruta 1622R V (d)</td>
<td>Pesenti 1630 V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diruta 1625R V (c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631-</td>
<td>Rossi 21634 R</td>
<td>Pesenti 1635R V</td>
<td>Pesenti 1639 V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frescobaldi 1637(i)R R (1)</td>
<td>Pesenti 1639 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frescobaldi 1637(ii)R R (h)</td>
<td>Pesenti 1639 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Rossi b1638R R]</td>
<td>Pesenti 1639 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641-</td>
<td>Croci 1642 V</td>
<td>Pesenti 1641 V</td>
<td>Pesenti 1644S V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pesenti 1645 V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651-</td>
<td>Giovanni 1650/52 PE</td>
<td>Pesenti 1650/52 PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rossi 1657R R</td>
<td>Pesenti 1650/52 PE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-</td>
<td>Rossi a1658R R (j)</td>
<td>Cazzati 1652 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storace 1664 V</td>
<td>Pistocchi 1667 B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-</td>
<td></td>
<td>D' Antonii 1687(ii) B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691-</td>
<td>Aresti 21697 ?</td>
<td></td>
<td>D' Antonii 1696 B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D' Antonii 1697R B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>Aresti a1701 ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 3.3 (cont.).

NOTES:

(a) = Double impression printing.
(b) = Partial reprint.
(c) = Treatise with thirteen toccatas as appendix.
(d) = Treatise with didactic examples of canzonas and ricercars.
(e) = Woodcut.
(f) = Combination of intavolatura and lute tablature.
(g) = Treatise with minimal music examples.
(h) = Second edition.
(i) = Third edition.
(j) = Probably printed after 1663.
(k) = Ristampato according to the title page; may refer either to earlier open score or partbook edition.
(l) = Accompanimental open score included with set of partbooks; suitable for solo keyboard performance as well.
(m) = Now-lost partbooks may have been printed with this.
(n) = Accompanimental volume with mixture of open score, short score, organ bass and partbooks.
(o) = Treatise with three pieces in open score.
(p) = Second edition; combination of FRESCOBALDI 1615(ii) and 1624.
(q) = Probable format.
(r) = Treatise with few music examples.
(s) = Accompanimental short score included with set of partbooks.
(t) = Verovio volumes with mixed formats: intavolatura, lute tablature and vocal music in choirbook format.
(u) = Bass score + partbooks.
(v) = Open score and bass score + partbooks.
(w) = Figured bass + partbooks.
(x) = Organ bass + partbooks.
Table 3.3 (cont.).

TOTALS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>engraved</th>
<th>typeset</th>
<th>short</th>
<th>number</th>
<th>open</th>
<th>accomp.</th>
<th>part-</th>
<th>books</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>intav.</td>
<td>intav.</td>
<td>score</td>
<td>tabl.</td>
<td>score</td>
<td>vols.</td>
<td>score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1511-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL | 21  | 38  | 18  | 1   | 51  | 26/1* | 68   | 224   |

*One figured bass volume for solo keyboard use.

Items not included in Table 3.3 but given in Appendices A and B include the following:

Asola’s chantbook for organists:

Asola 1592 V

Treatises with mixed formats:

Ortiz 1553 R
Banchieri 1605 V
Banchieri 1611R V
Banchieri 1622R V
Banchieri 1627R V
Banchieri 1638R V
Table 3.3 (cont.).

Lost works whose format is unknown:

[Bariola 1585 M?]
[Cecchino b1649 V?]

Ghosts:

[A Gabrieli 1563]
[A Gabrieli 1571]

Books with no music:

Banchieri 1609 B
Antegnati 1608b BR
Sabbatini 1628 V
Sabbatini 1644R V
Sabbatini 1669R R

One madrigal volume significant for quotation, but not its actual format (which is partbook):

Zoilo 1620 V
Chapter three: Italian prints

Intavolatura

Manuscript intavolaturas were known and used well before their first appearance in print. The first significant music printer, Petrucci, was given license to print 'intaboladure dorgano et de liuto' in 1498, the first reference to printed intavolatura; the option was never exercised (see ANTICO 1517). Antico's privilege stated that his volume was the first keyboard intavolatura. The privilege for M A CAVAZZONI 1523 is similar. The careful and costly production of the first four intavolaturas in Italy (ANTICO 1517, M A CAVAZZONI 1523, G CAVAZZONI 1543, b. 1549) suggest that they were intended for wealthier users who could have afforded expensive music.

One of the main reasons for printing the format was the ease of its use; when the more affordable single-impession intavolaturas began to be printed, their ease was regularly advertised. MERULO 1567 promised a series of twelve intavolaturas to aid organists in need of such works (although he was unable to produce more than two volumes). In BERTOLDO 1591(i), the printer Vincenti announced another series, less specific than Merulo's, which was 'intabulated for ease'. Although he promised works by three prominent composers (Merulo, A. Gabrieli and Guami), he never printed their keyboard works: Gardano did. MASSAINO 1607 suggested intavolatura in order to assist 'elementary players and monks' with accompaniment. PICCIONI 1610 similarly suggested an accompanimental part in either open score or intavolatura for those who 'are inexperienced and do not possess the art of Music'. A related outlook is seen in FRESCOBALDI 1628(iii): Grassi stated that keyboard players greatly preferred intavolatura to open score. Considering contemporary accounts on the difficulty of open score, the preference

10The earliest extant is Faenza 117; see Silbiger, Manuscript Sources, p. 11.
for intavolatura is at least partially accounted for by its relative ease in practical use.

The ease of intavolatura made it an expedient for those who wanted a simpler means of learning to play the keyboard. Those most in need of expedient notations were the second and third groups of users, amateurs and 'reluctant organists'. Both are addressed in VALENTE 1576, the most extreme example in Italy. Its notation is related to intavolatura, but its expediency was the chief point of attention for Mazza [the writer of its preface]; ease of performance (directly attributable to the notation) was one its prime attractions to prospective users. The volume is idiosyncratic in Italy (the only number tablature), and considering its Neapolitan origins should be directly linked to Spanish output. The advantages and ease of playing with the notation are clearly orientated towards amateurs, and the volume is autodidactic in a similar way to Italian lute (or Spanish vihuela) volumes for amateurs.11

Early keyboard dance and intabulation volumes in intavolatura can be specifically classed for amateur use, by direct analogy with lute music: ANTICO 1517 (frottolas), GARDANE 1551, FACOLI [1586] and 1588, RADINO 1592, ANERIO ?1600, PICCHI 1621. Short score is similar to intavolatura in that it was typeset, but required the inner parts to be realized by the performer (see PESENTI 1635). Most later volumes in short score, primarily dance-sets (Pesenti's works, CAZZATI 1662, PISTOCCHI 1667), follow on from dance-intavolaturas. STROZZI 1687 and DEGLI ANTONII 1687(ii) and 1696 show that short score had limitations and was apparently a second-best alternative for those composers who could not negotiate an engraved intavolatura from a publisher.

11 The only explicitly autodidactic work in Italy (also for use by amateurs) is SABBATINI 1628, which contains no music examples.
Three of the four 'reluctant organist' volumes cited earlier (I: 86) are intavolaturas; the fourth (BANCHIERI 1605) suggests intavolatura for those unable to play from open score. The unusual format of the anonymous VINCENTI 1598 (half the volume is blank) is peculiar, perhaps done to allow room for manuscript additions (although ruled paper would have been more helpful), or perhaps an uncompleted attempt to combine formats as in ARRESTI a. 1701. Most of the other liturgical volumes that are intavolaturas (G CAVAZZONI 1543, G CAVAZZONI b. 1549, G CAVAZZONI 1556-69, MERULO 1568, [GABRIELI ?1604]) show the use of this format for those least able to play in the liturgy. But this can also be viewed as a means to an end: BANCHIERI 1605 and BOTTAZZI 1614 provide instructions for fantasia. VALENTE 1576 can also be viewed as a volume appropriate for elementary liturgical organists.

Not all references to intavolatura confirm its ease or expediency, however. VIADANA 1602 said that reading this format is more difficult and time-consuming than playing figured bass. Similar observations appear in AGAZZARI 1607, which however recommends that the performer be able to understand open score and intavolatura. BIANCIARDI 1607 echoes Agazzari in this regard. FRESCOBALDI 1615(i) is the first intavolatura expressly to state that the works in that format 'do not appear to be easy'. Thus a contradiction between volumes which claim the ease of intavolatura and those which state the opposite arises. It is resolved according to two criteria: primarily, Viadana and Agazzari write for accompanimental purposes, where a certain amount of urgency in rehearsal and ease of preparation was a significant factor. The difficulty of intavolatura for 'all'improviso' accompanimental performance is not quite the same as its inherent difficulty. For FRESCOBALDI 1615(i), the difficulty is part of a stylistic development, and a significant change
from the status quo, also reflected in using engraved intavolatura (see I:106). 12

In concrete terms, the clearest exceptions to classing intavolatura for merely easy or expedient use are five ricercar volumes in intavolatura (see Table 3.6, I:105) which due to their genre would have been equally valid for use by serious beginners and amateurs. BUUS 1549 is expressly pedagogical; the others are implicitly so (at least in part). Since the rise of open score for ricercars coincided with their fall from use in intavolatura (see I:104), these five volumes represent a first, non-open score stage for keyboard ricercars. DIRUTA 1609-10 employs intavolatura for pedagogical reasons, but also shows a hierarchy whereby open score would have been used by more advanced performers; Diruta gave canzonas in the former format, ricercars in the latter.

Intavolatura was used by all three of the groups outlined above, but was intended primarily for the second and third, elementary church organists or amateurs, most of whom had no high ambitions for playing the keyboard. This is stated explicitly in BANCHIERI 1609, and the accompaniment volumes which suggest that less able players copy their part in intavolatura: ROGNONI 1605, MASSAINO 1607, PICCIONI 1610, MERULA 1615. The situation was changing, however, and later intavolaturas do not reflect the expedient side of the format evinced in these citations. The change in attitude to, and use of, intavolatura coincides with the rise of the 'virtuoso' performer and is considered below at greater length.

12 Frescobaldi's warning might also indicate that users of intavolaturas would normally not expect them to be difficult; the change required a specific comment.
Chapter three: Italian prints

Open score

As with intavolatura, manuscripts in open score predate prints. RODIO 1575 is the earliest Italian keyboard print in open score, and is directly linked to Spanish custom (see I:61). In GARDANO 1577, perhaps the printer used open score because there was no other precedent for the volume, it being the first printed collection of keyboard canzonas. The second canzona collection, [MASCHERA 1590], is the first open score in Venice to explicitly state that it was intended for organ players, but it may not have been printed. BANCHIERI (1609) placed open score above intavolatura in the hierarchy of the use of notational formats, recommending that ricercars in open score be used as pedagogical works in order to learn fantasia. But in discussing the least favoured format (basso continuo), he complained that some neglected to study open scores, and their playing suffered as a result. This testimony confirms the importance of open scores for keyboard at the time.

Other references to keyboard use of open score include RORE 1577, 'for students of counterpoint'; NANTERMI 1606, an open score of motets, which used that format for study purposes ('to uncover the inner workings' of the pieces); CORRADINI 1615, which states that it is to be used by beginners at the keyboard; MERULA 1615, which recommends putting the works (in partbooks) into open score; [STROZZI b. 1619], which

13 The Castell'Arquato manuscripts, c. 1550; Slim, 'Castell'Arquato', p. 47.

14 I was unable to examine the 'partitura' of Placido Falconio d'Asolo, Introitus et alleluia per omnes festivitates totius anni cum quinque vocibus (Venice: Antonio Gardano, 1575), cited in Gaspari, Catalogo, II:68, and Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 194. It may be an accompanimental open score.

GARDANO 1577 is 'ristampato', suggesting an earlier open score edition now lost.

15 See below, I:112.
Chapter three: Italian prints

acknowledges the difficulty of playing open score; BONIZZI 1626, which was printed in short score, although the author stated that he would have preferred open score, so that users could 'see such little scholarship' as the pieces contain.

FRESCOBALDI 1624 and 1635 both present important descriptions of the importance of playing open score to organists' training. In the latter, Frescobaldi declares 'I consider it a matter of great importance for players to use open score'. He considered performing from open score the main way to judge the competence of an organist.

The use of open score for study and pedagogy was probably recognized to be important. Most keyboard treatises cited the importance of, or actually used, open score: BANCHIERI 1605, BANCHIERI 1609, DIRUTA 1609-10, ANGLERIA 1622, PENNA 1672. Other volumes which reflect the pedagogical side to open score and not already cited include TRABACI 1603, ROGNONI TAEGIO 1605, CIMA 1606, CORRADINI 1624, [GIOVANNI 1652], BATTIFERRI 1669, FONTANA 1677, and ARRESTI a. 1701. They all illustrate that practising ricercars in open score is the best way for serious students to learn fantasia.

The format was generally favoured by better musicians, as indicated in BANCHIERI 1609. Paradoxically, the apparent decline in use of open score was accompanied by the rise in its appearance in print. The attitude shown in [STROZZI b. 1619], FRESCOBALDI 1624, 1628(iii) and 1635, that playing from open score was a lost art 'abandoned' in practice, belies its popularity in print throughout the century. Table 3.3 shows that open score was consistently employed throughout the period 1635-1700; this may reflect printers' preference, at least in part, considering comments in STROZZI 1687. The paradox is

16 The manuscript tradition is significantly different from the
significant, but the reasons for it are unclear at present. It is possible that the use of open score as a pedagogical tool was not a deeply-rooted tradition (unlike in Spain and Naples, where the format survived in manuscript form), and hence needed regular 'propping up' by its strongest proponents: Banchieri and Frescobaldi. They influenced at least two later musicians (BATTIFERRI 1669 and FONTANA 1677) who used open score.

The difficulty of performing from open score accords with the higher regard in which it was held. FRESCOBALDI 1628(iii) draws attention to the alignment of notes within the bar as a benefit of the volume, indicating that particular care was taken to achieve this difficult printing technique, which made the open score much more practical. The difficulty of reading open score was apparently significant enough for him to take special efforts to print a good, usable edition; otherwise, he said, one needed to be a composer to perform from open score. [GIOVANNI 1650 or 1652], an intavolatura, comments on the difficulty of FRESCOBALDI 1624, an earlier open score.

The use of open score by amateurs was certainly possible, but the genres most related to amateur use (toccatas, dances) appeared in that format less frequently (see Tables 3.4 and 3.5). Amateurs are explicitly mentioned in CIMA 1606, dedicated to the daughter of a wealthy nobleman who also composed (i.e. was interested in learning fantasia). This shows that more serious amateurs were quite willing to use the format.

The most significant format for instrumental ensemble, partbooks, was commonly used by keyboard players in the 16th century; the opposite printed regarding the use of open score; see Silbiger, Manuscript Sources, pp. 19-21.
occurs in the 17th, when the predominantly keyboard-orientated format of open score was taken up by instrumental ensembles. The interchange between the two media and formats is an indication of the lack of distinction between them in the minds of early performers.

The rise of open score was accompanied by a decline in partbooks (see Table 3.3), suggesting a correlation between open score and performance by instrumental ensemble. Frescobaldi 1628(iii) gives the clearest indication of this. Grassi stated that it was printed in open score so that it could be used by any instrument, including ensemble. One benefit of open score—ensemble performers could see the entire texture, not just their single line—is named as particularly important. The problem with intavolatura that Grassi saw was that it could not be used by other instruments, unlike open score, which was more easily adaptable. He said that the intavolaturas needed to be copied out 'with great effort' by non-keyboard players who wished to use them. Implied is that ensemble players appropriated the keyboard open scores for themselves, although Grassi said that they were 'for the sole use of keyboard players'.

Ensemble performance is mentioned for specific pieces within Trabaci 1615, Corradini 1624, Salvatore 1641, and Strozzi 1687. Cavaccio 1626 does not state explicitly what performance medium is intended, but its contents and style suggest that it is more suited to instrumental ensemble than keyboard. Open scores which contain canzonas à 8 are suited to ensemble performance: Beretta 1604 and Rovigo ?1613.

---

17 This may be contrasted with Johann Klemm, Partitura seu tabulatura italica (Dresden, 1631), which recommended copying out separate parts for ensemble performance. Cited in Silbiger, Manuscript Sources, p. 19.
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Volumes in two or more formats

The majority of mixed-format volumes are considered below with accompanimental volumes (I:129). Only BANCHIERI 1605, its re-editions, and ARRESTI a. 1701 combine several formats in one volume for solo keyboard use. Banchieri combined his unique notation of organ-bass versets with open score and short score. The short examples in open score are recommended for use as they are or copied into intavolatura; the impression Banchieri gives is one of flexibility of notation for particular parts of the treatise. The various aspects of the treatise are suited to particular formats, and Banchieri accordingly used several. It appears that Arresti employed both open score and intavolatura for didactic purposes; the open score portions are 'precepts', instructing how to compose vocally orientated versets.

Format/genre Relations

The development of keyboard formats is associated with specific genres in three cases: the relationships of toccatas and dances to intavolatura, and ricercars to open score. Although there are exceptions for all three, the music/format relationship appears to have had a bearing on composition, publication or use of the music in question. Other genres were less affected by format: for example, canzonas— the most common genre of the period— appear not to have significant links with any one format. Volumes containing music for specific liturgical use have certain relations with formats; they are considered in terms of use above (I:86).

Toccatas

The first reference to toccatas in the keyboard literature is found in the advertisement of MERULO 1567, but the first printed toccatas did
not appear until BERTOLDO 1591(ii). Toccatas had obviously been in circulation long before, since toccatas by Bertoldo (d. 1570), Padovano (d. 1575) and A. Gabrieli (d. 1586) eventually came to print. The preferred format for toccatas was intavolatura (twenty-two volumes or reprints). The particular suitability of engraved intavolatura for the expressive toccatas of Merulo and Frescobaldi is well known; these lead to the conclusion that the format was intimately linked with the genre.

Toccatas were occasionally published in open score, despite the relative unsuitability of that format for the genre. Of the nine such volumes (none was reprinted) six have direct Neapolitan links which influenced their format (see I:115), and the other three are stylistically distinct from intavolatura-toccatas (Frescobaldi and Giovanni also have Neapolitan links, albeit more tenuous). The format of toccatas is classified in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4. Toccatas and their format.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intavolatura</th>
<th>Open score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERTOLDO 1591(ii)</td>
<td>MAYONE 1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRUTA 1593 (+3 repr.)</td>
<td>TRABACI 1603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; G GABRIELI 1593</td>
<td>MAYONE 1609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERULO 1598</td>
<td>TRABACI 1615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERULO 1604</td>
<td>CAVACCIO 1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PADOVANO 1604</td>
<td>FRESCOBALDI 1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESCOBALDI 1615 (+4 edns. or repr.)</td>
<td>SALVATORE 1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESCOBALDI 1627 (+1 edn.)</td>
<td>[GIOVANNI 1652]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSSI 1634 (+3 repr.)</td>
<td>STROZZI 1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[GIOVANNI 1650/52]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORAGE 1664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 22 9

Dances

Dance volumes follow a similar pattern to toccatas, but are more numerous. When intavolatura fell from use dances were printed in short
score; five of the six open scores to include dances in a collection are Neapolitan, and the last (Strozzi) acknowledged that intavolatura would have been more suitable, but was ‘fuori dell’uso’.

Table 3.5. Dances and their format.\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intavolatura</th>
<th>Short score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GARDANE 1551</td>
<td>[PESENTI b1621] (+1 repr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VALENTE 1576</td>
<td>PESENTI 1630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACOLI 1586</td>
<td>PESENTI 1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FACOLI 1588</td>
<td>PESENTI 1641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADINO 1592</td>
<td>PESENTI 1645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A GABRIELI 1596</td>
<td>CAZZATI 1662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANERIO ?1600(^c)</td>
<td>PISTOCCHI 1667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESCOBALDI 1615(i) (+4 edns. or repr.)</td>
<td>STROZZI 1687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[PICCHI b1621] (+1 repr.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESCOBALDI 1627 (+1 edn.)</td>
<td>Open score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROSSI ?1634 (+3 repr.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[GIOVANNI 1650/52]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STORAGE 1664</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:
\(^a\) Two volumes for ensemble are not included here: MERULA 1615, BIUMI 1627.
\(^b\) Number tablature.
\(^c\) Both lute tablature and intavolatura.

Ricercars

The pedagogical aspect of both ricercars and open score unites the two, as made explicit in BANCHIERI 1609, DIRUTA 1609-10, ANGLERIA 1622 and PENNA 1672. But the classification of ricercars according to format reveals a significant change around 1605 which leads to the conclusion that the rise of the use of open score for ricercars was not fortuitous. The lack of ricercars in intavolatura or partbooks after 1605 (there are three and four respectively) compared to the number of open scores
(twenty-seven) indicates the change. The reasons for this can only be postulated, but are essentially related to four trends: the printing of the first pedagogical works cited above (which coincided with the shift to open score—the ricercar as pedagogy may only have taken on significant meaning after the shift in format); the rise of the use of open score by instrumental ensembles (see above, I:101); the decline of organists willing to use partbooks for keyboard music; and the decline in the appearance and use of printed intavolatura (see I:117). Ricercars are classified according to format in Table 3.6.

Table 3.6. Ricercars and their format.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTAVOLATURA</th>
<th>Ricercars only</th>
<th>Ricercars among several genres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BUUS</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>M A CAVAZZONI 1523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERULO</td>
<td>1567 (+1 repr.)</td>
<td>G CAVAZZONI 1543, VALENTE 1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A &amp; G GABRIELI</td>
<td>1595</td>
<td>BERTOLDI 1591(ii), A GABRIELI 1596, PADOVANO 1604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANTEGNATI</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>A GABRIELI 1605(i), A GABRIELI 1605(ii), CROCI 1642, STORACE 1664</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the three formats, intavolatura is least suited to ricercars, and only five intavolaturas contain ricercars exclusively. The choice of format for Neapolitan volumes probably had less to do with genre than the tradition of the city; see I:115.
Table 3.6 (cont.).

**OPEN SCORE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ricercars only</th>
<th>Ricercars among several genres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(or within treatises)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESCOBALDI 1608(^c)</td>
<td>RODIO 1575(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRUTA 1609-10 (+1 repr.)</td>
<td>MAYONE 1603(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORRADINI 1615</td>
<td>TRABACI 1603(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGLERIA 1622</td>
<td>CIMA 1606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRESCOBALDI 1624(^c)</td>
<td>MAYONE 1609(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BATTIFERI 1669</td>
<td>FRESCOBALDI 1615(ii) (+4 repr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PENNA 1672 (+3 repr.)</td>
<td>TRABACI 1615(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FONTANA 1677</td>
<td>CIFRA 1619(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CIFRA 1619(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CAVACCIO 1626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRESCOBALDI 1635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SALVATORE 1641(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FASOLO 1645(^d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STROZZI 1687</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PARTBOOKS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partbook</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrivabene</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>Bassano 1588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane</td>
<td>1543 (+2 repr.)</td>
<td>Gabrieli 1589 (+1 repr.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buus</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>Stivori 1589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buus</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>Raval 1593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiburtino</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>[Stivori 1594]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane</td>
<td>1551 (+2 repr.)</td>
<td>Sponga 1595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padovano</td>
<td>1556 (+1 repr.)</td>
<td>Mazzi 1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforti</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>Raval 1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffo</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>Borgo 1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merulo</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>Stivori 1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvezzi</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>Canale 1601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Luzzaschi b1578]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Quagliati 1601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Luzzaschi 1578]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bonelli 1602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Luzzaschi a1578]</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mayone 1606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassano</td>
<td>1585</td>
<td>Merulo 1607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macque</td>
<td>1586</td>
<td>Merulo 1608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pallavicino 1610</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

\(^a\) Not tabulated are two lost volumes which probably contained ricercars but whose format is not certain: [BARIOLLA 1585], [DELLA PORTA b.1639]; and DEGLI AN'IONII 1687(i), ricercate notated with figured bass for either keyboard or cello.

\(^b\) Number tablature, unique but related to intavolatura.

\(^c\) FRESCOBALDI 1608 and 1624 contain ricercar-like works, although they are entitled fantasia and capriccio respectively.

\(^d\) Neapolitan (see I:115).
The Absence of Formats

The strong affinity between intavolatura and its use by amateurs or elementary organists meant that the opinion expressed in BANCHIERI 1609— that playing from intavolatura was infra dignitatem for 'those who claim to be confident organists' — was probably a common one among the better organists of the day. Serious players would have used open score; the best organists would have used no music, but played fantasia. This is reflected by volumes which praise keyboard players who published little or no keyboard music: ANTEGNATI 1608, BANCHIERI 1609, BATTIFERRI 1669, and PENNA 1672. They refer to G. Cavazzoni (2), Padovano, Merulo (3), Luzzaschi (4), A. & G. Gabrieli, Stivori, Ascanio, Bariolla, G. Pallavicino, Frescobaldi (2), Milleville, and E. Pasquini; of these composers, Luzzaschi, Stivori, Ascanio, Bariolla, Pallavicino, Milleville, and E. Pasquini published no keyboard music. The significant proportion of the latter group reflects the importance of the unwritten art of fantasia throughout the period. Also noteworthy is the most reprinted book under consideration here, ASOLA 1592. It was intended to be used by competent organists as a guide to improvising alternatim versets, i.e. playing fantasia. Since its popularity is evident, the techniques it required of users must have been cultivated by a large number of performers.

Printing

Printing developments had a significant impact on the production of keyboard music. The first four volumes in Italy (ANTICO 1517, M A CAVAZZONI 1523, G CAVAZZONI 1543, G CAVAZZONI b. 1549) were all produced in a difficult and expensive format: engraved in wood or typeset (double-impression). The import of ANTICO 1517 is noted in its privilege and the circumstances surrounding it. The difficulties and
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cost of printing intavolatura were probably great enough to cause printers to be reluctant to produce such volumes unless there were unusual motivating factors. As Table 3.2 showed, the number of lute volumes well-outnumbered these four; furthermore, vocal music always dominated music printing (as Table 3.8, I:121, shows for a later period).\(^{19}\) Keyboard music was at best a secondary business for music printers.

The second stage of intavolatura printing began with the first typeset single-impression volume in Italy, BUUS 1549; it is also the first to proclaim its means of production ('tin type') in the title. The new means of printing made it less costly, but the rarity of such volumes is a sign of continued reluctance to produce the format. From BUUS 1549 to the last typeset intavolatura (CROCI 1642), only three firms printed in the format: Gardane, Merulo and Vincenti. This itself is enough to show the difficulty in its production; it required particular motivation to produce keyboard volumes. Gardane and his successors began and dominated the field; the other two, late arrivals to the business, had other interests as well as the problem of competing with Gardane.

**Gardane**

Antonio Gardane (later Gardano) and his successor firms (Sons of Antonio Gardano, Angelo Gardano, Angelo Gardano and brothers) were one of the most important music printers of the 16th century. As well as the first single-impression intavolatura, the first open score of Venice emanated from the firm (see note 14). Angelo Gardano printed keyboard music of some of the most important musicians of the day: A. and G.

\(^{19}\) Bautier-Regnier, 'Edition italienne', pp. 47-8, charts the total output of Italian presses from 1501 to 1563, tabulating 98 volumes from 1501 to 1535, increasing to 268 between 1535-1550.
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Gabrieli, Merulo and Padovano. The decline of the firm around 1610 saw the last of its intavolaturas (MERULO 1611), but it continued under the name of Magni for most of the 17th century. The Gardane volumes provided impetus for the work of Merulo and Vincenti, and in themselves indicate the significant output of the firm, but unlike the other two, no Gardane volumes include commentary on this production.

Merulo

In both printing and composition Claudio Merulo stands out as one of the most important men of the period for his work in keyboard music. Merulo’s keyboard music-printing is unique: for the first organist at St Mark’s Venice to enter the field is a striking indication of his belief in the importance of the venture he took up and advertised in MERULO 1567. His interests were not merely for keyboard players: he entered the business with a partner, Fausto Bethanio, and produced at least 29 volumes of music either in partnership or (after May 1567) as sole proprietor. The only two keyboard volumes he produced formed part of the incomplete series. The circumstantial evidence that these events give is substantial. Merulo had enough vision to see the importance of music printing, especially keyboard music. His advertisement in MERULO 1567 was unparalleled in keyboard music at the time, a first attempt to supply printed music in a format hitherto largely ignored or avoided. His advertisement is a valuable indication of the requirements or wishes of keyboard players and probably gives an accurate list of the sorts of music normally played.

The reasons he abandoned the series are not known. Merulo left the printing business in 1571, but influenced keyboard music production

20 Bastian, 'Merulo', pp. 37-42.
twice more before his death. He strongly promoted DIRUTA 1593, the first and most important keyboard treatise of the period, written by his pupil Diruta. Five years later the first volume of his toccatas was published, the first solo keyboard music to be engraved in copper. The second followed a few months after his death in 1604. Engraving was a difficult and expensive printing process, but produced exceptionally fine prints, and eventually dominated music printing before the invention of lithography. The toccatas utilize the advantages of engraving and present elegant and high-quality notation and printing; the limitations of typeset intavolatura in comparison are all too apparent in the similarly elaborately styled but less successful canzonas (1592, 1606, 1611).

Vincenti

Giacomo Vincenti (Vincenci, Vincenzi) and his successor (Alessandro Vincenti) were the most important printers after the Gardane firm in the first half of the seventeenth century. Vincenti came to Venice from Spain and began work in partnership with Ricciardo Amadino; his first independent volume of instrumental music was Pb-Bassano 1588. He began a keyboard series with an announcement in BERTOLDO 1591(i), but never fulfilled his promises to publish the keyboard works of Merulo, Gabrieli and Guami, and eventually stopped publishing typeset intavolaturas altogether. Yet he did develop a series of sorts; his nine typeset intavolaturas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BERTOLDO 1591(i)</th>
<th>VINCENTI 1598</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BERTOLDO 1591(ii)</td>
<td>PELLEGRINI 1599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RADINO 1592</td>
<td>DIRUTA 1609-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRUTA 1593</td>
<td>BOTTAZZI 1614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRUTA 1597R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 PELLEGRINI 1599 and BOTTAZZI 1614 were his last; Alessandro published the last two (PICCHI 1621, CROCI 1642).
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The music these volumes contain is uneven in quality: Diruta’s two-part work was very important and reprinted a number of times, and BERTOLDO 1591(ii) was the first volume to include toccatas; but Bertoldo had been dead for twenty years, Radino’s dances are uninspired and derivative of lute music, the anonymous versets of 1598 are admittedly ‘facilissima’ and expedient music for elementary church organists, Pellegrini’s canzonas were his first publication and he did not produce more keyboard music, and Bottazzi left no other record of his work beyond the volume, which itself was probably not successful. Apparently Vincenti abandoned typeset intavolaturas after Pellegrini, excepting the two treatise-volumes, indicating that the series proposed in 1591 was not a success.

Circumstantial evidence points to collaboration between Vincenti and the more established printer Angelo Gardano. The latter eventually printed keyboard works of the musicians Vincenti named in 1591, and the interrelation between MERULO 1592 and DIRUTA 1593 further supports this hypothesis. But whether there was a negotiated settlement between the two or outright competition in which Vincenti was the loser, his impetus must have been a significant influence on Venetian keyboard music printing in the period 1590-1615. His impetus in entering the printing business must have led to the increased activity of Gardano in the years following.

Vincenti additionally published first editions of some of the most important keyboard volumes that were not intavolaturas: ASOLA 1592; CROCE 1594 (with a preface by Vincenti) was the earliest accompanimental organ part; VIADANA 1602 was the most important figured-bass accompaniment volume of the period, reprinted seven times in ten years; BOTTAZZI 1614, one of his last volumes, is an important source of information for liturgical performance. He printed Adriano Banchieri’s
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first volume of music, BANCHIERI 1595, an important volume for accompanimental use at the keyboard.

It is difficult to place [MASCHERA 1590] in the context of Vincenti's later work, since there are unknown factors regarding its production. If the volume was ever printed, it was a forerunner to the later keyboard volumes and unusual for its format; if it was not printed, it represents another aborted printing effort, but the reasons for its failure remain obscure. Yet even proposing to print the canzonas in the same format as GARDANO 1577 indicates dependence upon the latter, and an uncommitted opinion regarding the usefulness of intavolatura to organists, at least in 1590.

Verovio

The third and final stage of intavolatura in the period was the development of the engraved variety by Simone Verovio. He joined Merulo to become the first to print engraved intavolatura for solo keyboard, but before that printed keyboard intavolatura accompaniments (along with lute tablature) to numerous vocal works in anthologies. Verovio provided notational ease for both keyboard and lute players, which suggests that amateurs would find these volumes— at least eight were produced between 1586 and 1601— particularly useful. His undated edition of Anerio's dances for either lute or keyboard (ANERIO ?1600) is similar, a provision for the less skilled who wished to use well-produced music. These are the only full accompanimental intavolaturas printed in the period, and thus are significant in reflecting the probable manuscript practice occasionally referred to, but not encountered in typeset works. His work was a significant influence on Borbone and Frescobaldi and appropriate to the rise of the virtuoso (see
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I: 125); engraved intavolatura replaced the typeset form entirely after 1621, with two exceptions.

Few printers prepared engraved music within this period. Short examples appear in AGAZZARI 1607 and BIANCIARDI 1607; [GIOVANNI 1650/52] is the first non-Roman volume; and STORACE 1664 is the first and only to be printed in Venice. Verovio, then Borbone, dominated the field.

Format and City of Publication

There is a significant correlation between city of publication and format. Table 3.3 is re-grouped according to city/format relations in Table 3.7. The general relationship of Venice and typeset intavolatura, Rome and engraved intavolatura, Milan and open score (especially for accompaniment), Naples and open score is clear.
### Table 3.7. City/format associations (excluding partbooks).

**KEY TO FORMATS:** engraved intavolatura / typeset intavolatura / short score / open score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decade</th>
<th>Venice</th>
<th>Rome</th>
<th>Milan</th>
<th>Naples</th>
<th>Bologna</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1511-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1521-</td>
<td>-/1/-/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1531-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1541-</td>
<td>-/4/-/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1551-</td>
<td>-/1/-/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561-</td>
<td>-/3/-/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1571-</td>
<td>-/-2/-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/-2b</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1581-</td>
<td>-/2/-/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591-</td>
<td>-/11/-</td>
<td>2/-/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1601-</td>
<td>-/8/3/</td>
<td>3/-/</td>
<td>-/-5/</td>
<td>-/-3/</td>
<td>-/-1/c</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611-</td>
<td>-/4/1/</td>
<td>3/-/</td>
<td>-/-3/</td>
<td>-/-1/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1621-</td>
<td>-/3/2/5</td>
<td>2/-/</td>
<td>-/-4/</td>
<td>-/- /</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1631-</td>
<td>-/-2/1</td>
<td>4/-/</td>
<td>-/-2/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1641-</td>
<td>-/-3/3</td>
<td>-/-/</td>
<td>-/-1/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/-1/d</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1651-</td>
<td>-/-2/1</td>
<td>1/-/</td>
<td>-/-/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/-/-/e</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1661-</td>
<td>1/-/-</td>
<td>1/-/</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/-2/1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1671-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/-1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/-2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1681-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/-1</td>
<td>-/-2/1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1691-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-/-2/1</td>
<td>1/-/-/g</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1701-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1/-/-/h</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL:** 1/38/12/16 17/-/-/7 -/-/-/14 -/-/1/8 -/-/6/5 3/-/1/1

| 67     | 24     | 14     | 9      | 11     | 5       |

**NOTES:**

- ^a^ **ANTICO** 1517, woodcut intavolatura.
- ^b^ **VALENTE** 1576, number tablature.
- ^c^ **CALESTANI** 1603, accompanimental short score.
- ^d^ **DEL BUONO** 1641 (Palermo).
- ^e^ **GIOVANNI** 1650/52 (Perugia).
- ^f^ **DEGLI ANTONII** 1687(i) and (ii), which use a variant notation to short score.
- ^g^ **ARRESTI** (?1697 (city unknown).
- ^h^ **ARRESTI** a. 1701 (city unknown).
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Naples

The clearest and most consistent publishing trend is found in Naples. Eight of the nine volumes were open scores (VALENTE 1576 is exceptional); of the four volumes with south-Italian connections published elsewhere, three are open scores as well. The continual use of open score probably derived from the predominance of that format in Spain in the 17th century, since there were strong political links between the two in the period. The strength of the tradition should not be underestimated; considering the unsuitability of much of the music for such a format, it is surprising that none of the Neapolitans made significant comments about its inadequacies.

ORTIZ 1553 discussed formats most fully, but did not refer to intavolatura, only fantasia, choirbook, open score and organ-bass. It would appear that intavolatura was simply less in use in the Spanish-influenced areas of Italy. VALENTE 1576 underscores the Spanish derivation of Neapolitan keyboard format, since it employs a modified Spanish number tablature, the only Italian volume to do so. The fact that the promised second volume appeared in a radically altered content and different format indicates that the 1576 volume was experimental, and not well-received. The established format soon became open score, and remained so throughout the period.

Rome

Rome was the dominant city for engraved intavolatura, the format seldom produced elsewhere. Verovio and Borbone established a small tradition in the format, although the two most important keyboard composers whose works they printed, Merulo and Frescobaldi, also published numerous other volumes that were typeset in Venice. The open scores from Rome are not insignificant, but in a sense provincial,
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following the lead of the more important centre of music printing, Venice.

Milan

Milan seems to have been the north-Italian equivalent of Naples, and open score was the dominant keyboard format, although there is barely enough material to define a trend. Frescobaldi's first keyboard volume appeared there (1608); the only other solo keyboard volume was CIMA 1606. Neither volume discussed the use of the format, which appears to have been conventional. Support for this may be drawn from the ten accompanimental open scores printed in Milan, since they were less common elsewhere. But the lack of volumes printed in Milan at all makes it impossible to define clearly the keyboard format traditions that surely existed there.

Venice

Venice was the centre of music-printing in Italy. Typeset intavolatura made its first appearance there, and was never produced outside Venice. The Venetian keyboard tradition may be attributed to the personal interest of Gardane, Merulo and Vincenti. The tradition was apparently not as strong as open score in Naples, for intavolatura fell from printed use; this also may be attributable to printers. STROZZI 1687 and DEGLI ANTONII 1687(ii) indicate that the two composers would have preferred intavolatura, although they employ another (otherwise unknown) notational format.

Intavolatura was replaced by open or short score, although all three formats were present in 16th-century Venice. The keyboard music business was nearly monopolized by Alessandro Vincenti after CAVACCIO 1626; but his last keyboard volume was [GIOVANNI 1652]. Only one later
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volume, STORACE 1664, can be traced to Venice, and its publisher is unknown. The last half of the 17th century witnessed the rise of Bologna as the centre of what little keyboard music printing there was.

Difficulties in Printing

Although it was not in the best interests of printers and publishers to actually print comments harmful to their craft, they are occasionally found in the keyboard literature. The earliest are 'ghosts' or unfulfilled promises: the first license was granted in 1498 to Petrucci, who never acted upon it; Merulo’s unfinished series (1567); VALENTE 1576, BERTOLDO 1591(i) and PICCHI 1621 gave promises regarding forthcoming volumes that were not kept. Printers or composers may have become wary of such promises by the time of [GIOVANNI 1650/52], where the author expressed his doubts about the future success of the volume (which were apparently unfounded).

ZOILO 1620 documents the fall from use of intavolatura, with which 'the press has difficulty'. (Notwithstanding, the press’s reluctance to provide an intavolatura for Zoilo may stem from printing convention, since typeset intavolaturas were never provided as accompanimental parts to vocal works.) DEGLI ANTONII 1687(ii) and 1696 both employ a notation developed because of the inability of the press to meet the composer’s requirements. STROZZI 1687 used open score for several dances, saying that four-part writing had fallen from use for such music; he also used a variant of short score similar to Degli Antonii, probably for similar reasons. The new format was apparently devised because it was no longer feasible to produce intavolatura; it resembles short score and uses figures for both right and left hands, and shows hand-division like intavolatura, but was probably technologically easier to print. Comments in these volumes indicate that neither Strozzi nor Degli
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Antonii chose the notational format, and that they were constrained to use it due to pressure from the printer.

The preface to BONIZZI 1626 states that open score would have been preferred, but was not practical for reasons of time. The implication is that the format actually used, short score, was a second-best alternative which Bonizzi was constrained to use for reasons of printing expediency.

Frescobaldi had more than his share of printing difficulties. FRESCOBALDI 1615(i) required personal financial outlay to enable it to be printed in the preferred format, engraved intavolatura. The format itself had not been used for keyboard music since 1604, and might have fallen from use entirely if not for Frescobaldi and the printer Barbone. The financial difficulties suggest uncomfortable relations with the dedicatee, whose name was left off the first edition.

Difficulties in the preparation of FRESCOBALDI 1624 were significant enough to force Frescobaldi personally to correct the copies he gave to friends. Whether due to his own indecision or the negligence of the printer, the incident probably led to Frescobaldi publishing the remainder of his open scores with the firm of Alessandro Vincenti in Venice.

Two printing anomalies in FRESCOBALDI 1627 -- the omission of publisher, place and date from the title page, and the inclusion of Vespers works inconsistent with the rest of the contents -- are inconclusive, but indicate irregularities in the preparation of the volume consistent with those seen in FRESCOBALDI 1624 and 1637(ii), the printing of which Frescobaldi apparently disrupted.

Vertical alignment in FRESCOBALDI 1628(iii) was important enough to merit careful attention, according to the editor (Grassi). As he stated, one of the reasons open score was found difficult was mis-
aligning of the parts. Grassi also noted that printing problems had something to do with Frescobaldi's not publishing more keyboard music, but the claim may not be entirely accurate, considering his other exaggerations.

Less significant problems occasionally cropped up: in Mayone 1603, the requisite type was not at hand and the volume required MS corrections for completion (similar corrections are found in Trabaci 1603, produced by the same firm); in Mayone 1609, Mayone stated that printing restrictions meant occasional awkwardnesses with clefs and accidentals in ornaments. Symbols also posed problems in Presenti 1645, when one for an accidental was unable to be provided by the printer.22

Statistically-related observations

It is difficult to draw significant conclusions from mere figures of printed volumes, but the totals of Table 3.3 invite further attention. Before comment, however, the keyboard output may be placed in a larger context. Table 3.8 approximates the total number of volumes printed in the period. While complete and accurate tabulation must await a chronological classification of RISM Einzeldrucke, a rough guide to relative production of various types of music may be quickly apprehended by classifying the entries in Mischiati, Indici. The publishers' catalogues confirm that there are relatively few sources of instrumental music from the 16th century that are lost, and can at least give a picture of the proportions of various genres. In this tabulation the occasionally blurry boundaries between genres have been artificially made more distinct to show the more general pattern of each catalogue.

22 A similar situation occurred with Agazzari's Bassus ad Organum & Musica Instrumenta ... Sacrarum Laudum (Venice: Amadino, 1608); see Arnold, Thorough-bass, p. 66 n2; Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 224.
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All but one of the catalogues are organized by genre but begin with 'musica à 2' and 'musica à 3'; instrumental music is usually classified towards the end.\textsuperscript{23}

\textsuperscript{23}A more detailed survey of the catalogues would reveal interesting trends regarding facets of the industry such as prices of volumes (In Vincenti (1649), for example, the 'Vesperi à più voci senza Basso' were considerably cheaper than those with continuo) and the continuing appearance of some volumes long after they were printed (Merulo's toccatas were included in catalogues up to 1676, indicating it was not economically successful).
Table 3.8. Publishers' catalogues: breakdown by genres.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genres</th>
<th>Publishers' catalogues&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G 1591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;sup&gt;â&lt;/sup&gt; 2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;sup&gt;â&lt;/sup&gt; 3</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vespers and other sacred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motets</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>madrigals and canzonas</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vocal)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lute tablatures</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misc. instrumental partiture</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keyboard volumes</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>treatises</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Mischiati, Indici.

NOTES:

<sup>a</sup>The catalogues are: Gardano, 1591; Vincenti, 1591; Scotti, 1596; Tini, [1596]; Giunta, 1604; Vincenti, 1621; Vincenti, 1635; and Vincenti, 1649. Not included are Vincenti, 1658; and Vincenti, 1662. These two are roughly comparable to Vincenti, 1649, with additions to most vocal genera, but not instrumental (1658 adds about 70 entries, but leaves the instrumental section unchanged; 1662 adds another 98 entries, again leaving the instrumental section unchanged).

(cont. overleaf)
Table 3.8 (cont.)

\( ^b \) Vincenti 1635 is organised according to composer.

\( ^c \) Giunta 1604 unites the two genera.

\( ^d \) The other works are headed 'Musiche per cantar, e sonar nel Chitaron, Tiorba, Arpicordo, & Chitarra alla Spagnola, & altro simile strumento.' They include operas, madrigals, and some sacred works, for solo voices and continuo (as opposed to the other works, which are in partbooks).

\( ^e \) The discrepancy regarding numbers of volumes between this tabulation and Mischiati's numbered entries is due to his counting several volumes as one entry when they were given in the catalogues on only one line (e.g. in Giunta, 1604, Mischiati's entry no. 875 is 'Ricercari di Andrea Gabrieli per tasti 1.2.3.', clearly a listing of his three volumes for keyboard (1593, 1595, and 1604)). In such cases, I have tabulated the total number of individual volumes.

---

This table indicates the lack of printed keyboard music in the period compared to other music. In comparison, the figures of Table 3.3 are dwarfed by the quantity of vocal music. Table 3.3 shows a 'bulge' of production in the years 1591 to 1620 and an arch-like rate over the 200 years. The most productive decade, 1601-1610, witnessed the shift away from intavolatura, the heyday of four-part instrumental music in partbooks with or without accompaniment, and the rise of open score.

The shifting assessment of keyboard formats by contemporaries was one of the causes of the burst of output. The rise of intavolatura has been attributed to the work of Gardane, Merulo and Vincenti; the watershed years around 1600 saw the change in perspective associated with the rise of the virtuoso, after which keyboard output returned to a trickle of volumes similar to the beginning of the period. Keyboard music never became a securely established kind of music to print, and without the personal influence of men like Merulo, Vincenti, Banchieri, and Frescobaldi, volumes were not printed. To judge from PISTOCCHI 1667, the trivial product of a prodigy, keyboard music was occasionally reduced to a novelty.
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Style, Old and New

The format trends discussed so far all point to the period around 1590-1610 as a time of upheaval for keyboard music; the changes of musical style taking place at the time also had a significant effect on perspectives of keyboard music. There are several types of references to musical style found in the keyboard literature which help to show the importance of the use of formats to contemporary performers.

The earliest references to an 'old style' are oblique: the printing of posthumous keyboard works. Seventeen volumes listed in Appendix A were printed posthumously.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Composer/Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1577</td>
<td>RORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1590</td>
<td>[MASCHERA]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591(i)</td>
<td>BERTOLDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1591(ii)</td>
<td>BERTOLDO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1593</td>
<td>A &amp; G GABRIELI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1595</td>
<td>A &amp; G GABRIELI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1596</td>
<td>A GABRIELI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1597</td>
<td>[A GABRIELI 1604]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1604</td>
<td>PADOVANO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>A GABRIELI 1605(i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>A GABRIELI 1605(ii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1605</td>
<td>MERULO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1606</td>
<td>MERULO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1611</td>
<td>MERULO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1613</td>
<td>ROVIGO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1645</td>
<td>FRESCOBALDI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The works of Bertoldo and Padovano stand out, since they died earlier than the rest. The publication of Rore and the others is not quite as significant, yet the implicit meaning of such a large number of posthumous works around 1600 is clear: the notion of an important older style, inherently valuable and worth recalling, had arisen.

Similarly, references in pedagogical works to the old keyboard masters recalls the perceived importance of the old style. They are found in ANTEGNATI 1608, ANGLERIA 1622, BANCHIERI 1609, BATTIFERRI 1669, and PENNA 1672. The latter is particularly striking, as he cited some of the earliest printed keyboard works as useful for students one hundred and fifty years later. But Antegnati's and Battiferri's comments are most important, and show the significance of the dichotomy of styles in 1608 and 1669 respectively.
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Specific reference to the old style is found in CALESTANI 1603, where the composer postponed publishing old-style compositions in favour of the new; and MAYONE 1603 and 1609, where the two styles are divided into genres: ricercars for the old, toccatas and other works for the new. Mayone noted that some preferred the old style and drew their attention to his ricercars. TRABACI 1603 and 1615 are similar; he referred to his ricercars as works of the prima scuola. The 'old style' was sought after by Battiferri and Fontana (1677); their works are the last two ricercar-volumes of the period, and they both draw attention to the importance of the stile antico, a term that Fontana actually used (the first occurrence in the literature surveyed here).

Comments regarding secretive aspects of the keyboard player's art are related to 'old style' comments in that both are indicative of the older ideas regarding keyboard playing. Only a few references to this are found, but they show that there were such tendencies lurking beneath the surface of the deceptively liberal printing trends of the time. Paradoxically, VALENTE 1576 is clearest, since his notation is manifestly opposed to retaining an exclusive 'art'. Exclusivity is implicitly opposed by the two series of Merulo and Vincenti; DIRUTA 1593 expressed amazement that such a worthwhile topic as the one he took up had not been written earlier, but the reason it had not been might well have been the importance, to some, of keeping the art closed; Picchi (1621) proudly proclaimed the value of his secret notation; and Frescobaldi believed that a secretive attitude was worthy to promote (1627). There are few specific references to secrecy, but it was an attitude prevalent in keyboard musicians of the time. Breaking this code was part of the rise of the new style.

The contrasting 'new' style is seen in the works of Mayone and Trabaci, as noted. It was not always well received, as Antegnati (1608)
showed; but eventually it stood alongside the old. It was related to the madrigal style and monody, but had its own characteristics for keyboard music. VIADANA 1602 and AGAZZARI 1607 gave instructions for accompaniment that were orientated towards the new style; Agazzari made specific reference to it. BANCHIERI 1612 drew attention to the ease and delight of the style; FRESCOBALDI 1615–16 has important comments regarding the style, reflected in his intavolatura-works.

One of the most noteworthy things which came with the new style was reference to playing ‘all’improviso’: on the spur of the moment, i.e. sightreading. This first occurred in VALENTE 1576; VIADANA 1602, AGAZZARI 1607 and [STROZZI b.1619] refer to the importance of ‘all’improviso’ accompaniment; one of the goals of fantasia was playing ‘all’improviso’, according to Bottazzi (1614); Frescobaldi was renowned for his improvisation, according to Grassi (FRESCOBALDI 1628(iii)); the instructor cited in [GIOVANNI 1652] taught children to play ‘all’improviso’. Thus the references are organized in three ways: playing fantasia, accompaniment, or expedient notation. The latter relied on notation, and merely imitated fantasia. Antegnati, committed to the old style, scorned ‘all’improviso’ playing with a contradictory statement which contrasted the ‘all’improviso’ of modish performers with the traditional ‘thoughtfully composed fantasia’ of the performers of the past, a sign of a change in perception of the art of fantasia.

Two musicians are worthy of individual consideration for their input into matters of keyboard style: Banchieri and Frescobaldi.

Banchieri

Banchieri’s volumes are important for revealing the prevalent perceptions of keyboard music: BANCHIERI 1609 in particular is the most important source of the period for this. He was a significant person in
many respects; for keyboard music, his work showed the fundamental place of fantasia in the performance practice of the best players. Any form of notation was acceptable to him if it were used for the proper goal, learning to play fantasia, and he recommended music in all the major formats. The old style and the new were both important to him, and are contrasted most clearly in his 1596 and 1612 volumes. His work for playing the organ in the liturgy was the first and most important of its kind, imitated or varied by Bottazzi and Diruta among others.

Frescobaldi

Frescobaldi was the preeminent keyboard player and composer of the period. His volumes reflect the dichotomy of style of the time, and he clearly saw the importance of both. The open scores explicitly stated the value of such notation and the old style; the intavolaturas did not discuss the format, but implicitly show the importance he placed upon the new style. He also received the compliment of imitation through the works of Cifra, Rossi, Croci, and Fasolo. Battiferri and Penna, later writers, praised him as the 'creator of all styles'. The balance of his output in terms of format (ten open scores, seven engraved intavolaturas, including reprints) indicates that he viewed both formats neutrally and valued the merits of each, for the appropriate music.

The amateur-virtuoso

Style-references indicate that there arose a new perception of who would use printed keyboard music. Amateurs in particular grew into an important body of users to whom much of the new-style music was addressed. These may be called 'amateur-virtuosos'. They were not
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virtuosos in the sense of the word documented by Reimer; there seems to have been another, more subtle meaning to it. BERTOLDO 1591(i) and CROCI 1594 demonstrate that the word was used in a loose sense to mean not a highly skilled musician or composer but something altogether different. The term as used in conjunction with music in intavolatura format seems to have applied to keyboard players interested in the 'modish' (as Antegnati put it) modern music, and especially in the music which was more easily accessible than the professionals' intangible aim, fantasia. The expediency of intavolatura was highly regarded by these users. They were virtuosos perhaps in the sense of highly skilled performers, and reflect, similar to Spanish trends, the rise of performers distinct from composers. Banchieri's somewhat condescending remarks about users of intavolatura (1609) indicate that the new users were not professionals, but the opinion is old-fashioned and reflects an attitude perhaps more valid twenty or thirty years earlier. A number of volumes show that these amateur-virtuosos were different from the impression Banchieri gave.

BERTOLDO 1591(i) and (ii) were expressly printed by Vincenti for 'virtuosos' who desired music 'intabulated for ease'. This is somewhat contradictory, since the real virtuosos would not need expedient notation. But the volume has a number of similar successors. MERULO 1592 and DIRUTA 1593 go hand in hand, a letter pertaining to the former printed in the latter; Merulo stressed that the user needed the proper approach to study to play his virtuosic canzonas (all three books of canzonas refer to 'virtuosos' in the dedications), and he recommended Diruta's work for the purpose. The latter was popular, reprinted three times. The 'complete works' series of Andrea Gabrieli (1593, 1595,

---

Reimer, 'Virtuose'.
1596, [?1604], 1605(i) and (ii)) published by Gardano was in a similar vein, although there were no explicit comments regarding its users. It would appear that these volumes were intended for a 'virtuoso' interested in performing good music well, but not interested in playing fantasia. Thus the format itself became a convenient and acceptable way of reaching the goal of performance.

The change in perception of intavolatura from a format disdained by professionals to a highly regarded one was made considerably smoother by the rise of the engraved form. These volumes were quite expensive and difficult to produce, but nevertheless took over from typeset intavolatura without exception after 1642. They were almost always intended for virtuoso use. MERULO 1598 and 1604 were the first; as noted earlier, the format was suited to the demanding idiomatic writing. The most significant music of this type was by Frescobaldi. The two volumes of toccatas (1615(ii), 1627) underwent numerous editions, clearly demonstrating the success of the work. Frescobaldi’s prefaces noted the difficulty of the music, an observation not found in earlier intavolaturas. Grassi, in FRESCOBALDI 1628(iii), makes it clear that amateur–virtuosos far preferred intavolatura to open score.

The distinction of styles for virtuosos prompted differing responses from the professionals, hence the divergence of BANCHIERI 1609 and FRESCOBALDI 1615(i). This is especially evident in the writing of Trabaci, who actually placed the blame for any possible criticisms of his work on the users themselves, who, he said, would certainly appreciate them if they studied them properly. Frescobaldi, on the other hand, left himself to 'the good taste and refined judgement of the
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performer'. Notwithstanding the opposing points of view of the two, they both were responding to the amateur-virtuosos and their needs.

Related Topics

Before drawing this summary of the trends in printed Italian keyboard music to a close, two subsidiary topics call for discussion: accompaniment and notational issues related to it, and partbooks. While they do not fall entirely within the scope of solo keyboard music, these notations were regularly used by keyboard players.

Accompanimental notations

The use of notations for keyboard accompaniment is intimately related to their solo use. To the two basic solo formats may be added a third for accompanimental use in the first instance: figured or unfigured bass. The purpose of this survey is not to examine the rise of figured bass and accompaniment, but merely to consider the notational implications of the third format and contemporary documentation of its value. Since both Kinkeldey and Arnold examined many of these sources, full discussion of the trends would be needless repetition, but a short summary of the basic notational elements is useful for completing the examination of solo printed keyboard sources.

One of the prime reasons for accompanimental formats such as figured or unfigured bass was their convenience and ease compared to open score or intavolatura. This is clear from the two most important

25 Cited in Alvini, preface to Trabaci, Ricercate I [repr.], unn. p. 2. Her parting comment, ‘Per il "Letitore" l’era delle scelte e del narcissismo è ufficialmente cominciata’, while polemical, sufficiently reflects the same point: the rise of a new class of performer-users of notated keyboard music.

26 One volume in Appendix A, DEGLI ANTONII 1687(i), employs figured bass intended (in part) for solo keyboard.
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such volumes, VIADANA 1602 and AGAZZARI 1607, as well as BANCHIERI 1612. This was not, however, a universal opinion, and MASSAINO 1607, PICCIONI 1610 and FRANZONI 1611 document that some were unable to play from an organ-bass. This notwithstanding, the usefulness of the format was generally accepted and it came to dominate accompanimental parts. The development, following on from intavolatura (also developed 'for ease'), indicates the importance accorded to ease of quick performance around 1600 (see I:125).

The accompanimental volumes ORTIZ 1553, GALLUS 1598, VIADANA 1602, NANTERMI 1606, AGAZZARI 1607, BANCHIERI 1607, BIANCIARDI 1607, MERULA 1615, [STROZZI b. 1619], ZOILO 1620 and FRESCOBALDI 1628(iii) merited attention above for their specific comments regarding the use of intavolatura and/or open score. The six volumes published by Verovio which include intavolatura accompaniment are noteworthy since no other printed volumes contain full intavolatura accompaniment. The first short score for accompaniment, CROCE 1594, is significant as one of the innovations of Giacomo Vincenti (see I:111).

At least nine volumes include open score accompaniment which would have been suited to solo keyboard performance, since open score was one of the predominant keyboard formats of the period; they are included in Table 3.3 with a note to that effect. Similarly, four accompanimental volumes in short score were well-suited to solo performance: BANCHIERI 1595, GUAMI 1601, FRANZONI 1613, and PESENTI 1639. Most of these contain old-style music (usually canzonas) in four equal voices. The volumes, when open score, also implicitly suggest that their composers wished the accompanist to double the voices. Not every open score accompaniment volume of the period is included in this survey, since a number contain music stylistically less suited to keyboard performance.
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Most of the remainder of accompanimental volumes included in Appendix A refer to the question of whether or not to double the voices with a full texture. The debate has been considered by Kinkeldey and Arnold and need not be repeated in full. The differences of opinion are summarized in Table 3.9.

Table 3.9. Volumes which refer to accompanists doubling parts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In favour of doubling</th>
<th>Against doubling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GALLUS 1598</td>
<td>AGAZZARI 1607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIADANA 1602</td>
<td>BANCHIERI 1607a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASSAINO 1607</td>
<td>GIACCOBI 1609b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROGNONI TAEGIO 1605</td>
<td>FRANZONI 1611a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIRUTA 1609-10</td>
<td>BANCHIERI 1612c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PICCIONI 1610</td>
<td>STROZZI b1619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MERULA 1615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZOILIO 1620</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a These two volumes recommend Agazzari for those in need of instruction in figured bass.

b The upper part in this volume was given ‘not to be played, but rather to help player to understand the requisite harmony.’

c A variety of performance options are given in this volume.

A simple listing of those for and against does not, however, fully reflect the nature of the difference in opinion; it can also be viewed as a facet of the dichotomy of old/new style. Diruta’s recommendation to double the parts is steeped in the prima prattica while Agazzari’s advocacy of the opposite is orientated towards the seconda prattica, as both writers acknowledge. There were specific advantages to full accompanimental notations: it made for fewer accompaniment errors, and emphasized the ‘horizontal’ rather than ‘vertical’ in performance, i.e. the linear nature of the music. This is obviously biased towards polyphonic composition for equal voices. The disadvantages—more difficulty in learning the part and consequent lack of ‘all’improviso’
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performance, inconvenience and effort in copying out the part, and
greater technical difficulty of performance—eventually offset the
advantages, and advocates of full accompaniment fell silent. The two-
or three-part texture of new-style works for one or two soloists and
bass did not require the linear support of full accompaniment, and
figured bass when properly performed was well suited to the music. Even
the harshest critic of figured bass performance, Massaino, acknowledged
that it was occasionally done properly.

Related to doubling are references in the solo literature to
playing the music come sta, or as it was written, without emendation.
PICCHI 1621 is explicit in this regard; provisos against transposition
are similar (see below). playing the pieces come stanno may be
directly contrasted to the approach in PESENTI 1635, where the user is
instructed to emend the works to make them succeed. That it was
necessary for Picchi to ask his works to be performed come stanno is an
indication that many solo keyboard performers would have altered or
embellished the notated music they used.

The use of figures with the organ-bass or short score is related to
doubling. PICCIONI 1610, FRANZONI 1611 and PESENTI 1635 advised against
using figures, advice which may be a remnant of secrecy in the art of
keyboard playing. They held that those who could play basso continuo
well (i.e. professionals who played fantasia) had no need of figures,
and conversely those who needed figures (i.e. elementary church
organists) were not skilled enough to attempt basso continuo in the
first place. Their opinion eventually gave way to the opposite view and
the convenience of figures (see STROZZI b. 1619);\textsuperscript{27} but the modern

\textsuperscript{27}See Kinkeldey, Orgel, pp. 208, 224-5, and Arnold, Thorough-bass,
p. 66.
editorial 'problem' of lack of figures in accompanimental parts\(^2\) is seen in many 17th- and 18th-century volumes, a sign of the prominence of the anti-figures argument and a remnant of secretive attitudes.

**Transposition**

Volumes which give instructions for transposition include CIMA 1606, DIRUTA 1609-10, BOTTAZZI 1614, BANCHIERI 1611, ANGLERIA 1622; the instructions take the form of detailed tuning instructions for harpsichord (Cima), or the alteration of clefs and/or key signatures (Diruta, Banchieri, Bottazzi, Angleria). The treatises thus confirm the importance of this skill as a part of playing the organ. Transposition reflects accompanimental concerns, or at least playing *alternatim* music which must match sung pitch, as well as the flexible approach to absolute pitch in the period.

Written-out transpositions of certain pieces are found in A & G GABRIELI 1593, CIMA 1606, PESENTI 1645, and DEGLI ANTONII 1687(ii). This suggests that they were aimed for fairly low-level users, since more advanced players would have learned to transpose for themselves, to judge from the treatises cited above. CIMA 1606 is exceptional in the detail with which his method is given, and suggests that unusual or distant transpositions were not the norm. MASSAINO 1607 shows that transposition of vocal works was common at the time, although he preferred for it not to happen. BANCHIERI 1612 also advised against distant transposition. FASOLO 1645 gives several transposed hymn verses with the comment that they were transposed for technical reasons (it was easier to play them in the key of F than D), and is unique in this respect.

\(^2\)See for example Steele, 'Continuo Accompaniment'.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
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Bad performance habits and basso continuo

Kinkeldey cited several early writers who commented on the bad performance habits which resulted from the rise of basso continuo: GALLUS 1598, ROGNONI 1605, MASSAINO 1607, BANCHIERI 1609, DIRUTA 1609-10, and BANCHIERI 1611. ²⁹ To these may be added BATTIFERRI 1669, who derided those 'who could not manage to play two imitative entries, let alone four', and 'who let what an old master could play in half an hour serve them for years'. These represent criticisms of the inevitable abuses that arose through the development of a notation whose primary purpose was ease or expediency.

Partbooks

Four basic characteristics serve to determine which partbooks to include in this survey: explicit recommendation of their use at the keyboard; absence of text; the presence of canzonas or ricercars, two of the most common keyboard genres; and four-part texture, most common in 'orthodox' keyboard music. This is arbitrary to some extent—most scholars agree that much of the texted music printed in partbooks in the sixteenth century would have been suited to transcription and performance at the keyboard, and it is shown above (I: 76) that the transcription of vocal music and imitation of its style was an important pedagogical step in learning to play the keyboard. All partbooks printed in the sixteenth century were considered 'available' for transcription and keyboard performance, and many titles of 16th-century volumes reflect this. ³⁰

²⁹ orgel, pp. 210-11, 223; most are also cited in Arnold, Thorough-bass, pp. 80-1.
³⁰ See above, I: 5.
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Attempts to classify performance medium strictly according to format are futile. Swenson's attempt to show that partbook ricercars are stylistically independent of intavolatura or open score ricercars ('Ricercar', pp. 113, 242) reflects an arbitrary distinction which contradicts performance practice of the period, one feature of which consisted of transcribing and performing partbook ricercars at the keyboard: see Pb-Padovano 1556; Pb-Merulo 1574, 1607, 1608; BANCHIERI 1609; and especially DIRUTA 1609-10. A number of works listed in Appendix A show that transcription of partbook canzonas was a suitable option. G CAVAZZONI 1543 includes chanson arrangements in keyboard format; MERULO 1567 promised to publish vocal works in keyboard format; GARDANO 1577 is an early collection of transcriptions in keyboard format; [MASCHERA 1590] is an edition for organ of canzonas in partbooks; BANCHIERI 1607 and MERULA 1615 recommend transcribing their contents for keyboard; DIRUTA 1609-10 instructs how to intabulate from partbooks and gives a G. Gabrieli canzona as an example. The shift away from partbook- to open score-ricercars around 1605 is a sign that before this time keyboard players had customarily appropriated the notation more orientated to ensemble, just as after this time instrumentalists began to use the format initially intended for keyboard for their own purposes (see I:101). Both partbooks and open score were used by either medium of performance at different times.31

The partbooks included for consideration in Table 3.3 (and listed in more detail in Appendix B) are restricted as outlined above. They amount to seventy volumes from 1540 to 1623, fifteen of which are reprints. As Table 3.3 shows, the partbooks most suitable for

31 It is worth noting that one publisher's catalogue classes partbook ricercars in the same category as intavolaturas: Giunta's 1604 catalogue lists 'Intavolature, & Ricercari' (Mischiati, Indici, p. 132).
transcription and keyboard use outnumber 'orthodox' keyboard volumes in
the 16th and early 17th centuries, and decline suddenly after 1610,
reflecting the emergence of instrumental ensemble music with specific
instrumentation in a different style, as well as a change in the manner
of imitating vocal music (see FRESCOBALDI 1615-16, PIETRAGRUA 1629).
But the sheer quantity of partbook music that was considered suitable
for keyboard performance by musicians of the period is a sign that to
ignore this notational format arbitrarily is to present a misleading
picture of keyboard music in the period. The foreign concept of using
partbook material as keyboard music has occasionally caused scholars to
doubt it;\textsuperscript{32} but material presented here regarding the use of canzonas,
ricercars, vocal music, and the development of fantasia show the
validity of considering these works.

To play a partbook-notated piece at the keyboard does not show that
it was written for such performance, however, and texted works may be
omitted from consideration here due to the fact that they were conceived
with texted performance in mind.\textsuperscript{33} Yet it is unlikely that there existed
any fundamental stylistic distinction for 16th-century musicians between

\textsuperscript{32} Apel, Keyboard Music, p. 174: 'Publications in the form of
partbooks belong to the field of ensemble music, not that of organ or
other keyboard music'. It should be clear that performance directly
from several partbooks is not being suggested as a possible alternative
(Bartholomew, Rauerij, p. 81, nevertheless admits the possibility).
Kinkeldey, Orgel, Kenton, 'Classification', and Ladewig, 'Frescobaldi’s
"Recercari"', p. 4, have shown that notational format alone is no guide
to the actual performance of the music. Indeed, Kämper stated
unequivocally that 'In Falle einer Aufführung ist das [partbook]
Ricercar in erster Linie für die Kirchenorgel ...' (Studien, p. 127).
The nearest relation to partbook format is choirbook, which fell
from use in Italy in the 16th century. One volume, ORTIZ 1553, employs
choirbook format for use by a keyboard accompanist.

\textsuperscript{33} Works with one or two instrumental pieces included in otherwise
vocal collections present ambiguity. That such works exist (e.g. Pb-
Ingegnieri 1579) provides further evidence that it was customary for
either instrumentalists or keyboard players to adopt vocal works as
their own, for performers surely played the vocal works on instruments,
or sang the non-texted ones.
notated instrumental ensemble and keyboard music. For learning to play or for entertainment, performers of both categories undoubtedly used the same repertoire, but it would have been significantly varied due to embellishment practice and the personal artifice of the performer. Much of the notated music of the period was a means to an (unnotated) end. The art of fantasia affected all performance.
PART TWO

MANUSCRIPTS
INTRODUCTORY NOTE

A study of prints without reference to manuscripts is one-sided and does not fully reflect the use of notational formats at the keyboard. Chapters four to seven consist of four relatively independent manuscript surveys which redress this imbalance and provide specific discussion of the sources, their notation, and how they were used at the keyboard. Although this material is unlike the previous in that there is little quotation from the sources upon which to rely, the questions asked about the sources are similar: this study seeks in all four chapters to examine the repertoire each manuscript transmits, who copied them (or who they were copied for), how and why they were copied, and how and why they were used.

The four sources chosen for study here are representative of a large body of manuscript material. Unlike Silbiger, Manuscript Sources, which surveyed all the 17th-century keyboard manuscripts of Italian provenance, the present study examines in detail a small number of sources of disparate provenance, but which all contain at least some Italian keyboard music. The link between the four manuscripts under consideration is their inclusion of keyboard works of Claudio Merulo. Although the choice of Merulo as the thread of continuity is in a sense arbitrary, his importance as a composer of keyboard music (see I: 109) and his place at the crux of the change in keyboard style around 1600 are ample justification for examining the manuscript sources of his keyboard music. The intention here has been to provide a study which
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reflects diversity in notation, and Merulo’s keyboard music amply provides examples for the purpose.

The differences among the four sources are numerous. Two stem from Italy: Bagnacavallo and Bourdeney (Chapters four and five); one from south Germany (Turin, Chapter six); and one from Liège (Chapter seven). They are notated in three ways: Bagnacavallo and Liège are intavolatura and its Belgian equivalent; Bourdeney is an open score; and Turin, although copied by an Italian, is notated in New German Tablature. They date from about 1580 (Bourdeney) to about 1640 (Turin); they vary enormously in scope, from Turin, the largest keyboard source of the 17th century, to Bagnacavallo, a modest copy of a few toccatas. Yet the differences among the sources do not radically alter the common ground that they have: they were used (at least in part) at the keyboard, and they were copied by scribes for specific purposes which reflect the varied uses of notated keyboard music. Conclusions for all four are similar. Thus the studies are as valid as any representative sampling could be in showing the basic trends that were taking place regarding keyboard sources in the 16th and 17th centuries.

Each chapter relies heavily on an inventory and concordance. For Bourdeney and Turin, inventories have been compiled previously;¹ for Bagnacavallo and Liège, they are included in this study. Concordances with prints or other manuscripts are compared with a number of pieces in order to identify the scribes’ exemplars and analyse their methodology. The construction and compilation procedure of the sources is examined in detail, and each is surveyed according to the stages or sections of compilation. The present order of works in two manuscripts (Bourdeney

¹Mischiati, 'Un'antologia' (Bourdeney); idem, 'L'intavolatura tedesca' (Turin).
and Liège) does not accurately match their order of compilation, and so these manuscripts provide interesting evidence of irregular or haphazard scribal methodology. The handwriting of each scribe is examined for evidence of the compilation procedure. The specific evidence of the manuscripts’ contents, dating, concordances, compilation procedure, and scribe is drawn together to form conclusions concerning the purpose of each source: how and why it was created and used.
CHAPTER FOUR
THE BAGNACAVALLO MANUSCRIPT

The manuscript Bagnacavallo, Biblioteca Comunale, Codice CMB 1 was discovered in 1969 by Fr Albino Varotti, organist at San Francesco, Faenza. He described the manuscript in hand-written notes kept in the Bagnacavallo communal library, and some of the description here relies on his work. The present study systematically examines the MS for its origin, content and purpose. It is small and straightforward in size and content, made up of three sections, traceable to three printed keyboard volumes, two of which are copied completely, one partially. There is a strong emphasis on the work of Merulo.

The volume is 34 x 23 cm (upright), and consists of 1 unn. title page, 84 pages of music, numbered 1-72, 85-96; at the end, there are two unn. pages with table of contents (pp. 73-84 are missing, but indexed). It is in intavolatura format (5 x 5/8), and bears striking resemblance to engraved volumes of keyboard music of the period.
## Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page and MS no. system</th>
<th>Titles and concordances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. $1_{1}-2_{3}$</td>
<td>Toccata di grado del Primo Tuono p Principianti del Revdo Padre Girolamo Diruta dell'ordine de minori.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= DIRUTA 1597, no. 1: TOCATA DI GRADO DEL PRIMO TVONO DI GIROLAMO DIRUTA</td>
<td>Turin II:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 142v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. $2_{4}-4_{5}$</td>
<td>Toccata dell'istesso del 2$^{o}$ Tuono di Salto bono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Ibid., no. 2: Toccata di salto buono del secondo Tuono di Gironimo Diruta.</td>
<td>Turin II:35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 143v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schmid, Tabulatur Buch, no. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. $5_{1}-7_{2}$</td>
<td>Toccata del 6$^{o}$ Tuono di Salto Cattiuo del Padre Girolamo Diruta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Ibid., no. 3: DI SALTO CATIVO DEL SESTO TVONO DI GIROLAMO DIRUTA.</td>
<td>Turin II:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schmid, Tabulatur Buch, no. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. $7_{3}-10_{4}$</td>
<td>Toccata del terzo Tuono Del Sig. Claudio Merulo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Ibid., no. 4: TOCCATA DEL TERZO TUON DI CLAUDIO MERULO.</td>
<td>Turin II:37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 146v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schmid, Tabulatur Buch, no. 32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[1\] These toccatas are concordant with the second edition of DIRUTA 1593. The entire set of thirteen was also copied in Turin I and II (see Chapter six) and Berlin 40615; for details of the concordances see Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura', pp. 25-6, 30-1.
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Inventory (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page and MS no. system</th>
<th>Title and concordances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Naples 48, fol. 39v</td>
<td>Toccata del 6\textsuperscript{o} Tuono d'Andrea Gabrielli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 11\textsubscript{1}-14\textsubscript{3}:</td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 5: TOCCATA DEL SESTO TVONO DI ANDREA GABRIELI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turin II:38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 148v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ravenna 545, fol. 8v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 14\textsubscript{4}-16\textsubscript{5}:</td>
<td>Toccata del 2\textsuperscript{o} Tuono di Giovanni Gabrielli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 6: TOCCATA DEL SECONDO TVONO DI GIOVANNI GABRIELI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turin II:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 150v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Schmid, Tabulatur Buch, no. 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trent, fol. 36v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 17\textsubscript{1}-18\textsubscript{2}:</td>
<td>Toccata del 4\textsuperscript{o} Tuono di Luzzasco Luzzaschi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 7: TOCCATA DEL QUARTO TVONO DI LVZZASCO LVZZASCHI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turin I:40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 18\textsubscript{3}-20\textsubscript{3}:</td>
<td>Toccata dell'ottauo tuono di Antonio Romanini</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 8: DI ANTONIO ROMANINI. DELL'OTTAVO TVONO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turin I:41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 20\textsubscript{4}-23\textsubscript{3}:</td>
<td>Toccata dell'8\textsuperscript{o} tuono di Paolo Quagliati.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 9: Toccata di Paolo Quagliati dell'Octauo Tuono.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turin I:42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Inventory (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page and MS no. system</th>
<th>Title and concordances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin 40316, fol. 57</td>
<td>Di Vincenzo bell’Hauer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 154v</td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 10: <strong>DI VINCENZO BELL’HAVER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 156v</td>
<td>Turin I:43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 157v</td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 11: <strong>TOCCATA DEL SECONDO TVONO DI GIOSEFFO GVAMI.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 158v</td>
<td>Turin I:45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 159v</td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 12: <strong>TOCCATA DEL X TVONO DI ANDREA GABRIELLI.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 159v</td>
<td>Turin I:46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 159v</td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 13: <strong>TOCCATA DEL XI. ET XII TVONO DI GIROLAMO DIRUTA.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ed. Varotti. I am grateful to Fr Varotti for providing me with a copy of his edition.
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Inventory (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page and system</th>
<th>Title and concordances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15 32<sub>3</sub>-37<sub>4</sub> | Toccata del P<sup>0</sup> Tuono del Sig<sup>5</sup> Claudio Merolo da Coreggio.  

= MERULO 1598, no. 1: Primo Tuono. **Toccata Prima.**  
Turin II:71<sup>3</sup> |
| 16 38<sub>1</sub>-44<sub>4</sub> | Toccata del P<sup>0</sup> Tuono del Sig. Claudio Merolo  

= Ibid., no. 2: Primo tuono. **Toccata Seconda.**  
Turin II:70  
Vienna 714, fo. 87v |
| 17 45<sub>1</sub>-49<sub>2</sub> | Toccata del 2° Tuono del Sig<sup>5</sup> Claudio Merulo.  

= Ibid., no. 3: Secondo Tuono. **Toccata Terza.**  
Turin II:52  
Turin II:60 |
| 18 49<sub>3</sub>-52<sub>4</sub> | Toccata del 2° Tuono del Sig<sup>5</sup> Claudio Merulo  

= Ibid., no. 4: Secondo Tuono. **Toccata 4.a.**  
Turin II:53  
Liège 153, no. 20 |
| 19 53<sub>1</sub>-56<sub>2</sub> | Toccata 2° Tuono del Sig<sup>5</sup> Claudio Merulo.  

= Ibid., no. 5: Secondo Tuono. **Toccata Quinta.**  
Turin II:54 |
| 20 56<sub>3</sub>-60<sub>5</sub> | Toccata del 3° Tuono del Sig<sup>5</sup> Claudio Merulo.  

= Ibid., no. 6: Terzo Tuono. **Toccata Sesta**  
Turin II:55 |

---

<sup>3</sup>These toccatas are copied from MERULO 1598 and have concordances with Turin vol. II (see Chapter Six).
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Inventory (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS no.</th>
<th>Page and system</th>
<th>Title and concordances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>61_1-66_2</td>
<td>Toccata del 3° Tuono del Sig. Claudio Merulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 7: Terzo Tuono. Toccata Settima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turin II:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>66_3-71_4</td>
<td>Toccata del 4° Tuono del Sig. Claudio Merulo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 8: Quarto Tuono. Toccata Ottava.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turin II:18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turin II:56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liège 153, no. 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>72_1-[75]:^4</td>
<td>Toccata del 4° tuono del Sig. Claudio Merulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 9: Quarto Tuono. Toccata Nona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turin II:69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liège 153, no. 41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[24]</td>
<td>76-82</td>
<td>Ricercare del primo tuono del Sig. Claudio Merulo^5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= MERULO 1567, no. 1: Ricercar del primo tuono.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turin VI:23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>[82]-86_1</td>
<td>[Ricercare del secondo Tuono del merolo]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 2: Ricercar Del secondo tuono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turin VI:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>86_2-90_4</td>
<td>Ricercare del 3° tuono del Merulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= Ibid., no. 3: Ricercar Del terzo tuono.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turin VI:25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^4 Pages 73-84 were removed from the MS; the completion of this inventory for these twelve pages is derived from the table of contents.

^5 The first five ricercars from MERULO 1567 were copied. The entire volume was copied in Turin vol. VI; see Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura', p. 56.
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Inventory (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page and MS no. system</th>
<th>Title and concordances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 90\textsuperscript{5} - 93\textsuperscript{4}</td>
<td>Ricercare del 4\textsuperscript{o} tuono del Merulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Ibid., no. 4: Ricercar Del quarto tuono</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin VI:26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 93\textsuperscript{5} - 96\textsuperscript{4}</td>
<td>Ricercar dell'undecimo Tuono del Merulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>= Ibid., no. 5: Ricercar. Dell'undecimo tuono.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin VI:27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96\textsuperscript{5}</td>
<td>At end: IL FINE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Description

The manuscript appears to have been copied in a straightforward manner in its present order. Save two alterations in hand characteristics, the change in formation of the F clef in B24-8\textsuperscript{6} (Ex. 4.1) and the change in formation of the mensuration sign after B4 (Ex. 4.2), the hand is consistent. The titles, given almost always in the left margin of the first page of a piece, bottom to top (as in Ex. 4.5b), are in a hand consistent with that of the title page and table of contents, and is probably that of the music scribe. The copying is accurate and neat. The only gaps in the manuscript are single lines left empty at the bottom of a page where a piece concludes on the fourth line (pp. 10, 37, 44, 52, 71, and 96). The scribe began the final two pieces on the fifth line of a recto page (pp. 90 and 93)—the only such cases—suggesting that he knew he was working within limited space, i.e., that the book consisted of 96 pages. It seems likely that it was

\textsuperscript{6} B[agnacavallo]'-numbers refer to the pieces according to the given inventory.
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gathered into eight quires of six leaves each, with the seventh either lost by accident or intentionally removed.  

Example 4.1. Change in formation of F clef.

pp. 1-72: ♯

pp. 85-96: E:

Example 4.2. Change in formation of mensuration sign.

pp. 1-10: ♩

pp. 11-96: ♩

The partially damaged title page reads:

I[ntavolatura . . . ]
Cop[iate . . . ]
Con cinque recercari nel fine del Sig:r
Claudio Merulo da Coreggio.
Con la tauola di dette sonate
nell’ultimo del libro.

Bibliothecae Conventus S. Francisci Ord: Min. Conv.

The last line may refer to the Franciscan Convent in Bagnacavallo, since the manuscript was discovered among material from there. The manuscript is also linked with the Franciscans through the titles of works composed by Girolamo Diruta, Bl-3, B13: Diruta, himself a Franciscan, is referred to as ‘Reverendo Padre Girolamo Diruta dell’ordine de minori’, and

7 I did not see the original manuscript; a photocopy was used for this study. Attempts to locate the actual manuscript (which is not now in the communal library) have not yet been successful.

8 The last line was added by another hand, ‘certainly datable to the first half of the seventeenth century’, according to Varotti.
'Padre Diruta'. Varotti hypothesized that the title page was defaced because it mentioned the name of Giovanni Pietro Biandrà, a Faenzan musician whose partially obliterated name may be detected on the inside front and back covers of the MS; he certainly owned it and possibly compiled and copied it. Although he is not known to have had Franciscan connections, Biandrà published five volumes of music in Venice between 1626 and 1629, and was in Faenza as maestro di cappella at the Cathedral there from 1619 to 1633. Since the MS also contains the work of the Faenzan Tomaso Fabri (see below), it is likely that it was copied in Faenza; although Biandrà cannot be proven to have been the scribe, it seems likely.

A terminus post quem is determined by the music copied in the MS, the latest of which dates from 1598; a terminus ante quem is determined by Biandrà's disappearance from Faenza records, 1633. Biandrà's dates in Faenza suggest the latter part of this period, after 1619; so does the term 'sonate' on the title page, an unusual designation for toccatas.

Contents

The MS consists of copies from three printed volumes with one unicum in their midst. None of the readings are surprising or ambiguous.

---

9 Varotti suggested the completion 'I[ntavolatura di sonate d'organo] | Copiate da Pietro Biandrà Romano'.

10 Casimiri, 'Disciplina musicae', pp. 14, 49. Casimiri quoted a document which states that Biandrà was 'riconfermato' on 31 December 1619, suggesting that he was in Faenza earlier.

11 The first printed association of solo keyboard music and the term sonata is BANCHIERI 1605, but the first printed collection of keyboard sonatas did not appear until DEL BUONO 1641. See Newman, Sonata, p. 17.
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The source for B1-13 was Diruta's *Il Transilvano*, 1597 edition. That it was this edition and not one of the other three can be conclusively shown by a printer's error which occurs only in the 1597 edition, copied identically in the Bagnacavallo manuscript (Ex. 4.3). The titles also closely follow the 1597 versions. The MS copies are generally very accurate, with only occasional minor variants regarding ties and other small details. Beaming is supplied in the MS in minim groups, with few exceptions.

Example 4.3. Claudio Merulo, Toccata del Terzo Tono (B4), bar 34.

Il Transilvano, 1593, 1612, and 1625 edns.

![Musical Example](image)

Il Transilvano, 1597 edn., Bagnacavallo MS

![Musical Example](image)

Tomaso Fabri's toccata B14 is without concordance. In the table of contents he is named as 'Faentino', but no other information on him has come to light. The work is undistinguished, in a formulaic style similar to some of the Diruta toccatas. Passage-work, consisting mainly
of scales, is almost exclusively in the left hand in bars 1-16, and in the right hand in bars 17 to the end (bar 24).

B15-23 comprise a complete copy of MERULO 1598. There is a close relationship between the two sources, which have such coincidences as identical hand layout, clef changes, and small notational idiosyncracies. Most beaming is identical as well. The fact that the manuscript was copied from the 1598 print can be shown by comparing the respective layouts of the two sources. The scribe grew concerned to keep the layout of the music on the stave identical to that of the print; in the first two toccatas this was not done consistently, but in the remaining seven, the scribe had to make adjustments in order to accommodate the music on the staves exactly as it was in the print. It was not always easy to maintain this identical layout, as Example 4.4 shows: staves two and four of p. 67 had to be extended by hand to accommodate the music found in the corresponding staves of Merulo’s eighth toccata. To show the remarkable similarity between the two sources, p. 1 of Merulo’s print and the first page of the corresponding piece in the manuscript are given as Example 4.5a and b.
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Example 4.4. MS p. 67, showing extended systems.
Example 4.5a. MERULO 1598, p. 1.

Primo Tuono.
Example 4.5b. MS p. 34.
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The first five ricercars from MERULO 1567 conclude the MS, B24-28. Merulo's ricercars were reprinted in 1605, but the scribe used the earlier edition; there are small variants between the two editions, and the MS agrees with 1567 in each case, two of which are shown in Example 4.6. The limiting of ricercars to five indicates that the MS was a given size that could not be enlarged, causing the curtailment.

Example 4.6. Variants (in ornaments) between MERULO 1605 (reprint) and Bagnacavallo's and MERULO 1567 readings.

\begin{tabular}{c c}
1605 & / & 1567, MS \\
\end{tabular}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ricercar no. 2</th>
<th>Bar 86.2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Ricercar no. 2 Bar 86.2" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ricercar no. 3</th>
<th>Bar 75.3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Ricercar no. 3 Bar 75.3" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

The examination of these pieces for variant readings and concordances is not productive, since the copies are so clearly traceable to specific editions and prints; the MS concordances listed in the inventory have no significance in the discussion of this MS. The narrow stylistic forms of the pieces within the MS indicate that the book was a special collection, and not one for daily use at the organ for liturgical purposes. Its elegant and careful hand and the lack of signs of wear support this hypothesis. It is therefore unlike most Italian keyboard MSS of the period, as described in Silbiger, Manuscript
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Sources; complete copies of printed volumes such as these are rare. There is a distinct emphasis on the music of Merulo. Diruta's work is based on Merulo's teaching (see DIRUTA 1593), and all but one of the other works were composed by Merulo. The MS is an example of a 17th-century musician's high regard for such music and its preservation, and as such indicates a subtle but identifiable change in outlook regarding notated keyboard music. Elements of fantasia have little place in this context; the written work was respected for its inherent qualities, not simply for its pedagogical value. The MS is non-typical, not surprising since this opinion of keyboard music was still relatively uncommon around 1620.

If the scribe was the musician Biandrà, the contents are unusually old-fashioned: the combination of ricercars and toccatas from an earlier age suggests that the volume was the work of someone with conservative tastes, but Biandrà's own compositional efforts show that he was conversant with the modern monodic style and do not suggest a particularly strong conservative tendency. This need not be contradictory, however, since there is no reason to doubt that Biandrà or any musician of the 1620s could appreciate the older styles as well as the newer. The unusual hiding of Biandrà's ownership and addition to the title page of a new ownership is a sign that the MS was highly regarded and not a common organist's copy-book. It was probably created simply because of the scribe's wish to retain the music for his own enjoyment; but later the MS gained stature, perhaps because of its elegance, perhaps because of its contents. The works it contained had more artistic or aesthetic significance for its later owners than actual day-to-day usefulness.

CHAPTER FIVE
THE BOURDENEY CODEX

The Bourdeney codex (F-Pn, Rés. Vma. 851) was acquired by the library in 1954 and brought to the attention of scholars in 1958.1 The most detailed study of it to date, its inventory, was made by Mischiati in 1975.2 Its importance as a source for Rore has been investigated,3 and Newcomb has examined the anonymous ricercars it contains.4 These ricercars, and its copies of works by Rore and Porta, are particularly important. The MS comes from the vicinity of the Po valley, and is one of a group of open scores of the region and period.5 Consideration of the methodology and identity of the scribe, along with the possible uses of the manuscript, contribute to a greater understanding of this milieu. This chapter considers the manuscript primarily for the background to its compilation, and examines its structure, formation, physical characteristics, and possible uses.6

After a detailed physical description, the compilation of the MS is considered, through which it will become evident that its present order

1Bridgman and Lesure, 'Une anthologie'.
2'Un'antologia'.
3Meier, prefaces to Rore, Opera Omnia; Mischiati, 'Nota bibliografica'.
4'Anonymous Ricercars'. I am grateful to Professor Newcomb for sending me a typescript of this article prior to publication.
5Mischiati, 'Un'antologia', pp. 267-74.
6I have relied on a microfilm for the present work and was unable to examine the source for its gatherings and binding.
Chapter five: Bourdeney

does not entirely represent its copying order; an order of copying is therefore proposed. Representative works are compared with concordances, and show that the scribe was careful and accurate; it is occasionally (but not always) possible to determine the exemplars the scribe used. Consideration of the dating of the MS, the identity of its compiler, and its uses conclude the study. Although its use as a keyboard source is secondary at best, its compiler was an organist, as was a second- or later-generation owner. The manuscript is a prime representative of a class of manuscript open scores for both study and use at the keyboard.

Physical Description

The MS is 362 x 255 mm, in open score throughout, 3–12 staves per system, with a variable number of systems per page. It contains 469 compositions copied on 579 pages: 437 vocal works with or without text, and 32 instrumental works. The physical characteristics of the MS have not been carefully detailed before now. Although there are signs of consistency, a number of anomalies surface upon close inspection. The title page and its references suggest that the MS does not now stand as it did early in its history; examination of pagination and points of wear support the hypothesis. The characteristics of handwriting or copying reflect the work of one person over an extended period of time and define, in conjunction with the other features, a probable systematic order of copying.

7 Mischiati, 'Un'antologia', p. 275.
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Title page

There is no original table of contents or other prominent indication of its owner or who the scribe was; the title page probably dates from after its copying. It contains two abbreviated tables of contents:


[horizontal line]


The beginning of the composer-list is nearly the same as the MS:

Adriano [Willaert] is first named on p. 1 (M2), Rore on p. 1 (M1), Dentici on p. 2 (M3), Animuccia on p. 14 (M12), Verdelot on p. 15 (M13), and Porta on p. 67 (M43); a few intervening composers are left out, perhaps due to oversights. The last five composers are not in the same order as they stand today: Lassus can refer to either p. 96 or p. 508; de Monte only to p. 238, Morales to either p. 11, p. 412 or p. 485; 'delle Ualiti' only to p. 70.11

---

8 Mischiati, 'Un'antologia', p. 276. He did not comment on it due to its later date.

9 In the original, a slash ('/') follows each name. To avoid confusion with the '|' sign used here to indicate a new line, the slash is replaced with '—'.

10 Following Mischiati, all page references refer to the numbering of the volume as it now stands; M-numbers refer to the pieces according his inventory.

11 As Mischiati observed (ibid., p. 276 n25), Bridgman and Lesure, erred in suggesting that the compiler of this list qualified 'Pauolo
The second part (in the same hand) cites page numbers and works in reverse order, making it clear that the MS was paginated in some way and consisted of more than 436 pages. The list generally agrees with the MS: ricercars, Masses and canzonas (p. 255) are correctly indexed; 'antifone P 129' may be a mistake for p. 229, where a Palestrina motet with text from an Alleluia verse is found;12 p. 129 contains a Rore five-part madrigal. If 'motetti P 221' refers to the present ordering it is odd, since although there is a motet there it falls in the middle of a series, and the word 'motet' is not found. The following canzonas, canons and motets agree with the MS, but there are no psalms on p. 2 and following, but madrigals; the nearest Psalm is on p. 6. The Regina Caeli on p. 1 agrees with the MS as it now stands.

The list then turns around and proceeds forward. There is no Mass on p. 3, but Rore four-part madrigals. A psalm is found on p. 6, M6; Rore's 'Caro mea' (p. 8) is similar to the antiphon text 'Caro mea requiescat in spe'. There is a portion of a cantus firmus Mass on p. 10 and a Psalm on p. 21; the entry is ambiguous, but perhaps suggests Psalms to p. 45, since there is a Psalm there as well, although most of the intervening pieces are not actually Psalms and none has three parts. The final entry refers to p. 67, where the note 'Motetti a 4 di Const: Portae' is found; the lack of page reference brings the list to an abrupt end.

Although there are ambiguities in interpreting the lists, several conclusions may be drawn. Most significantly, beginning the second list

---

Ammacio' with the succeeding words ('Une anthologie', p. 167); the '—' indicates the end of a composer's name. The compiler of the list evidently thought there was a composer named 'delle Ualiti' employed by Duke Ottavio of Parma, based on the entry above the Rore madrigal on p. 70. See below for further consideration of the madrigal and its heading.

12'M219, 'Tollite iugum meum'.
with the ricercars suggests that pages 439 to the end were not physically part of the MS, or at least that there were two parts which divided after the ricercars. The first list has mis-citations and irregular ordering, suggesting that the order of the MS was different when it was compiled; the second list accords fairly closely with the present ordering, but still contains inexplicable entries. Its inconsistencies suggest irregularities in pagination, and possibly two or more different paginated series. The compiler of the lists was unfamiliar with composers' names, and thus musically less educated (unlike the scribe); he preferred to make note of ricercars, canzonas and liturgical works but not madrigals, despite madrigals constituting a large proportion of the MS. This suggests that the person who drew up these two tables of contents was a musical novice, probably an organist, and may have used the works in church at the organ.

Pagination

It has already been suggested that the page numbering of the volume is awry, and closer inspection reveals a number of inconsistencies. Mischiati noted that three page numbers were omitted (202, 277, 477), and two pages lack numbers (between 447-8 and 477-8); in addition, there are different sets of page numbers in the volume. Pages 1 to 399 are numbered both in the outside corner and at the top-centre of the page; the top-centre numbering stops at p. 399, and only the corner-numbering continues. Some pages appear to have corrections to the corner page numbers (e.g. pp. 5, 11, 15 and 16). The page numbers at the end of the MS are incorrect and the last four folios are out of order (see below, I:184), indicating that they were numbered well after

13 'Un'antologia', pp. 274-5.
their copying, and whoever numbered them did not look carefully at the pages. A note by the scribe on p. 165, 'Dal Cypri. Rore! cinque fogli continuì' refers to Rore's 'Vergine' series M141-51, copied on the next ten pages (= five folios), at the end of which is the note 'Fine de le Verginj ecc.me'. If page numbers had been present at the time of copying the scribe probably would have referred to pages, not folios. Thus it is fairly certain that the numbering of pages as it stands took place well after the MS was completed, and does not fully reflect the actual order of copying.

Worn edges of the MS occur at its beginning (pp. 1-12), pp. 90-6, and at the end (pp. 568-80). These suggest that it was in its present order for a long period of time, which is hardly surprising; but also that there was a time when it was divided around p. 96. A division there is in fact quite likely (see below, I:175).

Handwriting and copying characteristics

Four features of handwriting or copying are examined here: custos formation, the number of staves per page throughout the MS, the number of bars per system, and the metrical lengths of bars. The style of writing, both of music and text, is generally consistent; but changes in small details suggest a single scribe working over a long period of time. These details may be drawn together to propose three general periods of copying.

Custos formation

There are two clearly different styles of custodes interspersed throughout the volume, as well as a 'transitional' style which seems to fall between the two. The two styles are illustrated in Example 5.1,
Example 5.1. Two styles of custodes in the MS: p. 566.
where they occur on one page of the MS, and will be referred to as custos A and B, respectively (the transitional style is labelled T). While the differences are not significant enough to suggest more than one scribe, the generally consistent use of the two types of custodes allows the pieces of each style to be grouped together in a rough chronological order of copying. Table 5.1 summarizes the three styles of custodes.

Table 5.1. Styles of custodes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS pages</th>
<th>M nos.</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-12</td>
<td>M1-12</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-16</td>
<td>M13-14</td>
<td>T, B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-67</td>
<td>M15-42</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67₁-3</td>
<td>M43-4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(M43-4 added later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68-9</td>
<td>M45</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-2</td>
<td>M46-7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-6₁</td>
<td>M48</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76₂-80</td>
<td>M49-55</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-96₁</td>
<td>M56-75</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>(cont. overleaf)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Page 566. The Wert madrigal illustrated here (M459, systems 2-4), was copied in later than the works preceding and following it, as shown in the discussion below. Curiously, this example shows the use of custos A for the first line of M459, copied later, although the rest of the piece uses custos B. It is an inconsistency which supports that there was only one scribe; he may have been influenced by the music on the first system. Otherwise the inconsistency is inexplicable.
Table 5.1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS pages</th>
<th>M nos.</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>96_2-4</td>
<td>M76-7</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(added later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-162</td>
<td>M78-136</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162_3-4</td>
<td>M137</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(added later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163-99</td>
<td>M138-51</td>
<td>A, T</td>
<td>(the custodes show signs of gradual change towards the end of this section)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163-99</td>
<td>M153-76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174_4-175</td>
<td>M152</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(added later, cross-opening)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199_3-4</td>
<td>M177</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(added later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-208</td>
<td>M178-86</td>
<td>A, T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>M187-8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-38</td>
<td>M189-228</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238_1-52</td>
<td>M229-42</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253-4_1</td>
<td>M243</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254_1-3</td>
<td>M244</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(added later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255-7</td>
<td>M245-6</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>258-61</td>
<td>M247-50</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262-305</td>
<td>M251-5</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306-10</td>
<td>M256-62</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311-64</td>
<td>M263-71</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>365-6</td>
<td>M272-3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367-86</td>
<td>M274-6</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387-90</td>
<td>M277-8</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391-7</td>
<td>M279</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(cont. overleaf)
Table 5.1 (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS pages</th>
<th>M nos.</th>
<th>custos</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>398-9</td>
<td>M280</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-408</td>
<td>M281-90</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>409-14</td>
<td>M291-5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-23</td>
<td>M296-303</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>423</td>
<td>M304</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>(added later)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>424-47</td>
<td>M305-26</td>
<td>A, T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447v2-3</td>
<td>M327</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4481-2</td>
<td>M328</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4483-4</td>
<td>M329</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449-63</td>
<td>M330-43</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>464-79</td>
<td>M344-52</td>
<td>T, B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>480-83</td>
<td>M353-5</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>484</td>
<td>M356</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485-7</td>
<td>M357-9</td>
<td>A, T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>488-506</td>
<td>M360-87</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>507-15</td>
<td>M388-404</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5154-18</td>
<td>M405-10</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519-37</td>
<td>M411-37</td>
<td>A, T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538-65</td>
<td>M438-57</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5653-80</td>
<td>M458-69</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Notes overleaf)
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Table 5.1 (cont.)

NOTES:

\(^a\) A = earlier; B = later; T = transitional.

\(^b\) The '---' lines demarcate the sections of the MS as outlined in Table 5.5.

CuStos formation falls into a pattern which suggests a series of sections to the MS, considered in more detail below.

Staves per page, bars per system, length of bars

The stave-per-page pattern falls into four simple groups, summarized in Table 5.2:

Table 5.2. Staves per page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page nos. (total no. of pp.)</th>
<th>no. of staves</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-72</td>
<td>(72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-80</td>
<td>(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-132</td>
<td>(52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133-580</td>
<td>(448)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This primarily suggests possible divisions of the MS between pp. 72-3, 80-1, and 132-3 (odd-numbered pages are recto in all three cases, allowing for changes in gathering here). Otherwise, the similarity of paper and general consistency of staves per page shows a unified MS, the work of one person.
The numbers of bars per system and metrical lengths of bars in the MS are summarized in Tables 5.3 and 5.4: 15

Table 5.3. Number of bars per system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page range</th>
<th>Number of bars per system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-56</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57-72</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73-6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77-80</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81-96</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-112</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113-32</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133-64</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165-88</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>189-208</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-28</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>10, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-45</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246-8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249-52</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>253-4</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255-60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>261</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>262-78</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>11, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280-302</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>11, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304-9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311-33</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>5, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>5, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>15, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>9, 5, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>7, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342-66</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367-8</td>
<td>5, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>369</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>370</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>371-3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>374</td>
<td>10, 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>375-86</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387-8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>389</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>391-7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>398-9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400-14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>415-46</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447r + v</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>448</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>449-51</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>452-9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>460</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>461-4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466-7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469-70</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>471-80</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>481</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>482-4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>485</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486-8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>489-93</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>494</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>495</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>497-9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>503</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>504-12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>513-18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519-20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>521-2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>523</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>524</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15 Mischiati, 'Un'antologia', loosely noted that 'i tagli di battuta sono quasi sempre ogni longa' (p. 272), and that the pages with 16 staves are divided into 13 bars at most, the pages with 20 staves into 15; the actual details are more diverse than this.
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Table 5.3 (cont.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>number of bars per system</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>number of bars per system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>525-9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>569-74</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>530-4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>535</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>536-7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>538-68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>578-80</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


20-stave pages: 5 bars/system: 2 p(p).

| 8    | "                 | 2    | "                 |
| 9    | "                 | 1    | "                 |
| 10   | "                 | 19   | "                 |
| 11   | "                 | 116  | "                 |
| 12   | "                 | 22   | "                 |
| 13   | "                 | 15   | "                 |
| 14   | "                 | 46   | "                 |
| 15   | "                 | 213  | "                 |
| 16   | "                 | 7    | "                 |
| 17   | "                 | 1    | "                 |

10 pages have differing numbers of bars on different systems.

Table 5.4. Length of bars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Length of bars(^a)</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Length of bars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-2</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>B, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>120-1</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B, L</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>L, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-8</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>123-4</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>L, B</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>B, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>126-30</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>L, LL</td>
<td>131-40</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-88</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>B, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>L, B</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-4</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>L, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>144-55</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>B, L</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>B, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97-109</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>L, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>158-60</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111-12</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>L, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>B, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114</td>
<td>B, L</td>
<td>163-82</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116</td>
<td>L, B</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>B, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>L, B</td>
<td>185-94</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>L, B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)B = breve; L = long; 3B = 3 breves; LL = two longs.
Table 5.4 (cont.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Length of bars</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Length of bars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>196</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>391-7</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>197</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>398-9</td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>198</td>
<td>L, B</td>
<td>400-36</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>B, L</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>L, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-8</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>438-42</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>L, B</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>B, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210-37</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>444-6</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>L, B</td>
<td>447r</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239-42</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>447v-79v</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>B, L</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>LL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>481-2</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>245</td>
<td>L, B</td>
<td>483-4</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>246-50</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>251-53</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>486-504</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>254</td>
<td>B, L</td>
<td>505-6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>255-78</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>L, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>279</td>
<td>L, LL</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>B, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280-333</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>L, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>3B, L</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>B, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>L, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337-8</td>
<td>L, 3B</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>3B, L</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>L, 3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>515-6</td>
<td>3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>3B, 6B</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342-66</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>L, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>367-75</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>519-23</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>376</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>377</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>525-75</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>378-82</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>576-7</td>
<td>B, L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>383</td>
<td>3B</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>L, 3B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>384-6</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>579-80</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>387-9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>390</td>
<td>B, L</td>
<td>581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTALS:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of bar</th>
<th>number of pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breve</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Breves</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double Long</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L + B</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other combinations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two tables demonstrate that the scribe did not adopt a completely consistent procedure. The pages with differing numbers of bars on different systems show that the pages were not all barred before
the scribe began to work (contrary to Bridgman and Lesure's proposal, 'Une Anthologie', p. 168). Although there is little discernible pattern to the number of bars per system, it is clear that 16-stave pages were barred quite differently from 20-stave pages; further, the information when coupled with other features supports the basic sectional divisions proposed below. Little significance can be attached to the barring which the scribe employed without an analysis of the gatherings of the MS. Table 5.4 shows that the scribe was not bound to a pattern regarding bar-length. Although longa bars predominate, the variety used (sometimes within one piece, e.g. M244) reflects a more pragmatic approach than either Mischiati or Bridgman and Lesure suggested in their summaries. Specific conclusions regarding the order of copying or compilation cannot be drawn from this data by itself, but the wide variety shown here is a clear indication of the flexible approach to the work taken by the scribe.

**Sections of the MS**

Using Tables 5.1-4 in conjunction with Mischiati's inventory, thirteen more-or-less discrete sections of the MS may be delimited. They are characterized by three features: 1) the appearance of a large integral body of works combined with the use of custos A; 2) a more varied ending with differing custodes; this often, but not always, includes material compatible with the original body of works; and 3) the later filling in of small interstices in the midst, usually unrelated to the surrounding works. The MS appears to have been collected into fairly large groups of pages (sometimes 70 or more together), but was

---

16 Newcomb, 'Anonymous Ricercars', examined the MS for its sections as a prelude to stylistic arguments regarding ricercars, but the present 'dissection' differs with his on a number of points: see below, I: 186.
probably not bound as a whole until late in its compilation period. The sections are summarized in Table 5.5, following which each is considered in more detail.

Table 5.5. Sections of the Bourdeney codex.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>p. nos. (total pp.)</th>
<th>M nos.</th>
<th>Major works within section</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-16 (16)</td>
<td>1-14</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17-72 (56)</td>
<td>15-47</td>
<td>Rore motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>73-80 (8)</td>
<td>48-55</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>81-209 (128)(^a)</td>
<td>56-188</td>
<td>Rore 4- and 5-part madrigals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>210-61 (52)</td>
<td>189-250</td>
<td>Palestrina motets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>262-310 (48)(^b)</td>
<td>251-62</td>
<td>Palestrina Masses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>311-66 (56)</td>
<td>263-73</td>
<td>Palestrina Masses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>367-99 (33)</td>
<td>274-80</td>
<td>Josquin, Mouton Masses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>400-38 (39)</td>
<td>281-312</td>
<td>Ricercars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>439-87 (50)(^c)</td>
<td>313-59</td>
<td>Porta motets and Masses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>488-518 (31)</td>
<td>360-410</td>
<td>Livre de melanges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>519-37 (19)</td>
<td>411-37</td>
<td>Porta hymns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>538-80 (43)</td>
<td>438-69</td>
<td>Gombert motets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)There is no p. 202.
\(^b\)There is no p. 277.
\(^c\)There is no p. 477, and pp. 447v and 479v are unpaginated.

The beginning of the MS is a small section, consisting of fourteen disparate pieces, six by Rore; it is noteworthy that there is a block of custos A followed by T and B, a recurring pattern in the MS. The edges of pp. 1-13 are very worn. There is evidence of irregular pagination in
much of the section, where the corner numeration (when visible) appears to be corrected.

The clear change in custos formation at p. 17 marks the beginning of section two, devoted primarily to Rore motets (30 of the 33 pieces, M45-42 and 45-6); the exceptions are two motets by Porta (M43 and 44), and a Verdelot canzone (M47). Mischiati observed that the works were probably taken from a few printed volumes, one of which was copied nearly completely. M40-6, however, either have no known concordance or printed concordances dating from after the completion of the MS, and thus stem from otherwise unknown MS sources. The Porta motets M43-4 were copied later on a single page (p. 67) with custos B. The section continues with the Rore motets M45-6 (pp. 68-71); the first uses custos A, the second B. At least one, and probably both, of the works were entered towards the end of the manuscript's compilation period (see below for more detailed consideration of M46). The last piece, using custos B, was a later addition. The change from sixteen to twenty staves per page occurs after p. 72, marking the end of the section. There is a fairly consistent number of bars per system (12 or 13) for the first two sections.

A small section occurs at pp. 73-80. This is indicated by the change in staves per page and bars per system, and change in custos formation. The group begins with Rore’s ‘Lamento de Didone a Enea’ (custos A), followed by three Merulo motets (custos B). One Willaert madrigal and two Rore madrigals, M52-4, concord with an anthology, and the group concludes with a Porta motet. All the pieces after M48


19 Mischiati noted that the Porta motet was inserted later (ibid., p. 275).
appear to have been added later. The Latin-texted lament and motets of Merulo and Porta may have led the scribe to put these eight pages, probably an independent gathering, near the previous section of motets; it is unlikely that these pages were copied as part of the preceding section.

The fourth section, the largest of the MS, is made up predominantly of Rore four- and five-part madrigals. The four-part madrigals were copied first, M56-75, 78-93, 95 (pp. 81-110). M76-7 (two Lassus madrigals) and M94 (anon. Kyrie) were inserted at a later date. The single empty system upon which M94 was copied was left because the scribe did not wish to begin a new madrigal on the last system of an opening, but there appears to have been a hiatus in copying after M74, since three systems were left blank there. At the end of M74 (the bottom of p. 94, a verso with 16 staves) is an empty four-stave system; since the previous four-part works were copied with four systems per page, to be consistent the scribe should have begun M75 on the fourth system of p. 94. But M75-7 do not fit in with the series, and are all on one folio (= pp. 95-6); furthermore, there are worn edges on pp. 90-6 (but not on p. 97), suggesting that the MS was separated at this point at some time in its history, and possibly that the single folio of pp. 95-6 was inserted here at a later date (presumably because it begins with a four-part Rore madrigal). M78, p. 97, resumes where M74 left off in a series of four-part madrigals.

The provenance of the four-part madrigals is problematical; the evidence suggests that several different sources were used, possibly MS as well as printed. They have concordances in five main printed sources, not counting unaltered reprints:

---

20 Ibid. (noting only the Kyrie).
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1. Rore's first book of four-part madrigals (Ferrara: Buglhat and Hucher, 1550); 21

2. a second edition which contains one additional madrigal and a different ordering (Venice: Antonio Gardane, 1551; New Vogel no. 2374);

3. Rore's second book of four-part madrigals (Venice: Antonio Gardano, 1557); 22

4. an open-score edition without text (Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1577); 23 and

5. the Tarasconi codex, whose provenance is near to Bourdeney. 24

Table 5.6 gives a summary of the concordances.

Table 5.6. Rore, four-part madrigals: concordances with MS. Bourdeney 1550 etc. 1551 1577 Tarasconi Other

<p>| | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>1-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21 Repr. Venice: Antonio Gardane, 1552, 1557, 1564, 1565, 1569; Venice: Hieronymum Scotum, 1554; Venice: Francesco Rampargetto, 1563; Venice: Giorgio Angelieri, 1573; Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1575, 1582; Venice: heirs of Girolamo Scotto, 1586; and Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1590; total of 13 editions; see New Vogel nos. 2373, 2375-86.


23 See RORE 1577.

24 Inventoried in Barblan and Laterza, 'Tarasconi'.
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Table 5.6 (cont.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bourdeney</th>
<th>1550 etc.</th>
<th>1551</th>
<th>1577</th>
<th>Tarasconi</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>23-24(=end)</td>
<td>24-25(=end)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 75 [Rore] | -         | -    | -    | 25        | RISM 1566\textsuperscript{2} p3 |
| 76 [Lassus] | -       | -    | -    | 38        | RISM 1555\textsuperscript{17}, p1 |
| 77 [Lassus] | -       | -    | -    | -         | RISM 1560\textsuperscript{17}, p1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1557</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>1577</th>
<th>Tarasconi</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>9 (=end)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>RISM 1561\textsuperscript{15}, n1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>RISM 1568\textsuperscript{13}, n8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>RISM 1561\textsuperscript{18}, n2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>RISM 1565\textsuperscript{15}, n3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>RISM 1575\textsuperscript{18}, n6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>RISM 1565\textsuperscript{18}, n2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the concordant volumes can be shown to be the scribe's exemplar. The order of the manuscript closely accords with the 1577 edition, but since full texts are included at M56-78 (there is no text in 1577) and the MS includes M74 (1577 does not), the scribe must have either used an exemplar other than 1577 or supplemented it with one or more other exemplars. Yet the coincidence of ordering (except M74) is extraordinary. A hiatus after M74 has been noted above; the continuation of 1577 in order to the end (except 1577 nos. 35-6, which were copied at pp. 3-5, M4 and 5) is evident, but again, text is present in some of the works (M78, complete; M79-82, partial). The manuscript and 1577 have undeniable links, yet the former was almost certainly not copied from the latter. It appears that the scribe's exemplar(s) were
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not any of the prints but other MS(S) (now lost), which were direct precursor(s) to both the Bourdeney codex and the 1577 print. The only piece in the MS series not included in the print, M74, a 'pastoral chanson' (French text), was presumably left out of the print because it was not quite a madrigal.

After the conclusion of the four-part madrigals and M96 (a single eight-part Rore madrigal) comes an extensive series of Rore five-part madrigals: M97-136, 138-151, 153-176, 178-183 (pp. 113-206). Three pieces were inserted among this series later on vacant staves: M137 (Forta motet), 25 M152 (anon. madrigal), 26 and M177, (Nanino madrigal). 27 Three other non-Rore pieces were printed in Rore's Terzo libro a 5; 28

26 Ibid. The work differs from those surrounding it in custos form; it was copied across the opening (pp. 174-5) where both pages had empty staves at the bottom. It also uses breve bar lengths, unlike the Rore madrigals (which use longa bar lengths). The work may be from Nanino's 1586 volume (a hypothesis based on the text incipit found in New Vogel no. 1992, from which M177 was also taken; I was unable to examine Nanino's work).
27 Mischiati, 'Un'antologia', p. 275. The work is no. 11 of Nanino's 1586 print; see note 26.
28 Ibid., p. 293, suggested the RISM 155225 edition (= New Vogel no. 2408) as the scribe's exemplar, for unstated reasons. Mischiati errored (132) regarding the contents of the RISM 1548 edition (= New Vogel no. 2407 bis); this was unlikely to have been used by the scribe, since it did not contain the entire 'Vergine' series (eleven madrigals), but only the first six; all eleven are in the MS, M141-51. The evidence of ordering suggests that the scribe had access to more than one edition of the Terzo libro, similar to the four-part madrigals. There were six editions possible to consult: 1548 (2), 1552 (repr. 1560, 1566), 1557, 1562, and 1593 (see New Vogel, nos. 2407-13). In a communication, Bernhard Meier agreed that 1552 was probably not the edition used by the scribe, and suggested that the 1557 edition was more likely, for two reasons:
1) the omission of the attributions of M162, 164, and 166 (Dorati and Willaert madrigals) from the MS follows their omission from the print; of the six editions, the attributions were given in 1548 (both) and 1552, and the three works were omitted from the 1562 and 1593 eds., leaving only the 1557 edition which both gave the madrigals and omitted their attributions; and
the volume begins to be copied at M141, p. 165, and continues to M169, p. 192. The scribe clearly worked straight through the volume and included the pieces (by Dorati and Willaert) in their places. The change in number of staves per page at p. 133 coincides with the scribe's beginning to copy Rore's *Primo libro a 5*,29 but no other discontinuity is found at this point.

M184-8 (pp. 207-9), a mixed collection of pieces, conclude the section, with variable forms of custodes (three Palestrina madrigals, two Maschera canzonas with headings, but no attribution). The gradual change in the characteristic formation of custodes is complete by the end. Thus the section consists mainly of custos A, with insertions. Staves per page identify its beginning, but not its end; bars per stave and length of bars offer no additional support.

Beginning at p. 210 is the fifth section, a complete copy of Palestrina's *Motecta Festorum* (1571), with custos A, almost exactly in the order of the print. The end of this section is first indicated by a work by Porta (M225) and four more Palestrina motets from other printed sources (M226-8 [the third, incomplete, was not given a number by Mischiati]), all still with custos A; five De Monte madrigals (M229-33), and a miscellany of eight madrigals, one canzona, two Janequin chansons and six motets up to p. 261 (M234-50) all use custos B or T, except for

2) three madrigals (M170-2) published in the 1557 edition follow in order; they are in no other edition of the *Terzo libro*, but occur in the *Quarto libro* (in a different order).
None of the editions can be shown to be the scribe's exemplar with absolute certainty.

29 Mischiati, 'Un'antologia', p. 288 n30 suggested that the 1562 edition was the scribe's exemplar; on the basis of the placement of M119 and M126-32, out of sequence or absent in the 1562 edition, but in sequence in the second 1544 edition (New Vogel no. 2392), the latter is more likely to have been the scribe's exemplar. This is confirmed by Meier (communication). The thirteen editions of this book published between 1542 and 1593 are indexed in *New Vogel* nos. 2389-2400.
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M243, a Luzzaschi madrigal. The evidence suggests that after the Palestrina volume was copied, there was a more haphazard approach to the remaining pages; some works copied earlier were put here; other works were added at various times. This transitional part completes the section. There is a distinction in bars per system between sections five and six.

Section six consists primarily of Palestrina Masses from Missarum liber I (1554 or 1572 editions) (M251-255). The change in custos style (M256-62) marks a miscellany (all motets) by Merulo (3), Animuccia (2), Porta and Clemens non Papa.

The seventh section begins with more Palestrina Masses, this time from his third book (M263-71), all with custos A (excepting M267, a Striggio madrigal, fitted into a small space at a later date). The conclusion of the section consists of two pages containing two motets by Porta with custos B (M272-3, pp. 365-6). The section includes a characteristic pattern of bars per system, different from either of those surrounding.

The eighth section consists of Josquin Masses (M274-6, pp. 367-86) and a single Mouton Mass (M279, pp. 391-7). Pages 387-90 (two versions of Janequin's 'canto delli Uccelli') appear to be a four-page gathering inserted between the two; pages 398-9, an opening of the MS (Josquin six-part motet), were clearly copied at a later time from either p. 397 or p. 400. There is a change in pagination after p. 399; and changes in bars per system and length of bars accord with the proposed insertions.

Section nine is devoted primarily to ricercars in three separate groups. M281-90 (pp. 400-8) are nine ricercars copied from Pb-Merulo

---

30 Mischiati, 'Un'antologia', p. 301.
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1574, a tenth left off after a few bars. The scribe ordered them not according to the printed source but according to tone. The second group, eight ricercars (seven of which are anonymous), is M296-303, pp. 415-420. The third group, all anonymous, is M305-12, pp. 424-38. These twenty-six works are unified by the use of custos A.

The two insertions, M291-295 (pp. 409-14) and M304 (last two systems of p. 423), are works with custos B (three Rore motets, one Morales motet, one ricercar, and one Animuccia motet). M291-295 were copied on three folios and may be an inserted gathering. M304 was probably entered later on two empty systems.

Newcomb considered the anonymous ricercars on stylistic bases and found that M295-300 and 305-12 are unified enough to be attributed to one composer, and are important precursors to FRESCOBALDI 1608. The theory neatly accords with the present findings except for M295. The title of M295, 'Recercare del Nono Tuono', is out of order with the rest of the set. The other ricercars are either not titled or numbered according to tone until M305 (tone 1), after which they progress in order to M310 (tone 4) and M311 (which skips to tone 12). Considering that the Merulo ricercars were carefully re-ordered according to tone, it is unlikely that M295 was a part of the exemplar(s) for M296-312; rather, it appears to have been copied later from another exemplar. It is possible that the scribe inserted M291-5 in their present place because of the relationship of M295 with the pieces following.

Newcomb's stylistic exclusion of M301-3 is legitimate, but not supported by a change in custos formation, and M296 to the end of the section were probably copied in the order they now stand (excepting

---

31 See below for further discussion of the works.
32 'Anonymous Ricercars'.
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M304). They were included at that place because they are ricercars, and their placement suggests the possibility that M296-300 stem from one exemplar, M305-12 another. The end of the section is proposed not on the basis of custos formation but the evidence of the title page, where the partial table of contents suggests that the ricercars were an independent group separate from pp. 439-580.

Section ten begins with seven madrigals by six composers (M313-19, pp. 439-443/1), probably copied from one anthology, but there is no custos distinction between them and the previous or following works. The madrigals are followed by a large group of Porta motets and Masses, beginning on p. 443, where the word 'Ravenna' is found in the margin. The location of the word suggests that the scribe travelled to Ravenna and noted his new dwelling-place when he returned to the MS. There is a small group of miscellaneous works by Porta (M320-6; M327, a Merulo motet, added later), followed by most of Porta's Musica Sacra Canenda Vocibus Liber Tertius (1585) (M328-47; M329, a Festa madrigal, added later). Five Masses from Porta's Missarum Liber Primus (1578) follow, the last incomplete (M348-52, pp. 468-79v); the section concludes, similar to earlier sections, with more diverse works: M353-9 (pp. 480-87), two

33 Newcomb argued that the compiler of the MS regularly interrupted a large series of works with a few (usually unrelated) pieces, and did so with M301-3; this is confuted by the present study (see I:156), and considering that M301-3 are not unrelated to a section of anonymous ricercars, as well as the circumstances of M295, it would appear more likely that several exemplars were used in this section of the MS.

34 RISM 1582; see Mischiati, 'Un'antologia', p. 306.

35 The bearing of the marginal note upon questions of the scribe and date of the MS is considered below.

36 The volume was not copied in order, nor completely (the last three motets of the print were not copied), but the scribe's exemplar appears to be the printed edition, to judge from comparison of one motet, 'Salve Regina' (see below).

37 Mischiati, 'Un'antologia', p. 275.
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Pallavicino madrigals, a Palestrina motet, another Porta motet, a Morales motet, a fragment of a Merulo Mass, and a Richafort chanson. At least some of this section was probably copied from Porta manuscripts in Ravenna, since it includes unica and pieces which predate printed concordances. The handwriting change at the end shows that pp. 480-3 were copied with custos B; pp. 484-7 use custos A and T, suggesting that they were copied earlier. It is possible that pp. 484-7 formed an independent gathering that was placed here because of the Porta motet which begins it; at least this accords with the layout of the MS (p. 484 is a recto), and M356-9 fill up the four pages.

Section eleven contains a copy of the anthology Livre de meslanges (Eitner, Sammelwerke, 1560c), not copied in order (M360-410, pp. 488-518); it also contains two Maschera canzonas within it (M386-7), but unlike earlier sections, there is no evidence that the canzonas were copied in at a later date; they fill one verso-recto opening. One other piece, M396 (Lassus chanson) appears to have been positioned (after five Lassus chansons from Livre de meslanges) because of the scribe’s desire to keep Lassus works together; again, it was not added at a later date, to judge from the handwriting. There is no varied group of works at the end of the section.

Section twelve consists of a set of commemorationes and hymns for the liturgical year by Porta (M411-37, pp. 519-37). The custos formation appears to be A or T. There is one extraneous piece (M421, a Porta madrigal), copied in at a later date to judge from its cramped

---

38 Mischiati, 'Un'antologia', pp. 309-14, 324 n47.

39 M411-14 are commemorationes, 415-37 hymns. All of the former are unica and the hymns M423, 428 and 430 were not printed in the 1602 edition. Mischiati determined that the MS has significant variants from the 1602 print of the hymns, and probably predates it ('Un'antologia', p. 274, 314-17).
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style of writing. Like section eleven, there is no varied group of works at the end of the section.

The final section consists mainly of Gombert motets from his [Motecta] cum V Vocibus Liber I (1552) (M438-58, pp. 538-566), copied with custos A. It is followed by a miscellany of eleven pieces of more variable handwriting (M459-69, pp. 566-80), and thus resembles the earlier sections of the MS.

The last eight pages (= four folios), pp. 573-80, are out of order. The layout of M464-8 shows that the original order of the pages (odd-numbered pages are verso) was pp. 573, 576, 577, 574, 575, 578, 579, 580; thus it was paginated after these pages were put out of order. The end of the MS is summarized in Table 5.7.

---

40 Ibid., p. 275.

41 Mischiati overlooked the mis-ordering and suggested that the scribe's methods here indicate his concern for saving space at the end of the volume ('Un'antologia', p. 275).
Table 5.7. Final pages of the MS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M no.</th>
<th>Page layout</th>
<th>Piece</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>464</td>
<td>569₁-573₁ + 576₁</td>
<td>Andrea Gabrieli, Magnificat à 12\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>465</td>
<td>569₂₋₃-573₂₋₃ + 576₁₋₃</td>
<td>'La battaglia a 4 di Clement'\textsuperscript{c}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>466</td>
<td>575 + 578₁</td>
<td>Marenzio, '[In un bel] bosco' à 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>467</td>
<td>577 + 1 bar on 574</td>
<td>Janequin, 'L'alouette' à 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>468</td>
<td>578₁₋₂ + 574₁₋₂</td>
<td>A. Gabrieli, 'Per farmi Amor' à 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>469</td>
<td>579-580</td>
<td>A. Gabrieli, ricercar à 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{NOTES:}

\textsuperscript{a}The page layout is indicated by page/number of system; where no systems are indicated, the entire page is dedicated to that work.

\textsuperscript{b}The 12-part work is copied across the openings; since there are twenty staves per page, the scribe could use but one system per page for this work.

\textsuperscript{c}Janequin's 'La Guerre' is copied on the eight staves below the Gabrieli Magnificat, cross-opening, two systems per opening, until p. 576. On that page, the Gabrieli work ends after two bars (of a total of 12 per system), and the remaining space of the top 12 staves is given over to the chanson.

The layout of M464-5 is clear evidence that p. 576 should follow p. 573. Hence the piece on p. 577 (the verso side of 576), M467, was copied directly after M465. The one-bar fragment of M467 on p. 574 occurs on the penultimate system, and was a cramped effort of the scribe to squeeze the work onto one page.\textsuperscript{42} Thus p. 574 should follow p. 577.

\textsuperscript{42}Merritt's hypothesis ('Reworkings', p. 606) that the scribe became 'confused and omit[ted] two measures' is confuted by the reordering of the pages as shown here; see below for further discussion of this work.
Marenzio's madrigal would then fall easily into one opening, as with the last piece.

The situation is less straightforward with M468; the second part of the madrigal was copied on an earlier page than the first, and after the first part is a note, in the scribe's hand, directing the reader back: 'La 2da Parte di questo Madrigale è nella fasciata qui inantj'. The significance of the unusual ordering is not clear. The fact that there are seven empty staves at the bottom of both pp. 578 and 574 (both recto pages, only two pages apart when their proper order is restored) argues against the idea that the scribe was trying above all to save space; on the contrary, the note to the reader is large and spaciously written over two staves, whereas had the scribe wanted to move in order and conserve space, he would have at least begun the second part immediately after the first. Whatever the reason for the reversal, the fact itself coupled with the mis-ordered pages indicates that the last few pages were gathered at one point but became separated and mis-ordered later.

The distinct sections of the MS show that when it was put into its final order, there was a clear and rational plan. A step back from detailed inspection reveals three 'meta-sections': sections one to four (pp. 1-209) contain works of Rore, first motets then madrigals (after p. 209 there is almost no Rore in the MS); sections five to eight (pp. 210-399) contain sacred works of Palestrina and older composers; sections ten to twelve contain works of Porta. The ninth and thirteenth sections are anomalous; the latter would fit well with the Palestrina group, and the former is independent, the only predominantly instrumental set of the MS.

The only previous discussion of sections of the MS, Newcomb, 'Anonymous Ricercars', pp. 100-1, presented a different view of the
sections of the MS here discussed and merits a detailed critique. Newcomb’s primary aim was not to present a detailed sectional plan of the MS but to justify a proposed interruption in section nine; his inaccuracies do not adversely affect his stylistic conclusions, but they should nonetheless be rectified. His theory is based on ‘interruptions’: ‘It looks likely that the compiler entered the pieces into his compendium, often from circulating manuscript sources . . ., pretty much as they came to him. If a particular manuscript fascicle was available to him for only a limited time, he would simply enter its contents in the midst of whatever larger project was underway.’ He identified seven such interruptions, five of which are spurious:

1. The proposed interruption of M15-46 by the Porta motets M43-4 is better viewed as a ‘miscellany’ at the end of section two.

2. Newcomb cited M78-183 as an interrupted series, but it is better to consider all the Rore madrigals (i.e., from M56) as a series. The interruptions, M76-7, M137 and 177, were certainly added later and filled in blank staves; the Dorati and Willaert madrigals (M162, 164, 166) were printed in the Rore madrigal books and were considered by the scribe to be part of the series he was copying.

3. Newcomb included M184-6, Palestrina madrigals using custos T, in the beginning of the following [fifth] section, but they are more appropriate to the end of the preceding section of madrigals; they are followed by two unrelated pieces with a later custos style, the hallmark of a section-end.

4. and 5. The madrigal (M267) in the midst of Palestrina Masses (M263-71), and the two extraneous works (M327 and 329) within a group of Porta works (M320-47) were added later to fill vacant staves.

The proposed ‘interruption’ of ricercars by M301-3 is not substantiated by scribe precedent, custos formation, or any other
copying characteristic, and should probably be viewed as a result of compilation from several exemplars.

Order of copying

The order of copying is thus different from the order of the MS as it stands; absolute boundaries cannot be drawn, but early, middle and late stages are visible in nearly every section. Generally, the beginnings of sections are contemporary, and other works were added to each of them at a later time. Sections nine and ten appear to be the last to be begun, and the handwriting distinction between the two is indiscernible. On the other hand, sections eleven and thirteen appear to predate nine and ten; section twelve is clearly linked with section ten in content.

Studies of selected pieces in the MS

It is beyond the scope of this chapter analytically to examine its entire contents for provenance, but a few works may serve as representative examples. One madrigal and one motet by Rore are considered in detail because of annotations in the MS which suggest the use of other MSS as exemplars. Also examined are works by Merulo (both ricercars and vocal works); a Porta motet which contains figured bass; and the Janequin 'L'alouette', notable for of its mis-ordered pages.

Rore

The note at the head of Rore's 'Mentre, lumi maggiore' (M97, pp. 113-4) is striking: 'Angustie mihi sunt undique'. In comparison with the printed version, the MS agrees in almost every detail. Exceptions

43 Consulted in the version given in Rore, Opera Omnia, ed. Meier, V:92.
are the heading (‘A gl’illustrissimi Principi Duca et Duchessa di Parma’ in the print; ‘All Ill. mo Duca di Parma in the MS), and where a bar line coincides with a longer note-value, when the scribe changes semibreves to tied minims, minims to tied crotchets, etc. There is also one place (Tenor, bars 30-1) where in the print are given five b naturals, whereas in the manuscript only the first is given. On the basis of lack of variants, it is reasonably certain that the scribe worked from a printed source, yet the note at the head is suggestive. The words are from Daniel 13:22, and were used by Rore for a motet (also copied in the MS, M39, p. 61). The madrigal is a paean to its dedicatees, first performed for them in Brussels in August 1560, just when Rore was hired. Indications are that the comment stems from Rore. Perhaps he had fallen upon hard times and was ‘rescued’ by Ottavio and Margaret as Susanna was rescued by Daniel in the Bible story. The scribe’s exemplar surely included the quotation; if it stemmed from Rore himself it predated the printed version (1566). It appears that the scribe had access to copies of Rore close to Rore himself, or his patron the Duke of Parma.

This is not implausible, since there are other Rore works in the MS that predate printed versions. One of these, ‘Expectans Expectavi’ (M46, p. 70), has a heading in the MS: ‘De la Valise del Duca Ottauio’. The heading signals that the source for the scribe was close to Rore’s patron; since it was first printed in 1595, after the

44 The Apocryphal story of Susanna, a righteous woman falsely accused of adultery by two Elders, and saved by Daniel’s advocacy.

45 Meier, ed., p. xiv.

46 The reading of the heading is disputed; Bridgman, Lesure and Mischiati read ‘Valite’; Meier, ed., VI:158 (and I) read ‘Valise’. The latter is preferable, since it makes good sense if the dialect-spelling of ‘valigia’ is acknowledged.
probable copying period, it is certain that the scribe used a manuscript exemplar. There are three minor variants between the MS version and the print (as edited by Meier), given below:

Example 5.2. Rore, 'Expectans Expectavi', bar 17 (variants in B and T):

Print: MS:

The printed version is better. The variants in the MS are inexplicable but the b in the tenor, beat 1, is a wrong note.

Example 5.3. Rore, 'Expectans', bars 39-40 (variants in T and Q, bar 40):

Print:
Example 5.3 (cont.).

MS:

Here both versions are acceptable. The MS version is marginally to be preferred, since it gives a firm C major chord on 40.3, whereas the printed version has a certain instability with the c sharp' on 40.1-2 followed by a c natural" on 41.1, Cantus.

Example 5.4. Rore, 'Expectans', bars 117-120 (variants in Q):

Print:
This shows that the scribe worked from partbooks; the tenor part becomes displaced by one minim from 117.2 to 120.2; from 120.3 the two agree again. Table 5.8 gives the remaining variants.

Table 5.8. Rore, 'Expectans', lesser variants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part and Bar</th>
<th>Print</th>
<th>Bourdeney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.1,b</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>no flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.3,q</td>
<td>Bb</td>
<td>no flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.2,q</td>
<td>minim b</td>
<td>minim c (b is better)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133.2-3,c</td>
<td>2 c sharps</td>
<td>first sharp only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other, more minor, variants (which make no difference to the sound of the piece) include occasionally changing two-note ligatures to two semibreves (109-10,b; 95.3-96.2,q); changing longer notes to two tied notes when a bar line intervenes; and arranging rests differently (e.g. 50.3,c, where there are two semibreve rests in the print and one breve rest in the MS). These changes could be due to the scribe's method, but do not matter in any case.

The scribe copied faithfully the material he used, as seen in other works examined here; it is likely that his source for this piece was a
very good copy of 'Expectans Expectavi', probably from the collection of Rore's last patron, the Duke of Parma, Ottavio Farnese.

**Merulo ricercars**

The Merulo ricercars (M281-90, pp.400-8) form the first part of section nine, the 'ricercar' section of the manuscript. The ordering of the ricercars in the MS suggests at first glance that the scribe was not working from the printed copy\(^{47}\) (he copied them in the order 3, 8, 15, 19, 9, 10, 11, 20, 13, 14); a closer inspection reveals that the order in the manuscript approaches a kind of tonal plan (whereas there is no discernible logical order in the print). The organization of the print is summarized in Table 5.9; the scribe began with pieces in tone 1 (tonal type b - g\(_2\) - G, nos. 3, 8, 15, 19), copied successively. He proceeded with no. 9 (b - cl - D),\(^{48}\) continuing with tones 2 (no. 10), 3 (nos. 11, 20) and 4 (nos. 13, 14), where he left in mid-piece. He did not omit any pieces in the first three tones.

**Table 5.9. Pb-Merulo 1574, Organization of the volume.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length (breves)</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>ambitus(^a)</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>number of staves</th>
<th>Page layout(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>g(_2)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1:1-26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>g(_2)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>3:1-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>g(_2)</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>4:1-56 (5: CB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[There is no 'ricercar quarto' in the partbooks.]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>cl</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6:1-76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{47}\) As Newcomb guessed, 'Anonymous Ricercars', p. 120 n9.

\(^{48}\) Powers ('Tonal Types') would classify the tonal type b - cl - D as tone 9 (transposed A); the scribe probably classed it as tone 1, because of its Final.
### Table 5.9 (cont.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length (breves)</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>ambitus</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>number of staves</th>
<th>Page layout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>+ c1</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.1–9.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>+ c1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.4–10.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>b g2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.1–11.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>b c1</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.1–13.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>b c1</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13.4–14.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>+ c1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.1–15.6 (15.5: B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>+ g2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.1–17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>+ g2*</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18.1–18.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>b g2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.1–19.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>b g2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20.1–21.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>b g2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.1–22.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>b g2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23.1–23.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>+ g2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.1–25.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>b g2</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26.1–27.4 (27.2: B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>+ c1</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28.1–29.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

- g2=g2c2c3f3; c1=c1c3c4f4; g2*=g2c2c3c4.
- There are six staves per page in the print, indicated by subscript here.

While the scribe’s ordering may be seen, this does not show that he necessarily worked from the partbooks; a close comparison with the partbooks reveals that he did. The number of variants between the two is remarkably small (see Table 5.10). This handful of variants, none of which is substantial, reflects the accuracy with which the scribe worked. In over 1000 breves of music copied, the mere occasional
Table 5.10. Variants between 1574 partbooks and MS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar, beat, voice</th>
<th>1574</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>M281 no variants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 8</td>
<td>M282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48,c</td>
<td>e flat</td>
<td>no flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66,c</td>
<td>e flat</td>
<td>no flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61,a</td>
<td>e flat</td>
<td>no flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 15</td>
<td>M283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140,c</td>
<td>f sharp</td>
<td>no sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101,t</td>
<td>c sharp</td>
<td>no sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111,t</td>
<td>no flat</td>
<td>e flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112,t</td>
<td>e flat</td>
<td>no flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120,b</td>
<td>f sharp</td>
<td>no sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141,b</td>
<td>2 b sharps</td>
<td>only first has sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 19</td>
<td>M284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.4,c</td>
<td>b sharp</td>
<td>no sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60.2,c</td>
<td>e sharp (caut.(^a))</td>
<td>no sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.1,c</td>
<td>e flat</td>
<td>no flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.1,c</td>
<td>b sharp</td>
<td>no sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 9</td>
<td>M285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.3,a</td>
<td>e sharp</td>
<td>no sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1,b</td>
<td>e flat</td>
<td>no flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 10</td>
<td>M286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.1,c</td>
<td>b (flat in k.s.)</td>
<td>redundant flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.3,c</td>
<td>f sharp</td>
<td>no sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.1,a</td>
<td>e sharp (caut.)</td>
<td>no sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>141.4,a</td>
<td>e flat</td>
<td>no flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>144.3,a</td>
<td>e flat</td>
<td>no flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2,t</td>
<td>e flat</td>
<td>no flat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.3,b</td>
<td>e sharp (caut.)</td>
<td>no sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.1,b</td>
<td>e sharp (caut.)</td>
<td>no sharp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 11</td>
<td>M287 no variants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 20</td>
<td>M288 no variants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 13</td>
<td>M289 no variants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no. 14</td>
<td>M290 no variants (only beginning copied: C and A, bars 1-28; T, 1-4; no B).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

\(^a\)A cautionary accidental in the print, to cancel what normally would have been interpreted with a flat by performers.
omission of accidentals (some of which are unnecessary, strictly speaking) is hardly significant. He went so far as to follow stem direction and rest placement in most cases. The scribe was careful, when errors were made, to correct them as well as he could. The most clear proof that the scribe worked from the printed partbooks may be seen in one of his corrected errors.

In ricercar no. 20 (M288), Tenor, bars 142-58, the scribe made an error and corrected it by writing over the wrong parts. Both parts are now legible. It is clear the the scribe mistook the passage of bar 142 for the very similar passage in bar 151 (which is almost exactly aligned, one stave lower, in the partbook). He copied bars 154-70 where he should have copied 142-58 (bars 140-1 and 152-3 are identical). Example 5.5a shows the relevant page of the partbook (marks for bars added), and Example 5.5b the passage in the MS:
Example 5.5a. Pb-Merulo 1574 (Tenor), p. 29, staves 4-6 (arrows show the similar material).

Example 5.5b. Bourdeney, p. 407, last system.

The Merulo ricercars copied into the MS demonstrate the careful work of the scribe, and his faithful copying of exemplars. When he saw fit, he was not unwilling to change the ordering of his exemplar to a better one.
Chapter five: Bourdeney

The fact that the group is incomplete perhaps indicates that the scribe's source was only available to him for a short period of time; other cases of a similar method are found in the MS, e.g. M227. More unusual is the lack of indication of the scribe's source: this is the only section where a group of pieces is copied without titles. The method of the scribe regarding text appears to have been to copy the entire music before dealing with it; perhaps he had intended to complete the Merulo with titles after completion of the volume, but was interrupted.

Merulo vocal works

The conclusions of a comparison of the vocal works of Merulo copied in the MS may be summarized. The first small set of the MS, M49-51, is taken from Merulo's six-part motets (1583). There is no discernible logic to the scribe's choice, neither according to tonal type nor liturgical function. Nos. 21, 8, and 12 concord with M49-51 (pp. 76-8). The variants are minimal, consisting mainly of accidentals which were not copied into the manuscript (four times). Cautionary accidentals in the print, not always copied in the ricercars, are generally copied here. In the triplum section of 'O Sacrum Convivium' the indication '3' in the print is changed to '3/2' in the MS. Only one difference is more noteworthy:

49 As Newcomb suggested, 'Anonymous Ricercars', pp. 100.
50 Ed. Bastian, vol. IV. The MS versions were not collated by Bastian.
51 Bastian noted that the volume was organized according to tonal type (edn. p. x), and that Merulo's five-part motets (1578) were organized according to liturgical function.
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Example 5.6. Merulo, 'Peccavi super numerum', bar 17 (variant in S):

While the printed version is not incorrect, the awkward Sextus part is improved in the MS version. The variant is too minor to base the hypothesis of another exemplar on it; perhaps the scribe modified it himself, or perhaps he used a modified copy of the printed work. In any case, on balance the MS version is better.

One other motet from the 1583 edition was copied, no. 1, 'In te Domine speravi' (M327, p. 447v). Here the scribe adopted the unusual procedure of compacting the work in order to fit it in to a small space (see Ex. 5.7). The page did not allow for three systems to be given to the work; most of it could fit on to two systems, but the Bass part caused problems. Consequently, from bar 26 (in the middle of the second bar of system 2 in MS) the alignment of the music is abandoned; below the second system may be seen the completion of the Bass part. While variants with the print are otherwise not significant, this copying method reflects the need to save space at the expense of vertical alignment.

Another small set of Merulo four-part motets (nos. 4,3 and 1 of the 1584 print)\(^{52}\) occurs in the MS at M256-8 (pp. 306-7). Again, the printed order is based on tonal types, and the order of copying has no discernible logic. The most significant variants are the different

\(^{52}\)Edn. vol. 5.
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Example 5.7. Bourdeney p. 447v (M327, end), showing unaligned bass part.
ambitus of M257-8: clefs for M257 are c3c4c4f4 in the print, and it is transposed up an octave (clefs = g2c2c2c3) in the MS; for M258, the clefs for the print are c2c4c4f4, and the MS transposes the work up a fifth (clefs = c1c2c2c4). There are five other more significant variants in the three works (see Table 5.11). Since there are several variants with preferable readings in the MS, it appears that the scribe either corrected while copying from the print or worked from a corrected exemplar.

Table 5.11. Variants, Merulo four-part motets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar.beat, voice</th>
<th>1584</th>
<th>Bourdeney</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 4</td>
<td>M256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.4,a</td>
<td>e'</td>
<td>d'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(Print’s reading incorrect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 3</td>
<td>M257</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.1,c</td>
<td>d'</td>
<td>e''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(MS reading preferable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no. 1</td>
<td>M258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.2,t</td>
<td>minim c</td>
<td>minim a(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(print’s reading preferable)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Transposed down a fifth this note is a whole tone higher than the print.

The final Merulo vocal work to be considered is the Kyrie and beginning of the Gloria of his Missa Benedicta es Celorum (1573), M358,
There are no variants in the MS at all (but the text was not copied). The copy of the Gloria ceases at bar 65 (up to and including the music for 'Filius Patris'), and it would appear that this is another case of the scribe having limited access to the volume. Since the copy is identical, it is probable that the scribe worked from the printed source.

**Porta, Salve Regina (part one)**

This work (M337, p. 457) presents evidence of the manuscript's having been used for accompaniment purposes, since a figured bass was added to it after the MS was completed. Comparison with the 1585 print reveals three variants, none significant, unlike some other Porta works copied in the MS, the motet was published around the time of compilation of the MS, and so was probably copied from the print.

The figured bass was added well after completion of the MS, in all likelihood. The work was copied with a stave between systems (six staves per system, three systems per page, = 18; plus a stave between each = 20 staves on the page), a common procedure for the scribe when copying six-part works. The figured bass was added on the two empty staves, and for the third system was put to the right of the open score (which only takes up half the system); see Example 5.8. Although no other works in the MS have figured bass added, it is reasonable to

---

53 Edn. vol. 1. Mischiati ('Un'antologia', p. 309) erred in stating that the entire Gloria was copied into the MS. He presented a facsimile of p. 487 ('Un'antologia', opposite p. 304), where it may be seen that the scribe left off in the middle.

54 Comparison was made with the edited version: Porta, Opera Omnia, ed. Cisilino and Luisetto, VI:26-8. The variants are such as may well be errors in the modern edition: 1) the clef for the uppermost part is c2 in the edition, cl in the MS; 2) 46.1-4, cl, one g sharp in the edn., two in the MS; and 3) 46.4-47.1, c2, two c sharps in the edn., one in the MS.
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Example 5.8. Bourdeney p. 457 (M337), showing added basso continuo.
suppose that more than just this piece was performed accompanimentally at the keyboard.

Janequin, L'alouette

The final work to be considered was examined by Merritt (see above, note 42). The work first appeared in three-part form in 1520; a four-part version appeared in 1529 and 1559. Another four-part version was printed in 1540, with a different contratenor part.\(^{55}\) It is this version which appears in the MS. Comparison of the chanson with the four-part version\(^ {56}\) reveals that the Cantus, Tenor and Bass parts are for the most part identical.\(^ {57}\) The different contratenor part copied in the MS clearly indicates that the scribe used the 1540 version as his exemplar, and the minor variants between the other three parts may be accounted for by assuming that they stem from the three now-lost partbooks. There are three variants:

1. 44-5,c:

   \[
   \begin{array}{c}
   \text{[1529] print:} \\
   \text{MS:}
   \end{array}
   \]

   \[\text{\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure}}\]

2. 93,c: the print gives the first semibreve in a '3' grouping; the MS does not (same pitches are used).

\(^{55}\)Only this partbook of the edition is extant. The printing history is given in Merritt, 'Reworkings', pp. 603-6.

\(^{56}\)In the edited version: Janequin, Chansons polyphoniques, ed. Merritt and Lesure, I:106-15.

\(^{57}\)The (minor) variants between the three- and four-part versions show that the scribe did not use the former (contrary to Mischiati's supposition; see 'Un'antologia', p. 320 n42).
3. At bars 90–1, there is a breves' worth of music in the C and A parts, and two breves' worth in the T and B parts. This might be attributable to scribal error, since the music of bar 90 of the chanson is repeated exactly in bar 91 and again in bar 92, in all four parts. These three variants are of little substance, but confirm that the scribe did not work from the 1520 or 1529 versions. The reuniting of bar 89 (now a fragment on p. 574) with the rest of the work, to follow the end of the penultimate system of p. 577, makes the MS version integral.

Conclusions

Date of the MS

Bridgman and Lesure proposed that the MS was copied in the last quarter of the sixteenth century. This is generally confirmed by the contents. The musical taste of the compiler was quite old-fashioned; he had a great deal of enthusiasm for the works of Rore and Porta, and evidently preferred them to the more modern composers of the day (only a few works by Luzzaschi, Marenzio and Wert were copied); the contents consist primarily of composers of older generations.

The Merulo works help in dating. The ricercars were printed in 1574, and copied in the MS from the print, relatively late in its compilation. M49-51 and M327, Merulo motets printed in 1583, were probably copied from the print; M49-51 use custos T and B; M327 appears

58. Merritt, 'Reworkings', p. 605, noted that the 1520 three-part version omitted bars 51, 52, 72, and 92. Since only bar 92 was omitted in the MS, and only in the C and A parts, the theory that the scribe used a hybrid set of partbooks printed at different times may be rejected.

59. Une anthologie', p. 163. They identified a watermark in currency 1575-6.

60. Mischiati, 'Un'antologia', p. 266 and passim.
to have been copied before M49-51. The Mass movements at M359 were printed in 1573 and copied with custos T; and finally the variants in M256-8 allow for the possibility that they were copied from other MSS, not the printed volume of 1584. This is admittedly speculative, but it appears that the scribe copied the works from prints fairly soon after they were published, and thus that the latter stage of copying (custos B) occurs around 1585.

A terminus ante quem of 1600 may be assigned based on the dates given on the last page of the MS: there are found two dated entries, apparently written after its completion.\(^6^1\) The size of the volume, the care of the scribe, and the handwriting characteristics all support the conclusion that it was copied over a number of years; if (as proposed below) the scribe was Jacques Brumel the younger, it was probably compiled between 1570 and 1590.

The scribe

The identity of the scribe is not made explicit in the MS, but an indication (overlooked by Bridgman, Lesure, Mischiati and Newcomb) occurs on p. 12. At the conclusion of the Morales motet (M10) may be found 'finis / Jacques brunellj',\(^6^2\) in writing which looks very much like a signature (see Ex. 5.9). Newcomb considered the links of the MS with various people named 'Jacques' or 'Giaches', since some of the ricercars about which he was writing concord with those in MS Chigi Q VIII, where they are attributed to 'Giaches'.\(^6^3\) He tentatively suggested the elder Jacques Brumel (d. 1564), organist in Ferrara for a

\(^6^1\)Ibid., p. 276.

\(^6^2\)Mischiati, 'Un'antologia', p. 275, had difficulty reading this, and questioningly proposed 'usque (?) brunellj (?)'.

\(^6^3\)Anonymous Ricercars', pp. 114-16.
Example 5.9. Bourdeney p. 12, bottom: 'finis / Jacques brunellj'.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
number of years, as the composer of these works, although he allowed the possibility of Giaches de Wert\textsuperscript{64} and Jacques Brumel the younger (son of Jacques the elder). If the 'Jacques Brunellj' on p. 12 is a signature, it could not belong to the elder, who died in 1564; Jacques the younger, on the other hand, was organist at Ravenna Cathedral from 1580 to 1594,\textsuperscript{65} and thus a plausible scribe. Although there is no reason for the scribe to sign his name on p. 12, it appears that he did; there is no other interpretation for the name's placement here. It is likely that the scribe was Jacques Brumel the younger.

The scribe had a high opinion of the works of Rore, as evinced by frequent marginal notes and the sheer quantity of music by Rore that he copied.\textsuperscript{66} He also appears to have been musically well-educated; he favoured masters such as Josquin, Mouton and Gombert, surely out of fashion by the last quarter of the century. His musical taste was quite sophisticated, to judge from the works he chose to copy. If he was Brumel the younger, the musical background as well as some exemplars may have stemmed from his father.

The dating of the MS accords well with the hypothesis that Brumel was the scribe. His whereabouts before 1580 are not known, but since he was organist in Ravenna 1580-1594, it is likely that the marginal note 'Ravenna' on p. 443 denotes the point of his move in 1580. After that time he would have fairly direct access to the music of Porta copied in sections ten and twelve. Thus most of the MS was copied before that

\textsuperscript{64} As MacClintock proposed in 'The "Giaches Fantasies"'.

\textsuperscript{65} Newcomb, 'Anonymous Ricercars', quoting Casadio, 'La cappella', p. 150.

\textsuperscript{66} E.g. the note 'Viva mai sempre il Divino Cypriano Rore' at the end of M10; see Mischiati, 'Un'antologia', p. 266, 288 and passim. (The compiler of the title page apparently did not share in this enthusiasm and failed to index any Rore madrigals.) See Bridgman and Lesure, 'Une anthologie', pp. 164-5, for other marginal notes praising Animuccia, Mouton, Josquin, Willaert and Porta.
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time, but pieces which use custos B were copied in Ravenna from 1580 onwards. The almost exact segregation of the works of Rore and Porta in the MS to before and after p. 443, or custos A or B, accords with this conclusion. Brumel had easy access to Porta in Ravenna, and similarly easy access to the works of Rore in his previous location.

Regarding the pre-1580 period, Bridgman and Lesure observed that there are ties between the MS and Parma. They were further developed by Barblan and Laterza, who first noted the connections with the Tarasconi Codex (from Parma), and Mischiati, who drew attention to a series of open-score MSS from the region now held by the Civico Museo, Bologna (as well as several from Treviso, now lost). However, archival investigation in Parma has failed to turn up evidence of Brumel’s presence there. Wherever his location, he had access to a particularly fine collection of Rore, including works or copies of works owned by the Duke of Parma. To speculate, he may have been the pupil to whom Luzzaschi referred in a letter of 10 November 1573: ‘usarò ogni diligentia in insegnare al figliolo di Messer Jaccheto di bona memoria . . .’. Considering that Luzzaschi was a pupil of Rore and a

---

68 ‘Tarasconi’.
70 Pelicelli, ‘Musicisti in Parma’; no one named Jacques or Giaches is listed. Neither did my own investigations in the Parma Archives reveal his presence there. If Brumel was in Parma, he was not on the Duke’s payroll.
colleague of the scribe's father, the circumstances fit the evidence at hand, although the issue must remain undetermined at present.\footnote{Arguing against the hypothesis is the lack of Luzzaschi in the MS (only one madrigal, M243, where there is nothing to suggest that it was composed by the scribe's master).}

The uses of the MS

Several features of the MS may be brought to bear on the question of its use. Its format (open score throughout) suggests study and use at the keyboard.\footnote{Ladewig, 'Frescobaldi's "Recercari"', p. 28, ruled out the possibility of its use at the keyboard on the grounds of the size of the volume; Mischiati sensed the problem of ruling out use at the keyboard---there are indications of such use in the MS---but pointed to the 8- or 12-part works as for study only ("Un'antologia", pp. 272, 273n21.)} The occasionally-unusual layout of the parts shows that ease of legibility or keyboard performance was not a high priority for the scribe; in one instance (M327, cited above) the open score alignment is awry for the last half of the piece, a result of the space-saving efforts of the scribe. In another (M13, a Verdelot motet), the final few bars are copied in choirbook format on the last stave of the page, in order to conserve space (seen in Example 5.10). The layout does not reflect an attempt to write keyboard music in an 'easy' format, but was more abstractly intended for a musician with good taste and a high degree of skill at the organ, in all probability the organist Jacques Brumel the younger.

The complete text of many of the works was copied in; this contradicts the possibility that the MS was copied solely for keyboard, although the text would be useful for accompanimental purposes, as well
Example 5.10. Bourdeney p. 16 (M13, end), showing the last bars copied in choirbook format.
as for the study of counterpoint and text-setting. 74 Although it made copying the works considerably more laborious, the addition of text is a sign of the scribe’s care to reproduce the music accurately.

At least some of the works in the volume were used at the keyboard: on p. 560, at the end of part one of M454, a Gombert five-voice motet, the scribe noted 'Verte ad 2dam Partem Nicolai Gombert. / Per li Organisti'; and on p. 457 the first part of Porta’s Salve Regina is given a figured bass for keyboard performance. The figures were probably added at a later date, as Bridgman and Lesure noted, 75 but still clearly show that the volume was used at the keyboard. 76 If the scribe was the organist Jacques Brumel the younger, it would further support at least partial use at the keyboard. What is more certain is that it could not be used for either instrumental or vocal ensemble performance. The notation and text is too small and cramped for a group of from four to twelve performers to read from one copy, and the text for many of the works is absent or incomplete. Thus, the manuscript was most likely used for counterpoint study and keyboard playing (both solo and accompanimental).

74 Notwithstanding, Bridgman and Lesure, 'Une anthologie', p. 169, rejected the idea that complete text would be useful to students.

75 Ibid., p. 163.

76 The two obstacles for modern scholars regarding using the volume at the keyboard are its physical size and the cramped and difficult-to-read style of writing. The first should be dismissed. It has been shown that the MS could have been in smaller groups of pages for some time; furthermore, while the volume would not sit on a delicate harpsichord music desk, there is no reason to rule out other means of setting the book on the instrument; and organ music desks of the time were large enough to accommodate it. The second obstacle may reflect modern preconceptions as well. Admittedly, the small and cramped notation would be difficult to be read at sight, but this does not rule out performance at the keyboard if the user studied the music carefully.
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Since the MS is a member of a fairly numerous group of Italian late sixteenth-century manuscript open scores,77 it serves as a representative source for this study. Yet such a generalization does not do full justice to the individuality of the source. Its size, contents and careful construction point to the care of its compiler as much as to common MS trends of the time.78 The open-score tradition must have been strong, if the extant MSS are any indication; this open score documents a significant aspect of that tradition.

As a source for 'unambiguous' keyboard music, Bourdeney is secondary. It was used at the keyboard, but nearly the only works that were composed with the keyboard at least partially in mind occur in the 'Ricercar' section, pp. 400-39. Its use at the keyboard for pedagogical or accompanimental purposes should not be underestimated, though. The large number of Masses and motets may well have been accompanied at the organ, and the two pieces of evidence in the manuscript cited above show an accompanimental side. Even if the scribe himself did not use the manuscript for accompaniment, one of his successors did; the strange table of contents shows an organistic viewpoint. As a source for the keyboard music of Merulo, the MS is again less important, but it is one of the few surviving manuscripts of Merulo's music that was copied in his lifetime, and its genesis was not far from Merulo, who was employed by the Duke of Parma from 1584 until his death in 1604. The scribe did not adapt the ricercars to his own purposes (as happened to many Italian works in later northern manuscripts, e.g. Berlin 40615 or Vienna 714), but copied them precisely. It may well have been more for study

77 See note 5.

78 Granted that there is a certain common repertoire in The MSS, Bourdeney is exceptional in presenting large tracts of Josquin, Mouton and Gombert, reflecting personal preferences as much as general trends.
purposes than keyboard performance that he did so. Its secondary importance as a keyboard source reflects the lack of keyboard sources altogether at this period. The scribe, who was presumably a competent organist, did not require keyboard music; his main musical legacy is this collection of predominantly vocal works. In a negative way, the source shows that professional keyboard players were orientated towards vocal music, and inversely, did not require notated music specifically for the keyboard.
CHAPTER SIX
THE TURIN TABLATURES

The Turin Tablatures (I-Th, Raccolta Giordano 1-8, Raccolta Foà 1-8) comprise sixteen volumes notated in New German Tablature, copied between 1637 and 1640.\(^1\) It is an important keyboard source, and has provided numerous scholars with material for modern editions of its many unica,\(^2\) but since Mischiati's path-breaking study the source has been more quarried for its contents than considered as a collection. In such a large source (2703 fols., 1770 pieces, the largest single keyboard MS in existence; comparable only to the Trent Codices or the Pelplin Tablatures, according to Mischiati, and yet copied by a single scribe\(^3\)) it is perhaps inevitable that the whole is neglected in favour of its parts; yet the whole takes a unique place in the study of keyboard music.

The present study examines the whole to some extent, but concentrates on volume II of the collection, containing toccatas.\(^4\) First, the provenance and physical aspects of the entire collection are reviewed, and certain scribal characteristics and methodology are summarized; these are elucidated in close study of volume II, where

---

\(^1\) Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura', p. 2. Mischiati's comprehensive study and inventory of the tablatures provided the foundation for the present study.

\(^2\) E.g. the works of Frescobaldi, Merulo, A. and G. Gabrieli, Sweelinck, H. L. Hassler, Bariolla, Borgo, Bianciardi, and Della Porta.

\(^3\) 'L'intavolatura', pp. 1-2.

\(^4\) Most of the works are available in modern editions; those that are not are given in Appendix C, II: 220.
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concordances of works, their variants, varied or missing attributions, and ordering of works are considered. The volume can be partitioned into nine sections, each of which has continuity of provenance. A few works from vol. IX (headed 'delle toccate del 2.do lib.') are examined for their relationship to the toccatas. The whole survey enables scribal methodology and the genesis of the collection to be more nearly determined, and the study concludes with consideration of its purpose.

Provenance

The collection’s binding dates from 1764–1784, and bears the name and crest of the Italian nobleman count Giacomo Durazzo, who probably acquired it during his tenure in Vienna, 1749–1764. No extramusical trace of its previous whereabouts remains. The notation itself agrees with the south German provenance that the content reflects; Mischiati suggested that the collection stems from the sphere of the Fuggers in Augsburg, since it includes unica by several Bavarian musicians, particularly the Hasslers. This receives support in the present work. Their music patronage is well-known, and it is reasonable to suppose that the scribe had access to a large and comprehensive collection of keyboard and vocal music in the possession of the Fuggers.

The compilation of the collection is a remarkable feat indeed, considering the political climate of south Germany during the period. In the years 1637 to 1640 Augsburg was convulsing from the effects of the Thirty Years War. The city had been occupied twice: by the Swedish

---

5 Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura', pp. 2-3. Each volume contains a table of contents which dates from the period of binding; they offer no further clues regarding the collection and are not considered in further detail.

6 Brothers Hans [Johannes] Leo, Caspar, and Jakob; and Johann Benedikt, son of Caspar. Ibid., pp. 6-9.
in 1632, and (after a devastating siege) by the imperial forces in March 1635. Although the war’s battles were fought elsewhere during the next few years, the plague had taken a large toll of the remaining population, and war-taxes further debilitated the economy; the city and environs took many years to recover. It would seem the unlikeliest of times to contemplate compiling the volumes, which after all constitute the largest cohesive early keyboard source in existence. These circumstances have a bearing on the collection’s genesis and are considered below, I: 301.

**Physical Description**

Mischiati gave ample space to physical description, the essence of which may be repeated here. The volumes, which range from 83 fols. (vol. XIV) to 233 fols. (vol. VIII), are 170 fols. in length on average. Each volume contains discrete musical genres according to Table 6.1.

---

7 After six months’ siege, the city surrendered to the imperialists. ‘They had been eating cats, rats and dogs for three months past, and eight weeks before the surrender the citizens were cutting up the hides of cattle, soaking and chewing them. A woman confessed to having cooked and eaten the body of a soldier who had died in her house.’ Wedgewood, *Thirty Years War*, p. 399.

8 Over 13,000 people in 1634-1635; in the census of 1635 a total of 16,432 people remained in the city, compared with about three times that number before the war began (Blendinger et al., *Augsburg*, p. 64).

9 Derived from Mischiati, ‘L’intavolatura’, pp. 119-22 (empty folios are not included).
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Table 6.1. Content of the volumes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I &amp; II:</td>
<td>Toccata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III &amp; V:</td>
<td>Versets (organ Masses, Magnificats, hymns for organ, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV:</td>
<td>Motets (without texts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI-IX:</td>
<td>Ricercars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X-XI:</td>
<td>Canzonas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII-XIII:</td>
<td>Madrigals (without texts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV:</td>
<td>Correnti, gagliards, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV:</td>
<td>Passamezzi, intrade, gagliards, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI:</td>
<td>Allemands, balletti, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most of the volumes (all but IV, XII and XIII) are dedicated to specifically keyboard-orientated works, and the entire range of keyboard music is found within, if use of vocal music at the keyboard is acknowledged. Although it contains a large number of vocal transcriptions, the collection was not intended to preserve vocal works per se; they were copied without text, and keyboard ornaments were freely added. The content is predominantly Venetian: many Venetian publications are copied completely, and the work of Merulo, A. and G. Gabrieli is prominent. Non-Venetian music does, however, make up a significant portion: the works of Sweelinck, Frescobaldi, and a number of south German composers. 10 Only a few English dances are present (vols. XV, XVI); Spanish and Neapolitan composers are absent. Surprisingly, copies of printed keyboard works from German-speaking regions are also not found (see below). With this exception, the repertoire is one that would have been encountered in south Germany at the time of copying (and reflects the overwhelming influence of Venetian and Frescobaldian music on the area 11 ).

10 Predominantly the Hasslers and Erbach.

11 Cf. Riedel, ‘Influence’. The Turin tablatures indicate that the musicians of first part of the 17th century were less selective and utilized a broad range of north-Italian music, not just Frescobaldi. See also idem, ‘Einfluss’.
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Methodology of the Scribe

The notes in most of the volumes which record payments to the scribe, who must have worked on commission, are summarized chronologically in Table 6.2.\textsuperscript{12} The scribe did not work on each volume separately, but began some while still completing others. Each volume was probably copied successively in the order it now stands; there is only infrequent evidence to the contrary.\textsuperscript{13}

\textsuperscript{12}Payment notes according to volume are listed, Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura', pp. 119-22; chronology is discussed, ibid., pp. 11-14, and tabulated on p. 13. Table 6.2 presents a more succinct chronology which differs in some respects with Mischiati's; most notably the difference between dates in middle, beginning, or end of the volumes is made more explicit.

\textsuperscript{13}Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura', pp. 119-22. The page ordering of vol. XIII is problematic, apparently mis-collated soon after its completion. Mischiati renumbered the pages and showed the order of its copying.
Table 6.2. Chronology of copying (based on payment records).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Date begun</th>
<th>Date completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>ricercars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9/1637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>toccatas</td>
<td>before 9/1637?</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>toccatas</td>
<td>before 9/1637?</td>
<td>-a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>ricercars</td>
<td>before 1/1639</td>
<td>3/2/1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI</td>
<td>allemande etc.</td>
<td>before 1/1639</td>
<td>9/5/1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>canzonas</td>
<td>1/1639</td>
<td>after 4/1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI</td>
<td>canzonas</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>ricercars</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>ricercars</td>
<td>before 6/1639</td>
<td>29/10/1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>madrigals</td>
<td>before 8/1639</td>
<td>after 10/1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV</td>
<td>correnti etc.</td>
<td>before 11/1639</td>
<td>3/4/1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>madrigals</td>
<td>before 11/1639</td>
<td>after 5/1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV</td>
<td>passamezzi etc.</td>
<td>before 11/1639</td>
<td>14/11/1639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>versets</td>
<td>before 12/1639</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>motets</td>
<td>before 6/1640</td>
<td>29/10/1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>versets</td>
<td>before 10/1640</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


NOTES:

\( ^a \) There is no date in vols. I and II; Mischiati ('L'intavolatura', p. 11) hypothesized that vol. I was begun before vol. VI was completed, on the basis of the placement of imitative sections pertaining to toccatas in vol. I appearing in vol. VI. The same argument applies to vol. II. The lack of dates in the two volumes suggest copying before the dates were entered more regularly (1639). See below for a problem regarding the copying order of vols. I and II.

\( ^b \) Regarding the dating of vol. XI, see ibid., p. 12.

\( ^c \) Although it is not possible to determine with certainty the dates of copying of vol. VII, in all likelihood it took place before the copying of VIII, where the latest date of the MS is found. This deduction is based on the apparent concern for dating in the years 1639-1640, the probable dates of completion of the set. Since dates are lacking here, it would appear that it was copied before 1639.

Where there are two or more volumes dedicated to one genre, the scribe usually, but not necessarily, completed one volume before beginning another; The division of DIRUTA 1593 between vols. I and II suggests that they were copied concurrently, as does the erroneous designation of vol. IX M10-11: 'from the toccatas of book II' (they are from toccatas
Further, an imitative section deleted from a toccata in vol. II (M44) was copied in vol. VI before the imitative sections deleted from vol. I M1-16, suggesting that vol. II was actually begun before vol. I.

There are gaps in payment, not all of which are recorded; it appears that payment records were kept more closely only after the beginning of 1639, since only one record is found before then. The chronology above makes it clear that during 1638 several volumes were underway, although none is marked with a date in that year. The scribe must have begun the task well before September 1637, since at least 202 folios were copied before this date. The scribe also worked on the MS after October 1640, since that date is found only on f. 44v of vol. V, and 95 folios were copied in the remainder of the volume.

The rate of copying may be projected from some of the payment dates; although it is not possible to determine the rate precisely, since volumes were copied concurrently, it appears that some of the folios listed in Table 6.3 were copied exclusively in the dates indicated, and the calculated average of folios per day is probably a good indication of copying rate.

14 M-numbers refer to the pieces according to Mischiati's inventory; each volume is numbered separately. The identification and pairing of two of these pieces is made in the present study: see below.
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Table 6.3. Rate of copying in Turin Tablatures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>folios</th>
<th>dates (d/m/y)</th>
<th>folios per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X,</td>
<td>140v-164v</td>
<td>5 to 12/4/1639</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>64v-120v</td>
<td>1/8 to 8/9/1639</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>122v-156v</td>
<td>3 or 8/9 to 4/10/1639</td>
<td>1.06 or 1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII</td>
<td>156v-184v</td>
<td>4/10 to 12/10/1639</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII</td>
<td>49v-73v</td>
<td>2/11 to 10/11/1639</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>142v-179v</td>
<td>2 to 8/3/1640</td>
<td>5.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>179v-221v</td>
<td>8/3 to 3/4/1640</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XJII</td>
<td>132v-184v</td>
<td>3/4 to 9/5/1640</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>48v-208v</td>
<td>3/6 to 29/10/1640</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE: 2.30 fols. per day.


The scribe worked as quickly as 5.29 folios per day in one instance, but was usually less rapid. At the average rate as presented here, the work would have taken about 1175 days, if done consecutively. The copying must have begun at least three months earlier than September 1637, and continued at least a month beyond October 1640. It is thus clear that the task was not a 'full time' occupation. It is reasonable to project a total copying period of about four years (1460 days), thus suggesting that the scribe worked about 'half time' at his task.

Scribal characteristics

The scribe's identity is not known, but the strongly Italianate hand and exclusive use of Italian language in the titles indicate an Italian working in south Germany sufficiently long enough to become thoroughly familiar with New German Tablature. He must have been an experienced musician. He probably copied the vocal music (vols. IV, XII and XIII) and most of the ricercars (vols. VI-IX) from partbooks, a

15 Mischiati (ibid., p. 6) suggested someone strongly influenced by Italian customs.
difficult task requiring the careful following of notation and mensuration. Several features show that he was a keyboard player: the works are copied into keyboard tablature and are predominantly keyboard-orientated, keyboard ornamentation is regularly added to works originally in partbooks, voice-leading is not consistently maintained, and texture in the vocal works is occasionally 'thinned out', making them more manageable at the keyboard. 16 Three unusual characteristics require elaboration: the scribe deleted the imitative sections of toccatas in vols. I and II; he regularly copied pieces more than once; and he occasionally made minor adjustments or emendations to the music he copied.

The scribe distinguished between genres so thoroughly that he deleted ricercar-like sections from at least thirty-four toccatas in vols. I (M2-10, 15-17, 60, 64) and II (M3, 18, 14-6, 50, 52, 56, 58-65, 67-70). He entered fourteen in ricercar volumes, as noted above: vol. VI M77 is matched with vol. II M44; vol. VI M80-90 with vol. I M2-10, 15-16; 17 and vol. IX M10-11 with vol. I M64, M60. 18 The shorter deleted sections from Padovano and Merulo toccatas were simply omitted altogether. He also copied nine imitative sections 'from the second book of toccatas' (vol. IX M1-9) which have not been paired with toccatas from either vol. I or II. 19 He did not, however, delete all the imitative sections in the two volumes; for example, in vol. II M3

16 Ibid., p. 17.
17 Identified in Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura', pp. 23-4, 59.
18 The entries in vols. VI and IX confute the theory that the scribe's deletions were merely the result of copying exemplars with deleted sections.
19 See below.
although a large imitative section is deleted, there is another imitative section (bars 25-42) which is retained; in vol. II M31, M32 and M38, imitative sections were not deleted. In the Merulo toccatas of vol. II a number of inconsistencies are found (see below, Table 6.15); the most surprising inconsistency is in M52/60 (one toccata copied twice), where the imitative section was not deleted but other material was, two times (see I:287).

The reasons the scribe deleted imitative sections are unknown, but since he was commissioned, it is possible that he was under orders to make strict genre delimitations; if so, it would explain the inconsistencies encountered: since he was not doing it for himself, he was not rigorous in carrying out the segmentation. Leaving aside the inscrutable inconsistencies, the fact of the fragmentation of the pieces is significant. There is no indication that the divided works were to be integrated in performance: no specific cross-references to aid someone performing (or copying) from the tablatures to join the pieces in vols. I, II, VI and IX together. The lack of concern for an 'ideal' complete piece reflects the fragmentation encountered in Italian keyboard music of the time.20

One of the most puzzling traits of the scribe is his copying of works twice. Duplication occurs twenty-eight times: seven toccatas, nine ricercars, eight canzonas, and four galliards.21 Thirteen occur in different volumes, fifteen within the same volume. The duplications occurring in vol. II are considered in detail in the present study and

Witess Frescobaldi’s allowance for fragmentation of works in FRESCOBALDI 1615(i), 1624, and 1635.

The tabulation of duplications here is derived from the inventory in Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura'.

---

20 Witness Frescobaldi’s allowance for fragmentation of works in FRESCOBALDI 1615(i), 1624, and 1635.

21 The tabulation of duplications here is derived from the inventory in Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura'.
the conclusions to be drawn are that in some cases two quite different exemplars were used by the copyist, and in others the same exemplar was actually copied twice. Examples of the former are M18=M56 and M19=M61; of the latter, M15=M23 and M52=M60 (all vol. II). These last two are doubly strange, placed as close to each other as they are in the MS. Only once did the scribe stop after realizing that he had already copied a piece: vol. XV M2 (fol. 8) was begun again (with a different heading, suggesting two exemplars) on fol. 42, but soon stopped, with the note directing the reader back (without actually specifying a page).

Duplication is probably due in large part to the amount of exemplars that were being handled by the scribe. None of the music unambiguously copied from a printed volume is duplicated, only those works apparently stemming from other MSS, which were numerous and doubtless in a less organized state. The process of the scribe’s classifying, ordering, and copying the mass was complex; he was after all working on several volumes at any given time, and the duplication that seems at first sight to be obvious carelessness should be regarded as an almost inevitable accident due to the size of the task that was being undertaken. The copying of one work twice in close proximity in one volume indicates that enough time intervened between the two for the scribe to forget that he had copied the work; time most likely spent copying in other volumes.

For works copied twice from different exemplars (M18=M56, M19=M61), the MS is particularly important, for it shows that two entirely different versions of the same piece were circulating— at some point, even if not at the actual time of copying. Moreover, it draws more attention, if such were needed, to the fact that the scribe had access to a large amount of music, including duplications of some works. This suggests a source library which included miscellaneous MS volumes.
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acquired by a collector. In the case of Merulo, vol. II presents two levels of dissemination: one before 1598, one after. Merulo’s revisions of the two toccatas may be seen.

The scribe regularly amended or adjusted the music he copied, but made very few errors, to judge from comparison of his work with concordances. Several general characteristics of his copying may be summarized here. He transposed works printed with high clefs down a fourth as a rule, but in vol. II this appears to have been of lesser concern, for not all high-clef works are transposed; this may be due to the use of intavolatura as an exemplar, not four part-books with more traditional clefs. More importantly, his regard for exemplars was tempered by a sense of musical individuality. He was not unwaveringly bound to the exemplar he used, and in addition to copying carefully, he emended errors in prints, or even passages he interpreted as errors. A number of errors are explored below (MS sections five, seven and eight) and examples of his improvements are given.

This freedom to change is also reflected in small details of copying such as the altering of notation (e.g. the changing of a two tied minims to a single semibreve), the lack of concern for ties, the regular re-arrangement of the last chord of a piece, and so on. The tabulation of these demonstrates the lesser value of such tabulation in defining exemplars, because the scribe did it regardless of his exemplar. More significant is the addition of ornamentation to works originally free of them. This is not as applicable in vol. II, but for works copied from part-books, it is a common occurrence. Even the Merulo Masses in vol. III, copied from a keyboard print which itself contains a

---

22 Mischiati, ‘L'intavolatura', p. 17. Mischiati erred in that the practice is not consistent.
large amount of elementary ornamentation, is regularly changed in this regard. 23

Changes and additions naturally arouse doubt as to the quality of copying, but this is not borne out through close inspection of works in these tablatures. On the contrary, examination of his work on the seventy-six toccatas in vol. II and about eighty works in other volumes 24 leaves one impressed by the scribe’s high degree of accuracy. He worked carefully; there are very few signs of errors in the volume. Even where there are variants, rarely is there a bad mistake. There are few deletions visible, and the MS is spacious, neat and legible. This judgement of the scribe’s working methods depends upon determining the exemplars he used, and much of the detailed discussion below centres on that topic. The broad view, however, is probably more important in coming to conclusions regarding the question of exemplars. Variants tabulated for one piece, or even one set of pieces, need to be assimilated with variants on a contextual basis; scribal method is determined by examining as large a cross-section of works as possible. The scribal methods determined here show the work of a competent musician, an exceptionally good scribe, and a keyboard player confident in his willingness to adjust the text to give improved readings.

The contradiction between inconsistencies in handling imitative sections or duplicating pieces, both of which suggest a certain carelessness, and the scribe’s careful copying procedure on the bar-to-bar level is difficult to reconcile. The fact of his careful copying is undeniable and important; it is idle to speculate about the less consistent aspects of copying without more concrete evidence. At any

23 See Merulo, Messe, ed. Judd, Critical Commentary, for a detailed presentation of the altered embellishment.

24 Merulo Masses (vol. III) and ricercars (vol. VI, VIII, and IX).
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rate, it is clear that the scribe placed more importance on the detailed level than on the overall structure and content of the sixteen volumes.

Volume II

The volume comprises 76 toccatas on 119 folios, divisible into nine sections:

Table 6.4. Sections in vol. II.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>M nos.</th>
<th>Contents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-11</td>
<td>H. L. Hassler, Erbach, A. Gabrieli, anon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12-20</td>
<td>Merulo (M18-19 from Toccate (1598 and 1604)), anon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>G. Gabrieli, anon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>31-3</td>
<td>from G. and A. Gabrieli, Intonationi (1593)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>34-9</td>
<td>from Diruta, Il Transilvano (1593 etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40-3</td>
<td>Giovanni Staden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>44-51</td>
<td>from Padovano, Toccate (1604)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>52-71</td>
<td>from Merulo, Toccate (1598 and 1604)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>72-6</td>
<td>anon., H. L. Hassler, Erbach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Works without printed concordances (M1-17, 20-30, 40-3, 72-6; thirty-seven in all) make up slightly less than half the volume. Of the nine sections, five contain works with printed concordances; only two (those containing Diruta and Padovano) agree with the prints in the ordering of the pieces. Works with concordances receive the most attention here; systematic comparison with other contemporary sources is undertaken, and possible exemplars for the works are posited. The sections show that
both German and Italian works appear in the MS, but they are generally grouped separately. None of the German works were copied from printed sources, which is not surprising, considering the infrequency of German toccata publications (unlike in Italy).

It is reasonable to assume that the exemplars for the unica were other MSS; much of the examination that follows attempts to determine whether printed volumes were used as exemplars for the remainder of the works, or whether manuscript versions intervened. Each section is examined according to its ordering, concordances, variants with concordances, and attributions. The hypothesis that a fairly large number of independent manuscripts were used as exemplars receives considerable support; but more tangibly, wherever the copies in vol. II stem from, their readings often reflect considerable thought and care on the part of the scribe, and deserve to be considered in critical editions of these pieces. On occasion, the scribe had demonstrably less difficulty in 'editing' works than some modern editors.

Section one: the opening miscellany (M1-11)

This section consists of toccatas by H. L. Hassler, Erbach, A. Gabrieli, and anon., outlined in Table 6.5.25 The works are generally ordered according to their titles, except M6; additionally, M1-3 are ordered according to tone. These titles do not actually reflect different genres; all of the works are toccatas. The distribution of composers and lack of more coherent ordering of the works indicate reference to several manuscripts in a fairly haphazard manner; one might expect that M6 would have been put with works with the same title.

25 Publ.: Erbach, ed. Rayner, IV; A. Gabrieli and four following, ed. Dalla Libera; M1, 3 and 4 are given in Appendix C (II: 222).
### Table 6.5. Toccatas M1-11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M no.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>ambitus $^a$</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Tone $^b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>intonatio</td>
<td>H. L. Hassler</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>D-$f''$</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Erbach</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>D-$e\ fl&quot;$</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>H. L. Hassler</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E-$f''$</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Toccata overo Ricercar</td>
<td>[Erbach]</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>C-$f'''$</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>A. Gabrieli</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>F-$b\ fl&quot;$</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Praeambulum</td>
<td>anon.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E-$e''$</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Erbach</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>F-$f'''$</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

$^a$ The ambitus is gauged according to the actual range of the works, since there are no clefs.

$^b$ Tones are not indicated in the titles to M5 and 11, and are determined by analogy with MERULO 1567, 1598 and 1604.

$^c$ Attributed (in a different hand from that of the scribe) to ‘Romanini’ in the MS; it is concordant with a toccata attributed to Erbach in Berlin 40316 (Mischiati, ‘L’intavolatura’, p. 28 n43).

The anonymous works were attributed to Andrea Gabrieli by Dalla Libera on erroneous grounds; they are also doubtful because of their titles, which suggest German provenance, and their style, which is unlike Gabrieli’s known work. Considering the miscellaneous nature of the section, it is likely that these three works came to the scribe as a small collection without attribution. The relatively disorganized

---

$^{26}$ Edn. p. [ii]. Mischiati, ‘L’intavolatura’, p. 15, showed that Dalla Libera’s basis for attribution, the table of contents, was not compiled until the time of its binding in the 18th century, and was probably based on nothing more than the attribution directly preceding the works.

$^{27}$ The Latin term was more in use in German-speaking lands than Italy. It is noteworthy that the Germans represented in vol. II receive Italianate references: the works of Hassler, Erbach and Staden are named ‘toccata’; and Staden’s Christian name is given in its Italian form, ‘Giovanni’. The titles here are the only non-Italianate ones in the volume.
nature of the section suggests that there were several manuscript exemplars.

M3

Only one of the first eleven toccatas has a concordance: M3 is partially concordant with the toccata vol. I M3 and MS Padua 1982 no. 2. Diagram 6.1 illustrates the relationship between vol. I M3 and vol. II M3. The solid line (bars 1 to 23.2, 25.3 to 26.2, and 177.1-187.1; bar numbers follow the von Werra edition) indicates concordance with only minor variants; but whereas two breves of music lie between 23.2 and 25.3 in vol. I M3 and Padua 1982, only one breve is found in vol. II M3 (marked \_ in the diagram). Bars 26.3-176.4 are omitted from vol. I M3 and appear in vol. VI M81 intact. Bars 43.1 to 176.4 are omitted in vol. II M3, but were not copied elsewhere. The two versions are brought to a different close: vol. I M3 and Padua 1982 have 5.3 breves (total of 192), Turin vol. II has 3.1 breves (marked \_ in the diagram) (total of 54 1/2). Since the two cadence in the same key, certain resemblances are found in their last few bars.

---

28 Vol. I M3, coupled with the imitative section vol. VI M81, is entirely concordant with Padua 1982 no. 2.

29 The edition of Padua 1982 (Erbach. Hassler and Hassler, Werke, ed. von Werra, pp. 105-11), was used for comparison. Mischiati's comparison of the three versions ('L'intavolatura', p. 23) is accurate as far as it goes, but necessarily brief.

- One breve in vol. II, two breves in vol. I. No overt relationship between the two.
- Bars 26.3-176.4 omitted from vol. I, and appear in vol. VI (M81) intact.
- Bars 43.1-176.4 omitted from vol. II (not copied elsewhere in the collection).
- 3.1 breves in vol. II, 5.3 breves in vol. I. Little overt relationship between the two.

The deletion of imitative sections from both vol. I M3 and vol. II M3 is a scribal characteristic; it is noteworthy that he was inconsistent, deleting a larger portion from vol. I than from vol. II. Vol. I M3 is closely linked to Padua 1982 no. 2, and one may have been copied from the other (see below). The variants between vol. I M3 and vol. II M3 suggest that the scribe had two exemplars of the work, and did not copy the same exemplar twice; they are minor and not accounted for according to scribal method. The different transition in bars 23.3 to 25.2 and the different ending confirm that two exemplars were at hand. Indications are that vol. I M3 was copied before vol. II M3, since ornaments are all fully written out in vol. I, but abbreviated in vol. II. Also, the care in dovetailing and deleting the imitative section of vol. I is consistent with the theory of planning such partitioning carefully, as in vol. I M2-17; the good intentions of partitioning seem to have deteriorated by vol. II M3, where little evidence of consistency is found.
Section two: Merulo, anon. (M12-20)

Section two contains nine toccatas, and is summarized in Table 6.6.

Table 6.6. Toccatas M12-20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M no.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>ambitus&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Tone&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Toccata</td>
<td>Merulo</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>F-b flat''</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>seconda</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>F-c''</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>terza</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>E-b flat'</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>11/5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>primi toni</td>
<td>anon.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>D-a'</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>per l’Organo</td>
<td>Merulo</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>BB flat-f'</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F-f'</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>high&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>low&lt;sup&gt;e&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>con minute</td>
<td>anon.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>G-f''</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:

<sup>a</sup>Nos. 12, 13, and 14 are high, no. 16 is low, and nos. 15, 17 and 20 are unable to be determined.

<sup>b</sup>Tones are determined by analogy with MERULO 1567, 1598 and 1604.

<sup>c</sup>The tonal type b - high - D does not occur in Merulo’s tonally categorized works; Tone 9 is classed b - low - D, so this work is correctly classed as Tone 10 on the basis of the analogy with b - high - A as Tone 4.

<sup>d</sup>g2c5f3 in the print; the actual range is F-b flat''.

<sup>e</sup>clc6f4 in the print; the actual range is C-g''.

The unusually low range of M16 (it also uses E flat, a note not often found on early keyboards) is not found in other keyboard works of Merulo and indicates that the copyist transposed it down. Also unusual is the use of A flat in M12 bar 63, a pitch not used by Merulo elsewhere (its high range precludes suggesting that the copyist transposed this work as well). Three toccatas have concordances: M15 with another piece in the 30M12-14, 16-17 and 20 are published in Merulo, Toccate, ed. Dalla Libera, vol. 3; M15 is in G. Gabrieli, Composizioni, ed. Dalla Libera, vol. 2, pp. 58-60; M18 and M19 are given below in parallel with their other versions.
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same volume (M23); M18 with 1598:8 \(^{31}\) (and another version at M56); and M19 with 1604:8 (and another version at M61). The titles of M12-14 suggest a single exemplar; M16-19, all by Merulo, another. M15 and M20 may or may not stem from either; it is likely that at least two exemplars were used for the section. The works without concordance are examined first; then M15, and finally the two toccatas concordant with the prints.

The toccatas attributed to Merulo which have no concordances (M12-14, 16-17) have little in common with the toccatas in 1598 and 1604. Particularly noteworthy is the lack of mannered ornamentation and figuration so common in the prints, and the chordal foundation which differs from linear orientation of the printed toccatas. Dalla Libera proposed that they constitute a 'terzo libro', \(^{32}\) but they should more properly be considered as predecessors to the printed works, on stylistic grounds. Indeed, Dalla Libera recognized this, for he suggested that the works were copied from manuscripts which predated the prints of toccatas. \(^{33}\) The hypothesis that M12-14 and 16-17 are early works is confirmed through examination of M18-19, which although concordant with printed versions have variants significant enough to show that they stem from exemplars which predate the prints. It is known that Merulo had some toccatas prepared for printing as early as 1567 (see MERULO 1567); these may be the same works. Since the tablatures have a close affinity with Venetian music, the Merulo

\(^{31}\) Merulo's two books of toccatas (MERULO 1598 and 1604) are hereafter abbreviated with their publication dates.

\(^{32}\) Edn., III:[i]. Since these five works, unlike the printed volumes, are not in a tonal order, the proposal is vague at best.

\(^{33}\) Edn., I:[i]. While the suggestion is confirmed by the present study for the works in section two, it is confuted for the works in section eight; see below.
toccatas in section two most likely stem from a manuscript of Venetian provenance, perhaps from the collection of Hassler, who spent eighteen months in Venice in 1584-1585, and later worked in Augsburg. Since Merulo left Venice at the end of 1584, it is possible that the two communicated directly; at any rate, the toccatas were somehow taken north where they formed part of the music collection ultimately used by the Turin copyist.

M20, unattributed, should not be considered a work of Merulo's. Stylistically it differs from M12-17, let alone the printed toccatas. Since most of the group contains attributions to Merulo, the lack of attribution here suggests that it is not by Merulo.

Dalla Libera's edition of the works is generally accurate, but the occasional silent corrections or errors warrant a critical commentary (Table 6.7).

---

35 M20 was attributed to Merulo by Dalla Libera on the basis of the unreliable table of contents at the head of the volume.

Bar lines are editorial (usually every one breve). Note values are unaltered, but the MS never uses values greater than a semibreve; tied notes in the MS are frequently altered to single long note values in the edition. Since they do not affect the sound of the pieces, they are not noted here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar beat, voice</th>
<th>error¹</th>
<th>correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

M12: *Toccata* / di Ms. / Claudio. /

| 10.3,t   | m      | cr       |
| 11.1,a   | MS: e'  | edn.: f'  |
| 42.1,b   | round brackets | rest is in MS |
| 54.3,a   | sb      | m        |

M13: *Toccata* / seconda / di Ms. / Claudio.

| 14.3-4,b | sb      | no note value in MS |
| 39.6,b   | first sq: G | MS pitch: B flat |

M14: *Toccata* / 3.a di / Ms Claudio.

| 7.1,t    | MS: m   | edn.: sb (silent correction; footnote indicates this applies to t and b, but b is sb in MS) |
| 11.3,b   | m       | no note value |

M15: *Toccata* / Primi / Toni.

| 1.2-3,satb | 4xm and cr rest | 4x dotted m |
| 14.2,b     | round brackets | note is in MS |
| 19.4,b     | round brackets | note is in MS |
| 22.4-23.1,t | round brackets | tie is in MS |
| 23.1,b     | 4th q pitch = D | MS: G |

M16: *Toccata* di / Ms. Claudio / per l'Organo.

| 21.1,t    | MS: e   | edn.: c (silent correction) |
| 43.3,t    | sb      | MS gives a tie preceding the note, indicating that it should be held for as much of the bar as possible (the scales in the b must interrupt it) |

| 49.1,b    | pitch = B flat | BB flat in MS |
| 53.3,a    | sb      | as 43.3; scales in t |
| 56.1-2,t  | sb      | m and editorial m rest |
| 56.3,t    | rest    | sb c' |
Table 6.7 (cont.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bar beat</th>
<th>voice error</th>
<th>correction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M17: Toccata / di Ms. / Claud.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3,t</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>sb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.2-3,t</td>
<td>tied</td>
<td>an editorial addition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.2,t</td>
<td>ornament</td>
<td>MS uses shorthand notation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.3,t</td>
<td>MS: m</td>
<td>edn.: sb (silent correction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M20: Toccata / con minute.

| 4.4,sat | no notes | add m chord: d'', a', f' |

Notes:

Unless otherwise noted, all entries in the 'Error' column refer to the edn., all entries in the 'Correction' column to the MS. Abbreviations: sq = semiquaver; q = quaver; cr = crotchet; m = minim; sb = semibreve; add = additional.

M15 and 23

M15 occurs without attribution both here and at M23; the latter is attributed to G. Gabrieli by Dalla Libera on the basis of its position: it immediately follows M22, entitled 'Toccate di Giouan Gabriel. Toccata Prima.'.

Attributions at only the first of a series of toccatas by one composer are also found in sections seven and eight and support Dalla Libera's blanket attribution here. More problematic is the copying of M15/M23 twice in such close proximity: the two versions are nearly identical.

It suggests that there was a time lag between the two, despite their proximity; and either there were two exemplars of the same piece to hand, or (more likely) the same exemplar was copied twice.

36 Dalla Libera attributed eight toccatas in all (M23-30) to G. Gabrieli (edn., II:[iii]).

37 The errors in Dalla Libera's edn. (II:58-60) are noted in in Table 6.7. There are only two minor variants between M15 and M23: bar 2.3,s (b flat in M23, b natural in M15) and 22.4-23.1,s (no tie in M23, tie in M15).
Chapter six: Turin

In any case, the copies show that the scribe worked accurately in this instance; no other MS toccatas in the volume share this degree of conformity with their concordances, suggesting that one exemplar was copied twice.

M18 and 1598:8

The two Turin versions of Merulo's 'toccata ottavo quarto tono' (1598:8; MS M18, M56) help to establish some of the scribe's working habits and show that Merulo's toccata was extant in more than one version in the early 17th century.38 M18 and 1598:8 are presented in parallel format in Example 6.1.

---

38 Neither Mischiati nor Dalla Libera considered the differences between the versions carefully; the former ('L'intavolatura', p. 29) erred in stating that only bars 20-8 are omitted from M18 (bars 20-45, 54.3-55.2, and 61.1-63.3 are omitted, and others are added in the MS version), and the latter (edn., I:[iii]) did not note the additional material in M18 and made no mention of most of the differences between the two MS versions.
Example 6.1. 1598:8 and M18 in parallel format.
Example 6.1 (cont.).
Example 6.1 (cont.)
Example 6.1 (cont.).
Example 6.1 (cont.).

\[\text{Example notation here.}\]
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Example 6.1 (cont.).
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Example 6.1 (cont.).
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Example 6.1 (cont.).
Example 6.1 (cont.).
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Example 6.1 (cont.).
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Example 6.1 (cont.).
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Example 6.1 (cont.).
Example 6.1 (cont.).
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Example 6.1 (cont.).

\[ \text{M18} \]

\[ \text{1543-8} \]
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Example 6.1 (cont.).
Chapter six: Turin

The two are generally similar from bars 1 to 19.4; bars 20-45 are not found in the MS, but two bars not found in the print act as a short transition from bar 20 to 46. From here the two again generally coincide until bar 54.3, at which point a short imitative section is inserted in the MS (4 bars), and four beats (54.3-55.2) of the print are omitted. At bar 55.3, the two again coincide, except the note values of the MS are double that of the print, up to 56.3. Here the note values return to equal and the two coincide to bar 60.4; 61.1-63.2 are omitted from the MS, and the two present roughly equivalent endings, except the MS concludes in a higher register.

The omission of bars 20-45 is not exceptional—as already noted, the scribe deleted imitative sections from many toccatas. But the addition, at the same point, of material which is not found in the print suggests that the imitative section may not even have been in the exemplar, although it is possible that the exemplar contained both the additional material and the now-absent imitative section. Even more unusual is the inclusion of a brief imitative section not found in the print, after bar 54.3. According to the pattern, the scribe should have omitted this as with bars 20-45; that he did not supports the hypothesis that bars 20-45 were not in his exemplar. The presence of this small imitative section also suggests that the scribe did not carefully segregate imitative and non-imitative parts of the Merulo toccatas, thus making it impossible to discern a systematic method in this regard. The basic differences in the two versions of the toccata thus suggest an

39 The hypothesis that the scribe deleted the bars and added his own linking passage is less supportable, since this work is the only instance of substantial additional material in the Merulo toccatas, where the scribe deleted nineteen imitative sections in twenty-one pieces.

40 This is not surprising, given their nature; see below, I:286, and Table 6.13.
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exemplar far removed from the print of 1598. This accords with the hypothesis regarding the Merulo toccatas adjacent to M18, and it is probable that this version of the toccata dates from Merulo’s tenure in Venice, 1557-1584.

The variants between M18 and 1598:8 in bars 1-19 are similar to those found in most MS copies with concordances and fall into eight classes, given in full here to exemplify the variants throughout the MS.

Table 6.8. Variants in 1598:8 and M18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bar.beat,voice</th>
<th>Variant</th>
<th>bar.beat,voice</th>
<th>Variant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2-3,t</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>12.3-4,t</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4-2.1,s</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>13.2-3,sa</td>
<td>NT+R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2-3,t</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>13.1-2,t</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4-3.1,a</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>13.3-4,sa</td>
<td>Pm+Pm+Pm+R+R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2-3,t</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>13.3-4,b</td>
<td>Pm+R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3-4,s</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>13.4-14.1,st</td>
<td>NT+NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3-4,b</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>14.2,a</td>
<td>Pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-3,a</td>
<td>R+Oct</td>
<td>14.3-4,at</td>
<td>NT+NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1-2,t</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>14.4-15.1,s</td>
<td>NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1-2,at</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>15.1,s</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1-2,b</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>15.1-2,a</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.1-2,t</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>15.3-16.2,s</td>
<td>R+R+Pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.1,b</td>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>15.4-16.1,a</td>
<td>P+R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.3-4,t</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>15.4,t</td>
<td>Pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1-2,sat</td>
<td>T+T+NT+P</td>
<td>16.1,t</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4-10.1,t</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>16.3-4,s</td>
<td>R+NT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1-2,a</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>16.4,t</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.4,t</td>
<td>Pm</td>
<td>17.1-2,b</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3-4,a</td>
<td>NT</td>
<td>17.3-4,sat</td>
<td>Pm+R+R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3,b</td>
<td>Orn</td>
<td>18.1-4,b</td>
<td>Major R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.1,b</td>
<td>P+P</td>
<td>19.2,b</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.2,t</td>
<td>Pm</td>
<td>19.3-4,atb</td>
<td>Pm+Pm+P</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABBREVIATIONS:

NT: tied note in the print not tied in the MS;
T: notes not tied in the print are tied (or made into a longer note value) in the MS;
P: pitch in the print is altered in the MS;
R: rhythmic variant;
Oct: octave displacement in the MS;
Pm: pitch in the print is missing in the MS;
Orn: ornament is presented in a different manner in the MS;
Major R: major rhythmic variant occurs.

(cont. overleaf)
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Table 6.8 (cont.).

TOTALS:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pm</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orn</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maj R</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These variants are of only limited value in further determining an exemplar for M18. The Tie, No Tie, and Octave variants are attributable to the scribe’s method or the notation itself. Ties generally do not seem to have been important to the scribe, although his treatment of them is statistically consistent. Octave variants are attributable to small slips in the notation, as they are indicated only by lines above the letters. For many of the variants listed here and seen in Example 6.1, no plausible theory can dismiss the possibility of the scribe simply altering complex passages in the work. On the other hand, many of the Pitch variants and the major Rhythm variant must have stemmed from a source other than the print. Beyond this, little else can be deduced. The evidence presented here regarding the nature and cohesiveness of M16-19 supports the hypothesis that this work stemmed from a MS which predated the print; it is therefore evident that Merulo did not radically alter the first nineteen bars of the piece when he revised it for publication in 1598.

The other copy of 1598:8 in vol. II, M56, bears little resemblance to M18. It is transposed down a fourth (the print gives high clefs) in accordance with the scribe’s practice; in bars 1-19, there are eight variants between M56 and 1598:8: four Tie and four Rhythm. These are relatively small and suggest an exemplar close to the print or the print
itself. Bars 20.1-27.2 and 28.1-31.4 are omitted from M56, indicating the unsystematic handling of imitative sections. Unlike the duplication of M15 and 23, the copies M18 and 56 are quite different; the scribe certainly had access to two versions of the toccata.

**M19 and 1604:8**

Like M18, there are two versions of Merulo’s ‘toccata ottava ottavo tono’ (1604:8) in the MS: M19, and M61. M19 is quite different from the other two. Example 6.2 presents 1604:8 and M19 in parallel format.

---

41 Mischiati did not note this.
Example 6.2. 1604:8 and M19 in parallel format.
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Example 6.2 (cont.).
Example 6.2 (cont.).
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Example 6.2 (cont.).

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Example 6.2 (cont.)} \\
\end{array} \]
Example 6.2 (cont.).
Example 6.2 (cont.).
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Example 6.2 (cont.).

\[ ... \]

\[ ... \]

\[ ... \]
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Mischiati noted that there was 'una certa semplificazione delle figure ornamentali' in M19; the numerous variants in addition to this (bars 24-5 and 64-5 present several clear examples) indicate that the two versions are relatively independent. Perhaps most interesting is the doubled note values in the imitative section, bars 42.3 to 50.2 (similar to the doubled note values in the imitative section of M18). This section has relatively few variants, none which simplify the ornaments. As in M18, the variants in M19 probably stem from an early version of the toccata and Merulo himself. The lack of changes in the imitative section indicates that Merulo's revisions did not affect this section as the remainder, and that his notation of complex ornaments developed from simpler beginnings. The doubled note values seem justified and compatible with ricercar composition of the period, but performance-tempo would probably not have been affected by the difference. Unlike M18, the basic structure of the piece is unchanged, and the variants are mostly of the 'surface' type, indicating a revision process that touched upon mannered ornamentation more than anything else.

The second copy, M61, is more closely related to the version of the print (see below), and as with M18 there were certainly two exemplars of 1604:8 available to the scribe.

It is highly likely that the two toccatas M18 and 19 are early versions of toccatas printed at the end of Merulo's life, and comparison with the printed versions allows a revision process to be seen, in which Merulo's primary emendations appear to have been the elaboration of ornamentation and the addition or alteration of imitative sections. Of

42 'L'intavolatura', p. 29 n45. Alvini, preface to repr. p. [ii], erred in supposing M19 to be 'restored [ricondurre] to its pure chordal structure'; the numerous instances of elaborate embellishment confute the theory that this piece is somehow an 'idealization' of 1604:8.
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the other toccatas in this section of the MS, only M12 contains an
imitative section, and none contains elaborate ornamentation. It is
therefore reasonable to propose that chronologically the toccatas M18-19
postdate the other works in the section, and all date from before 1584.

Section three: G. Gabrieli, anon. (M21-30)

Section three contains ten toccatas, two attributed, as shown in
Table 6.9. M22 is headed 'Toccate di Giouan Gabriell.', so the
following toccatas may be attributed to him.\footnote{All ten are published in G. Gabrieli, Composizioni, ed. Dalla Libera, II:54-74.}

Table 6.9. Toccatas 21-30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M no.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>ambitus</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Toccata</td>
<td>G. Gabrieli</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>F-a''</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Toccata. Prima.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>D-b''</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Toccata Primi Toni.</td>
<td>anon.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>D-a''</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Toccata Primi Toni.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>G-a''</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Toccata.</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F-b''</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>G-f''</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F-b''</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>F-g''</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>F-a''</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>D-g''</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ordering shows no sign of a tonal plan such as found in A. & G.
GABRIELI 1593 or MERULO 1598 and 1604. The predominance of tones 1 and
7 perhaps reflects a more modern outlook, which would accord with
attributing the anonymous works to Giovanni. The only work to have a
concordance is M23, discussed above. None of the works contain
imitative sections. It is interesting to note the similarity of the
openings of M25 and 27: the first three and a half breves of the two
works are identical. This supports the theory that the section is
unified and by a single composer.
Section four: Andrea Gabrieli (M31-3)

This consists of three unattributed toccatas which are concordant with pieces from A. & G. GABRIELI 1593. They are distinguished from the previous section by the inclusion of tone categories in their titles. The works are in a different order from that of the print, which contains eleven intonations and their transpositions by Giovanni, eight intonations and four toccatas by Andrea. The toccatas are in tonal order in the print, where the tones are indicated in the titles; in the MS, the fourth, second and third toccatas are copied, in that order.

The MS versions are very similar to the print. Variants of the type found in M18 and shown in Table 6.8 are also common here; several cases of a series of notes errant by the interval of a third suggest that the exemplar was in staff notation. Some variants indicate preferable readings in the MS to that of the print, suggesting a capable copying job; eight such instances from M31 are given here to represent the scribe’s way of improving his exemplar with ‘editorial’ decisions.

Example 6.3. GABRIELI 1593, toccata del nono tono, bar 7.1-2 (MS fol. 37, system 1).

Print:  

MS:  

The bass f in the print is an obvious error, corrected to a in the MS. The change in the MS is suggested editorially in the modern edition.44

44 Edn. p. 23 (Pidoux did not refer to the MS in his edition).
Example 6.4. GABRIELI 1593, toccata del nono tono, bar 11.3 (MS fol. 36v, system 2).

Print:  

\[ \text{MS:} \]

The rhythm error in the print (bass) is corrected in the MS (corrected silently in the edition, p. 23).

Example 6.5. GABRIELI 1593, toccata del nono tono, bar 30.3-4 (MS fol. 38, system 1).

Print:  

\[ \text{MS:} \]

In the lower stave, the print version is repetitive and suggests a typesetting error; the MS emendation reflects the scribe’s awareness of its weakness.

Example 6.6. GABRIELI 1593, toccata del nono tono, bar 33.1-4 (MS fol. 37v, system 2).

Print:  

\[ \text{MS:} \]

The weak bass figure in the print (with its repeated at the end of beat 2 and beginning of beat 3) is altered in the MS. (Note also the in the MS, obviously an understood accidental in the original.)
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Example 6.7. GABRIELI 1593, toccata del nono tono, bar 37.1–4 (MS fol. 38, system 2).

Print:  

MS:

The scale and chord following (upper parts) are lowered a third in the MS. This is possibly an error in reading the exemplar a third too low, but also possibly an editorial emendation. The MS leap of two octaves seems preferable to the print leap of a thirteenth.

Example 6.8. GABRIELI 1593, toccata del nono tono, bar 55.3–4 (MS fol. 38, system 4).

Print:  

MS:

An obvious error in the print (e') is altered in the MS. Note also the alto, where a semibreve is substituted for two minims (a common variant throughout the MS).

45 It is unlikely to be an adjustment for reasons of range, since c''' occurs elsewhere in the MS.
Example 6.9. GABRIELI 1593, toccata del nono tono, bar 66.3-4 (MS fol. 38v, system 2).

Print:

MS:

Another error in the print (tenor) is corrected in the MS, making the previous $a'$ into a semibreve.

Example 6.10. GABRIELI 1593, toccata del nono tono, bar 72.1 (MS fol. 38v, system 3).

Print:

MS:

A repeated $a$ (tenor), possibly an error in the print, is changed to $c'$ in the MS, thus filling out the A minor chord.

The variants shown here indicate the careful corrections the scribe made. There is only one copying error of any significance: two beats are omitted in M32 (bar 13.1-2). Even this is attributable to a simple slip, since the two omitted beats are almost identical to bar 13.3-4.

The variants are not significant enough to suggest 'early drafts' as in Examples 6.1 and 6.2; since the versions are so close, the scribe must have worked from a source close to the print; but the absence of one

They could, of course, have stemmed from the scribe's exemplar. The variants are valid, wherever they stem from; but the similarity of these with many variants found in the volume suggest that the present scribe made the adjustments himself.
toccata and the lack of order in the MS indicate that the actual
exemplar was not the print. Two toccatas (M31-2) have imitative
sections, but neither is deleted.

Section five: Diruta toccatas (M34-9)

This section, six toccatas from DIRUTA 1593, is the first to
contain a series which follows a printed concordance in exact order and
closely similar title and attribution. The only feature of the MS
copies that brings the exemplar into question is the fact that the
thirteen toccatas in the original print are divided between vols. II and
I of the MS, nos. 1-6 here and nos. 7-13 in vol. I, M40-6. Why this was
done is not known; it indicates that the two MS volumes were copied
concurrently, and the scribe for some reason switched to the other
volume after he copied the first six toccatas.

M34-9 present versions which are very close to the print, and it is
likely that the print was used as exemplar. Having said this, the
different editions of the print (1593, 1597, 1612, 1625) have certain
variants that invite consideration as to which was used as exemplar.
The MS does not entirely agree with any of the four editions in their
variants; this accords with the pattern seen thus far in that the scribe
emended errors or perceived errors in the prints. Table 6.10 presents
the variants which may prove significant for determining which edition
was used.

---

47 Mischiati ('L'intavolatura', p. 30) noted the concordance between
four of these toccatas and Schmid, Tabulatur Buch, but the absence of
two other toccatas found in Schmid, their different ordering there, and
the presence in Schmid of the only toccata from A. & G. GABRIELI 1593
not to have been included in the MS is evidence enough to dismiss the
suggestion that the Turin scribe used Schmid as an exemplar.
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Table 6.10. Variants in Diruta prints\(^a\) collated with MS. ('x' indicates which edition the MS agrees with.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M no.</th>
<th>bar no.</th>
<th>1593</th>
<th>1597</th>
<th>1612</th>
<th>1625</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3-4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>19.3-4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.4-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

\(^a\) Variants between the prints were collated in Diruta, repr. ed. Soehnlen and Bradshaw, pp. 38-41, and I have relied on the variants presented there for comparing the prints with the MS in the present table (the MS is not considered by Soehnlen and Bradshaw).

As Table 6.10 indicates, the problem is perplexing since the MS does not consistently agree with any one print's readings. Four examples serve to illustrate the point:

Example 6.11. Diruta, Il Transilvano, Toccata di salto cativo del sesto tono, bar 5 (MS fol. 44v system 4).

1593, 1612:  

\[\text{[Musical notation image]}\]

1597, 1625:  

\[\text{[Musical notation image]}\]
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Example 6.11 (cont.).

MS:

The chord in the lower parts agrees more closely with the 1593 and 1612 editions, not the 1597 or 1625. (Although the MS has no chord here, the scribe adopted the technique of writing a long chord only once, assuming it to be held until changed; so the chord which began in bar 4 would be held throughout bar 5. It unlikely to be simply a case of omitting the chord, given the common occurrence of such unwritten chord extensions in the MS.)

On the other hand, in bar 8 the MS version agrees with the exact opposite:


The chord in the top parts beats 3 and 4 agrees with 1597 and 1625, unlike Example 6.11.

In these two examples the difficulty of determining the exemplar may be seen. Generally speaking, the most inconsequential differences are the least likely to have been changed purposely, and therefore most useful for this question. So for example the variant in the same work,
bar 15, is a fairly certain indication that the 1625 edition was not used:

Example 6.13. Diruta, Il Transilvano, Toccata di salto cativo del sesto tono, bar 15 (MS fol. 45v system 1).

1593, 1597, 1612, MS: 1625:

The difference (presence or absence of the tenor g, beat 3) is obviously minor; it is highly unlikely that if the scribe was using the 1625 edition he would have emended his fairly consistent reading by altering it as found in the earlier editions.

It is not possible to deduce the edition that the scribe used any further, due to his habit of emending or altering versions as he saw fit. Errors in the prints which were obvious were probably corrected by him. Examples 6.11-13 can be reconciled only by acknowledging that the scribe made frequent emendations for musical reasons.

The MS versions of M34-9 contain an assortment of variants which coincide with none of the editions, a few of which present improved readings on the prints; one example may be cited here.


All prints: MS:
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The variant in the soprano here probably stemmed from the scribe's wish to improve the repetitious line in the print (similar Ex. 6.5).

Most of the variants in these works reflect, as in section four, careful readings of these toccatas, with numerous emendations intended as corrections to the print. Only one of the toccatas (A. Gabrieli's, M38) has an imitative section; it was not deleted in the MS version.

Section six: Giovanni Staden (M40-3)

This section comprises toccatas by Staden (1581-1634), an organist in Nuremberg most of his life; he replaced Caspar Hassler there (St Lorenz, 1616). Mischiati established that Caspar's son Johann Benedict was working in Augsburg at the time of the manuscript's copying, so it is reasonable to propose that the works reached the MS via him and his father, and date from Caspar's time in Nuremberg prior to 1616.

Each work is identified with Staden's name in the MS, and they have no concordances. They are short works (respectively 15, 14, 13, and 12 breves) in four different tonal types, as seen in Table 6.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M no.</th>
<th>system</th>
<th>ambitus</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>D-a''</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>D-a''</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>G-a''</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>D-b''</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The works resemble the Italianate style popular in early seventeenth-century south Germany, and may represent Staden's

---

48 Transcribed in Appendix C (II:231).
50 Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura', p. 7.
contribution to ‘intonation’ writing. Their brevity and chordal basis (there are no imitative sections in the works) bear little relation to the developments of Italian toccata writing exemplified by Merulo or Frescobaldi, nor to the more idiomatic keyboard writing found in the works of Hassler, Erbach or Sweelinck.

Section seven: Padovano, 'incerto' (M44-51)

These toccatas are all concordant with works from PADOVANO 1604,51 which comprises three toccatas and two ricercars by Padovano, and five toccatas designated only ‘d’incerto’; the eight toccatas are copied here in the order of the print (the two ricercars are copied in vol. VI along with the imitative section from Padovano’s first toccata).

Comparison of the MS and printed versions reveals a similar method of copying to that of sections four and five; the MS presents versions which are fairly close to the print. There are a number of variants, most attributable to the method of the scribe, some of which present improvements upon the print. Moreover, certain ambiguities in the print are resolved in the MS version. Two examples with which the modern editor had difficulty are shown below; the MS version interpreted the awkward printed edition fairly carefully.

51 Ed. Speer, with which comparison was made.
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Example 6.15a. Padovano, Toccata del Ottavo Tono, bar 5 (MS fol. 55v system 2).

Print: 52

Neither the print nor the MS is perfectly satisfactory in this instance. Judging from the MS, there should be a dotted minim on beat 2. The MS omission of one voice (the scribe was fairly careful regarding texture, and occasionally avoided thick doubling as in the original by omitting voices) makes the spot awkward in the MS as well, however. The g suspension is best harmonized without the f', as in the print. The best reading will combine the hint from the MS (dotted minim for g on beat two, tenor) with the remainder of the original, as follows:

Example 6.15b. PADOVANO 1604, Toccata del Ottavo Tono, bar 5, corrected reading.

Another awkward spot in the original occurs in the same piece, where a bar-division is incorrectly indicated:

---

52 Speer's uncertainty caused him to give the layout of the original in a footnote (edn., p. 14 n1), from which the 'Print' version here is obtained; his own solution is 'conjectural' and unsatisfactory.
Example 6.16. PADOVANO 1604, Toccata del Ottavo Tono, bars 17.3–18.2 (MS fol. 55v system 4).

Print:53

There are several variants here: the chord in the upper parts, bar 17.3, is an error in the print, emended by the scribe; likewise the $ in bar 18.1–2 bass (the error of a third in each case indicates a slip by the typesetter). Lastly, the note values in bar 18.1, tenor, are changed from semiminim to fusa. I was unable to determine whether there was a bar line misplaced in the original or whether this fragment occurs at the end of a line (where no bar line would be found), but clearly the MS version is correct.

Two toccatas (M44, M47) are transposed. This, the first transposition in the volume (judging from concordances), reflects a scribal characteristic, as noted earlier. The imitative sections are deleted from all four of the toccatas in this section that have them (M44–6, 50), but only the first (from M44) was copied in Vol. VI (with the heading ‘Ricercar del Hannibal Padovan. della prima Toccata.’). The remaining deleted imitative sections in Padovano’s toccatas are much shorter than the one in M44, which is probably the reason they were not copied into Vol. VI as well. Deleting them here but not in MS sections four and five suggests that after having deleted the lengthy imitative section from M44, the scribe began to pay closer attention to them,

53 Speer again presented a solution which did not adequately recognize the error in the print; the ‘Print’ version above is based on the original as given in edn., p. 15 n2 and p. 16 n3.
continuing to delete them throughout this section and the next. For M44, the scribe provided his own ending for the toccata, one breve of figuration over an A major chord and the final D minor chord (follows bar 44 of the edn.). The relatively close versions of the works in the MS and their adherence to the order of the print suggest that the scribe used the print for his exemplar.

Section eight: Merulo toccatas (M52-71)

This section, the largest of the MS, comprises Merulo toccatas concordant with those in 1598 and 1604.

Table 6.12. Titles and concordances, M52-71.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M no.</th>
<th>Title in MS</th>
<th>concordance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Toccata / di Claudio / del secondo / tono.</td>
<td>1598:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Toccata / di secondo / tono.</td>
<td>1598:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Toccata / di 2.do tono.</td>
<td>1598:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Toccata / di 3.o tono.</td>
<td>1598:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Toccata / del 4.to / tono.</td>
<td>1598:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Toccata / del sesto / tono.</td>
<td>1604:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Toccata / di Nono / tono.</td>
<td>1604:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Toccata / di 3.o tono.</td>
<td>1598:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Toccata / di seconda / intonat.e</td>
<td>1598:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Toccata / d'ottauo / tono.</td>
<td>1604:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Toccata / d'ottauo / tono.</td>
<td>1604:7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Toccata / di Quinto / tono.</td>
<td>1604:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Toccata / di 5.to tono.</td>
<td>1604:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Toccata / del sesto / tono.</td>
<td>1604:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Toccata / di Settimo / tono.</td>
<td>1604:5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Settimo tono. / Toccata sesta.</td>
<td>1604:6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Decimo / Tono. / Toccata.</td>
<td>1604:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Toccata / di 4.to / tono.</td>
<td>1598:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Toccata / di P.o tono.</td>
<td>1598:2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Toccata / di P.o tono.</td>
<td>1598:1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Merulo's name is given in the first instance only; the scribe apparently placed all the works under the single attribution. He seems to have been fairly careful regarding such attributions, to judge from toccatas in sections five to seven. The titles of M67-8 differ from the remainder and are very similar to those of the print. M67 in particular
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gives the number of the toccata in the print, which has no meaning in
the context of the MS. These two titles clearly stem from the print;\textsuperscript{54}
but characteristics discussed below suggest that the print was not the
exemplar. The present examination considers the order of the section,
its duplication of pieces, treatment of imitative sections,
transposition, and variants with 1598 and 1604, and reaches the
conclusion that the toccatas were copied from intermediate MSS which
ultimately derive from the prints.

The ordering of the works in the MS is problematic, for there is no
discernible plan to it. Toccatas in tones 2, 8, 5, 7 and 1 are grouped
together, but not those in tones 3, 4, 6 and 9-10; they are obviously
not in tonal sequence. The scribe copied some printed volumes in order
(DIRUTA 1593 in vols. I M40-6 and II M34-9; PADOVANO 1604 in vol. II
M44-51; many works in other volumes of the tablature), so the lack of
order here suggests that the exemplar was not the two prints but a MS
copy of the toccatas, perhaps in a haphazard or loose-leaf form.

\textsuperscript{54} Thus confuting Dalla Libera's suggestion that the scribe used a
MS source which predated the prints (edn., I:[i]). There are four
additional flaws in his hypothesis.

1) Contrary to his belief, transposition does not support the theory
of another exemplar; transposition by the scribe was a regular
occurrence for works in high clefs, and this applies to Merulo's
toccatas as well.

2) He claimed that the imitative sections of toccatas 1598:1, 7 and 8
were deleted from the MS; in fact, toccata 1 has no material deleted,
and toccatas 2, 3, 7, 8, and 9 all have a certain amount of material
deleted; as noted above, other toccatas in the MS have imitative
sections deleted, and it appears to be a scribal characteristic.

3) He erred in supposing the portion of M52 and M60 (=1598:3) after
bar 27 to be different from the print: in fact, only bars 27-9 are
omitted from the MS (both times), as Mischiati noted ('L'intavolatura',
p. 31).

4) His point that the MS mensuration signs are different from the
prints is true, but all 76 pieces in vol. II use the same sign,
indicating that the scribe made this consistent emendation. His theory
of manuscript sources which predate the prints is applicable only to the
works in section two, M12-20.
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Three toccatas in section eight were copied more than once in the MS: within the section, M52 = M60; also, M18 = M56 and M19 = M61, both discussed above. In the first instance (M52 = M60), the versions are not identical (see Table 6.14), but of the forty-nine variants with the print in M52, thirty-nine are repeated in M60; given the complexity of the piece and the ways the scribe was prone to emend his exemplar, it appears that the thirty-nine common variants stem from his copying the same exemplar twice, similar to M15 and 23.

The other two duplications have been shown to stem from divergent exemplars of the toccatas. In M56, the toccata is a fourth lower than at M18; the omitted bars are different, and none of the additional material in M18 is repeated. It is certain that another version from that of M18 was used for M56, one corresponding much more closely to the print. The same is true for M61: the imitative section is omitted, unlike M19, and M61 has no simplification of ornaments.

Table 6.13 compares the actual imitative sections in the printed toccatas with the sections which the scribe deleted.

Table 6.13. Imitative sections in the Merulo toccatas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toccata</th>
<th>M no. (conc.)</th>
<th>Bars of imitation</th>
<th>Bars deleted in MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52/60 (1598:3)</td>
<td>34.3-39.4</td>
<td>27.1-29.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 (1598:4)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 (1598:5)</td>
<td>15.3-20.2</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 (1598:6)</td>
<td>35.1-37.2</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 (1604:3)</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 (1604:9)</td>
<td>26.1-47.2</td>
<td>21.1-47.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 (1598:7)</td>
<td>34.1-50.2</td>
<td>34.1-51.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 (1604:8)</td>
<td>42.1-50.2</td>
<td>41.3-50.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 (1604:7)</td>
<td>17.3-31.4, 36.1-55.4</td>
<td>17.3-31.4, 36.1-58.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 (1604:1)</td>
<td>14.3-21.1, 24.3-29.2, 39.3-46.2</td>
<td>14.3-29.2, 39.3-46.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 (1604:2)</td>
<td>18.3-26.4, 35.1-44.3</td>
<td>18.3-26.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 (1604:4)</td>
<td>17.3-44.3</td>
<td>17.3-45.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 (1604:5)</td>
<td>24.4-29.2, 33.4-38.2</td>
<td>17.3-40.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 (1604:6)</td>
<td>17.3-40.3</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 (1604:10)</td>
<td>22.1-30.2, 40.3-67.2</td>
<td>22.1-30.2, 40.3-67.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 6.13 (cont.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Toccata</th>
<th>Bars of imitation</th>
<th>Bars deleted in MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M no. (conc.)</td>
<td>16.4-30.2, 32.3-42.4</td>
<td>12.3-22.2, 32.3-42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 (1598:9)</td>
<td>16.2-20.4, 37.1-61.2</td>
<td>37.1-60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 (1598:2)</td>
<td>10.2-21.4</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 (1598:1)</td>
<td>12.3-22.2, 32.3-42.4</td>
<td>37.1-60.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The imitative sections of the toccatas are not always easily seen; nor did the scribe systematically delete them. In the two works without any imitative sections no material is deleted; in the ten works with one imitative section, however, inconsistencies are readily apparent.

Surprisingly, in one case (M52/60) material not related to the imitative section is deleted, and the section itself is copied intact (both times). In three cases (M54, 55, 71) the section is not deleted; in the remaining six cases, the deleted sections are more or less compatible with the actual imitation in the toccatas. For the six toccatas with two imitative sections, both are deleted in M62, 68, and 69; neither is deleted in M66; only the first in M64; and only the last in M70. The single toccata with three imitative sections (M63) has all three deleted (plus a little extra) in the MS. The conclusion to be drawn from this comparison is that the scribe did not trouble himself to search for and delete the sections, but did so in an inconsistent manner.

M56 and M69 are transposed. Contrary to Mischiati’s blanket statement (see note 22), the scribe did not transpose three other toccatas in high clefs in the prints (M63, M66, M68). This may simply be scribal inconsistency; but the coincidence that the transposed

55 The list in Table 6.13 does not always agree with the sections as discussed in Apel, Keyboard Music, p. 226, Völkl, 'Die Toccaten', pp. 78-9, or the annotations to Dalla Libera’s edition, an indication of how well the sections are sometimes disguised.
toccatas are both from 1598 and the untransposed ones all from 1604 may be noted.\textsuperscript{56}

Variants are useful only to a limited extent for attempting to determine the exemplars of the scribe, as noted earlier; although they are appropriate to a critical commentary of the works, there is little to be gained by presenting lists of variants here. Variants are therefore summarized in Table 6.14 without further detail.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M no. (conc.)</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>Pm</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Bars omitted\textsuperscript{a}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52 (1598:3)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27.1-29.4\textsuperscript{b}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 (1598:4)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 (1598:5)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 (1598:6)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 (1598:8)\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.1-27.2, 28.1-31.4\textsuperscript{*}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 (1604:3)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58 (1604:9)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21.1-47.2\textsuperscript{*}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59 (1598:7)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34.1-51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 (1598:3)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27.1-29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 (1604:8)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41.3-50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62 (1604:7)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.3-31.4, 36.1-58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 (1604:1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.3-29.2, 39.3-46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 (1604:2)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18.3-26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 (1604:4)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.3-45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 (1604:5)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 (1604:6)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.3-40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 (1604:10)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>22.1-30.2, 40.3-67.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 (1598:9)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.3-22.2, 32.3-42.4\textsuperscript{d}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 (1598:2)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.1-60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 (1598:1)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABBREVIATIONS:

T: tie
NT: no tie
Pm: pitch missing
P: different pitch
R: different rhythm

\textsuperscript{56} Although beyond the scope of this study, other inconsistent transpositions occur in the Turin MS copies of MERULO 1567 (vol. VI, M23-30) and Pb-Merulo 1574 (vol. IX, M15-31, 35).
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Table 6.14 (cont.).

NOTES:

a Bar numbers follow Dalla Libera’s edition, which in turn closely follows the original prints. Discrepancies between this list of bars omitted and Mischiati’s citations, ‘L’intavolatura’, pp. 31-3, are sometimes attributable to differing bar numbering; but in several cases Mischiati’s citations appear to be erroneous. Asterisks indicate places where Mischiati erred.

b These bars are not the primary imitative section of the toccata.

c Transposed down a fourth in the MS. Mischiati erred in closely equating M56 with M18, and did not indicate the omitted bars.

d Mischiati did not indicate the omitted bars of M69.

The variants found in M52-71 are of quite little consequence, despite their seemingly large number. The copies generally adhere closely to the prints, and many of the variants can be attributed to the scribe’s customary handling of ties, accidentals (varying accidentals fall into the P category), and complex rhythmic and pitch notation found in the prints.

The most significant such variant is found in M53, where two additional beats of material are inserted in bar 4 of the MS version (marked with broken square brackets):
Example 6.17. 1598, toccata quarta (secondo tuono), bars 1-6 (MS f. 65 system 3).

Secondo Tuono.

Print

MS

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Except for the addition, the versions are nearly identical. The relationship between the added MS material and the print’s bar 6 is close, and may indicate the source of the additional material. The addition is musically satisfactory, and may stem from the scribe’s wish to improve the lead-in to bar 4.3; or from a similar emendation in the scribe’s exemplar. The relationship to bar 6.1-2 suggests the former rather than the latter.

Several errors in the print are corrected in the MS reading, shown in the following examples.

Example 6.18. 1598, toccata terza (secondo tuono), bar 5 (MS f. 62v, system 4).

Print:  

\[ \text{MS:} \]

The rhythm error in beat 1, soprano, is corrected in the MS.

Example 6.19. 1598, toccata nona (quarto tuono), bar 25 (MS f. 100v, system 4).

Print:  

\[ \text{MS:} \]
Here, a similar rhythm error (beat 2, tenor) is corrected in the MS by halving the note values.

Obvious misprints in 1604:1, bars 7 and 10, are emended in the MS: the print gives the notes g flat' - e' in both cases, and the MS corrects them to g' - e flat'.

In the same piece, bar 38 soprano, a possible error is emended in the MS:

Example 6.20. 1604, toccata prima (undecimo detto quinto tuono), bar 38.3-4 (MS f. 89, system 1).

It appears likely that the second c'', which the MS changes to e'', is a misprint; also noteworthy is the omission of the parts beneath the scale, attributable to scribal error.

Examples such as these are obviously minor, but indicate the care the scribe frequently took; he was also careful regarding voice-leading and rhythm. Perhaps this does not accord with the large number of variants, the unsystematic deletion of imitative sections, and the alteration of most of the last chords (usually by deleting one note), but about some things, the MS readings are important and show the scribe's thorough familiarity with the works.

Variants, deletion of imitative sections, and transposition in section eight are consistent with scribal characteristics throughout the MS, suggesting that the scribe copied from the prints; but the ordering
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and duplication within the section suggests otherwise. The resolution of the problem is impossible but ultimately unimportant, since the copies certainly derive from the prints. The nature of variants suggests that if there were intermediary MSS, they were generally accurate copies.

Section nine: The closing miscellany (M72-6)

The last section of vol. II comprises five works, the first two without attribution. Dalla Libera's attribution of these two to Merulo on the basis of their position is plausible but doubtful on stylistic grounds. Dalla Libera was unaware of the concordance between M72 and vol. I M23, where the work is attributed to 'Sig.r Hasler', and Berlin 103, no. 9, where it is attributed to Sweelinck (‘G.P.S.’). Also significant is the lack of tone indications here, unlike the Merulo series. The scribe probably began a new set of works here, not further works of Merulo.

The relationship between M72 and vol. I M23 is quite close, but the variants are numerous and significant enough to indicate that the scribe had two exemplars of this work. Most significant is the insertion of two breves of material between bars 10.2 and 10.3 of M72 (bar numbers follow the Dalla Libera edition).

57 The first two are in Merulo, Toccate, ed. Dalla Libera, III:26-31; M74 is given in Appendix C (II: 230); M75-6 are in Erbach, Compositions, ed. Rayner, IV:54-9, 77-83.
58 Edn. III:[i].
59 Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura', p. 33. The work is thus edited in Sweelinck, Opera Omnia, ed. Leonhardt, I/1:149-51, and Hassler, Toccatas, ed. Stribos, pp. 55-60, as well as in Dalla Libera's Merulo edn. Apel (Keyboard Music, pp. 227, 331 fig. 332) did not recognize the concordances and cited the piece twice: first, as composed by Merulo and showing characteristics of Sweelinck; second, as composed by Sweelinck and showing the influence of Merulo!
M74-6 have no concordances; the first is attributed to Hassler, the others to Erbach. Thus this final section appears to be another miscellany, with no further discernible organization. The five works are not in tonal order; the last three are given tonal indications in their titles (sixth, second and fourth, respectively), while the first two are not.

Table 6.15. Tonal types in M72-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M no.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>system</th>
<th>ambitus</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Toccata</td>
<td>anon.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>D-(g'') (low)</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>anon.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>C-(a'') (low)</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>&quot; sexti toni</td>
<td>H. L. Hassler</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>F-(f'')</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>&quot; 2.di toni</td>
<td>Erbach</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>D-(f'')</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td>&quot; Quarti toni</td>
<td>Erbach</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>G-(a'')</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The section is similar in some ways to the opening miscellany, with works by Erbach, Hassler, and anon. M72-6 all contain imitative sections.

Imitative sections in vol. IX

Vol. IX M1-11 comprise eleven imitative sections headed 'nelle Toccate del 2.do lib.' (M1) or 'del detto libro' (M2-11).

Table 6.16. Tonal types in the fuge vol. IX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M no.</th>
<th>system</th>
<th>ambitus</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Tone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>D-(d'')</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>A-(g'')</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5 or 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>E-(f'')</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3 or 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>F-(f'')</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5 or 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>flat</td>
<td>F-e flat''</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5 or 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>D-(f'')</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>F-(f'')</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>E-(e'')</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>d-(a'')</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1 or 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>G-(a'')</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>7 or 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>natural</td>
<td>C-(e'')</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>5 or 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Mischiati was unable to determine which fuge (as they are entitled in vol. IX) should be paired with which toccatas, and suggested that they might not bear any relationship to the toccatas in vol. II.\(^{60}\) In this he was at least partially correct;\(^{61}\) two should be paired with toccatas not from vol. II but vol. I.

The fuga vol. IX M11 belongs with the toccata vol. I M60, a work attributed to Erbach in the MS that is partially concordant with a version in Lynar A 1.\(^{62}\) Comparison of the two versions (not undertaken by Breig, Dalla Libera, Rayner, or Mischiati) reveals several significant variants: most prominently, the imitative section in Lynar Al (bars 18.3–31.2 (Dalla Libera’s bar numbers)) is omitted in Turin vol. I and given at vol. IX M11.\(^{63}\) Vol. IX M11 should be inserted between bars 33.2 and 34.1 (Rayner’s bar numbers) of vol. I M60.

There is no overlapping or duplication of material in these works, making the pairing entirely dependent upon the concordance. Nevertheless, the pairing makes it reasonably certain that some, if not all, of the fuge vol. IX M11 are related to toccatas in vol. I, not vol. II, despite that indication at their head.

---

\(^{60}\) L’intavolatura’, p. 66 n79.

\(^{61}\) Thus negating his hypotheses of links between several fuge and toccatas in vol. II; see below, note 67.


\(^{63}\) Other significant variants: Turin bars 41.2–44 (Rayner’s bar numbers) are not found in Lynar Al (they would be inserted between bar 35.1 and 35.2 of Lynar Al, Dalla Libera’s bar numbers); Turin bar 52 (= Lynar Al bar 38.3–4) is a different realization of the same harmony; and Turin bar 56 (one semibreve) is not found in Lynar Al (would be inserted between bar 40.2 and 40.3). Otherwise, the versions are close.
One other pairing can be established: vol. IX M10 and vol. I M64, a
toccata by H. L. Hassler. This is not possible to confirm through
concordances, since the toccata is a unicum, but thematic evidence shows
the coupling. Bars 37-9 of vol. I M64, given in Example 6.21a, are
clearly a continuation of the fuga, the incipit of which is given in
example 21b. The use of the subject-countersubject of the fuga in the
toccata bars 37-9 is evident. Again, there is no actual overlapping in
the two works; the scribe deleted the entire fuga from vol. I, and
concluded it with a simple cadence.

12).

Example 6.21b. fuga 10 (vol. IX M10), bars 1-3.

---

64 Hassler, Toccatas, ed. Stribos, pp. 9-12. Stribos' edition is
inadequate in some ways, since he did not include works by Hassler which
are not explicitly named 'toccata'; hence the toccatas in Turin vol. I
M1-5 (introits in name only) were not edited, nor did he mention or edit
the Hassler toccatas in vol. II.

65 The fuga is quite interesting, and uses an elementary inganno in
its course (see Ex. 6.22b, bar 3).
Resolution of the remaining nine fuge is not possible at present. Neither volume should be ruled out for examination; Table 6.17 summarizes possible pairings according to tonal type.

Table 6.17. Possible pairings, toccatas vols. I and II, fuge vol. IX.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>natural-D</td>
<td>1, 6, 7, 9</td>
<td>20, 23, 31, 59, 61, 91 (b)</td>
<td>1, 4, 10, 15=23, 16, 17, 24, 26, 30, 40, 72 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural-E</td>
<td>3, 8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>3, 7, 43, 73, 76 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural-C</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14, 6, 74 (b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flat-F</td>
<td>4, 5</td>
<td>26, 28, 29, 58 (b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:

\(a\) The system and Final only are given, since the ambitus is ambiguous in these works.

\(b\) These works have full imitative sections.

The field is considerably lessened if one assumes that the pieces with full imitative sections in vol. II did not have further sections deleted, but more specific relationships cannot be made. It may be

\(\text{Vol. I M1-14, 20, 23-31, 52-3, 55-9, 61-3, and 91-2 (works by Erbach, Frescobaldi and Sweelinck) show no thematic evidence of relations with the fuge; Toccatas in vol. I still to be examined are M21, 47-51, 54, 65-7, and 93. It must be admitted that determining which pieces should be paired is often difficult when the works have no concordances, since the thematic relationship such as in M64/fuga 10 is not necessarily present in the toccatas. Tonal type relationships, may present the likeliest pairings of the toccatas which I was able to examine. Of these, the works by Frescobaldi (M20, 26, 28, 29, 31) are less likely on stylistic grounds; and two of the toccatas were copied with full imitative sections, making it unlikely that they had sections deleted. Further research may find additional pairings.}
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noted that of Mischiati's suggested possible pairings (vol. II M2, 4, 6 with vol. IX M10, 1, 6),\textsuperscript{67} M10 is already accounted for in vol. I, and the tonal types of fuga 6 and toccata 6 are different, making it an unlikely pair.

Although no other relationships between the fuge and toccatas may be drawn, there are two cases of similarity in subjects between the fuge and works of Erbach, suggesting the possibility they should be coupled with works of his. Fuga 6 has a subject similar to Erbach's toccata vol. I M92, but the tonality is different.


Example 6.22b. Fuga 6 (vol. IX M6), bars 1-3.

Another fuga (M7) is similar to the imitative subject of an Erbach toccata found only in D-Mbs Ms. 1581 (edn. IV:16-21). The fuga has

\textsuperscript{67}L'intavolatura', p. 66 n79.
three subjects (labelled A, B and C in Example 6.23b); two of the subjects in the toccata resemble A and C.


Although neither of these relationships is suggestive of actual pairing, the similarity of subjects may at least indicate that the two fuga are by Erbach.

The scribe's citation of the 'second book of toccatas' for these fuga is inexplicable, but suggests that volumes I and II were being copied concurrently (he may simply have confused the two). It also suggests the possibility that he copied the fuga before the toccatas themselves, which he intended to put in vol. II. If the latter is true the scribe may not have ever actually copied the toccatas from which these are deleted.

68 The scribe correctly cited vol. I when he copied imitative sections from vol. I M2-10, 15-16 at vol. VI M80-90.
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Conclusions

The works in vol. II of the Turin tablatures fall into a symmetrical pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sections</th>
<th>content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 + 9</td>
<td>miscellany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 + 8</td>
<td>Merulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5 + 7</td>
<td>other Venetians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Staden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This may or may not be coincidental; at least it has been shown that in all probability volumes I and II were copied concurrently, suggesting that the ordering was not merely the result of copying exemplars utterly at random. There are still several inexplicable inconsistencies regarding vol. II, however; works copied twice, imitative sections handled haphazardly, works from DIRUTA 1593 copied in two groups and separate volumes. Although possible explanations for these features are suggested above, the answers must remain speculative. The lack of further evidence renders determining the purpose of the collection nearly as speculative, but a few conclusions may nevertheless be drawn.

The size and content of the collection indicate that its purpose is unusual: it was probably not intended to be used at the keyboard on a daily basis, but rather as a reference- or source-library from which other MSS could have been made. There are few signs of wear, in any case. Its contents show a collector’s desire for comprehensiveness; it is certainly not a ‘working’ organist’s collection. In this sense the MS is highly unusual, for most extant keyboard MSS were made for pragmatic reasons and day-to-day use, not for ‘monumental’ purposes. Thus the collection is paradoxical: grand in scope, modest in performance medium. The keyboard was one of the most common instruments of the period, and its music had little of the artistic appeal that one might expect for such an immense musical project. Indeed, like most
other keyboard MSS, the scribe did not restrict himself to works of high quality, despite his musicality.

The notation itself suggests that the commissioner was a German who specifically asked for German tablature; the Italianate scribe was familiar enough with reading intavolatura and mensural notation to have copied in that notation if he had desired. It appears, moreover, that little music was copied from German tablature. In direct contrast to the Italian works, none of the German keyboard publications of the period were used, in all probability.\(^{69}\) There is virtually no Protestant music (Praetorius, Scheidt, etc.; Sweelinck is the only notable exception), absent German volumes include Schmid (1607), Woltz (1617), Steigleder (1627), and Klemm (1631).\(^{70}\) The reason for the omissions cannot be established, but it seems likely that they were common enough not to require copying.

The scribe worked 'part time' on the project, and was paid for his work. He worked carefully and musically on the level of detail, but less so on the broader level, to judge from duplications and treatment of imitative sections. He did not work for himself; nor for the Fuggers (at that point in time their financial empire was in collapse and they could hardly afford to pay for such an extravagance). Given the foregoing circumstances, it is reasonable to deduce that the commissioner was a wealthy German Roman Catholic who wished to acquire a comprehensive collection of Italianate keyboard music from the Fugger library. The commissioner did not pay for the work in a lump sum, at least for the latter part of copying, but made regular smaller payments, suggesting that he or an agent was in Augsburg in the period of copying.

\(^{69}\) See the list in Caldwell, 'Sources', pp. 728-9.

\(^{70}\) Although there are concordances with the first two, they are coincidental in all likelihood; see above, note 47, regarding Schmid.
The scribe was able to use the library (and hence was probably in the service of the Fuggers\textsuperscript{71}), a skilled musician, and probably needy enough to be glad of the income the copying brought.

Given that several MS exemplars are posited in this study, the lack of significant MS concordances reflects the large amount of material that has been lost since the collection’s creation. The one exception is Padua 1982, the entire contents of which appear in Turin. The connections between the two merit an independent study and cannot be fully shown here; briefly, Padua 1982’s thirty-nine pieces are organized according to composer (Hasslers, Erbach, Sweelinck), and most are copied in Turin’s genre-classifications in order. Only closer comparison can reveal whether or not Padua was the actual exemplar, but even if it was not, the two are closely related.\textsuperscript{72}

For works without concordances, the MS presents important material by Merulo, G. and A. Gabrieli, Hassler and Erbach; for works with concordances, it frequently presents thoughtful and important variants. For Merulo’s works in particular, two early versions of printed toccatas are found, and significant readings of the other printed toccatas presented. It is probably not coincidental that the revisions in Merulo’s toccata vol. II M18 (1598:8) are mirrored in the scribe’s most

\textsuperscript{71}The Fuggers supported music at at least two churches in Augsburg: St Moritz and St Ulrich (Hettrick, ‘Fugger’, The New Grove, 7:8); the scribe may have been an organist at one of these.

\textsuperscript{72}It is unlikely that Padua was copied from Turin due to the first set of works in both: Turin vol. I M2-10 are concordant with Padua nos. 1-9, and comprise introits and toccatas by the Hasslers. Turin vol. I M1 is also an introit by Hassler, and would have been copied into Padua if Turin had been the exemplar. Similar arguments apply to Hassler works in vols. VII and XI: many more are in Turin than were copied in Padua. The attributions of works in the two MSS are similar except in one instance: Turin vol. XI M40 is attributed to Andrea Gabrieli, while in Padua it is attributed to J. L. Hassler (see Mischiati, ‘L’intavolatura’, p. 81). Other ordering discrepancies throw doubt on the otherwise undoubted connection between the two.
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noteworthy characteristics: adjustment and addition (or deletion) of ornamentation and imitative sections. Both Merulo and the scribe did them; they were the kinds of things that performers were free to revise in the period. The problems this creates for modern editors seem on the one hand to be insurmountable, if an 'ideal' text is to be sought; on the other hand, it brings into question the validity of the concept of the 'ideal text' itself. There was no such thing for many musicians of the period. The notated music was ultimately less important than the performance resulting from it; the addition of 'fantasia' elements to written notation was common performance practice. Merulo's toccatas represent an early stage in the development of the idea that the written text is important in itself, hence the two toccatas which show his revisions are particularly significant. But these works are exceptions, and the scribe interpreted the texts of the toccatas in vol. II primarily as means, not ends in themselves. This source presents good, not ideal, texts. Its qualities, inconsistencies, origins, and methodology form a complex and interesting picture of the transmission and performance of keyboard music in early seventeenth-century south Germany.

73 Witness Picchi's remark that he wished his pieces to be played 'come stanno' (see I: 152 and PICCHI 1621).
CHAPTER SEVEN

THE ORGAN BOOK OF THE CRUTCHED FRIARS OF LIEGE

The keyboard manuscript B-Lu MS 153 (olim 888) was first brought to
the attention of scholars by Ritter, and was transcribed and published
by Guilmant shortly before his death. Although a number of scholars
have made use of the MS (mostly for the Sweelinck pieces it contains),
no systematic study of it has been undertaken since Guilmant. The
present study begins with a detailed inventory of the MS, following
which handwriting characteristics, titles and attributions, the order of
copying and its discrepancy with the present order of the pieces, dating
the MS, and the identity of the scribe are considered. Much of the
content appears to be the work of the scribe himself, and the MS an

1 Geschichte, pp. 48-50.

2 Paris: Durand, 1910. A second printing (Mainz, 1914) led Dart
erroneously to state that Pirro supervised the publication after

3 Sweelinck, Werken, ed. Seiffert, p. xlii; Frotscher, Geschichte,
pp. 293, 303; Schierning, Die Überlieferung, pp. 86-7; Dart, 'Organ-
book'; Sweelinck, Opera Omnia, ed. Leonhardt, pp. xxi-xxii, liv; Dart,
'An Early Seventeenth-Century Book'; Apel, Keyboard Music, pp. 344-5;
Curtis, Sweelinck's Keyboard Music; Vendome, 'Spanish Netherlands';
idem, Spanish Netherlands Keyboard Music, ( 2 v.); Cunningham, Bull, pp.
111-12; Dirksen, 'Sweelinck's Opera Dubia'.

4 Schierning's brief summary of the MS (Die Überlieferung, pp. 86-7)
is inaccurate: generalizations like 'the octave placement is often
misplaced', and 'this error leads to the conclusion that an exemplar was
notated in German tablature', that the copying is 'frequently
irregular', and that the scribe adjusted northern sources according to
an Italian personal taste, are errors or simplifications that require
revision. Dart's study of 1963 ('Organ-book') is the most detailed
examination to date, but is brief, inaccurate to some extent, and one-
sided, since he primarily sought to determine the identity of the
scribe. Some of his summary conclusions are confirmed, but some must be
revised, including the dating and exemplars of the MS.
amateur's compilation over a number of years. A systematic chronological survey of the contents examines concordances, musical style and possible exemplars for the scribe. Finally, the provenance and purpose of the collection is discussed, along with the significance of its text-transmissions. The purpose of the MS has a direct bearing on its transmissions, and an evaluation of its entirety helps to reach conclusions regarding its significance as a source of keyboard music.

Physical Description

The volume is upright, 25 x 36 cm, 76 fols., mensural notation, six systems per page, ten lines per system. \(^5\) It was rebound in this century, when the folios were renumbered 1-77, \(^6\) including the title page. \(^7\) This took place some time after 1943: Seiffert's edition of that year cited the volume's spine-title, 'Gabrieli Musicaia', no longer present. \(^8\) Rastrations are generally regular: fols. 2-71v are rastrated with margins on the outside edge of each page, while fols. 72-77v have none. An inventory with concordances follows.

---

\(^5\) The system layout is occasionally described as two five-line staves per system (Schierning, Dart, Vendome); the lines were rastrated in groups of five, but carefully spaced to form ten-line systems (see Exx. 7.1-3); hand-division is indicated by stem direction.

\(^6\) Guilmant's edition was based on an earlier foliation which did not number the title page nor the last six folios of the MS; hence his folio references are one less than the manuscript's present numeration, and there are no folio references in his edition for the last eight pieces of the MS (edn., pp. 139-51).

\(^7\) The title page reads 'Liber Fratrum Cruciferorum Leodiensium'. Although there is no cause to doubt the designation, the leaf itself is unlikely to have originally been associated with the MS, due to its different paper and lack of reference to the volume's contents (Dart, 'Organ-book', p. 24).

\(^8\) Seiffert, ed., Sweelinck, p. xlii. The former spine title refers to the first works of the MS.
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Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Folio and no. system</th>
<th>Title and concordances(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>2(^{1}) - 5(^{4})</td>
<td>Authore Andrea Gabrieli: Primi Toni—Secundi—Tertij—Quarti—Quinti—Sexti—Septimi—Octavi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= A &amp; G GABRIELI 1593, fols. 11v-20v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Schmid, Tabulatur Buch, nos. 23-30 [attributed to Giovanni Gabrieli]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5(^{5}) - 6(^{6})</td>
<td>Fantasie. de petro philippi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6v(^{1}) - 7(^{6})</td>
<td>Fantasie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7v(^{1}) - 8(^{4})</td>
<td>Fantasie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8(^{5}) - 10v(^{5})</td>
<td>Fantasie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>10v(^{6}) - 13(^{5})</td>
<td>Fantasie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= Woltz, Nova Musices, III:74: fuga colorata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 196v: Can: 2: Ton: Auth: Chris: Erba:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed. Rayner, V:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Turin XI:34, fol. 47: Canzon di Ms. Claudio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paris 27, fol. 26v: Canzon di Giovanni Gabrielli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ed. Charteris, 'Another Keyboard Canzona'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>13(^{6}) - 15(^{3})</td>
<td>Fantasie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>15(^{4}) - 16v(^{6})</td>
<td>Fantasie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17(^{1}) - 17v(^{6})</td>
<td>Echo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>18(^{1}) - 19(^{4})</td>
<td>Fantazie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>= PELLEGRINI 1599, p. 14: Canzon detta la Casiodora</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)See the Bibliography for resolution of short titles. Modern editions of works with cross-references to Appendix A are not repeated here.
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Inventory (cont.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS no. system</th>
<th>Title and concordances</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 195-20v5</td>
<td>Fantazie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= Lynar Al, p. 1: <strong>Toccata Joan Peters.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vienna 714, fol. 56v: <strong>Tocata M.J.P.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vienna 714, fol. 210v: <strong>Tocata</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed. Leonhardt, 19, 19a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 20v6-24v6</td>
<td>Echo D'Jean Pierre Swelingk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= Vienna 714, fol. 222v [untitled]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed. Leonhardt, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 24v1-26v4</td>
<td>Fantasie de Claudio Merulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= <strong>MERULO 1598 no. 4: Secondo Tuono. Toccata. 4a.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turin II:53, fol. 65: <strong>Toccata di secondo tono.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bagnacavallo no. 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 26v5-29v2</td>
<td>Fantasie de C. M.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= <strong>MERULO 1598 no. 8: Quarto Tuono. Toccata Ottava.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turin II:18, fol. 23: <strong>Toccata di Ms. Claudio</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turin II:56, fol. 71: <strong>Toccata del 4to tono.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bagnacavallo no. 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 29v3-30v5</td>
<td>Fantasie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 30v6-32v6</td>
<td>Fantasie de Claudio Merulo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>= <strong>MERULO 1604 no. 5: SETTIMO TUONO Toccata Quinta.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turin II:66, fol. 93v: <strong>Toccata di Settimo tono.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 33v1-33v6</td>
<td>Echo pour trompette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 34v1-34v6</td>
<td>Echo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 35v1-35v6</td>
<td>Fantasie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 36v1-36v6</td>
<td>[untitled]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Inventory (cont.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Folio and Title and concordances</th>
<th>no. system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>37r-38r [untitled]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>38v-39v [untitled]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>40r-40v Echo [at end: FR GERARDUS SCROND]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>40v-41v Echo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>42r-44v Fantasie de petro philippi.</td>
<td>[intabulation of 'Chi fara', madrigal by Striggio; different from Philips's setting in Fitzwilliam Virginal Book]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>46v-48v Fantasie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>48v-50v Fantasie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>50v-51v Fantasie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>52v-53v Echo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>53v-55v Echo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>55v-56v Fantasie</td>
<td>[ornamented intabulation of 'Petit Jacquet', first intabulated in MERULO 1592 no. 9; different from settings in Pb-Raverii 1608, Verona 1128, Vienna 714, Woltz Nova Musices]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>56v-58v [untitled]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>59v-60v [untitled]</td>
<td>= MERULO 1598 no. 9: Quarto Tuono. Toccata Nona. Turin II:69, fol. 100v: Toccat di 4.to tono. (transposed down a fourth) Bagnacavallo no. 23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Inventory (cont.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Folio and Title and concordances no. system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>61-62v₂ [untitled]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Berlin 340, fol. 20v: <em>Fantasia J. P.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed. Leonhardt, 34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>62v₃-64₁ [untitled]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>64₂-66v₆ [untitled]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fitzwilliam p. 181: <em>Praeludium Toccata 1. Johan Pietersen Swellinck</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynar A1 no. 7: <em>Toccata J. P. S. noni Toni</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turin I:17, fol. 28v: <em>Toccata J:P:S:</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lüneburg KN 207/15, no. 27: <em>Praeambulum ex clave E</em> (bars 1-45 only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berlin 40615, fol. 128v: <em>Leon: Has. Toc: 4ti Ton.</em> (bars 1-45 only, with variants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed. Leonhardt, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>67₁-68₃ [untitled]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>68₄-69v₄ [untitled]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69v₅-7₁v₆ empty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>7₂₁-7₂₆ <em>Fantazia</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>7₂v₁-7₃₆ [untitled]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>7₃v₁-7₄₆ [untitled]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>7₄v₁-7₅₆ [untitled]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>7₅v₁-7₅v₆ <em>Fantasia per sonar le Cornetto</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>7₆₁-7₆₆ [untitled]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>7₆v₁-7₆v₅ [untitled]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>7₆v₆-7₇v₃ [untitled] (at end: 1617)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7₇v₄-7₇v₆ empty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Scribal characteristics**

**Number of hands**

Scholars have disagreed about the number of scribe hands found in the MS; the present study supports Dart’s hypothesis of one scribe working over a period of several years. Vendome’s ‘three hands’ (and Schierning’s ‘several hands’) hypothesis is unsupported by evidence from the MS; but there are several changes in the scribe’s hand which are readily discernible in clef and custos formations. Examples 7.1 and 7.2 show the two primary distinctions, hereafter referred to as hands A and B.

These examples show the general similarity of the two styles of handwriting as well as their differences: most similar are the descending note-stems, which have a characteristic shape and angle of descent throughout the MS. A striking example of the two hands is found on fol. 58v, where a piece was left off in the middle, and resumed at a later date when the hand had changed. The change may be pinpointed to the third bar of third system; most noticeable is the differing C-clef between the top and bottom of the page, and the differing custos at the end of the third system.

---

9 Dart suggested ‘a single scribe working over a period of several years’ (‘Organ-book’, p. 24), admitting as exceptional only L51, fol. 75v (‘Liège’—numbers refer to the pieces according the given inventory). This is erroneous, for L51 is clearly in the same hand as the following three works. Seiffert also believed it was one hand (Seiffert, ed., Sweelinck, p. xlii); Vendome, ‘Spanish Netherlands’ (p. 28), suggested three hands; Schierning, Die Überlieferung, p. 86, suggested ‘several hands’.
Example 7.1. Liège 153, fol. 2 (top): hand A.

Example 7.2. Liège 153, fol. 17 (top): hand B.
Example 7.3. Liège 153, fol. 58v, showing change in hand in bar 121 (bar nos. added).

![Musical notation image]
Table 7.1 outlines the different hand forms, including a transitional hand (T) falling between A and B, and a later style which appears to follow B (B').

Table 7.1. Hands of Liège 153.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MS no.</th>
<th>folios</th>
<th>Hand</th>
<th>MS no.</th>
<th>folios</th>
<th>Hand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-13</td>
<td>2-13</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>32-6</td>
<td>42-51v</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14-15</td>
<td>13v-16v</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>17-17v</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>37-8</td>
<td>52-55</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>39-40</td>
<td>55v-58v3</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-23</td>
<td>18-32v</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>40 (end)</td>
<td>58v3-6</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>33-33v</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>59-60v</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>34-34v</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>42-4</td>
<td>61-66v</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>35-35v</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>45-6</td>
<td>67-69v</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>36-36v</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>47-9</td>
<td>72-74</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28-9</td>
<td>37-39v</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>74v-75</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-1</td>
<td>40-41v</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>52-4</td>
<td>76-77v</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES:

1) Dashes delimit groups of pieces which begin on the first system of a recto and end on the last system of a verso page.

Fol. 58v is unequivocal proof that hand B is later than hand A. Having established this, two apparent contradictions need to be resolved, both of which consist of pieces in hand B which conclude on a recto and are followed by a piece in hand A on the verso: L38-9 and L50-1. It appears that in these instances the works in hand A were copied earlier, beginning on a single folio and leaving what is now the recto empty; they were taken up by the scribe at a later date and filled in to complete the works L38 and L50, respectively.
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Order of copying

The different hand formations indicate that the order of copying differed from the present order of the pieces; the lack of binding and gathering supports this conclusion. The recent rebinding of the MS has obliterated any evidence of original binding (each folio is individually mounted), but the heavy paper (about .5 mm thick, with no watermarks) suggests that if there was any gathering at all, quires could not have been made up of more than four folios. Further, there are signs of exposure to open air on some pages (e.g. fols. 27 and 31), suggesting that the MS was unbound and stacked in a loose form for an extended period.

The present order of the pieces accords with the theory that there were few or no gatherings. The dashes in Table 7.1 indicate places where a piece ends at the bottom of a verso page; hence these are places that form the boundaries of possible sections that could have been re-ordered without disturbing any one piece. For example, since L27 and L28-9 form two units, each of which begins at the top of a recto and ends at the bottom of a verso page, it is reasonable to propose that they were placed where they presently stand without relation to the order of copying; their differing hand and lack of titles support this conclusion. It is likely that works grouped within the dashes of Table 7.1 were copied in order as they now stand, e.g. L1-15, which since it ends with works in hand T, was probably copied later than works in hand A such as L17-23. Proceeding on this basis, the order of copying may be established according to five stages as follows:
Table 7.2. Order of copying.

| Stage 1 (hand A): 17–23; 26; 30–1; 32–6; 39–40 (beg.); 51–4; |
| Stage 2 (hand A to T): 1–15; |
| Stage 3 (hand T): 41; 42–4; 45–6; |
| Stage 4 (hand B): 16; 24; 25; 27; 28–9; 37–8; 40 (end); |
| Stage 5 (hand B to B'): 47–50. |

Each subsection of pieces that begins at the top of a recto and ends at the bottom of a verso page is demarcated by a semicolon in Table 7.2; these were probably copied as a unit. It is not possible to determine a more specific chronological order within the individual stages, with one exception: it is likely that L51–4 were copied before the other pieces in stage one (see below). The order of the pieces with respect to the handwriting as seen in Table 7.1, the signs of exposure in the MS, and the small likelihood of the folios ever having been gathered, all support the conclusion that the ordering of the MS as it now stands does not reflect the order of its copying.

Present order, dating of the MS

Although not chronological, the present order of pieces L1–26 and L30–46 stems from near the scribe, due to their titles. The elaborate and elegant titles were added systematically from the beginning of the volume to L39. Since works from hands A, T, and B are titled

10 As suggested above, L27–9 were undoubtedly put in their present position after the titling process was complete.

11 Although the titles must have stemmed from the scribe, it is not certain that he wrote all of them; the beauty of the titles for L1–26, L30–9 is possibly the work of the scribe, but his rather undistinguished music copying suggests otherwise.
similarly, and some titles were clearly adjusted because of the layout of the music, it is safe to conclude that the titles were added well after the music was copied. The titling process broke off after L39, for unknown reasons, but L40-6 are unified in hand and content, and appear to have been ordered along with L1-26 and 30-9.

For the remainder of the volume, L27-9 were probably placed in their present position after titling; L47-54 form a cohesive body due to the different rastration of fols. 72-7, but hand formation shows that they date from the earliest (L51-4) and latest (L47-50) stages of the MS. The first of each set of four is titled (L47 and L51), but hastily and in a rough hand, unlike the earlier ones; the titles probably date from the time of copying the music. L47-54 could have been placed with the (loose) folios any time after the compilation of the MS; indeed, the empty systems and folios after L46 indicate that L47-54 were not meant to be incorporated into the collection, but were placed there by someone else after the scribe completed his work. Since L47-54 date from the extremes of copying style, it appears that the entire corpus was copied before the volume was ordered; at a later date it was ordered and titled, and finally the works that were left over were added at the end.

It follows that the date at the end of L54 (1617) does not necessarily represent the date of completion of the MS. The evidence is inconclusive, but the date may merely indicate the copying of L54, one of the earliest of the collection. Apel noted that the date was unusually early for manual-change pieces such as are contained in the MS, as well as some unusual registration indications and harmonies. 12 Moving the *terminus ante quem* forward by about ten years would be more

---

accurate if the date applies to L54 and not the entire collection; consideration of who the scribe was agrees with a later dating.

The scribe

Speculation as to who the scribe was must also remain inconclusive; Dart considered the question in detail, and little more can be added to his findings. He showed that the book comes from the library of the Crucched Friars of Liège; the paid organist there from 1610 to 1624 was Guillaume Huet, who could not have been the scribe, since he was blind. Gerardus Scronx, the only person from Liège named in the MS (between L30-1, fol. 40v), was identified by Dart to be a member of the Order, and he found specific references to him in the years 1619-1622. There are three further references in 1623:

A Fratre Gerardo Scronx pro duaris missare apud hapsely . xii st
A fratre Gerardo Scronx a 3 missis apud hapsely . . . iii st
A frate Gerardo pro quint missis . . . . vi st

Scronx could have been the scribe, since he was a modest composer and would have had use for such a volume; Quitin suggested this was 'most likely', and also that he may have been a pupil of Huet, but the question must remain undecided. At any rate, the revised dating of the MS accords with his recorded activity in the years 1619-1623.

---

13 The following summary relies on Dart, 'Organ-book', pp. 23-7; he adequately confuted Seiffert's hypothesis of a south-German scribe.

14 Both 'Gerardus Scronx' and 'Griffarius Scronx' [griffarius = notary] appear in archival references; Dart assumed that the two names were one person, a theory which lent support to the hypothesis that the scribe was a calligrapher. Quitin ('Scronx', The New Grove, 17:90) stated that 'Dart is probably wrong in identifying the "Griffarius Scronx" cited in the monastery records of 1619 with Gérard [Scronx]' (for unknown reasons).

15 Not specifically dated, but before July 1623. Liège, Archives de l'état, Couvents des Croisiers de Liège, Régistres aux recettes et de penses, vol. 44 (1618-1628), fols. 3, 5, and 6v.

16 'Scronx', The New Grove.
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Contents: survey

The following survey examines the contents in the order of the five stages of copying (see Table 7.2), according to concordances, musical style, titles, and attributions, after which the purpose of the collection and its reason for being compiled are considered.

Stage 1 (hand A)

L51-4. Of the seven sub-sections within stage one, L51-4 was most likely the first copied, since it has elementary and insignificant pieces, is on differently rastrated paper, and appears to have been appended to the collection after its compilation proper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>length</th>
<th>L no. (breves)</th>
<th>style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>solo (upper register)/accompaniment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>exercise?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L51 is more interesting stylistically than the last three. Dart believed that the title ('Fantasia per sonar Le Cornetto') was added in a later hand and wrongly placed;\(^{17}\) there is, however, no reason to doubt that it was added by the scribe at the time of copying, and although it would be appropriate to L52 or 53 in a certain sense, it also applies to L51. The piece opens with a canzona motto which breaks down after the first six bars. In bar seven the right hand begins a solo line with left-hand accompaniment; unlike the other solo/accompaniment pieces in the MS, the solo continues for the remainder of the piece. The title more properly applies to L51 than L52 or 53, which, according to the

\(^{17}\) 'Organ-book’, p. 28. Dart noted elsewhere the registration phrase 'per le cornetti' in Oxford 89, another Spanish Netherlands keyboard source of the same period ('An Early Seventeenth-century Book’, p. 32).
terminology of the scribe, would be named 'echo', not 'Fantasia'.

L52-3 use solo/accompaniment texture without actual echo. Notational devices to indicate manual change are not found in any of these three pieces. L54 consists of a series of unrelated extended sequences, and appears to be nothing more than an exercise. None of these four pieces offer very much interest; they are probably early compositional efforts of the scribe.

L17-23. Of the remaining pieces in stage one, L17-23 present a unified group due to their attributions and concordances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L no. (breves)</th>
<th>composer, style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Pellegrini canzona (unattributed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sweelinck toccata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sweelinck echo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Merulo toccata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Merulo toccata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>[unicum with relation to Merulo toccata]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Merulo toccata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The unattributed Pellegrini canzona L17 has forty-one variants with the 1599 print, the most significant being the absence of the triplum section, bars 52-63. The remainder of the variants are minor enough to

18 The three solo/accompaniment pieces in the MS in which the solo lines are broken by rests are entitled 'Echo' (L24, L25, and L37).

19 Cunningham's discussion of the works (Bull, pp. 111-12) misinterprets L51-4, erroneously suggesting that the title of L51 applies to L51-4 and that they constitute a four-movement piece based on solo and accompaniment texture suitable for a 'cornet' registration; the registration argument could apply only to L51-3, but even these works share little thematic relationship and are very unlikely to be parts of a larger whole. Their tonal types, moreover, are not consistent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L no. System</th>
<th>Ambitus</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>high</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 Comparison was made with the modern edition.
be attributable to scribal error or discretion. It is highly likely that the exemplar for L17 stemmed from the 1599 print, but was not the print itself. The nature of the group L17-23— the Sweelinck pieces were copied from other manuscript(s), as were at least some of the Merulo toccatas (see below)— coupled with lack of triplum, accurate title and attribution to L17, suggest a MS exemplar.

The unattributed Sweelinck toccata L18 has three MS concordances, all of which were considered to some extent by Leonhardt. He disregarded V1 ('of inferior quality'), gave Ly and V2 prime place in the edition (no. 19), and classed L18 as less significant (edn. no. 19a). Ly/V2 and L18 are identical in most respects except for bars 39-40, 43-44.2, 85.3-87.4, 89.2-4, 91.2-4, 93.2-94.4, and the endings, 97-102 in L18, 97-104 in Ly/V2. Almost all of these differences consist of scalar passages in Ly/V2 which are arpeggiated in L18, such as in Example 7.4:

\begin{example} \end{example}

\footnotetext{Edn., pp. xlvii-xlviii. The concordances are abbreviated V1, V2 and Ly in the following discussion; see the inventory, I: 307.}
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Example 7.4 (cont.).

NOTES:

Differences between V2 and Ly are not shown, but noted here:

bar

37 fingering given in Ly — see edition.
38.4 rh: crotchet rest given in edn.
39 fingering in V2 given here (none in Ly or edn.)
40 fingering given in Ly — see edn.
41.1 bass: additional c in Ly.
41-2 treble tied in Ly.
44 fingering given in Ly — see edn.

47.1-2 alto: d' in V2, d in Ly (not noted in edn).

48.2 alto: V2: [error]; Ly: [error]
The variants between Ly/V2 and L18 did not arise for reasons of instrument compass, since both have the same range; nor to make the piece easier to play in one source or the other. L18 is not consistent throughout; passages entirely in scales in Ly, V1 and V2 are changed to a combination of scales and arpeggios in Liège. The inconsistencies make L18 the less preferable source, and show that it did not serve as a model for the other three, but the origin of the variants cannot be determined. V1 is fairly close to Ly/V2, especially bars 48-104; the scales of Ly/V2 are reproduced in V1, and the arpeggios of L18 are not found. The most significant variants occur in bars 37-47 and are seen in Example 7.4; while they are extensive, they do not reflect inferior quality; indeed, there are several variants in V1 which may be improvements upon Ly/V2, and its neglect is undeserved.22

The echo piece L19 is attributed to Sweelinck, and has only one incomplete concordance; the Vienna 714 version (unattributed) does not contain bars 158-221 (the end of the work). The sectional nature of the piece does, however, allow for conclusion at this point, where a fermata is given in Liège 153. The echoes are notated differently in the two sources: L19 uses red ink for echo passages, while Vienna 714 has no specific echo marks (probably since it is obvious in the context of the piece). None of the sixty-nine variants which Leonhardt noted23 are as significant as the differences between the versions of L18.

Three of the four Merulo toccatas in Liège 153—L20, L21 and L23—were copied within this subsection of stage one, the fourth (L41) in stage three; for convenience, all four are considered together. L22,
although not a Merulo toccata, presents a striking initial resemblance to 1598:3 and thus may be located significantly. A summary of the variants between the Merulo prints and Liège versions is given in Table 7.3.

Table 7.3. Variants between MS and prints.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L no.</th>
<th>Print (breves)</th>
<th>Length Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1598:4</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1598:8</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>1604:5</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>1598:9</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABBREVIATIONS:

A: accidental in ornament
R: rest
B: beaming
C: clef change
Al: accidental, not in ornament
O: other
T: tied notes in print changed to longer note value in MS
NT: 'no tie': tie in print omitted in MS
AT: 'added tie': untied notes in print are tied in MS
OT: 'opposite to T': longer note value in print changed to tied notes in MS

The large number of variants is deceptive; the mere fact that they are able to be classified fairly precisely is a sign that the prints and MS copies are generally close. Hand division, shown in the print by note placement on the staves, in the MS by stem direction, is nearly identical. The MS versions certainly stem from the printed versions of 1598 and 1604, but the following discussion shows that there was one or more intermediary MS sources between the prints and Liège 153.

24 The resemblance caused several writers (Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura tedesca', p. 31; Debes, 'Merulo', pp. 74, 355; Schierning, Die Überlieferung, p. 87) to erroneously cite the works as concordant.
Most of the variants considered singly are insignificant. Accidentals in ornaments (A) were not treated consistently by the engraver of the prints, and so these differences probably reflect the scribe's similar lack of concern. The scribe occasionally was more consistent than the engraver, as in Example 7.5.


Rests (R) are attributable to scribal method; he generally avoided using them. It should be noted that the rests in the prints serve a different purpose from what might be expected today: they often indicate hand changes rather than actual voice movement, as in Example 7.6.

---

25 This is difficult to discern from Guilmant's edition, which freely adds rests from the prints without comment.
Example 7.6. L21/1598:8, bar 43.3-4.

L21:

1598:8:

There was no attempt to maintain strict four-voice partwriting through the use of rests in the prints (although four-voice writing dominates the texture throughout the toccatas). Although not reflected in Table 7.3, the variant of beaming (B) is the most frequently encountered in Liège 153, since the scribe customarily beamed semiquavers in groups of four, while in the print they are usually beamed by eights. The tabulated beaming variants represent a departure from the scribe’s norm. For example, there are about 130 ‘customary’ beaming variants between L20 and 1598:4 in addition to the ten tabulated variants. The rhythms of the toccatas are often difficult and beaming variants are understandable. Clef variants (C) indicate that clef changes were
common in the print, but not in the MS, and are attributable to scribal method. Variants under 'Other' (O) and 'Other Accidentals' (Al), some of which are interesting but few musically preferable, can give no help regarding scribal characteristics; most of them are unexplainable and may simply be errors. 'Other' comprises various rhythmic differences, omission of notes, the very occasional pitch difference, hand change, etc., and none is significant enough on its own to suggest a source other than the print.

The variants regarding ties (T, NT, AT OT) are so insignificant that the scribe may not even have been conscious of them, and are therefore accurate reflections of his exemplars in all probability. Variant T, where $\text{\textdollar}\text{\text{-}}\text{\textdollar}$ (print) becomes $\text{\textdollar}$ (MS), occurs numerous times in three of the four Merulo toccatas. In 1598:4, the variant occurs 57 times, although there were 124 possible places (if the scribe were working from the print). Either the scribe was inconsistent in his treatment of the figure $\text{\textdollar}\text{\text{-}}\text{\textdollar}$, or he copied from an intermediary source (which was itself inconsistent). One might conclude that such a small detail would be attributable to scribe alteration, but the dramatic difference between L20-21 and L23 throws such a conclusion into doubt: L20 has 55 T variants; L21 has 138; L23 has none. The difference indicates a change, not in copying procedure, but in exemplar.

Other pieces in the MS shed light on the scribe's inconsistent treatment of $\text{\textdollar}\text{\text{-}}\text{\textdollar}$. Variant T is not common in L1-8 (it occurs only six times, all within two bars in L3, where it is attributable to the scribe's method). But in the Sweelinck echo L19, tied minims (rather than semibreves) are encountered 47 times in the first 60 bars, but semibreves are written only six times, five in the first four bars. Clearly it was not the unchanging custom of the scribe to change $\text{\textdollar}\text{\text{-}}\text{\textdollar}$ to $\text{\textdollar}$, or he would have done it in L19, but this variant is found
almost 200 times within L20-21. These inconsistencies show that 1598 is unlikely to have been the exemplar for L20-21.

The tabulation of T, OT, AT and NT variants is a clear sign that the scribe was not consistent regarding ties or longer note-values. The relatively few NT variants in comparison with T in L20-21 show only a tendency towards consistency; but this is reversed in L23 and L41, which show nearly the opposite pattern. The points to emerge from Table 7.3 regarding exemplars are that L20 and 21 were probably copied from the same source, L23 stems from a different source from the other three, and L41 stems from a different source from the other three. Other considerations regarding the placement of the works within the MS and handwriting characteristics confirm the first; it is probable that they were copied from the same exemplar (which was not the print).

L22 is closely related to 1598:3 for the first breve, excepting the obvious difference that they have different tonal types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>Ambitus</th>
<th>Final</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1598:3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar 3 of L22 has no discernible relation to the Merulo toccata, but bars 4-9 have several points of similarity to bars 14-16 of 1598:3. The initial nine bars of L22 and the corresponding material of 1598:3 are given in Example 7.7.
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Example 7.7. Merulo, 1598:3, bars 1, 14-16; and L22, bars 1-9 in parallel. Bracketed parts of 1598:3 are unrelated to L22.
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It is likely that L22 was written with reference to 1598:3; the relations in Example 7.7 are too striking to be mere coincidence. It is unlikely to have been written by the scribe of the MS for stylistic reasons which will become clear by the end of this survey; more likely, it stems from a (now-lost) manuscript which served as exemplar for the Merulo toccatas within this subsection, and is the work of a composer who emulated Merulo by actually copying a part of one of his toccatas in a different piece.

Thus L20-23 present a unified group in terms of handwriting characteristics and relation to Merulo; and a diverse group in terms of scribe characteristics. The scribe showed no particular desire to group pieces of one genre together in the MS; the placement of L41 shows this, as well as numerous other placements which appear to be more random than classified according to the type of piece. The placement here of four toccatas, three by Merulo, thus suggests reference to a single intermediary source which contained these works. If there was only one exemplar used for the toccatas L20-23, this exemplar was itself copied inconsistently (suggesting the possibility of a further intermediate source, or more than one scribe at work). Alternatively (but less likely), it is possible that the scribe of Liège 153 used more than one exemplar even for these pieces. Either way, it appears that there was more than one intermediate manuscript copy between L20, 21 and 23 and the Merulo prints.

L41 (=1598:9), since it stands more nearly on its own (it forms a possible subsection within stage three), is more likely to have been copied from the print. The lack of A variants (there is only one) supports this possibility; the treatment of ties does not. Of the 228 ties in the print, 176 were altered: 118 by omitting the tie, 58 by changing two tied notes to a longer note value. The pattern of variants
shown in Table 7.3 makes it clear that the exemplar was not the same as either that of L20–21 or L23; this is to be expected, since the pieces are placed in different parts of the MS. The question of exemplar for L41 must remain open, but the possibility of another intermediary MS cannot be ruled out.

Stage one (cont.): L26; 30–1; 32–6; 39–40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L no. (breves)</th>
<th>composer, style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26 47</td>
<td>anon. toccata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 67</td>
<td>Scronx echo (single part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 83</td>
<td>?Scronx echo (single part)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 115</td>
<td>Philips madrigal intabulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 100</td>
<td>Browne 'tocata'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 104</td>
<td>anon. canzona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 108</td>
<td>&quot; madrigal intabulation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 96</td>
<td>&quot; madrigal intabulation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 79</td>
<td>&quot; canzona (Petit Jacquet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 133</td>
<td>&quot; canzona opening, sequence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining pieces of stage one fall into four subsections. L26, entitled 'Fantasie' without attribution, is a short toccata-like piece with figurations typical of early seventeenth-century northern Europe;
its brevity and lack of interest suggest the work of an inexperienced composer.26

The echo pieces L30-31 are closely related in style and resemble Sweelinck's echo technique, but lack his musical craft.27 Echoes are notated with red ink, as in Sweelinck's echoes L19 and L42. L30 is attributed to 'Fr Gerardus Scronx' at the end; considering the proximity of L30-31 and their similar style, they are probably both by Scronx. The location of the attribution may thus not be as significant as Dart supposed (see 'Organ-book', p. 28); Example 7.9 shows the attribution, which could apply to both the end of L30 and the beginning of L31.

---

26 Schierning claimed that the work is Italianate in style (Die Überlieferung, p. 87 n407), but figures in bars 19-21 and 25-8 are particularly un-Italian:


The ornament signs in bar 2 (omitted from Guilmant's edn. (p. 70)) are not Italianate; Schierning further erred in supposing no ornament signs are found in the MS.

27 Dart commented that L30 is 'competent, but entirely uninspired' ('Organ-book', p. 28); the assessment applies equally to L31.
L32-6 begin with two works by English expatriates. L32 is quite different from the other Philips intabulations of this madrigal.

Browne's work L33 is concordant with an unattributed 'Tocata a 3' in Oxford 89. Vendome showed relationships with the piece and stylistic elements of Peter Cornet and Sweelinck, and compared the two versions.

---


29 'Wilhelmo Brouno' is named 'Gulemo Brouno Inglese' in another manuscript of Spanish Netherlands provenance, Berlin 40316. For more on Oxford 89, see Dart, 'An Early Seventeenth-century Book', and Vendome, Spanish Netherlands.
citing thirty-seven variants. The most significant is the ending; the antepenultimate bar in Oxford 89 accords with the fourth-last bar of L33, and L33 is one semibreve longer, using different material from the Oxford 89 version in its last three bars; the L33 ending is preferable.

Example 7.10. Browne, Fantasie L33, two endings.

Although the two versions of L33 are closely related, it appears that neither was actually copied from the other. L33 cannot have been copied directly from Oxford 89, due to the difference in attribution, and while the reverse cannot be ruled out, this also seems unlikely, due to the various circumstances of Oxford 89 outlined by Dart and Vendome. Its appearance in the two manuscripts (it is the only work of Browne with a concordance) suggests that it was circulating in the

---

30 Spanish Netherlands Keyboard Music II:5, 32.
31 It is also unlikely due to the different endings; the likelihood of the scribe re-arranging the ending by abbreviating it in a less satisfactory way is small.
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Brussels-Liège region around 1620 in at least one other manuscript now lost.

L34 is a fully-developed Italianate canzona of the style cultivated by Erbach. It concludes with seven bars of semiquaver figurations, and appears to be an original keyboard composition. L35 and 36 both resemble madrigal intabulations (although it is difficult to assess them without reference to a model).

The anonymous intabulator of L39, a canzona based on Claudio Merulo’s 'Petit Jacquet', referred to an unembellished version for his work; there were two printed versions available in the early seventeenth century which could have been used. Ritter first noted the concordance of this piece with Merulo’s setting, and therefore attributed the intabulation to him, but it is unlikely that this arrangement was actually the work of Merulo, since it is stylistically unrelated to his known canzona intabulations.

L40 has an opening canzona motto, but breaks down into repetitive sequences by bar 11. Its musical value is minimal, and thus seems unlikely to have been copied for musical reasons; more likely, it is an exercise by the scribe. This would help to rationalize the change in handwriting which occurs at bar 121 (see Example 7.3); the piece appears to have been left off in mid-sequence and the last bar of sequence

---

32 The first printed version (MERULO 1592) was embellished. Another embellished and transposed intabulation appeared in Terzi, Intavolatura (1593), no. 14, p. 43. A later MS copy of Merulo’s print is found in Turin vol. XI, fols. 120-121v.
34 Geschichte, pp. 48-9.
35 The Liège 153 version gives the only instance of repeat signs in the MS, discussed in detail in Judd, ‘Repeat Problems’. 
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completed according to the established pattern. The stylistic
difference between bars 1-121 and 122-33 is noticeable (the figure in
bars 122-4 and 129-31 appears nowhere else in the piece); and although
it is not great enough to suggest another composer altogether, it
indicates that the scribe was merely 'filling out the page', and not
concerned to compose a unified and formally well-ordered piece.

Stage two (hand A progressing to T)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>length</th>
<th>L no. (breves)</th>
<th>composer, style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-8</td>
<td>Gabrieli intonations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>64 Philips [madrigal intabulation]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>57 canzona opening, sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>&quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>143 &quot; &quot; &quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>148 canzona with concordances</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>84 [madrigal intabulation]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>94 toccata opening, sequence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The works with concordances are considered first. For those
without concordance, conclusions are minimal.

Ll-8 have two printed concordances (see the inventory); it is
virtually certain that the Schmid tablature was not used, for two
reasons: in Schmid the intonations are attributed not to Andrea but
Giovanni Gabrieli; and there is a significantly different ending to L5
given in Schmid but not in Liège 153 (which concords with 1593). On the
other hand, it is quite possible that the 1593 print was the exemplar. 36
The variants between 1593 and Ll-8 are given in the Table 7.4.

36 Dart's summary comments regarding the exemplar are erroneous: his
reference to 'many discrepancies' is not borne out in examination, and
the supposition of 'a rather defective manuscript several stages removed
from Gabrieli's autograph' is unfounded ('Organ-book', p. 27).
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Table 7.4. Variants between 1593 and Liège 153.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L no.</th>
<th>length</th>
<th>NT</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>LC</th>
<th>Rest</th>
<th>O</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>diff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>diff</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>diff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>diff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>diff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>diff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ABBREVIATIONS:**

- NT: tie in print, no tie in MS
- T: tie in print, longer note-value in MS
- P: pitch
- R: rhythm
- A: accidental
- LC: last chord
- Rest: rests different
- O: other
- Length given in units of semibreves

**NOTES:**

Two rhythm variants, one each in L1 and L5, are corrections to errors in the print.

The most numerous variant concerns ties, which are usually omitted in the MS. In one intonation, the variant T (where tied notes are altered to longer note values, e.g. \(\text{\text{j}}\) becomes \(\text{\text{o}}\)) occurs six times within two bars; but this was not maintained consistently. The remainder represent a fairly consistent level of variance, whether due to intermediate MS sources or the characteristics of the scribe. There are several copying errors (e.g. in L7, 29.2, s, there are eight quavers instead of eight semiquavers, i.e. a beam was omitted); and several variants noted above represent errors in the print which the scribe altered and corrected. Last chords appear to have been changed.
customarily, although two were not. Conclusions from comparison are not as exclusive as Dart supposed; it is plausible for the scribe to have used the 1593 print as an exemplar. While the possibility of an intermediary MS source cannot be ruled out, it seems less likely.

L13 was widely disseminated, to judge from the number of surviving versions. The differing attributions (anonymous in two sources, Merulo, Erbach and G. Gabrieli in the remaining three) also suggest a popularity which went beyond the bounds of composer identification. Examination of the variants produces no clear pattern of dissemination; there are about 340 points of variation among the five sources, detailed presentation of which would be pointless. On a more basic level, the formal plan of the versions is not entirely duplicated in any of the five. The sections of L13 are summarized:

A (bars 1-24)
A repeated (bars 24-47)
B (bars 48-73)
Transition (bars 73-80)
B' (bars 81-107)
Transition repeated (bars 107-113)
B' repeated (bars 114-40)
Coda (bars 140-8)

The following diagram collates the five versions of this formal plan.

---

37 Last chords in Turin vol. II were regularly changed (see I: 226); in two of the four Merulo toccatas copied in the MS (L20–21) the last chords are altered; even in Schmid, the last chords of the intonations are often different from 1593. It appears to have been a widespread practice to take liberty in arranging final chords.
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DIAGRAM 7.1. Formal plan of Canzona L13, five versions (notes overleaf).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
NOTES TO DIAGRAM 7.1:

(1) There is a repeat sign in Paris, Berlin, and Turin at bar 24; all three sources have one bar of ‘first ending’.

(2) Woltz has no repeat of A.

(3) L13 has a written-out repeat of A.

(4) Bar 74 is omitted from Berlin.

(5) Bars 86-7 are omitted from Paris, Berlin, Turin, and Woltz.

(6) Bars 107-39 are omitted from Paris; bar 107 is written, and crossed out.

(7) In Berlin there is a repeat sign after bar 106; bars 107-9 follow, and constitute a first ending. There is no indication of where to go back to.

(8) In Turin there is a repeat sign after bar 112, but no indication of where to go back to.

(9) In Woltz bars 113-39 are omitted; there are no repeats.

(10) In L13 bar 109* (corresponds to bar 76 of the first transition) is omitted.

(11) The transition (excepting bar 109*) and B’ are fully written out in L13.

(12) There is one extra bar in the coda of Berlin (see Example 7.14).

The lines descending from each source-name indicate the actual bars found in each. The horizontal dash-lines indicate the sections of the formal scheme of the canzona.

The ‘formal model’ is not identical to any of the five extant sources. Numbers given here are bar numbers with reference to L13, the version closest to the model. It is identical to the model with the exception of the omission of one bar in the repeat of the Transition; this bar should follow bar 109, and is labeled 109*. 
L13 is the only version not to use repeat signs but write out the repeats in their entirety. Comparing internally the two written-out repeats in the MS, it is evident that the scribe used an exemplar which employed repeat signs for at least section A, and probably section Transition + B’ as well. The five variants between bars 1–23 and 24–47 are minimal and all fall within the field of the scribe’s discretion. The four other sources treat section A as follows: Berlin 40615, Turin XI and Paris 27 use repeat signs; Woltz does not indicate a repeated section.

The second written-out repeat, bars 73–106/107–139, contains four variants, three of which are minor:


1) bar 77.1/110.1, soprano

2) bar 86.2/119.2, alto + tenor:
Example 7.11 (cont.).

3) bar 98.2/131.2, alto:

1) is simply the reworking of an ornament (which may have been included in a 'first ending' anyway); 2) appears to be an error that was corrected without eradicating the two wrong notes; 3) is an added note.

The fourth variant is the omission of bar 76 in the repeat (it should follow bar 109). The omission suggests that there was a 'first ending' of a repeated section in the exemplar at this point, which probably comprised bars 107-9, indicating a return to bar 76; but the scribe returned a bar later than he should have, resulting in the missing bar. The four concordances support this theory. In Paris, bar 107 is partially crossed out, and the piece proceeds directly to bar 140; the scribe saw that there was a repeat, and decided against including it in his version. In Woltz, a first ending of six bars is given (including the extra bar corresponding to bar 76); the same first ending is found in Turin. In Berlin, first ending bars are given as well, bars 107-109 (the same as those proposed for the exemplar for Liège 153). Since all four concordances indicate to a greater or lesser extent that there were several first-time bars and a repeat of the Transition and section B', and since Berlin's first-time bars match with those that would have suited the Liège version correctly, it can be

---

38. Woltz misunderstood the repeat, apparently; he did not include repeat signs for the section, despite the inclusion of the first ending. See Judd, 'Repeat Problems'.
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established with a high degree of certainty that the exemplar for Liège had repeat signs.

The variants suggest no clear stemma for the canzona. There are four variants of greater significance that the rest, however, which call for attention.

1) In all versions except L13, bars 86-7 are omitted; L13 is more formally orthodox, due to the similarity with bars 60–67; the polychoral effects in both sections call for the presence of bars 86-7. Example 7.12 shows the parallel formal plan of the two.
Example 7.12. Canzona L13, bars 60-7, 81-8 showing parallel structure.

2) In Berlin, bar 74 was omitted. This is curious, because the corresponding bar in the first ending is given. The omission is not musically satisfactory, and may be simply a scribal error.
3) In Berlin, there is an added voice, bars 62-66.
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4) The endings of the works have a number of variants.
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Variants (1) and (3) are musically satisfactory additions, and look very much like having stemmed from the original of the piece; if this is so, two unreconcilable stemmata would be postulated: Liège/other four, due to variant (1); and Berlin/other four, due to variant (3). Likewise, the different endings defy a simple explanation within a stemmatic system. The conclusion to be drawn is that there is no systematic way of revealing the transmissional stemma for the piece; the variants are due to modifications, emendations, or errors of omission by various scribes, and the missing links in the chain of transmission make it impossible establish a concrete connection among any of the five. Some of the scribes’ changes must be regarded as musical decisions, and thus they acted as arrangers as well.

The conclusions from examining the concordances are drawn primarily in the negative. Surprisingly, the only printed version (Woltz) was not used as a model by any of the other sources (indeed it is the least satisfactory of the five); the primacy of a printed text does not apply in this case. None was actually copied from another of the five, to judge from both major and minor variants; and there must have been a number of copies of the piece which are not now extant. 39

39 It is necessary to survey each MS in terms of its origin and purpose in order to evaluate the implications this piece has for questions of dissemination. Whether any of the four manuscript versions actually moved during their compilation cannot be determined at present (although it is unlikely that Turin was a ‘travelling source’); but the classification of manuscripts into those which moved from place to place and those which remained permanently in one place during their compilation may be a useful distinction in further investigations on the subject.
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Stage two (cont.): L9-12, 14-15 (no concordances)

The 'Fantasie de Petro Philippi' (L9) appears to be a madrigal intabulation, as does L14; but neither has an identified model. The four anonymous pieces L10-12, L15 all bear resemblance to the style of L40: they begin with canzona-style motives, and break down into repetitive sequential figurations. It is quite probable that they are by the same composer, the scribe.

Stage 3 (hand A'): 41; 42-4; 45-6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>length</th>
<th>L no. (breves)</th>
<th>composer, style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Merulo toccata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Sweelinck echo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>anon. toccata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Sweelinck toccata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>anon. toccata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>anon. canzona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Merulo toccata L41 is examined above. The Sweelinck echo L42 was examined by Dirksen, who rejected Leonhardt's 'doubtful work' theory. Its partial concordance with a work in Berlin 340 is unhelpful due to the late date of the Berlin MS and its unreliable transmissions. Dirksen believed that L43 may be a Sweelinck composition, due to its structure, style and position in the MS. The present study supports the positional argument: the three works L42-4 present a clear subsection of stage three, and were probably copied at

40Apel, Keyboard Music, p. 299, classed it 'a toccata of the Italian type, but here and there it includes Sweelinck-like keyboard figures.' The borderline between madrigal intabulation and toccata is indistinct; while there are many toccata elements in L9, the alternating homophonic/imitative texture and use of a short triplum bars 51-4 suggest a madrigal model.


42Ibid., pp. 107-8, although he concludes 'it would seem impossible to give an unequivocal verdict on this question.'
the same time. It is quite likely that they stem from the same exemplar.

L44 enjoyed wide popularity, to judge from its concordances. The Fitzwilliam, Lynar Al, Padua 1982, and Liège versions present the entire piece; Turin omits the imitative section bars 21-43, but is otherwise complete. The Berlin 40615 and Lüneburg 20;75 versions give only the beginning (bars 1-43, with differences in beginnings and endings), and may represent a different branch of the stemma. It would appear that the work travelled with Sweelinck's students in the same form, for the variants among the first five sources, while numerous, are not indicative of significantly different versions of the piece. Perhaps the most significant variant that Leonhardt noted was the omission of one bar in Liège:

Example 7.15. Sweelinck toccata (after edn.), bars 56-60.

Bar 58 is omitted from L44.

Even this variant may be attributable to the scribe's losing his place and mistaking bar 59 for 58, since the two begin similarly.

Dirksen considered and rejected L45 as a possible Sweelinck toccata, on stylistic grounds.\textsuperscript{43} It and the canzona L46 are of relatively good quality (if not up to Sweelinck's standard), and may be

\textsuperscript{43}Ibid., p. 118 n87.
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the work of one of Sweelinck's better students, considering their placement in the MS.

Stage 4 (hand B)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L no. (breves)</td>
<td>style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Echo (multiple voice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Solo (low register)/accompaniment ('Echo pour trompette')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Solo (low register)/accompaniment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Echo (multiple voice)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Solo (low register)/accompaniment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>Intabulation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Solo (low register)/accompaniment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Echo (multiple voice)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the works in stage four are anonymously transmitted, and all except L29 have echoes in one form or another. 'Echo' was apparently taken by the scribe in two senses: either a straightforward echo passage, where musical material is repeated implying one- or two-hand manual changes; or a single line solo, analogous to the later basse de trompette or similar French solo and accompaniment style. In stage four, L16, 27, 28 and 38 belong to the first category. L16 is a simple piece, likely to be the work of a novice; the echoes change register, and are possibly intended to be played on one manual. The normal notational devices used to indicate echoes (red ink, phrase marks, slur-like signs) are not found here. L27 adopts a short slur-like sign to indicate the echoes; Guilmant was unsure of their interpretation, suggesting either manual changes at each sign or a repetition of each phrase as demarcated by the signs; since the signs do not occur elsewhere in the MS it is more likely that they indicate actual repeats

---

44 Edn. p. 72 n1.
Chapter seven: Liège

of the phrases;\textsuperscript{45} this is the most satisfactory solution to the question.

L28 is an unusual piece with twenty-four clef changes to indicate echoes. Both Dart and Apel assumed that the clef changes indicate hand crossing;\textsuperscript{46} given the experimental sorts of notational devices used by the scribe for his echoes, it is unlikely that the Italian 'right hand plays top stave, left hand plays bottom' type of notation is indicated here. The top stave clearly is intended for a solo manual, and solos are in both upper and lower registers; it is plausible for this notation merely to indicate manual changes for each hand, without hands ever crossing. This would be the easier meaning, technically speaking, even though it would mean the left hand being notated physically 'above' the right.

L38 has manual-change 'echoes' (without exact repetition of musical material) marked with phrase marks; like L16, the 'echoes' are all in the upper register and would have been played on a separate manual. It is made up of 33 phrases which range from one to six bars in length; there is little sense of large-scale formal unity, and each phrase appears to be simply 'tacked on' to the previous.

Of the remaining pieces in stage four, L24, 25, and 37 fall into the second category of 'echo'. All three are similar in style, with solos to be played on a second manual in the bass register. The only non-echo piece in stage four is L29. It falls into no clear genre, but may be an intabulation of a vocal model.

\textsuperscript{45}It is well known that repeat signs were not highly developed in the early seventeenth century. A further difficulty with the theory that the signs indicate manual-change but not repetition is that if the piece were played strictly according to this method it would conclude on the secondary manual, an unlikely possibility.

\textsuperscript{46}Dart, 'Organ-book', p. 28; Apel, \textit{Keyboard Music}, p. 345 (with example).
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The stylistic similarity of many of the works in stage four, coupled with the evidence of their having been copied at roughly the same time, suggests that they are by the same composer, who was also the scribe. The works are interesting experiments with the technique of using a second manual, despite their superficiality.

Stage 5 (hand B progressing to B')

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>length</th>
<th>L rc. (breves)</th>
<th>style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Abbreviated canzona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Solo (upper voice)/accompaniment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Solo (upper voice)/accompaniment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Abbreviated canzona</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These four works present a unified positional group in the MS, and bear stylistic resemblance to the works in stage four. L47 and 50 are canzona-like pieces, although not as sectionalized and developed as might be found in Italian types of the same period; the sequences of L50 bars 44-53 bear an uncomfortable resemblance to similar (although lengthier) passages in L10-12 and 40. L48 and 49 are similar in style, having as ‘echo’ a solo line in the upper register. L48 has registration and manual-change references, ‘Corr.et’ and ‘Echo’, marked by the scribe for the first three echoes; the remainder, and all of those in L49, are indicated by phrase marks. These works are more analogous to the typical Sweelinck echo, since the material is regularly repeated, unlike the solo ‘echoes’ L24-5.

Five stages: summary

The contents of Liège 153 are summarized according to genre, stage of copying, and concordance/attribution in Table 7.5.
### Table 7.5. Styles and stages in Liège 153.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genre</th>
<th>Stages</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one</td>
<td>two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toccata</td>
<td>18(a), 20(a), 21(a), 22(b), 23(a), 26(b), 33(a)</td>
<td>41(a), 43(b), 44(a), 45(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intonation</td>
<td>1-8(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrigal intabulation</td>
<td>32(c), 35(b), 36(b)</td>
<td>9(c), 14(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzona (regular)</td>
<td>17(a), 34(b), 39(b)</td>
<td>13(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo (single part)</td>
<td>19(a), 30, 31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toccata (sequential)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzona (abbreviated)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canzona (sequential)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10, 11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echo (multiple part)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solo (upper part)/</td>
<td>51, 52, 53(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solo (lower part)/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>solo (upper + lower parts)/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise</td>
<td>54(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES:**

- \(a\) Works with concordances.
- \(b\) Works likely to have originated outside Liège.
- \(c\) No concordance, but attribution from outside Liège.
- \(d\) 51-4 were probably copied before the others in stage one.
Reading according to axis, the horizontal shows the general chronological order of copying. It is evident that there are no works with concordances copied in stages four or five; nor were any of these works likely to have had concordances, to judge from their quality and style. Seven concordances occur in stage one; stage two has nine, but the first eight (L1-8) are very short; and stage three has three. This shows tendency towards less concordance as the stages progress. A steady output of more provincial musical styles is evident in all five stages, but the Italianate and international styles—toccata, intonation, madrigal, and canzona—were left behind after stage three.

The vertical axis shows that most of the works with concordances fall into category of international styles and were transferred throughout Europe in the 17th century. Stylistically, the toccatas could be subdivided according to those by northern composers (Sweelinck: L18, L42-4; Browne, L33) and those by Merulo (L20-1, L23, L41) or Italianate in style (L22, L26, L45). Only two works below the genre ‘canzona (regular)’ have concordances: Sweelinck echoes. The pieces from ‘echo (single part)’ downward are not Italianate, and in many cases are not competent pieces. The resulting bipartite stylistic division of works is significant; it is probable that most of the works in the lower half of Table 7.5 were composed by the scribe.

Conclusions

The results of this study may be viewed on two levels. First, an intimate understanding of the organization and compilation of Liège 153 has been reached; this is valuable both in itself and for considering its purpose. The dating of the MS and identity of the scribe remain inconclusive at present; more ambiguities are raised than answered, and some conclusions of earlier scholars must be revised. The MS should be
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given a later terminus ante quem, according it more nearly with its contents.

On a detailed level, the attempt to determine exemplars leads to several important conclusions. The MS was most likely the work of an amateur organist-cum-composer at the house of the Crutched Friars of Liège. It was compiled over a number of years for the purpose of study, performance and composition; its apparently original compositions show a modest musical attainment consistent with the theory that the user was an amateur; but the virtuoso works show his willingness to attempt a high level of performance. The volume shows clear signs of being a steadily progressing work intended for personal use. The elaborate titles suggest something more than an ordinary organist's volume, but the fact that they are incomplete further suggest that the scribe never finished the volume. Such elaborate handwriting is more appropriate to a 'special' presentation volume, and incongruous for much of this music; hence it is not a day-to-day organist's book, but more likely belonged to a wealthy amateur who wanted the works to be fastidiously titled. Considering that the handwriting underwent changes which indicate a lengthy period of copying, the volume should be classed as a 'working book' of original and copied compositions compiled over a number of years. The experimental echo notations indicate the work of a person learning to make use of a two-manual organ. His tastes reflect both local and international styles; his own compositional efforts should perhaps not be judged too harshly, being the work of a beginner who had no intention of disseminating them. The MS is not the work of a professional musician.

47Dart classed it and Fitzwilliam together as 'anthologies compiled by adult amateurs of music' ('An Early Seventeenth-century Book' pp. 27-8), but the two are quite different, and Liège 153 is less an anthology than working book.
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Although the dating of Liège is not certain, it is probable that it was copied between about 1617 and 1625, and is the work of Gerardus Scronx, active in Liège in that period. This revision is pertinent to Sweelinck chronology, since it was formerly held to have been completed before his death. Later dating makes the presence of Merulo and the absence of Frescobaldi in the MS noteworthy, suggesting that Merulo’s influence was still felt after Frescobaldi began publishing keyboard music in earnest. This is consistent with Sweelinck’s style, which reflects Merulo more than Frescobaldi.

The examination of copying methods evaluates the MS as a transmitter of sources, and reveals an interesting distinction made by the scribe: some works appear to have had more authority than others. Most works were accurately copied, but considerations above show that the Merulo and A. Gabrieli pieces were exceptionally carefully done, the others less so. The actual significance of this for evaluating the Merulo toccatas is that the music was respected by someone far away and a number of years after it was published. In a narrow sense the Merulo copies are not significant, since they stem from the prints and merely reflect a student’s interpretation; but in a larger sense, they show the existence of other intermediary MSS, suggesting that they were in common circulation and judged worthy of study by northern keyboard students in the sphere of Sweelinck. Their accurate readings are deceptive. For Liège 153, the assumption that when MS copies are concordant with prints they are copied from the prints is shown to be false in the case of Merulo, Pellegrini and the canzona L13. Silbiger, dealing with a different MS repertoire, held the assumption to be true; these

49 Manuscript Sources, pp. 49-55.
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conclusions suggest that further afield from Italy, printed sources were not used as exemplars as oft-n, and careful comparison is necessary before confirming that a print was used as an exemplar.

The Merulo concordances show the value of 'insignificant' variants and their inconsistent treatment in the MS for determining intermediate sources. The treatment of tied notes betrays a more complex stemma for the works than might be otherwise assumed. The toccata L22 is particularly unusual since it borrows material from a Merulo toccata for the purpose of forming another piece. It may have been part of a pedagogical exercise for a student to base a new piece on thematic material from a published model. Similarly, L39 gives an embellished version of a Merulo canzona in circulation at the time.

The canzona L13 in particular appears to have been adjusted regularly, if not by the scribe of Liège, by scribes of its MS and printed concordances. The actual differences in Liège 153 are not great, but they are probably a good indicator of scribal approach to copying in the period. The piece falls into the category of parody or pastiche discussed by Ward, Reimann and Silbiger. The issues confronted in L13 and the MS as a whole confirm Reimann's observation that the scribe, not the composer, was probably responsible for emended or corrected versions of the same piece. The purpose of changes is not always evident, but neither is it essential to determine it. Simplification of more difficult passages, variation due to an instrument's range, or even due to the amount of paper available, is rarely found. The changes do not help to form stemmata, but the amount of small- and large-scale variation between different versions of the same piece provides abundant evidence that music texts were

---

representations of pieces that never had a single ideal form; some had more authority than others, but none were inviolate. The search for stemmata in such a literature is beside the point; the translation of notation to sound in performance was the primary concern of the scribe, and the notational means of copying merely a means to an unwritten end.
CONCLUSIONS
CONCLUSIONS

In one sense this thesis is actually six independent studies: printed keyboard music in Spain, printed keyboard music in Italy, and four manuscript surveys. By drawing them together under one cover, however, their similar roots may be seen, compared and evaluated. They are linked in several ways, but the dominant theme to emerge is that the concept or purpose behind the written sources is an essential factor of their content. Viewed merely as ends in themselves, they cannot be properly understood, but placed within a larger context, the sources surveyed here reveal a complex web of reasons for the writing down of what was essentially an unwritten art.

Prints

The most explicit descriptions of playing music at the keyboard are found in Spanish printed sources. Although only seven volumes were printed, most of the authors gave detailed descriptions of musical notation and the reasons for its development and use. The prior condition for keyboard music—playing un-notated fantasia—is most clearly expounded in Sancta Maria’s work, but all the writers referred to fantasia in one form or another. Mudarra showed the importance of the vihuela output earlier in the 16th century for providing a precedent for written keyboard music; the development and early use of formats is explained in Bermudo by means of a tripartite division (choirbook, open score, number tablature), symmetrically reflected in his three-fold classification of musicians (theorists, singers, performers). The three
Conclusions

printed number tablatures of Venegas, Cabezón and Correa show a systematic development of the use of number tablature in a fairly large corpus of music.

The Spanish clarity of purpose and intent in explaining the use of notational formats at the keyboard provides a necessary context for interpreting the keyboard production in Italy in the same period. The Italians— with few exceptions— did not write in the detail of the Spaniards, but the trends in their printed output of keyboard music are directly related. The sheer quantity of the output makes distillation and determination of the underlying reasons for the production difficult to show as clearly as the Spanish material in Chapter two, but the important trends and themes summarized in Chapter three and Appendix A provide ample evidence for the similarity of the general point of view in the two countries regarding the use of notational formats.

Perhaps the most fundamental development of the period was the rise of music printing. Its importance for early Italian keyboard music is reflected in the emphasis upon printed works in this study. Notational formats appeared in quantity due to printing; notational refinements, variations and developments occurred more quickly due to the ease of publication that the press provided. The period shows typical signs of the early stages of notational development: widely differing solutions to various problems, experimental notations soon discarded, and the establishment over a period of preferred notational formats for particular styles of writing. The change in availability and access to written materials had a significant impact on the status quo of keyboard playing. Fantasia, the predominant technique of professionals prior to the advent of printing, diminished in inverse proportion to the rise in use of written music. The greater availability of notated music
eventually led to a class of keyboard players with technical proficiency at reading the notation, even at sight, yet who could not play fantasia. The numerous sub-topics and themes of Chapters two and three and Appendices A and B have as their starting point these basic developments.

Vocal music provided a model for playing fantasia, and the transferral of vocal genres and styles to the keyboard was the predominant activity of performers early in the period. Plucked-instrument music, although similarly derivative of vocal music, also preceded and provided models for printed keyboard music. This is particularly evident in Spain, but also true in Italy, where plucked-instrument music declined rapidly after 1610. Both vocal and plucked-instrument music were used by particular people for particular reasons; Chapter three imitates Bermudo's three-fold classification of musicians by proposing three classes of users of notated keyboard music: would-be professionals, who used various notations to achieve the goal of performing fantasia; more modestly gifted musicians who played the keyboard (sometimes of necessity) for religious establishments; and wealthy amateurs, who wished to learn to play the keyboard for personal enjoyment and recreation.

The would-be professionals used the more 'difficult' formats that had been long established: choirbook and partbooks. The notational developments of the period were primarily of use to the second and third classes of users, who greatly benefitted from formats that made it easier to learn to play, or play quickly. Theoretically, a performer could sound as if he were a competent professional as long as the musical notation was performed accurately. In practice, no doubt, this was not always successful, but the element of deception—that a person
reading notation could sound like a person playing fantasia—lay behind
the production of many keyboard sources of the period.

Expediency and ease of learning is an important topos in several
early keyboard sources. Pedagogy itself was one of the prime
motivations for the publication of much of the extant music, whether it
was meant to be easy (as in Valente) or difficult (as in most ricercar
volumes around 1600). The concept of study is significant in terms of
notation as well, for open score format was particularly suited to study
purposes, more so than to composition. There was a dichotomy of purpose
for the music of the period: it was intended either to obviate the
tiresome and difficult amount of study required, or to reinforce the
ideals of the earlier age when a long period of study produced players
of fantasia. The theme of study is central in either case. The
importance of a teacher is occasionally stressed, and there are only two
 overtly autodidactic volumes in the literature. In this respect
keyboard music is quite different from lute, which regularly highlighted
that one could teach one's self to play. The keyboard was probably
perceived as the more 'academic' or serious instrument, and accordingly
required a higher degree of training.¹

Related to the need for a teacher (or not) is the secretive guild­
like attitude found in some sources. The manuscript tradition was
personal in a way that the nascent printed tradition could never be.
Private instruction from a teacher changed to at least the possibility
of self-tuition; but even if a teacher was employed, the greater
availability of music meant that the pupil potentially had at his
disposal a large amount of musical material that was less dependent upon
a single individual. The traditional method of learning the instrument,

¹Riedel, Quellenkundliche Beiträge, pp. 14-15.
studying privately with a professional who passed on his art to a small number of students, was threatened by the less personalized printed output. Although the fears of the secretive that their art would be compromised were largely groundless, the attitude seems to have resulted in a relatively low output of keyboard music compared to vocal. Several advertised series of music failed to get off the ground, suggesting that for many there was a deep-seated reluctance to use the new kinds of printed music.

These series were the work of individuals with particular (sometimes idiosyncratic) ideas or goals: men like Merulo, Giacomo Vincenti, and Banchieri. Particular musicians or printers had a significant impact on the general situation. This is reflected in such features as the relationship of printing format to the city of publication, and the various difficulties that resulted in compromised publications that did not fully meet the composers' wishes. Format was occasionally determined by the composer for particular purposes (as in the work of Frescobaldi), but the printer also had a say in the matter. Several composers' desire for a particular format was frustrated due to printing difficulties.

Accompanimental notations for keyboard are related to solo keyboard music in specific ways. They had as their primary goal ease of performance and quickness of preparation— the concept of sightreading is perhaps most prominent here. The studies of transposition provided by several musicians bear primary relation to accompaniment. Indeed, for the professional keyboard player accompaniment or alternatim performance was probably the main element of day-to-day duties. The various notations for such purposes found in works by Merulo, Asola, Banchieri, Bottazzi, and others reflect the wide spectrum of users and approaches to such performance.
Conclusions

Bermudo stated explicitly that composers sometimes suppressed their best keyboard works and gave out less consequential pieces in number tablature; a related state of affairs must have existed in Italy, where some of the most renowned keyboard players did not publish any keyboard music at all. This should serve as a salutary reminder that the extant notated music does not reflect the highest achievements of the early part of the period under consideration.

Manuscripts

The manuscript studies of Chapters four to seven have approached the issues surrounding the use of notational formats at the keyboard in an entirely different way. There are no quotations to provide support; the broad survey of Chapters two and three is replaced with detailed survey of a few sources. These chapters are more autonomous, but taken as a whole they give a fair representation of Italian keyboard music in manuscripts, and its use and dissemination to various parts of Europe.

The studies concentrate upon the methodology of each scribe, the order and construction of the manuscripts, their content, and possible meanings behind the numerous variant readings they offer. Not surprisingly, the primary conclusion to emerge is that the scribe (not the content) was an overwhelmingly significant factor in each manuscript's preparation. The trends that are visible all stem from individuals working for particular reasons. For these manuscripts, the scribes took varying degrees of liberty with their work, showed signs of respect for some features of the music, and often copied for personal, pragmatic or expedient reasons, not in order to preserve 'ideal texts' for future generations. Each source was a means, not an end in itself, from the point of view of the scribe. The manuscripts were means for learning, playing and re-playing music; fantasia would have been the
goal for keyboard players who copied them. Fantasia is the unstated higher art that lies behind the manuscripts surveyed here. The unwritten art impinged heavily upon the scribes, and they used freedoms similar to fantasia in varying degrees when copying and composing.

Bagnacavallo is the most straightforward source, copied from three printed volumes. The Bourdeney Codex, the Turin tablatures, and Liège 153 are all considerably more complex, and the examination of scribal methodology, compilation procedure and possible exemplars is an elaborate process. The issues of scribal methodology offer a rich field of investigation. They concern how the scribe worked, changed over a period of years, compiled, and used the music that was copied. The text is the primary source of information, but its evaluation allows issues of performance practice and the historical events of keyboard playing to be raised and often clarified.

The notated keyboard music of the period, whether printed or manuscript, was conceived in the context of an art that at the highest level was not written down. The music that is represented in extant sources does not fully reflect that unwritten art; the extant sources were conceived and created for specific purposes, and show the gradual change in appreciation of notation for use at the keyboard. In the final analysis, the tracing of the evolution of keyboard music from its printed beginnings reveals the overwhelming dominance of the intangible, unwritten art; a dominance which gave way to greater use of a variety of notational formats at the keyboard. Ultimately the unwritten tradition was replaced by a performing tradition that had notated music as its point of departure.
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PREFACE

The appendices present information or music that due to its bulk was not incorporated into the main body of the thesis. Appendix A, the longest, presents a chronological annotated bibliography of Italian printed keyboard music c. 1500-1700. The information represents collation (and occasional correction) of the material in Brown, Sartori, and Caldwell, 'Sources', with considerable commentary. Fuller bibliographical information may usually be obtained from these three sources. I have not personally examined every source included here, and have relied extensively on Sartori for quotations, although original sources or facsimiles were consulted wherever possible.

Reprints and further editions are included under separate headings in each case, with cross-reference to the first printing or edition.

A considerable amount of space is dedicated to quotation and translation of prefatory or other contemporary writing which provides evidence for the use of the volumes in the appendix. Many of the quotations are taken from Sartori, some are found in Kinkeldey, Orgel, and many are extracted from the original sources themselves. The main purpose of providing these quotations is to gather them together under one cover to show their interrelations; English translation is provided to facilitate the narrative. When a translation is already available in print it has been referred to; many translations are published here for the first time.
ABBREVIATIONS AND TERMINOLOGY

Pitch: c' is 'middle C'.

Clefs: pitch letter name and line of stave (bottom line is one, top line is five), e.g. clc3c4f4 for standard 'low clef' pieces.

Specific partbooks are abbreviated in the usual manner: e.g. 'CATQBBC' for 'Canto — Alto — Tenore — Quinto — Basso — Basso continuo'.

Libraries are abbreviated by their RISM sigla.

Manuscripts are referred to by short title consisting of location and number, e.g. 'Oxford 89', short for GB-0Ch, Ms. 89. Full references are given in the Bibliography.

Appendices A and B are chronological bibliographies of primary sources printed in Italy c. 1500-1700; they are referred to by composer (or author) and date. In the case of Appendix A, upper case is employed, e.g. 'BATTIFERRI 1669'. If two volumes by the same composer appeared in the same year, they are numbered (i, ii, iii) in alphabetical order. If the volume is a reprint the letter 'R' follows the date. References to lost volumes are enclosed in square brackets. Question marks precede dates that are probable but uncertain. 'Before' and 'after' are abbreviated 'b.' and 'a.' Full references for modern editions of these volumes are listed in the Bibliography ('Primary Sources') under the composer's name, or in the case of anthologies or manuscripts under the editor's name.

In Appendix A itself, the last date (year) which is discussed on a given page is centred in the heading of the page for ease in finding references.
References to Appendix B are given in lower case and date, preceded by 'Pb-' (short for 'Partbooks'): e.g. 'Pb-Merulo 1574'. Square brackets indicate a lost volume that is attested in the literature.

Short titles are employed throughout for reference to primary literature not indexed in Chapter two or Appendices A and B, and all secondary literature; full references are given in the Bibliography. The two most important bibliographical works for this study, Howard Brown, Instrumental Music Printed before 1600: a Bibliography, and Claudio Sartori, Bibliografia della musica strumentale italiana stampata in Italia fino al 1700, are abbreviated Brown and Sartori respectively.

Notational formats are abbreviated following the definitions in Chapter one, I:9-13. Specific layout is abbreviated according to number of systems per page, number of staves per system, and number of lines per stave; e.g., '2 x 5/8' denotes two systems per page, two staves per system, the top stave consisting of five lines, the bottom of eight. 'Cross-opening' indicates that the music is to be read across an opening, i.e. from line one of the verso to line one of the recto to line two of the verso, etc.

Tonal types are calculated and abbreviated according to the theory established in Powers, 'Tonal Types'. The abbreviation scheme in each case is 'system' (natural or transposed; B natural (+) or flat (b)) — 'ambitus' (range according to clefs: high or low) — 'final' (final of the piece).
APPENDIX A

PRINTED SOURCES OF ITALIAN KEYBOARD MUSIC:

CHRONOLOGICAL SURVEY (EXCLUDING PARTBOOKS)
ANTICO 1517

Andrea Antico, publ., Frottole intabulate da sonare organi libro primo (Rome: Antico, 1517).¹

Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/5).

Contents: 40 fols., 26 frottolas.

The idea of printing keyboard music was at least twenty years old by the time this, the earliest volume of Italian printed music specifically intended for keyboard, was published. Petrucci’s Venetian privilege was granted in 1498,² and revised for the Papal States in 1513. He failed to produce any organ intabulations, and the privilege was taken from him and granted to Antico in December 1516, who printed the present volume in January 1517.³ The new privilege related that Antico ‘is shortly going to be the first person to publish keyboard tablatures printed with [his] own type, an undertaking not only useful and necessary to all who take pleasure in this branch of the arts but also something new which before our time has never been done in printing . . . ’, and also that the privilege to Petrucci was revoked: ‘Notwithstanding any concession made by us in this matter to anyone, particularly to our beloved son Octavianus Petrutius of Fossombrone, whose concession, since he has published nothing of this sort these last three years and more, but has kept us and other waiting in vain, we repeal.’⁴

¹ Brown 1517; Sartori 1517 (+II); ed. Hogwood.
² Sartori, Petrucci, pp. 14-15. He was given a privilege to print ‘canto figurado, intabuladure dorgano et de liuto’ for twenty years, the agreement dated 25 May 1498.
³ Picker, 'Anthologies', p. 212.
In the woodcut on the title page (see Ex. A.1), the reader is presented with a figure seated not at the organ (as the title might lead one to expect) but at the harpsichord. Radole and Hegwood noted that the woodcut resembles one in Antico's print Quindecim Missarum (1516), suggesting not that it represents any particular performance practice for the music of either volume, but merely an illustration of the art of Musica; the contents of the Frottole are nevertheless appropriate for the harpsichord. Jeppesen and Hegwood suggested that the woodcut mocks Petrucci (depicted as a monkey with a lute); Agee's documentation of other printers who make monkeys of competitors makes this more than 'nicht undenkbar' (Jeppesen).

The contents of the volume, a series of frottola intabulations, are intimately related to vocal music; but to the simple rather than learned style, cultivated by amateurs in wealthier secular establishments. There is no contradiction with the organ named in the title and the volume's secular orientation; many secular courts had organs. The volume reflects the influence of contemporary lute volumes, and Antico's initiative in transferring the music to a keyboard format when Petrucci failed to do so is noteworthy. The careful production of the volume (every page a woodcut) must have made it very costly, and suggests that its users were wealthy amateurs.

---

5 Radole, intro. to repr.; Hogwood, edn. pp. 5-6.


7 Analysed and inventoried in Jeppesen, Italienische Orgelmusik, pp. 52-53.
Example A.1. ANTICO 1517, title page.

Marc'Antonio Cavazzoni, Recerchari motetti canzoni ... libro primo (Venice: Bernardinum Vercelensem, 1523). 8

Format: intavolatura (2 x 6/6).

Contents: 38 fols., 2 ricercars, 2 motets, 4 chansons.

Several scholars have noted the idiomatic instrumental writing in M. A. Cavazzoni’s ricercars. 9 They resemble written-down improvisations

---

8 Brown 1523; Sartori 1523 (+II); ed. Jeppesen, Italienische Orgelmusik.

9 Jeppesen, Italienische Orgelmusik, pp. 76–113; Slim, ‘Keyboard Ricercar’, pp. 271–282; etc.
and suggest a similar technique to the Spanish fantasia, yet their form does not rely on points of imitation, but on larger harmonic motion, and they are formally linked with the later toccata, as Slim showed. The ranges of the works are extraordinary, sometimes extending from F to f''', but this notwithstanding, vocal references in this volume are clear: the motets and canzonas have titles alluding to texted works, and textural relations with vocal music may be seen.

Cavazzoni's reasons for publishing the work are unknown; he alluded to the dedicatee's encouragement of the work in the dedication (a common topos in volumes of the period), but indicated no other motives. The format is similar to that of Antico, and was apparently in common currency for keyboard music. The Venetian privilege for this volume refers to 'a new form of tablature for setting songs, masses and other things to play them on the organ and other similar instruments (Una nova forma de tabulature de metter canti, messe, et altre cose, et quelli sonar in organo et altri simel instrumenti)',\(^{10}\) using the word 'metter' in a similar way to the Spanish 'poner' (see I:27). The reference to a 'new form' probably refers not to intavolatura per se but its appearance in print. There is a hint of the use of notation as an expedient way of learning to play vocal music at the keyboard, since vocal forms ('canti, messe') are emphasized. The volume itself is a typeset double-impression carefully crafted by Vercelensis, and, like Antico's, must have been costly.

---

\(^{10}\) Slim, 'Keyboard Ricercar', p. 74; Agee, 'Venetian Privilege', p. 28.
G. CAVAZZONI 1543

Girolamo Cavazzoni, *Intavolatura cioe recerari canzoni himni magnificati composti per Hieronimo de Marcantonio da Bologna, detto d'Urbino, libro primo* (Venice: B. v., 1543). 11

Format: intavolatura (2 x 6/7).

Contents: 28 fols., 4 ricercars, 2 chansons, 4 hymns, 2 Magnificats.

As is evident from the title, this volume is indebted to Girolamo’s father and his work of 1523. Like it, this is a carefully produced typeset double impression. 12 This difficult and expensive process was obviated by Attaingnant’s development of practical typeset single impression music printing in 1528, and this volume is one of the last typeset multiple-impression music books printed in Italy.

The contents of the volume reflect a vocally-orientated compositional style with additional ornamentation. The hymns and magnificat settings are intended for *alternatim* performance, and are composed in a simple style with cantus firmus melodies. Unlike Marc’Antonio’s, these ricercars are imitative, reflecting newer ideas in instrumental writing. 13

---

11 Brown 1543; Sartori 1543b; ed. Mischiati.
12 Sartori suggested Bernardino de Vitali (‘Cavazzoni’, p. 364); or it may be the work of Bernardino Vercelensis, considering its similarity to the 1523 volume (despite their different typefaces).
Appendix A

G. CAVAZZONI before 1549

Girolamo Cavazzoni, *Intabulatura d'organo, cioe misse himni magnificat composti per Hieronimo de Marcantonio da Bologna detto d'Urbino, libro secondo* (Venice: n.p., before 1549, the year of the death of the dedicatee). 14

Format: intavolatura (2 x 6/7).

Contents: 40 fols., three organ Masses (2 Credos), 8 hymns, 2 Magnificats.

Coupled with the previous volume by similar title and privilege, G. Cavazzoni's works provided the precedent of a wide repertoire of vocally-orientated keyboard music genres which was taken up in Merulo's larger publication venture of the 1560s.

BUUS 1549

Jacques Buus, *Intabolatura d'organo di recercari ... nouamente stampata con carateri di stagno libro primo* (Venice: Antonio Gardane, 1549). 15

Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/6).

Contents: 32 fols., 4 ricercars.

Antonio Gardane began printing lute tablatures in 1546, completing at least ten in two years. 16 This volume was his first keyboard

14 Brown 1547; Sartori 1547; ed. Mischbi. Agee, 'Venetian Privilege', p. 29; listed the privilege for the libro primo in which the second book is unmentioned, thus making it unlikely that the two were printed simultaneously.

15 Brown 1549; Sartori 1549a; ed. Schlee.

16 There was a burgeoning of lute music printed in Venice in 1546-47, during which period Gardane and Girolamo Scotto printed at least sixteen lute volumes; to judge from volume-numbering, several volumes
intavolatura. Gardane hints at the novelty of its printing in the title: 'newly printed with tin type'. This unusual remark identifies the printing technique as recently developed; it was the first intavolatura in Italy printed with the relatively inexpensive technique of single impression movable type.

The volume's dedication suggests motivations for publication: Buus referred to 'the ricercars in tablature which [he] composed at [the dedicatee's] instance (i Ricercari in Tauolatura ad instantia uostra da me fatti)', noting that 'by publishing them they can be useful to many others, as they were to [the dedicatee] (potendo essi con l'uscir fuori così giocare à molti altri, si come à voi fatto hanno)'. It is significant that the volume is intavolatura format, unlike his two volumes of ricercars printed in partbooks (Pb-Buus 1547, 1549); the latter were intended at least in part for organ, as their titles indicate. The intavolatura's dedicatee was a youth (the 'giovane Paolo di Hanna'), and it appears that the format reflects pedagogical use for one particular novice, extended to many by the act of publishing them. Although the ricercars in this volume have characteristics which differentiate them from vocal music of the period— noteworthy is their

---

are no longer extant. Scotto published five more volumes in 1548-9, but Gardane none; he did not return to lute music until 1554 (see Brown, pp. 75-153). There appears to have been some collaboration between Gardane and Scotto, who reprinted each other's lute books during this period; see Bridges, 'Gardane', and idem, 'Scotto', The New Grove, 7:159, 17:86.

17 I know of no other Gardane title page that states the kind of type used.

18 G. CAVAZZONI before 1549 was probably printed like his libro primo, with a double impression (I was unable to examine the original). Gardane, who came from the south of France, was no doubt influenced by the printing technology of Attaingnant and Moderne.

19 Sartori.
wide range and the number of imitative entries, different than that of motets—²⁰ their basic style is vocally orientated.

[SEGNI 1550] [lost]²¹

GARDANE 1551

Antonio Gardane, publ., Intabolatura nova di varie sorte de balli da sonare per arpichordi, claviciembali [sic], spinette, & manachordi ... libro primo (Venice: Gardane, 1551).²²

Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/6).

Contents: 23 fols., 25 dances.

Agee noted that in 1550 a privilege was given to one 'Zuan Battista Seriati' for a volume of 'diverse danze da balare'.²³ The book is probably the same as the present work, although no explanation may be found for why Gardane chose to remove Seriati's name from the volume. The work is significant for its contents and title. Dancing was of course common throughout the century, but only a few volumes were printed for the keyboard performer to use to accompany the dance, probably owing to the lesser status of dance music. Since dance music was usually improvised, this volume was for amateurs and novices unable to perform dances in the more customary way. Gardane unashamedly cited keyboard instruments in the title that are rarely mentioned in more

²¹Brown [1550]. References to this volume indicate it was an intavolatura.
²²Brown 1551; Sartori 1551b; ed. Heartz; ed. Oxenbury and Dart.
²³'Venetian Privilege', p. 7.
serious keyboard volumes, but omitted the more orthodox instrument, organ.

That the collection was deemed desirable or necessary indicates the continuing shift away from exclusive professionalism and a populist approach. It is analogous to numerous lute books which contain dance sets, and may have been Gardane's attempt to transfer the evidently-popular lute book repertoire to a keyboard notation.

The names of most of the dances suggest family surnames. Their musical content is limited, and Heartz noted a 'sameness' to the collection. It was not by any means a contribution to the 'learned' art, and the lack of similar volumes in later years suggests that it was not well-received.

ORTIZ 1553


Contents: 62 fols., embellishment treatise with numerous music examples.

Ortiz signed his dedication in Naples, and so the *Tratado* may be considered Neapolitan for the purposes of this discussion. The Spaniard emigrated to Naples and held the post of Maestro di Cappella at the Viceregal Chapel there from 1553 to 1570. Published simultaneously in

24 See Sartori, 'Pratique'.
26 Brown 1553 + 6; Sartori 1553a, II:1553a bis; ed. Schneider.
Spanish and Italian, the volume provides evidence for connections between the two countries. As an early ornamentation manual for bowed string instruments it is of considerable interest, but the ornamentation was also applicable for keyboard players, as evidenced by Coimbra 242 (the only MS to refer to his ornamentation). His comments on how the keyboard player should accompany, made in Book II, give insights into notational practices. He described three ways of playing together, fantasia, on an undecorated melody, and on a polyphonic model.

This is how he described fantasia:

La fantasia on [sic] la puedo yo mostrar por que cadauno la tañe de su manera mas dire lo que sereiere para tañerla, la fantasia que tañere el Cimbalo sea consonancias bien ordenadas y que el violon entre con algunos pasos galanos y quando sepusiere en algunos puntos llanos le responda el Cimbalo approposito y hazen algunas fugas aguardandose el uno al hotro al modo de como se canta contra punto concertado y desta manera sebiran [sic] conociendo y con el exercicio descubriran secretos muy eçelentes que hay enesta manera de tañer...

I cannot demonstrate fantasia, since everyone performs it his own way; but I will say what is required to play it. The fantasia performed by the harpsichord should be well-ordered chords, upon which the viol enters with elegant passages; and if it dwells on undecorated notes, the harpsichord responds appropriately, and imitations are made, the performers waiting for each other, as is done when singing concerted counterpoint. And in this way they will continue learning, and with practice they will discover most excellent secrets which this manner of playing holds...

Vocal technique was an important metaphor for Ortiz, who hinted at a secretive art of performing. Fantasia is an improvisatory technique; four pieces are given in this section, none of which includes a keyboard part. The second way of playing is described thus:

---


29 Edn. p. 51.

DE LA SECONDA MANERA DE TANER el violon con el Cymbalo que es sobre canto llano. Desta manera de tañer pongo aqui 6. Reçercadas sobre este canto llano quese sigue, el qual se ha de poner en el Cymbalo por donde estã apuntado por contrabaxo, acompanándole con consonanças y algun contrapunto al proposto de la Reçercada que tañera el Violon destas seys, y destã manera la Reçercada dira bien por que es de contrapunto suelto ... 31

On the second way to play the viol with harpsichord, which is on an undecorated melody. For this style of playing I give here six ricercadas on the given melody which follows, which is to be played on the harpsichord, for which it is given as the bass, and which should be supplemented by chords and some counterpoint in a similar fashion to the six viol parts. This type of ricercada is good, because it is made of free counterpoint ...  

There follow six ricercars, all similar to Ex. A.2. A prototype of 'thorough-bass' (unfigured) is given, over which simple chords are played as accompaniment.32 The technique of using only the bass part to assist in accompanying was common enough to appear in print here as standard practice. This also indicates the importance of improvisation; accompanists provided upper parts over a given bass, as well as improvising the entire texture.

The third way of accompanying is described as follows:

LA TERCERA MANERA DE TANER el violon con el Cymbalo que es sobre cosas compuestas. Hase de tomar el Madrigal, o Motete, o otra qualquier obra que se quisiere tanner, y ponerla en el cimbalo, como ordinariamente se suele hazer, y el que tañer el Violon puede tañer sobre cada cosa compuesta dos o tres differentias, o mas. ... 33

The third way to play the viol with harpsichord, which is on composed pieces. One takes a madrigal or motet, or whatever piece one wishes to perform, and sets it for the harpsichord in the usual way; the violist may perform two or three or more variations on each piece. ...
Example A.2. ORTIZ 1553, fol. 32.

Two sets of four variations follow, one on a madrigal, the other on a chanson. The 'usual way' to set the work for the keyboard implies any performance or notation techniques familiar to the user;\(^{34}\) Ortiz gave the keyboard music in choirbook format, and this was undoubtedly used by those able, as Bermudo suggested (see I: 28).

Following the variation sets, nine pieces with a full keyboard accompaniment are given, with the following preface:

Para mayor cumplimiento desto obra me pareció poner aquí estas Recercadas sobre estos Cantos llanos que en Italia comúnmente llaman Tenores, en los quales se ha de advertir que queriéndolos

---

\(^{34}\) Reese ('Ortiz', p. 203) probably erred in suggesting that 'the usual way' means only the way it was notated in the Tratado; it may well have been recopied, or ornaments added.
In order the better to complete this work it occurred to me to give here the following ricercadas on the undecorated melodies commonly called Tenores in Italy, regarding which it should be noted that for those wishing to play in this way, four voices are appended, and the ricercada on them is the main reason for which I made them.

The keyboard music is of secondary importance (see Ex. A.3). The viol part begins underneath the score, and continues on the recto side of the opening. Page turns for the two parts coincide, allowing the possibility that the two performers used the same copy. The accompaniment is simple in the extreme, possibly because of the difficulty of the viol part and ensemble considerations; but it also suggests that in addition to the virtuoso who could perform fantasia, less talented players who could not improvise the chords above the bass given in the second section would use the volume and require written-out accompaniment. Ortiz stated earlier (p. 55) that he gave these pieces to satisfy various tastes; this could euphemistically imply the need to satisfy those who were not expert accompanists. Yet the format is not as easy to read as others current in Italy at the time, and the lack of bar lines recalls partbooks as much as open score.

Ortiz’s three types of keyboard notation (unfigured bass, choirbook, proto-open score) indicate the infrequency of keyboard accompanimental notation of any sort; the accompanist’s needs were secondary, and Ortiz’s specifications for accompaniment probably accurately reflect current ‘usual’ practice. Unnotated accompaniments, like fantasia, appear to be dominant.

---

\[35^\text{Edn. p. 106.}\]
Example A.3. ORTIZ 1553, fol. 56v.

G. CAVAZZONI after 1555

Girolamo Cavazzoni, Il primo libro [sic] de intabolatura d’organo
dove si contiene tre messe ... ristampato (Venice: Antonio Gardano,
n.d.).

Format: intavolatura.

Contents: 29 fols., 3 organ Masses (2 Credos).

36 Brown 1543; Sartori II:after 1555.
The three Masses from Cavazzoni's libro secondo were reprinted (with a different page layout), probably between 1556 and 1569 (based on the spelling of the printer's name, which was used from 1556 to his death). Significantly, this is the first keyboard volume to undergo a reprint (and by a different printer than the first edition), suggesting a certain demand for the Masses; but few other keyboard volumes were reprinted in the course of the 16th century. Sartori suggested that the designation libro primo implies that Gardano intended to print Cavazzoni's remaining works—canzonas, hymns, magnificats—in a second book.\(^{37}\) Since this was apparently never printed, the printing of the present book may have been not a response to demand but a business risk which did not succeed, thus making the unpublished remainder of Cavazzoni's works similar to Merulo's unfinished series (see MERULO 1567).

\[\text{[A. GABRIELI 1563]}\] \[\text{[ghost]}\]

Mischiati quoted a citation taken from Padre Martini for Gabrieli's libro quarto (which consisted of organ Masses; it is now lost, but was copied into the Turin Tablatures), dated 1563.\(^{38}\) Martini's citation ('Messe Tre ... Libro quarto ... appresso Angelo Gardano, 1563') is internally conflicting, as Mischiati noted.\(^{39}\) Angelo Gardano did not print his own name on works of the press until after 1576; before him only his father Antonio's name appeared. It appears that the date is incorrect; Mischiati showed why that and not the name should be doubted: mainly due to the reference to Gabrieli in Merulo's publication list.

---


\(^{38}\) 'L'intavolatura tedesca', p. 35.

\(^{39}\) Ibid. Masses ed. Dalla Libera.
(MERULO 1567). Libro terzo of Gabrieli's edition is dated 1596, and libro quinto 1605, and since Giunta's catalogue of 1604 refers only to '[Intavolature] d'Organo Andrea Gabrielli. 1.2.3.', with no reference to the fourth volume (which appeared in subsequent publisher's catalogues), the strongest probability is that it was printed in 1604 or 1605 (See A. GABRIELI 1571). See [A. GABRIELI 1571] for consideration of an alleged 'first edition' of A. Gabrieli's keyboard works.

MERULO 1567
Claudio Merulo, Ricercari d'intavolatura d'organo ... libro primo (Venice: Merulo, 1567). Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/8).
Contents: 4 + 78 + 2 pp., 8 ricercars.

Merulo had been an organist at St Mark's Venice for ten years when he entered the music printing business with Fausto Bethanio. His partner soon dropped out, but Merulo continued playing and printing concurrently for four years. In the dedication to this volume, his first for keyboard, Merulo noted a projected series of volumes:

Questo è il primo libro de' Ricercari d'Intauolature d'Organo fatte da me: il quale per esser il primo di quella concatenation, ch'io ho composta, & a poco a poco spero dare in luce ... 42

This is the first book of ricercars intabulated for organ that I have made; which being the first in this form that I have composed, and little by little hope to publish ...
The following page contains a 'plan of the books of organ tablatures that Claudio Merulo da Correggio promises to publish successively':

Ordine de' libri d'intavolature d'organo, che promette successivamente dare in luce Claudio Merulo da Correggio

Primo et secondo libro d'Intavolature d'Organo, ne' quali si contengono Ricercari di Claudio Merulo da Correggio.

Terzo libro, nel quale si contengono Ricercari, Magnificat, Hinni, et altre compositioni di diversi autori.

Quarto libro, nel quale si contengono Messe di Claudio Merulo.

Quinto libro, nel quale si contengono Hinni del medesimo.

Sesto libro, nel quale si contengono Magnificat del medesimo.

Settimo libro, nel quale si contengono Toccate d'organo del medesimo.

Ottavo libro, nel quale si contengono Canzoni intavolate dal medesimo.

Nono libro, nel quale si contengono Canzoni, Madrigali et Motetti intavolati dal medesimo.

Decimo libro, nel quale si contengono Ricercari di Jaches de Ferrara intavolati da Claudio Merulo.

Undecimo libro, nel quale si contengono Messe di diversi autori intavolate da Claudio Merulo.

Duodecimo libro, nel quale si contengono Ricercari d'Andrea Gabrieli Organista di San Marco in Venezia. 43

Only the first and fourth of these volumes are known to have been printed. It may be concluded that the remainder never were, partly on evidence taken from the dedication to MERULO 1568 (see below), and partly due (apart from the two) to their absence from publishers' catalogues. 44 Merulo’s project was very ambitious, considering the lack of printed keyboard music and its infrequency of publication in sixteenth-century Italy (only seven or eight intavolaturas were printed

43 Repr. in Benvenuti, Gabrieli, II:xlv, and Debes, 'Merulo', pp. 2-3.

44 Mischiati, Indici.
earlier). The two keyboard volumes he printed are the only two extant from that decade; it is clear that Merulo believed strongly in publishing keyboard music, since such a series had never reached this stage of planning before.\textsuperscript{45} It was surely a reason for his entering the printing business in the first place.

The music-list also acts as a useful guide to the music Merulo perceived as regular keyboard music: ricercars, magnificats, hymns, Masses, toccatas, canzonas, madrigals, and motets. The emphasis on vocal forms is apparent. The ricercars themselves are in a vocal style, with ornaments thinly added. Appropriately enough for the first volume in an unprecedented series, it consists of traditional forms and styles. Less conservative pieces like toccatas were not scheduled to be published until the seventh volume, when the series should have been firmly established. But in the event, it never got off the ground.

\textbf{MERULO 1568}

Claudio Merulo, \textit{Messe d'intavolatura d'organo ... libro quarto} (Venice: Merulo, 1568).\textsuperscript{46}

Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/8).

Contents: 148 pp., 3 organ Masses (3 Credos).

Merulo printed the fourth volume of his advertised works in the year following the ricercars. In the dedication he noted that this was the second book of his series to be published, after he explained why he chose this volume:

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{45} Although series of lute music had been published (see note 16), and there is a hint of a series which never reached fruition in Gardano's \textit{CAVAZZONI} after 1555.
\item \textsuperscript{46} Brown 1568$_5$; Sartori 1568a; ed. Labat; ed. Judd.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Perche nella vigna di Dio diversi diversamente lauorano; ma però
tutti, a mio giudicio, mirano a lodare et honorare sua diuina
Maesta; però io che nella profession della Musica la lodo & honoro
con l'Organo di questa serenissima Republica, quanto meglio so &
posso; considerato che non sarà se non bene incitare anchor
gialtri [sic] Organisti a questo medesimo fine; ho pensato di dare
in luce vn mio libro d'Intauolature d'Organo, che contien Messe:
accioche possano giouare a tutti coloro, c'hanno l'istesa mira,
c'ho io. . . Io come assiduo operaio, mi sforzerò di publicare
anco, a Dio piacendo, l'altre mie fatiche d'Intauolatura d'Organo,
c'ho promesso al mondo nel libro de' Ricercari gia dato in
luce . . . 47

Whereas in the vineyard of God many workers do many different
things, but all, in my opinion, aim to praise and honour His divine
majesty; yet I, who in the profession of music praise and honour it
with the organ in this serene Republic, how much better do I know
and am able [to do this]. I have considered that it will be
nothing if not well to encourage still other organists to the same
end, and have decided to publish a book of my organ tablatures
which contains Masses, so that they may be of use to all those who
have the same aim as I. . . I, like an assiduous worker, will
strive to publish, if it please God, still more of my works in
tablature which I promised to the world in the book of ricercars
already published.

He apparently deemed it more appropriate to publish the organ Masses,
volume four of the series, than the second and third volumes, which were
to contain additional ricercars, magnificats and hymns.

The music employs basic keyboard ornamentation, but is in strict
four-part writing throughout and gives the impression of vocal music
transferred to the keyboard. There is evidence that these works were
not the sort that would have been used at St Mark's, where more
elaborate music would have been performed; 48 these works would be used
by more modest religious establishments and by those unable or unwilling
to improvise the versets. It is noteworthy that there are no
performance instructions in the volume; Merulo left such matters to the
users, despite the probability that they were most likely novices.

Merulo must have assumed that users knew how to perform the works

---

47 Unn. fol. lv.

correctly within the liturgy. Such an assumption may have been well-founded in 1568, but by 1605 detailed printed instructions for the performance of organ Masses were required (see BANCHIERI 1605), suggesting a commensurate loss in individual instruction in organ-playing and traditional use of the organ.

[A. GABRIELI 1571] [ghost]

Fétis included the following citation in his worklist of Gabrieli:

'10° Canzoni alla francese per l'organo Venezia, 1571. Deuxième edition Venise, 1605. La deuxième partie de ce recueil a paru dans le même année dans le même cité'. The reference was apparently picked up by Wasielewski and later bibliographers. Fétis is known to have been inaccurate occasionally; since there is no indication 'ristampato' in A. GABRIELI 1605 (the reprint of MERULO 1567 in 1605 is carefully indicated 'ristampato') it cannot have been a reprint of an earlier edition.

49 There is an unusual liturgical anomaly in the volume: Merulo was the last composer of organ Masses to employ the Marian trope *Spiritus et alme* within the Marian Gloria. The trope was removed from the canon by the Council of Trent (1545–1563), and since the printing industry had to take into account the various revisions made by the Council, few liturgical books were printed between 1567 and 1571 (see Massena, Missals). In missals before that period, the trope was present; after the hiatus it was removed. Merulo the printer acted independently in this instance.

50 Fétis, Biografie (2nd edn.), III:365. I am indebted to Anthony Newcomb for drawing my attention to this reference.

51 Wasielewski, Geschichte, p. 141; Brown [1571]2; Caldwell, 'Sources'.
Appendix A

RODIO 1575

Libro di ricercate a quattro voci ... con alcune fantasie sopra varii canti fermi (Naples: Giossepe Cacchio dall'Aquila, 1575).\textsuperscript{52}

Format: open score.

Contents: 49 fols., 5 ricercatas, 4 fantasie sopra canti fermi.

The first open score printed in Italy appeared in the Italian city with the closest links to Spain,\textsuperscript{53} and it is possible that the use of open score in Spain\textsuperscript{54} influenced Rodio, about whom little is known.\textsuperscript{55} Kastner noted additional links between Spain and Rodio: his ornamentation is Spanish in style, his sacred music was performed in Barcelona, he may have known Spanish musicians in Naples (Ortiz, Clavijo del Castillo, Obregon), and he may have intended some of his music for harp performance (suggested by wide spacing), as well as the obvious connection made by inclusion of a work based on the Re di Spagna theme.\textsuperscript{56}

Rodio's use of the terms ricercata and fantasia appears to be generically-based and is not specifically classifiable: the ricercate may indicate exercises, similar to Ortiz, while the fantasias may

\textsuperscript{52} Brown 1575; Sartori 1575 (+II); partial edn. Kastner.
\textsuperscript{53} Apel, 'Neapolitan Links', p. 437, summarized the numerous musical connections.
\textsuperscript{54} See I: 66.
\textsuperscript{55} His Regole di musica ... ristampato (Naples: Gio. Giacomo Carlino and Costantino Vitale, 1609-11, repr. 1626) includes methods for composing canons on cantus firmus themes, and examples of transposing the twelve tones (given in open score), but at no point is the keyboard discussed. (Although the title page is dated 1609, the colophon and dedication are both dated 1611 in the L-Bl edition. The first edition, not listed in RISM, is dated 1600 by Lederer in 'Rodio', The New Grove, 16:91, and Kastner, preface to edn.)
\textsuperscript{56} Kastner, preface to edn.
indicate more performance-orientated works, since they are based on cantus firmi. The works contain bold idiomatic keyboard figures, and little reflect the 'learned style' which imitates vocal polyphony, but the use of open score despite idiomatic keyboard writing is an indication of polyphonic conception as well as the lack of an established format more suited to keyboard music-printing.

VALENTE 1576

Antonio Valente, Intavolatura de cimbalo: ricercate fantasie et canzoni francesca desminuite con alcuni tenori balli et varie sorte de contraponti libro primo (Naples: Gioseppe Cacchio dall'Aquila, 1576). 58

Format: number tablature (6 systems/page).

Contents: 8 + 84 pp., 1 fantasia, 6 ricercars, 1 Salve Regina, 4 canzonas, 9 dance-sets.

The only Italian writer to consider keyboard notation in a manner like the Spaniards was Antonio Valente (d. c. 1600), organist at San Angelo a Nido (Naples), 1565-1580. The unique notation he developed required a lengthy introductory letter and introduction to the new system. The letter, written by Brother Alberto Mazza, raises important points regarding the notation:

Si come per la comodità ch'oggi hauemo dele [sic] stampe non è huomo (se non fusse alcuno priuo della libertà, et del tutto infelice) che con ragione possa scusarsi, di non esser letterato, così d'oggi auanti non sarà chi hauendo desiderio di essere musico possa allegare legittima scusa di non poterui giungere. Poichè a gicrni nostri per opra [sic], et Ingegno del Eccelente musico Antonio Valente si è ritrouato questo speditissimo et facilissimo modo, co'l quale ciascuno quantunque ignorante a fatto d'ogni fondamento di musica potrà da se stesso senz'aiuto di mastro imparare a sonar' il cimbalo: inuentione con effetto diuina ne

57 Apel, Keyboard Music, p. 186.
d’altri mai più vsata degnà di esser pregiata non meno per vutilità ch’apporta quanto di essere admirata per esser l’autore di essa cieco da i suoi teneri anni della pueritia, che pur con tutto il difetto della natura mai si stanca di gioiare altrui. Hora insegnando, hora dittando à scrivere cose bellissime in questa facultà, et accì che non paiano cose da non credersi non è molto ch’ in certi giovani rozi, et che non conosceuano nè note nè tasti, si è uista una rara esperienza ch’appena con essercitio da due mesi di pratica sopra quest’intauolatura, al impruviso sonano qual si uoglia Canzone ch’intauolata in questo modo lor si proponga, onde l’autore così bel secreto non era incontr’alcuno per publicare, ma come diceua lo riserbaua à cari amici, et discepoli, nà poi uedendo che altri cercuano farsine inuentori, et hauer’ lode delle sue fatiche, s’è risoluto à comune vutilità delli studiosi dare questo per hora, frà tanto attenderà ad complire l’intauolatura delle masse, et gl’altri diuini officij insieme con alcuni scelti madrigali, motetti è [sic] fantasie bellissime ch’appresso si stamparanno, quando l’Autore intenderà à che queste ui siano state care. 59

As, from the ease we have today in printing, there is no man (except one deprived of freedom and completely unhappy) who can reasonably be pardoned for not being literate, so, henceforward, there will not be [anyone] who, wishing to be a musician, can formulate a legitimate excuse for not being able to succeed. Because, in our days, through the work and ingenuity of the excellent musician Antonio Valente, this most rapid and easy way has been discovered by which everyone, however ignorant of any facts of musical fundamentals, can learn to play the harpsichord by himself, without the aid of a master: [an] invention of divine effect, never used before by others, worthy to be appreciated no less for the utility it provides as to be admired since its author has been blind from the tender years of his childhood, who, despite this natural defect, never tires of helping others, now teaching, now telling how to write beautiful things in this field. And so that [these claims] do not appear to be unbelievable things, it is no exaggeration to say that in certain rustic youths who knew neither notes nor keys, a rare experience was observed: who, with scarcely two months’ practical study of this tablature, played on the spur of the moment whatever canzona was desired that was intabulated in this way, whenever asked. For this reason the author had no intention of publishing so excellent a secret but, as he said, was reserving it for dear friends and students; but then seeing others were trying to make themselves its inventors and receive praises for his efforts, he decided, for the common utility of the studious, to provide this [volume] for now; meanwhile, he will wait to complete the intabulation of masses and other divine offices, together with some selected madrigals, motets, and

59 Sartori.
beautiful fantasias to be printed shortly, until he sees that these have been well received by you. 60

The analogy of book-printing and literacy to music-printing and musical 'literacy' is a striking indication of the importance of the press in the development of a written keyboard idiom. Printing this notation was novel, and Valente at first had no intention of giving away the secret of his teaching (a sign of a guild-like attitude). This changed as a result of those who pirated his ideas and claimed them for their own, forcing him into print, and secrecy is exchanged for wider music literacy.

Mazza was unashamedly in favour of expediency and the wider dissemination of keyboard skills through an expedient notation; the heavy emphasis on ease is reminiscent of the work of Bermudo and Venegas, and given the Neapolitan origin of Valente’s work he may well have been influenced by these two Spaniards. The claim that a teacher was unnecessary is an indication of the level of musician the volume addresses.61 Like some lute volumes, Valente’s volume was aimed for beginners and amateurs. Learning to play quickly, and learning to play ‘all’improviso’, are paramount concerns.62 The works he planned to publish in the forthcoming volume were primarily for sacred use, (the madrigals notwithstanding), and suggest an orientation towards the organ rather than harpsichord. The vocal basis of all the forthcoming works is evident. In the present volume, the reference to ‘cimbalo’ and not

60 Jacobs, edn. p. 2 (with emendations).

61 Although autodidactic books for lute are common (see Vaccaro, La musique de luth, p. 32), Valente’s is the only such keyboard volume printed in Spain or Italy in the period.

62 The letter is similar to comments made by Venegas in this regard: see 1:37.
organ in the title is different from other similar title-references\(^{63}\) in that the volume does not consist entirely of dance music and contains one sacred piece; it is therefore a curious omission, since the works could have been used at the organ as well. It further suggests that Valente intended the volume for wealthy amateurs more than for beginning church organists. It would appear that he intended a two-volume set, the first for harpsichord, the second for organ— an exceptional distinction in a period which saw most volumes advertised for as wide a field as possible. The appearance of VALENTE 1580 four years later is evidence enough to conclude that Mazza’s conclusion was optimistic; the second volume eschewed the notational innovations of the first, and its contents bear little relation to the indications here.

After Mazza’s introductory letter Valente included a set of specific instructions for using his new notation. He first commented generally on why he published the work:

\[\ldots\text{Ho considerato, e parmi che cosa graditissima à molti farei.} \]
\[\text{Se con particolare è nuovo ordine giungessi alla facilità de quella, ò er ritrouassi un nuovo modo di facilità, specialmente intorno la pratica del cimbalo, che sempre hò fatto la mia professione, essendomi dunque occorso tal modo non hò voluto tenerlo occulto; ma per gratificarmi à studiosi, comunicarlo \ldots.} \,^{64}\]

\[\ldots\text{I have considered and it seems to me that I should do something very rewarding for many. If in particular it is a new order with which I attain the ease of that [art], or if I discover a new way of ease, especially for the practice of the harpsichord, which I have always made my profession, then such a way being required of me, I did not want to keep it hidden; but to win the favour of the studious, to communicate it \ldots.} \,^{65}\]

\(^{63}\) For a similar omission with more significance, see FRESCOBALDI 1615(ii). Jacobs (edn. p. xi) posited that Valente might have been referring to keyboard instruments generically with the term 'cimbalo'.

\(^{64}\) Caravaglios, 'Valente', p. 496.

\(^{65}\) Jacobs, edn. p. 3 (with emendations).
Valente seems to contradict Mazza and wished to generously share the secret with a wider audience. But since it is hardly likely that Mazza would mention pirating without some basis of truth, perhaps Valente was merely putting forth a facade of magnanimity. At any rate, he clearly believed the new notation was a great aid. Although Valente is referred to as blind in both his volumes, this may be interpreted loosely as referring to poor vision. As this and the following comment show, he composed in and used the notation.

Prima per maggior facilità et commodità de quelli, quali uogliono imparare di sonare al cimbalo hò voluto far questa nuova intavolatura in abaco, poi che la musica in altro non è composta, se non in detto abaco, e che ciò sia il vero; non si può accordare sorte di consonanza niuna se prima non si sa la lontananza da vna uoce ad un'altra . . .

First, for greater ease and comfort for those who wish to learn to play the harpsichord, I wished to make this new tablature in graphic form, since the music is not composed in any other, if not in the said graphic form; and so that this might be the truth, one cannot attune any kinds of chords if one does not know the distance from one voice to another beforehand . . .

Valente evidently composed the works directly in this notational form. He emphasized the number system, graphic in layout and from which the size of intervals may be calculated. The system assigns a number to each white key, and uses only sharps to indicate 'black keys'. Unlike Spanish Tablature, however, he did not follow strict voice-leading on separate lines, but divided the numbers by a single line which indicates which hand plays which notes, similar to Italian intavolatura. The rhythmic signs used are similar to those used in German Tablature, but

---

66 Caravaglios, 'Valente', p. 496.

67 Considering his other idiosyncratic characteristics, Valente's compositional technique may be regarded as unusual as well; composing in separate parts would still have been common for some. See Owens, 'Milan Partbooks'.

68 One of the notations Bermuda cites; see I: 36.
like Spanish notations, each sign is valid until changed, and only the shortest note value is given.\textsuperscript{69} Despite Valente's claim to the invention, it is clear that these notational trends were in general use in Europe. The integration of characteristics of three different notational systems into his own may justifiably be attributed to him; but considering that VALENTE 1580 switched to open score, it was apparently not well-received or widely used.

The remainder of the preface merely explains the notation system; there is no reference to musical fundamentals as found in Spanish sources. The music itself varies greatly in style. The dance variations are often very short and simple; indeed, he has been classed as a 'keyboard primitive'.\textsuperscript{70} The Fantasia is toccata-like, with idiomatic keyboard figures and an imitative section. The ricercars are imitative, in a different style from those of Rodio. The secular orientation of most of the volume with its emphasis on dances, and its lengthy discussion of notation, confirm its appropriateness for amateurs and beginners.

**GARDANO 1577**

Angelo Gardano, publ., *Musica de diversi autori: la bataglia francese et canzon delli ucelli, insieme alcune canzoni francese, partite in caselle per sonar d'instromento perfetto: novamente ristampato* (Venice: Gardano, 1577).\textsuperscript{71}

Format: open score (3 x 5/5/5/5), cross-opening.

Contents: 27 fols., 12 canzonas, 1 battaglia.

\textsuperscript{69}See Apel, *Notation*, p. 48, for a full description of the notation.

\textsuperscript{70}Burns, 'Valente'.

\textsuperscript{71}Brown 1577, Sartori 1577b (+II).
There is no dedication or prefatory matter in this the first of two open scores printed by Gardano in 1577. *Ristampato* in the title may refer either to a lost volume or earlier vocal editions; considering the distribution of keyboard publications in open score in the sixteenth century, the likelihood of an earlier open score edition is small. Gardano felt free enough to publish in open score for keyboard (or plucked instruments; *instruments perfetto* refers to an instrument capable of playing all the parts of a work), departing from the precedent of his father's two keyboard volumes in intavolatura (1549, 1551). The printing of keyboard music was not constrained by a prescribed format; indeed it was so infrequent that there was no 'customary' way to print it.

The contents of the volume are significant; this is the first book of canzonas to be printed for keyboard (although Merulo had promised one in 1567), and the genre soon became popular. It is unlikely that the rise in organ arrangements of French chansons is due entirely to Gardano's publishing work; they were probably copied out from vocal partbooks or improvised throughout the course of the century. Gardano's 1577 print indicates that printers found it unnecessary to print canzonas for keyboard before this time (only the two Cavazzonis published canzonas for organ earlier): a further indication of the closed craft of the keyboard player.
Appendix A

RORE 1577

Cipriano de Rore, *Tutti i madrigali ... a quattro voci, spartiti et accomodati per sonar d'ogni sorte d'instrumeto perfetto, et per qualunque studioso di contrapunti* (Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1577). 72

Format: open score.

Contents: 32 fols., 36 madrigals without texts.

Two purposes for Gardano’s second open score published in 1577 are given in the title: for playing on any kind of ‘perfect instrument’, and for the use of the student of counterpoint. Although Lowinsky emphasized the volume’s usefulness for the study of counterpoint to the exclusion of its value for keyboard players, the latter is now generally accepted. 73 It appears that Gardano brought out two open scores in one year to test the ‘perfect instrument’ market, and contrasted his volume of French chansons with another of Italian madrigals (also foreshadowed in volume nine of Merulo’s 1567 series). The few further citations for open scores published in order to aid students of counterpoint indicates that study was secondary to performance. The format was apparently unsuccessful, for after RORE 1577 the next open score printed in Venice was BANCHIERI 1605, and the format never became dominant in that city.

72 Brown 15775; Sartori II:1577c.

VALENTE 1580

Antonio Valente, Versi spirituali sopra tutte le note, con diversi canoni spartiti per sonar negli organi, messa, vespere, et altri officii divini ... libro secondo (Naples: heirs of Mattio Cancer, 1580). 74

Format: open score (2 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 56 fols., 43 versets ordered according to tone.

Although Valente promised in VALENTE 1576 to publish further works (with the implication that they would also be in number tablature), these versets appeared in a different format from a different publisher, radically altering the proposed contents given in 1576. Instead of Masses, divine offices, madrigals, motets, and fantasias, the works are non-chant-based versets for general liturgical use. The first volume and its notation apparently did not succeed, and a reduced second volume printed in a more orthodox notation was substituted for the earlier proposal. The attempt in the first book to promote expediency may well have backfired, since it was unlikely to be well received by professional organists. Since there is no introduction to the volume, the full reasons for his change of plan remain unknown.

74 Brown 1580; Sartori 1580 (+II).
Appendix A

[BARIOLLA 1585] [lost]
Ottavio Bariolla, Ricercate per suonar l'organo (Milan: 1585). 75
Format: unknown.
Contents: as title.

This lost volume is part of a series continued by at least one set of partbooks. 76

[FACOLI ?1586] [lost]
Marco Facoli, [Il primo libro d'intavolatura d'arpicordo]. 77

Facoli's two books of dances are both listed in four publishers' catalogues; 78 Brown hypothesized that at least one work from this lost volume was copied in London 2088 (which is dated 1586 on the title page), fols. 1-10v. 79

75 Brown [1585]; Sartori 1585d. The title is taken from the citation in Picinelli, Ateneo.
76 Pb-Bariolla 1594, his libro terzo. A volume entitled 'Recercari d'Ottavio Bariola lib. 2. a 4' (evidently a set of partbooks) is referred to in Mischiati, Indici, IV:122, which may be the same volume as the present.
77 Brown [1586].
79 Brown's and Silbiger's (Manuscript Sources, pp. 13-14, 93) incomplete descriptions of the MS may be supplemented with the following information. There is a change in handwriting at fol. 11r, top system, and piece 2 ('Padoana ditta La Paganina') breaks off at the bottom of fol. 11v without an ending. There is a brief untitled fragment on fol. 12r, top system, unindexed by Brown; this fragment is repeated on fol. 19v, second system (cross-opening; also unindexed). Brown's comment 'In one case the upper set of staves contains two superius parts' applies not, as he thought, to the 'Corrente vesta' but to this unindexed fragment at the bottom of the opening. Two canzonas (nos. 6 and 7) are in short score format, with occasional added middle-voice entries: Maschera's 'La Capriola' and Crecquillon's 'Ung gay bergier'. Due to
VEROVO 1586

Simone Verovio, ed., Diletto spirituale: canzonette a tre et a quattro voci composte da diversi ecc.mi musici ... con l'intavolatura del cimbalo et liuto (Rome: Verovio, 1586). 80

Format: choirbook, intavolatura, lute tablature.

Contents: 24 fols., 7 canons, 22 vocal works with their intabulations.

Verovio's first volume is the first to be engraved in copper and printed. It was intended for singers and players together; a voices-only edition of the same volume was also printed in 1586. It was reprinted in 1590 and 1592. The voice parts are on the verso of each opening, the keyboard at the top recto, the lute part at the bottom recto. It explicitly addressed lute and keyboard accompanists on an equal footing and implicitly recommended full accompaniment of voices through its intabulations.

FACOLI 1588

Marco Facoli, Il secondo libro d'intavolatura di balli d'arpicordo, pass'e mezzi, saltarelli, paduane, & alcuni aeri novi dilettevoli da cantar ogni sorte de rima (Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1588). 81

Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/6).

Contents: 34 fols., 22 dances and arias.

the change in handwriting character at fol. 11v and the change in texture from full to mainly soprano-bass at fol. 12r, it is unlikely that more than the first two works stem from Facoli's lost volume.

80 Brown 1586b; Sartori 1586a (+II).
81 Brown 15883; Sartori 1588c; ed. Apel.
In addition to dances, this volume includes accompanimental verses for terza rima, a genre common in lute music. Like GARDANE 1551, it was directed toward amateurs and novices who wished to play such music not on the lute but keyboard.

VEROVIO 1589


Format: choirbook, intavolatura, lute tablature.

Contents: 27 fols., 25 madrigals and their intabulations.

The book may have had two printings, as the title pages differ in two extant copies dated 1589. 83 It was reprinted in three books in 1591 by Vincenti in typeset, not engraved format, without the keyboard intavolatura. The voice parts are on the verso of each opening, the keyboard at the top recto, the lute part at the bottom recto.

[MASCHERA 1590] [lost]

Florentio Maschera, Canzoni ... à 4, novamente ristampate per i professori d’Organo, Libro Primo (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1590). 84

(MS) Format: open score.

Contents: 26 fols., 21 canzonas.

82 Brown 1589.
83 Ibid. The Bologna copy omits the line ‘Raccolte et stampate da Simone Verovio’.
84 Brown 1590.
This is a citation to a MS (US-We) which appears to be a complete copy of a printed volume now lost, which would have been the fourth edition of Pb-Maschera 1582. It includes a dedication by Vincenti, where he said 'this work is intended particularly for players of the organ (quest'opera s'aspetta particolarmente a suonatori d'Organo)'. In 1591 Vincenti published the works of Bertoldo with an advertisement for further volumes, signalling the beginning of a keyboard music series; this manuscript is a copy of a precursor to the series, or possibly a printer's fair copy that never reached publication.

VEROVIVO 1590 reprint of VEROVIVO 1586 (Brown [1590]9).

BERTOLDO 1591(i)

Sperindio Bertoldo, Canzoni francese intavolate per sonar d’organo (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1591). Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/8).

Contents: 32 pp., 4 canzonas.

The dedication to this volume was written by the publisher to 'i virtuosi professori d’organo':

Il mio desiderio di sodisfarui con qualche Opera d’Intavolatura d’Organo, fa che hora ui dia le presenti Canzoni Francese Intavolate con facilità dalla buona memoria di Sperindio Bertoldo, il quale fu Organista nella Magnifica Città di Padoua, & in breue hauerete anco gli Ricercari, Tocate, & Canzoni, & altre cose dell’Eccellente Signor Claudio Merulo, del Gabrielli, & del Guami: & vedendo, che l’Opere mie ui siano grate, non manarò,

---

85 McKee, 'Maschera', p. 32.
86 Brown 15913; Sartori 1591b; ed. Speer.
My desire to satisfy you with some intabulated works for organ results in my now giving to you the present canzoni francese intabulated for ease, as a memorial to Sperindio Bertoldo, who was organist in the great city of Padua; and in short you will also have ricercars, toccatas, canzonas, and other things by the excellent Signor Claudio Merulo, by Gabrieli, and by Guami. And seeing that my works may be pleasing to you, I will not fail to strive to produce new things for you regularly, [composed] by other well-known men...

The works are 'intabulated for ease', i.e. so that performers could play them more easily. Intavolatura format was significantly easier to use than other alternatives. The composer, Bertoldo, had died twenty-one years earlier. It was unusual to publish music by such a dated composer; the dedication itself is a rare publisher's prospectus (resembling Merulo's of 1567, which was never fulfilled). Publication of Bertoldo indicates difficulty in getting material to publish from living organists. It also reflects a conservatism which contrasts with the new developments in keyboard music-printing which Vincenti here promised to undertake. This is the first volume consisting only of canzonas to appear in typeset intavolatura format (although Merulo had promised one, the eighth in his series).

Vincenti never actually printed keyboard volumes by Merulo, Gabrieli, and Guami, three of the most well-known organists of the day. This, the lack of dedicatee, the choice of Bertoldo, and his intentions as stated in the dedication combine to show the speculative nature of the venture and his desire to alter the status quo in keyboard music-printing.

—

87 Sartori; Mischiati, Indici, p. 98; Speer, edn. p. xii.
BERTOLDO 1591(ii)

Sperindio Bertoldo, *Tocate ricercari et canzoni francese intavolate per sonar dorgano* (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1591).  

Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/6).  
Contents: 32 pp., 2 toccatas, 3 ricercars, 1 canzona.

Vincenti apparently printed this and the previous volume as a pair; the second contains no dedication or preface. Two of the ricercars are literal transcriptions of portions of pieces by Padovano first published (in partbooks) in 1556, one of which is a setting of the plainchant *Kyrie Cunctipotens genitor*. Precedent for Speer’s supposition that Bertoldo merely ‘borrowed’ Padovano’s pieces is not substantiated in the published music literature of the time, and it is more likely that the publisher Vincenti used manuscripts which included music by both Bertoldo and Padovano that were not properly attributed. This volume is the first Italian print to contain toccatas, again showing Vincenti’s desire to break the status quo. The genre itself must have been quite old, since Bertoldo had died in 1570, and other composers had written toccatas well before 1591: Andrea Gabrieli’s (d. 1586) were not published until 1593, Padovano’s (d. 1575) not until 1604; Merulo had promised a volume of toccatas as early as 1567. It is clear that there was an existing unpublished tradition of toccatas prior to this volume.

---

88 Brown 1591; Sartori 1591c; ed. Speer.  
89 See Pb-Padovano 1556, 1588R.  
90 Speer, preface to edn.
VEROVIO 1591

Simone Verovio, ed., Canzonette a quattro voci, composte da diversi ecc. ti musici, con l'intavolatura del cimbalo et del liuto (Rome: Verovio, 1591). 91

Format: choirbook, intavolatura, lute tablature.

Contents: 22 fols., 20 vocal works, 19 intabulations.

The voice parts of this work are printed across the top of each opening, the keyboard part on the bottom verso, and the lute part on the bottom recto. The works were reprinted without intabulations (Venice: G. Vincenti) in 1597.

ASOLA 1592

Giammateo Asola, Canto fermo sopra messe, hinni, et altre cose ecclesiastiche appartenenti à' sonatori d'organo per giustamente rispondere al choro (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1592). 92

Format: single-staff notation (6 staves per page).

Contents: 64 pp., cantus firmi for Masses, Credos, hymns, Magnificats, antiphons, Te Deum.

Asola's work is the first volume of plainchant specifically designed to be used by organists for liturgical performance. Vincenti's printing of the work indicates his concern for keyboard music, and reflects his desires as expounded in BERTOLDO 1591(i). The volume does not give text or performance instructions, but only the chants which the organist would have used as the basis for improvised alternatim settings.

91 Brown 1591 11.

92 Brown 1596 2 (Brown was unaware of the 1592 edition cited in RISM Einzeldrucke).
of the works; it does not give the chant to be sung by the choir (see Ex. A.4). The assumption that organists would know how to use the chants was not given up until BANCHIERI 1605. The volume was an important and useful publication, as its frequent reprinting demonstrates. 93

93 Repr. 1596, 1603, 1615 (Venice: G. Vincenti); 1616 (Milan: F. Lomazzo); 1621, 1625 (Rome: G. B. Robletti) (further editions are cited in Eitner, Quellen-Lexicon (1607, 1635) and Fétis, Biografie (1602), but are not listed in RISM Einzeldrucke).
Appendix A

MERULO 1592

Claudio Merulo, Canzoni d'intavolatura d'organo ... a quattro voci, fatte alla francese ... libro primo (Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1592). 94

Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/7 or 8).

Contents: 1 + 42 fols., 9 canzonas.

These may be related to the canzonas Merulo advertised in 1567, although in the dedication Merulo indicated that they stemmed from his time in Parma (where the Duke, the volume's dedicatee, had heard them), and that they were newly intabulated. 95 The volume was printed by Gardano, although Vincenti had promised to publish works by Merulo only a year earlier.

Although there is no letter to the reader, it is probable that the letter by Merulo appearing at the head of DIRUTA 1593 (unn. fol. 4) was originally written to be placed in this volume. There are two reasons for this: first, Diruta refers in his opening 'al lettore' to a nonexistent letter to be found in MERULO 1592:

... per vna sua Epistola nel primo libro suo de Canzoni alla Francese Intauolato, si mostra, quanto questa Regola sia necessaria per bene intendere is vero modo di Sonare. 96

A letter of [Merulo's] in his first book of intabulated Canzoni alla Francese demonstrates how necessary [Diruta's] method is in order to properly grasp the true manner of playing. 97

Second, Merulo's letter in DIRUTA 1593 reads more appropriately within the context of MERULO 1592 than where it was actually placed. It is therefore presented here:

94 Brown 1592; Sartori 1592c; ed. Pidoux.
95 Sartori; McDermott, 'Canzoni', II:2, 4.
96 Diruta, Il Transilvano, unn. fol. 3v.
In tutte le facoltà Signori miei; per esser professioni particolari, c’hanno i loro principij, & termini differenti l’uno dall’altro, sogliono spesso occorrere certe loro proprie osseruationi, che non possono intieramente esser note à coloro che non sono perfettamente intendenti delle facoltà medesime. Però essendomi venuta occasione di mandare alla stampa il presente mio primo libro, delle mie Canzoni alla francese, da me poste di nuouo in intauolatura hò Voluto dare un auuertimento à tutti, che giouerà loro a saper certe cose intorno all’ordine, che in esse è da osseruare: le quali, se ben paiono cose di poco momento, sono però tali, che non hauendosene qualche notitia, & lume non s’haurebbe quel compito gusto nel suonarle, che sapendosi, à parer mio si potrà maggiormente hauere, l’auertimento dunque ch’alla gientilezza, vostra mi pare hora necessario di dare, e che per leuer qualche difficolta, che potesse nascere nel volersi seruire di queste presenti mie intauolature, fa di mestiero il saper gli ordini, co’ quali io sogio regolare quelle diminutioni, ch’èvso mio d’adoperare. Ma affine ch’a tutti possa esser facile il redurlo in prattica, con l’apprendere con qual dito s’haurà da dar principio alla Minuta, ò tirata che vogliam chiamarla; & come si debbono prendere i salti tanto con la destra quanto con la sinistra mano, farà ciascuno accurata diligenza per hauere vn libro non molto tempo fa, composto dal R. P. fra Gerolamo Diruta: . . . Nel medesimo libro egli à con ogni destrezza, & eccellentia trattato tutto quello che in questa pratica saper si conuiene: . . . Anzi lo persuasi, che per publica vtilita, non douesse in modo alcuno lasciar di darlo in luce, come credo che senza dubbio haurà fatto. Studisi dunque ogni studiosa persona, ch’haurà caro d’intendere il medesimo ordine, col qual queste intauolature s’hauranno da trattare d’hauere il detto libro . . . 98

In the case of every aptitude, gentlemen, in order that it develop into a specific profession, there are proper principles and ends which are different from one another. They usually necessitate some particular observations of their own which cannot be known in their entirety by those who are not fully conversant with the aptitude itself. Thus, having had occasion to send to press the present first book of my Canzoni alla francese, which I lately intabulated, I wanted to give advice to everyone which will help them learn certain things regarding the order to be observed. These things, although they appear trivial, are nevertheless such that, without some knowledge and enlightenment regarding them, one would lack the requisite taste for playing the canzonas. However, if one knows these things, he will, in my opinion, be able to attain it to a greater degree. The advice, then, that now seems necessary to draw to your kind attention is intended to alleviate a few difficulties that might arise from the desire to use my current intabulations. As a matter of course, learn the various orders by which I am accustomed to regulate the diminutions I use. So that the actual application might be easy for everyone, including the understanding of which finger will have to begin the minuta, or tirata as I call it, and how leaps must be executed as much with the right as with the left hand, each person will take special care to have in his possession a book recently put together by the

98 Unn. fol. 4.
friar, Reverend Father Girolamo Diruta. In the same book, he has treated in an entirely skillful and excellent manner everything that one must know in the realm of practice. Indeed, for the benefit of the public, I persuaded him that he should not by any means fail to publish it, as I believe he doubtless will have done. So every diligent student who would value understanding the order of diminutions with which these intabulations deal should strive to have the above-mentioned book.

The appropriateness of Merulo's letter for Diruta is as apparent as the fact that it was written to be published in Merulo's canzona book, not the treatise. He placed prime importance upon understanding the correct hand- and ornamentation-technique; without the proper preparation and training the canzonas would not succeed as they ought. Although he did not go into detail (leaving that for Diruta), he showed that simply taking up the volume without proper preparation would not suffice. In this respect Merulo foreshadowed Frescobaldi's detailed performance-practice instructions (see FRESCOBALDI 1615(i)): Merulo had specific musical intentions with the ornamentation in the canzonas, and was attempting here to convey them via Diruta. He did not submit to the 'good judgement of the performer', and did not write for players of fantasia but players who relied on notated music.

It is unclear why the letter was published in DIRUTA 1593 without the editorial emendations it needed to appear appropriate in that volume, nor why Diruta wrote his preface as if the letter were in the canzona book. It is tempting to speculate about collaboration between Gardano and Vincenti, but evidence for such collaboration is lacking. Since the letter was unaltered in reprints of DIRUTA 1593, the inconsistencies must have been deemed unimportant, and perhaps lent an air of credibility to Merulo's recommendation, which otherwise may have appeared too insincere.

---

99 Soehnlein, 'Diruta', pp. 95-7 (with emendations).
 Appropriately, the canzonas employ elaborate ornamentation, for which Merulo became well-known. They are technically difficult, and not by any means intended for beginners at the instrument. The complexity of the keyboard arrangements reflects Merulo's continuing interest in sharing the secrets of the professional by means of printed notations which enabled others to emulate him.

RADINO 1592

Giovanni Maria Radino, Il primo libro d'intavolatura di balli d'arpicordo (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1592). 100

Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/8).

Contents: 2 + 50 pp., 8 dances.

This volume of dance music was obviously intended not for the aspiring organist, but for the amateur who needed help improvising keyboard dances. In the dedication, Radino says the music could be used by harpsichord ('gravecembalo') or lute; 101 apparently the term 'arpicordo' was synonymous with 'gravecembalo' as far as Radino was concerned. Vincenti published the volume in lute tablature simultaneously (Brown 1592g), with minor alterations. 102 Though not of great musical interest, Radino's work reflects Vincenti's desire to develop keyboard music printing in different genres, and is a clear example of the influence of lute music on keyboard: 103 the existence of

100 Brown 1592g; Sartori 1592a; ed. Harding; ed. Ellingworth.
101 Sartori; transl. Ellingworth, preface to edn., p. ix.
103 Or vice versa, as Coelho suggested ('Lute and Chitarrone Toccatas', p. 139). But Coelho surely inferred too much to suppose
amateur lutenists led to analogous considerations for the keyboard (see I: 80).

VEROVIO 1592 reprint of VEROVIO 1586 (Brown 1592; Sartori 1592d) with one additional piece.

DIRUTA 1593


Format (toccatas): intavolatura (4 x 5/8).

Contents: 4 + 36 fols., treatise including 13 toccatas.

Diruta’s work is the first keyboard treatise printed in Italy, written under the influence of his master Claudio Merulo. It consists of detailed technical instruction on fingering, ornamentation, hand position, and other physical aspects of playing, as well as the rudiments of music theory appropriate for beginning keyboard players. Diruta mentioned in his opening letter his astonishment that no one had taken on this type of work earlier, thereby confirming that the craft of organ-playing was regarded somewhat jealously by many organists; they did not share their skills freely.

Quelche hauendo io per proua veduto, & con diligenza compreso, mi sono non poco marauigliato che tra tanti nobilissimi & Eccellentissimi Organisti, che fino à questa hora hanno sonato si egregio istromento, non habbino pienamente posto in luce l’Eccellenza d’esso, e’l modo di ben trattarlo ... 105

---

104 Brown 1593; Sartori 1593b (+II); repr. with introduction by Soehnlen and Bradshaw; transl. and commentary, Soehnlein; music ed. Zaszkaliczky, Pernye and Barlay.

105 Unn. fol. 3.
Having actually seen and carefully observed many very noble and excellent organists who up to now have played so remarkable an instrument, I am not a little astonished that none of them has fully elucidated its excellence and the manner of playing it well. 106

Diruta, through Vincenti, provided the treatise, suggesting a certain secretiveness to the art. Its appearance was of major importance for the wider dissemination of the keyboard player’s art, consistent with Vincenti’s desires expressed in 1591. One passage refers to the nature of keyboard music:

Non è dubio alcuno, ne questa mia regola sortirebbe nome di regola generale, se con essa non si potesse sonare l’opere di qual si uoglia, anzi ui dirò di più, che anco quelle, che son fatte per altri Istrumeni; come l’opere, & regole composte da misier Girolamo da Vdine, maestro di concerti della Illustissima Signoria di Venetia[,] Et anco quelle del uirtuosissimo, & gentilissimo misier Giovanni Bassano, nelle quali opere uedrete ogni sorte di Diminutioni, & per Cornetti, & per violini, & anco passaggi per cantare, le quali diminutioni sono difficilissime, nè uerrebbero mai ben fatte nel Organo, se non si osseruasse questa regola. 107

There is no doubt; my method would never deserve the name ‘general method’ if it did not enable one to play whatever work one desired. Indeed, I would say further that those [methods] written for other instruments, such as the works and methods composed by Girolamo [Dalla Casa] da Udine, Director of Music for the Very Illustrious Signory of Venice, and by Giovanni Bassano, a most noble virtuoso (in which works you will see all kinds of diminutions, intended for cornets and violins, and also passaggi to sing, which are the most difficult diminutions of all) would never be done well on the organ if one did not observe my method. 108

Here Diruta revealed that although Dalla Casa and Bassano wrote for other instruments, keyboard players would commonly have used their diminution manuals and other works for instruction. 109

An independent

106 Soehnlein, 'Diruta', p. 91.
107 Fol. 5.
108 Soehnlein, 'Diruta', p. 126 (with emendations).
109 Dalla Casa’s Il vero modo di diminuir (Brown 1584,) was also intended to be used by keyboard players: in the letter to the readers, fol. 1, Dalla Casa said, ‘I desired to send this volume to the press so that it might be able to serve everyone; for all wind instruments, and keyboard instruments, and every kind of viol (Ho voluto darli alla Stampa, accio ogn’uno se ne possi seruire, per tutti gli Strumenti di
art of keyboard diminution arose from the solo diminution tradition beginning with Ganassi.\textsuperscript{110}

He discussed more elementary things on fol. 7: ‘how to understand intavolatura’, not considering varieties of notation but merely explaining that the left hand plays the bottom stave, the right hand the top. After discussion of consonances, rhythm, scales, leaps and embellishments, Diruta included an appendix of thirteen toccatas by a number of composers. These works are stylistically conservative; Merulo’s, for instance, is not nearly as complex as those in MERULO 1598. The music is more significant for its place in Vincenti’s output, the fourth volume for keyboard in three years and the second example of his toccata-publishing. Its publication is a clear sign of his interest in keyboard music.

A. & G. GABRIELI 1593

Andrea and Giovanni Gabrieli, Intonationi d’organo ... composte sopra tutti li dodici toni della musica (Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1593).\textsuperscript{111}

Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/8).

Contents: 44 fols., 11 intonations and their transpositions [Giovanni]; 8 intonations, 4 toccatas [Andrea].

---

\textsuperscript{110} Brown 1535. See Brown, \textit{Embellishing Sixteenth Century Music}, introduction.

\textsuperscript{111} Brown 1593; Sartori 1593c (+II); ed. Dalla Libera [Giovanni]; ed. Pidoux [Andrea].
Andrea Gabrieli's organ works were published in a posthumous 'complete works' series by Gardano in the 1590s and 1600s; this is the first of the six volumes (for the 'ghost' series of 1571, see above). Gardano seems to have appropriated another of Vincenti's composers (see BERTOLDO 1591(i)). Some of the series includes works by his nephew as well, who may have been responsible for their preparation. The volume's contents indicate that it was perhaps intended for novices; it would have been fairly common for organists to transpose without having the music rewritten (a number of writers and composers gave detailed instructions for transposing—see I:133), but the short and simple intonations are here transposed for the user. The toccatas are more sophisticated, though, and would be demanding on players well past beginning stages.

CROCE 1594

Giovanni Croce, Mottetti a otto voci ... comodi per le voci, e per cantar con ogni stromento (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1594). 112

Format: 8 partbooks + organ bass (bass-score).

Contents: 8-part motets with organ-bass.

This set of part books contains the first expressly designated organ-bass to be printed. Vincenti offered the following notice at the end of the organ part:

Aspettate honorati Virtuosi da me continuamente nove inventioni per facilitarvi la strada alla fatiche con Intavolature, Passaggi, & Partidure dellì quali già ne hò fatte alquante sorte, & ne andrò tuttavia facendo, come vegga che voi ve ne serviate, & che vi sia grata l'opera mia. 113

You may expect, honoured virtuosos, new inventions from me for facilitating the course of work: intabulations, ornaments, and

112 Repr. 1596, 1599, 1603, 1607, 1615.
113 Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 196.
partituras, some of which I have already made, and will go on to make all the same, since it may be seen that you are served by them, and that my works may please you.

Vincenti referred to works he had already printed: intavolaturas (BERTOLDO 1591(i) and (ii), RADINO 1592, DIRUTA 1593) and passaggi (DIRUTA 1593); he had not printed partiture, or scores (with the possible exception of MASCHERA 1590), of which the present volume is a prime example. This again reflects Vincenti’s concern for the needs of keyboard players.

Horsley classified early organ parts into three types: open score, a score of several basses (for the various choirs of polychoral works), and short score, usually bass-soprano in a format resembling intavolatura. This volume is a set of basses in open score. As Vincenti stated, it was intended to make the efforts of accompanying easier for performers; the lesser able were no longer forced to copy out accompanimental parts by hand.

BANCHIERI 1595

Adriano Banchieri, Concerti Ecclesiastici a otto voci ...

Banchieri’s first printed work is similar to CROCE 1594; unlike Croce, Banchieri had specific ideas on playing organ accompaniments, and wrote about them in a number of volumes. He explained here how one might copy some of the works for organ accompaniment:

\[\text{114 Horsley, ‘Full and Short Scores’, p. 468.}\]
\[\text{115 Mischiati, Banchieri, p. 1; Brown 1595_2; Sartori II:1595d.}\]
Volendo la Spartitura di tutti due Chori, sarà facil cosa accommodarla prestissimo, pigliando la parte acuta & graue del Secondo Choro, & dove in questa dice à 8. lasciarlo, & aggiungendo quella a questa, vi saranno tutti due; ma l'Autore non l'ha fatta, atteso che l'intentione sua è per concertarla à Chori separati. 116

If you want to make a partitura for both choirs, it will be a simple thing to do very quickly, taking the high and low parts of the second choir, and where it says 'à 8.' to leave it; adding that to this [copy], you will have them both. But the author has not done it, considering that his intention is to set the music for separated choirs.

The organ part consists of the bass and soprano of choir I in short score (Horsley's type 3). There is no implication that organ alone would play the pieces, but two of them are four-part works suitable for such performance. Banchieri, not Vincenti, wrote advice to the organist here. The two men seem to have had similar ideas on the subject of organ parts, but it is unlikely that Vincenti would have asked his readers to make manuscript copies of the works he printed. Banchieri, however, was not pleased with the course of development of keyboard accompaniment by 1609, when he chastised players for relying too much on organ-bass parts (see I:134). It is significant that in Banchieri's first volume the two men joined in formulating works to aid keyboard players.

A. and G. GABRIELI 1595

Andrea and Giovanni Gabrieli, Ricercari ... per ogni sorte di stromenti da tasti, libro secondo (Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1595). 117

Format: intavolatura.

Contents: 44 fols., 13 ricercars (2 by Giovanni).

---


117 Brown 1595; Sartori 1595b; ed. Pidoux [Andrea]; ed. Dalla Libera [Giovanni].
VEROVOIO 1595

Simone Verovio, ed., Lodi della musica a 3. voci, composte da diversi ecc. ti musici con l'intavolatura del cimbalo e liuto (Rome: Verovio, 1595).\textsuperscript{118}

Format: choirbook, intavolatura, lute tablature.

Contents: 20 fols., 18 vocal works and their intabulations.

The voice parts of this work are printed across the top of each opening, the keyboard part on the bottom verso, and the lute part on the bottom recto.

A. GABRIELI 1596

Andrea Gabrieli, Il terzo libro de ricercari ... insieme uno motetto, due madrigaletti, & uno capricio sopra Pass'èmezo antico ... tabulati per ogni sorte di stromenti da tasti (Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1596).\textsuperscript{119}

Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/6).

Contents: 44 fols., 6 ricercars, 'fantasia allegra', 'canzon ariosa', 1 motet and 2 madrigal intabulations, passamezzo with five parts.

This volume is noteworthy for the wide variety of genres it contains, an unusual feature for Venetian keyboard prints. The inclusion of a passamezzo indicates not liturgical but amateur use, as does the free choice of instrument indicated in the title.

\textsuperscript{118}Brown 1595\textsubscript{10}.

\textsuperscript{119}Brown 1596\textsubscript{7}; Sartori 1596c; ed. Pidoux.
Appendix A 1597 reprint of DIRUTA 1593

DIRUTA 1597 reprint of DIRUTA 1593

GALLUS 1598

Joseph Gallus, Totius libri primi sacri operis musicae alternis
modulis concinendi partitio, seu quam praestantiss. musicae partiturem
vocant (Milan: heirs of Francesco and Simon Tini, 1598).

Format: [8] partbooks, 2 organ-basses (bass score, open score).

Contents: 8-part double choir works, Mass, motets, and 3 canzonas à 8.

Nothing is known of Gallus apart from this work, which includes the
first accompaniment part printed by Tini. It employs bass score for
some of the works, but also has full scores of the first group of
motets, the Crucifixus and Benedictus of the Mass, and the 8-part
canzonas. One organ book is the only part book now extant. An
extensive preface by Aurelius Ribrochus (apparently the editor of the
volume) included certain performance practices:

Surgite candidissimi Pulsatores . . . ecce sacri operis musici
Libri primi Partitiones, sive quam Partituras vocatis: ecce allatam
vobis facilitatem omnia libentissime canendi, madulandique . . .
Multi subterfugiendi laboris gratio, etiam quod aptum, quod
conveniens, quod opportunum inimico quod necessarium penitus esset,
turpiter negligent, praeterereunt, transmitunt: idq praeipue in
arte Musica fieri conspicimus. Nonne plures, deficiente
partitione, quae perjucunda, perfrataque animis ad audiendum
forent, insuavia, inconvenientia, absena, et discrepantia
modulantur? Ne quid igitur sacro operi musico nostro deesset, illud
in gratum non modo Organistarum, verum etiam caeterorum canentium
quam diligentissime partitum voluimus . . . di hoc nostrum sacrum
opus musicum pulsare, concinereque haud gravabimini, Partiturae
ipsiul Libri duo sunt vobis habendi, ut hinc et inde, hoc est in

120 Venice: G. Vincenti; Brown 15973; Sartori 1597f.

121 Brown 1598; Sartori II:1598f; Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 199; Arnold,
Thoroughbass, pp. 8-9; Horsley, 'Full and Short Scores', p. 469.
utroque choro omnia facilius suavius et expolitius modulemini. . . 122

Arise fairest players . . . Behold, here are the first books of the sacred art of music, Partitiones, or as you would say Partituras: behold, the skill freely to sing and make music has been brought to you . . . Many, to escape from toil, foolishly omit what is appropriate, what is convenient, and indeed what is wholly necessary, and this we particularly see happen in the art of music. Surely many things lacking partitio, which should be uttered to be heard by souls through joyfulness and through frata, are sung with unpleasantness, inconvenience, discord and mistakes. In order therefore that nothing should be lacking from our sacred art of music, we have wished that it be divided as carefully as possible, not in the manner of organists or indeed of other singers . . . [However,] allow this our sacred art of music to have a pulse and to sing out, not to be weighed down; there are two books of this partitura for you to have, so that here and there, that is in either choir, everything may be sung more easily, expressively and in a more refined manner . . .

The preface alludes to the development of an organ part. Apparently, organists did not always accompany choirs with as much efficiency and ability as might have been wished; the critique is significant. By providing an organ part the editor enabled the organist to perform more accurately. Tini's entry into the organ-bass genre indicates the novelty of accompaniment volumes. Explaining how it should be used was essential.

Two comments of the preface are similar to those of Sancta Maria: the barring or dividing of the organ part, and the importance of keeping a steady pulse.123 The unbarred printed music of the 16th century was more susceptible to errors of pulse and rhythm; the comments need to be considered within this context. The bar lines of the organ part may well have been unfamiliar to organists accustomed to more informal accompaniment parts, and perhaps it took some time for them to be fully integrated into an accompaniment technique. Dividing the music into

---

122 Repr. Kinkeldey, Orgel; Sartori.
123 SANCTA MARIA 1565, fols. 52-52v; see I: 44.
bars was apparently a part of learning to accompany which attained importance only late in the century.

MERULO 1598

Claudio Merulo, *Toccate d'intavolatura d'organo ... libro primo* (Rome: Simone Verovio, 1598). 124

Format: engraved intavolatura (5 x 5/8).

Contents: 2 + 43 pp., 9 toccatas.

Merulo's toccatas are some of the first virtuosic keyboard works to be printed in Italy and represent a landmark in the history of keyboard music and publishing. The volume was the first keyboard music to be printed with engraved copper plates (earlier work of Verovio included keyboard intavolatura in conjunction with lute tablature and vocal music; see I:112). The music itself is embellished with the most complex ornaments found in Merulo, and represents a highly developed idiomatic style, designed for the organ; yet it still refers to vocal music in its voice-leading. There is a conscious effort to retain a four-part texture, even in the most idiomatic writing. The pieces are structurally divided into two styles—embellished and unembellished—as if short ricercars were inserted in the midst of idiomatic sections.

Verovio, not Merulo, dedicated the volume to Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, the powerful Roman cleric and brother of Merulo's patron the Duke of Parma. In the dedication Verovio nearly claims the works for his own:

... par giusto, che si come egli hà dedicate tutte l'opere del suo ingegno ad esso Ser.mo S.or suo fratello, così io dedichi

---

124 Brown 1598, Sartori 1598b (+II); ed. Dalla Libera. Both Sartori and Brown erred in referring to the volume's page numbers as folio numbers.
queste poche fatiche della mia mano insieme con dette opere a V.S. Ill.ma . . . 125

... it seems proper that since [Merulo] has dedicated so many of the works of his imagination to His Highness your brother, likewise I may dedicate these slight efforts of my own together with [the toccatas] to Your Lordship . . .

The dedication by the printer, not the composer, is another sign of the unusual nature of the volume, and its artistic merit as an engraving, which was at least as important as the music to Verovio. Why Merulo himself (who travelled to Rome with Parma’s retinue and surely played for the Cardinal) did not write the dedication is unknown. Merulo must have had dealings with Verovio when preparing the volume. This expensive printing format,126 which enabled Merulo to show precise manuscript-like details of his work (far more expressive than the limited characteristics of typesetting) was an overt demonstration of both respect for the performer and consideration of compositional details. The virtuosic toccatas, printed in an equally ‘virtuosic’ format, were the last of Merulo’s keyboard works to be printed in his lifetime. Their nature indicates the further encouragement of the concept of the virtuoso who performed, rather than improvised or composed, keyboard music.


125 Unn. fol. lv.

126 The relative cost of the volume was about three times the price of conventional printed intavolaturas. (Mischiati, Indici; see below, note 269).
VINCENTI 1598

Giacomo Vincenti, publ., *Intavolatura d’organo facilissima*, accomodata in versetti sopra gli otto toni ecclesiastici, con la quale si può giustamente risponder à Messe, à salmi, & à tutto quello che è necessario al choro (Venice: Vincenti, 1598).}

Format: intavolatura (2 x 6/6); the verso of each page is blank.

Contents: 17 fols., 16 versets.

Vincenti's sixth volume of keyboard music was printed in an unusual format (half the short volume was blank), without composer or dedication, hardly an auspicious sign of a successful keyboard series. The work was intended for church use. Some of the versets are based on tones of the Magnificat and some on plainchant Masses, but as the title indicates, they could be used for any liturgical need. If they were used for Masses, psalms and Magnificats, tedious repetition would have been inevitable, since there are only two versets for each tone. The music is patently for inexperienced organists; competent organists would improvise versets for Masses, etc., based on the appropriate chant (perhaps employing ASOLA 1592). Vincenti was aiming towards novices with this print, as the word facilissima in the title confirms.

---

127 Brown 1598.; Sartori 1598e; ed. Kastner; Kastner, 'Una intavolatura'. Kastner, preface to edn., erred in supposing that the phrase 'novamente date in luce' in the title indicates that this volume is a reprint.

128 Apel, Keyboard Music, p. 128, and Kastner, preface to edn. Neither Apel nor Kastner noted that some of the versets derive from plainchant Masses: the 'primo del primo tono' is based on the Kyrie for Marian masses (Liber usualis Mass IX), and the subject is nearly identical to that used by Merulo in 1568; and the 'primo del quinto tono' and 'secondo del quinto tono' are based on the plainchant Sanctus for the same Mass. More analysis may reveal further plainchant relationships; it is premature to agree with Apel that many of the versets are 'based on a freely invented idea'.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
PELLEGRINI 1599

Vincenzo Pellegrini, Canzoni de intavolatura d'organo fatte alla francese ... libro primo (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1599). 129

Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/8).

Contents: 4 + 98 pp., 13 canzonas.

Pellegrini (c. 1560-1631) composed a large number of sacred vocal works; this was his first publication, the only one for keyboard. Although more substantial than Vincenti's previous, the volume indicates the difficulties he was having in finding keyboard music to publish, having to resort to a young and inexperienced composer rather than the likes of those he cited in 1591. It was to be Giacomo Vincenti's last publication of keyboard music that was not connected to a treatise.

ANERIO c. 1600

Giovanni Francesco Anerio, Gagliarde a quattro voci intauolate per sonare sul cimbalo et sul Liuto ... libro primo ([Rome: Simone Verovio], n.d.). 130

Format: engraved intavolatura (5 x 5/5); lute tablature, 5 systems per page, below the keyboard notation.

Contents: 10 fols., 16 Galliards.

Anerio (1567-1630) published seventeen volumes of sacred vocal music and seven volumes of madrigals. This is his only publication of purely instrumental music. Fétis first cited a publisher and date

129 Brown 1599g; Sartori 1599c; ed. Lynn; Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura tedesca', pp. 76-78. Brown erred in stating that the volume has 61 fols.; it has 51.

130 Sartori 16071; Eitner, 'Anerio'; Becherini, 'Anerio'.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
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(Venice: Vincenti, 1607) for this volume, for unknown reasons, but the work was undoubtedly published by Verovio in Rome, as Becherini showed. Given Fétis' mistaken publisher and place, there is little reason to accept his date. Because of the simple nature of the music, the brevity of the volume, its anonymity, and Anerio's lack of other instrumental publications, it is likely that the music dates from early in Anerio's career, before 1600 (his first vocal works were published in 1599).

Like other dance-music volumes, this offers little musical interest. The volume lacks titles to all but the first galliard, publication details and dedication, indicating a certain lack of care regarding its preparation. The double-format of lute and keyboard is a sign of the close relationship of the two for such music, and the music's suitability for use by amateurs.

ANERIO 1600

Giovanni Francesco Anerio, Dialogo pastorale al Presepio di Nro S.re ... con l'intavolatura del cimbalo et del liuto (Rome: Simone Verovio, 1600). Format: choirbook, intavolatura, lute tablature.

Contents: 17 fols., 16-section dialogue for three voices and accompaniment.

\[131\] Fétis, Biografie, I:104.

\[132\] New Vogel no. 68.
GUAMI 1601

Gioseffo Guami, *Partidura per sonare delle canzonette alla francese* (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1601).\(^\text{133}\)

Format: [4 partbooks +] short score.

Contents: 41 fols., 15 canzonettas à 4, 2 à 5, 1 à 8; 1 madrigal à 5; 1 battaglia.

This collection of canzonas was most likely published in partbooks (now lost) with a keyboard accompaniment volume, and therefore does not correspond to Vincenti's reference to Guami in BERTOLDO 1591(i). The reprint (Antwerp: Phalèse, 1612) consists of four partbooks (CATB), the organ part apparently lost.\(^\text{134}\) The title-reference to *partidura* is an indication of the ambiguity of the term at the beginning of the 17th century, as Kinkeldey observed. The canzonas are suitable for solo performance on the keyboard.


\(^{134}\) Sartori II:1612f.
LUZZASCHI 1601

Luzzasco Luzzaschi, Madrigali ... per cantare et sonare a uno, doi, e tre soprani (Rome: Simone Verovio, 1601). 135

Format: open score, intavolatura (7/7), lute tablature.

Contents: 41 pp., 12 madrigals and their intabulations.

The parts for these madrigals are all in score, unlike Verovio’s earlier volumes.

VIADANA 1602

Lodovico Viadana, Cento concerti ecclesiastici a une, a due, a tre, & quattro voci. Con il basso continuo per sonar nell’organo. Nova inuentione commode per ogni sorte di cantori, & per gli organisti (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1602). 136

Format: 4 partbooks, figured organ-bass.

Contents: 5 x 60 pp., 48 concerti, 1 Magnificat, 1 canzona, falsi bordoni.

It is not surprising that Vincenti was the printer of this, the first volume to contain true figured bass for the organist, since he had experimented with several varieties of organ parts for accompaniment in the previous decade; Viadana’s system was to prove the most enduring. It was, however, inherently experimental, and printing it was consistent with Vincenti’s desire to aid keyboard accompanists.

135 New Vogel no. 1524.
136 Sartori 1602a (+II); Arnold, Thorough-bass, pp. 11-19; Kinkeldey, Orgel, pp. 202-205. Repr. 1603, 1604, 1605, 1607, 1608, 1610, 1612.
In addition to explaining the figured bass system, Viadana’s introduction to the volume goes into detail on a number of facets of organ playing and the use of notations. Item 2:

Che l’Organista sia in oblige di suonar semplicemente la Partitura, & in particolare con la man di sotto . . . 137

The organist is bound to play the organ part simply, especially in the left hand . . . 138

The word Partitura here refers simply to the figured bass, reflecting the imprecision of the term. Viadana may have had some experience of organists over-accompanying vocal works, with too much embellishment in the lower part. The left hand would of course be required to play the main written part of the figured bass, which was especially important to perform unaltered.

The sixth item turns to consideration of the ease of particular formats:

Non si è fatta la Intauolatura a questi Concerti, per fuggir la fatica, ma per rendere più facile il suonargli a gl’Organisti, stando che non tutti suonerebbero all’improviso la Intauolatura, e la maggior parte suonarono la Partitura, per essere più spedita: però potranno gl’Organisti a sua posta farsi detta Intauolatura, che a dirne il vero parla molto meglio. 139

No tablature has been made for these Concertos, not in order to escape the trouble, but to make them easier for the Organist to play, since, as a matter of fact, not everyone would play from a tablature at sight, and the majority would play from the organ-bass as being less trouble; I hope that the Organists will be able to make the said tablature at their own convenience, which, to tell the truth, is much better. 140

This comment again relies on the correct understanding of partitura as any type of organ part, not open score. Viadana made a concession with

137 Sartori.
138 Arnold, Thorough-bass, p. 11.
139 Sartori.
the organ part; he implied that he preferred the accompaniment to double the voice parts through use of an intavolatura (the alternative of open score is unstated, but implied). But he decided not to print an intavolatura, since organists would find the organ-bass less trouble, and might even play the basso continuo at sight. The difficulty of playing an intavolatura was an important consideration to Viadana. Viadana’s solution meant that doubling the voices was sacrificed, but the ease of performance meant that accompanists would be less likely to make mistakes, and better performances would result. In any case, Viadana acknowledges that he would prefer more effort to be spent on the accompaniment, but his attitude was strictly pragmatic (as the entire preface indicates), and he wanted to make the works easier to accompany properly.

Two other of Viadana’s guidelines are of interest and deal with more minor facets of the organist’s duties:

[9] Che non sarà mai in obbligo la Partitura guardarsi da due quinte, nè da due ottaue; ma si bene le parti che si cantano con la voce.

[10] Che chi volesse cantare questa sorte di Musica senza Organo, o Manacordo, non sarà mai buon effetto, anzi per lo più se ne sentiranno dissonanze. 141

The Partitura is never under any obligation to avoid two Fifths or two Octaves, but those parts which are sung by the voices are.

If anyone should want to sing this kind of music without Organ or Clavier, the effect will never be good; on the contrary, for the most part, dissonances will be heard. 142

It is reasonable for a keyboard instrument to be exempted from consecutives: voice-crossing (which alleviates such problems in vocal writing) is inaudible on the keyboard, and its supporting role as

141 Sartori.

142 Arnold, Thorough-bass, pp. 18-19.
accompaniment allows for compromises that would be less acceptable in solo performance. This is not to say, however, that the keyboard should be omitted; its role as supporting instrument is defended vehemently.

Figured bass techniques were used for over two hundred years, and soon became an important part of the keyboard player’s training. It is ironic that one of the earliest and most significant accompaniment volumes clearly states that figured bass was designed for expediency, and accompaniment from a full organ part was preferable. But this preference was only viable with music of the prima prattica, and the rise of more monodic styles rendered it an archaism.

CALESTANI 1603

Girolamo Calestani, Fiori musicali a otto voci con il Te Deum a choro spezzato a quattro voci, commodissimi per cantare in cappella, & concertare nell’organo, con ogni sorte di strumento musico ... Con il Basso continuato, & soprano, ove è stato necessario, per maggior commodità de Sig. Organisti (Parma: Erasmo Viotti, 1603).

Format: 8 partbooks + organ-bass (short score).

Contents: 1 Mass, 6 motets, 1 Magnificat, 1 Te Deum.

Calestani is known only through this volume, his opus 2. He commented on the need for an organ part in the organist’s partbook:

Hauend’io in odito in alcune Città d’Italia la frequent’Armonia, che suole vsar l’Organo, tanto ne’ concerti, & in Salmi del Vespero; quanto in altr’hore Canoniche, & con falsi Bordoni, & simili lodi in vari tempi diuise: hà con dolcissimo modo rapito me stesso (e massime nella nostra Città di Lucca, che di cotanta gratissima Melodia odita hor co’l solo Basso, adesso il semplice Soprano, in vn punto i vari strumenti sì di fiato, come di corde, dir posso c’ha pochi pari) c’havendo vn anno già fabricato sopra il Theoristo bersaglio vn vago Mazzetto d’alquanti Fiori a 4. 5. 8. & 10. voci incommodi per l’Organo, ho fatto resistenza alla tacita censura. Et gradito il gentil modo di ben lodare quel Centro d’infinita grandezza, sommi posto in animo posporre quelli, & seminar questi pochi in quella maniera, che per commodità vostra hò
giudicato che debba essere. E se bene considerarete la Partitura, veramente conoscerete, ch'io l'hò ridotta in forma, che ogni professo ne resterà ben servito ... 143

Having heard in some Italian cities the frequent harmony, which is customarily to use the organ in concerti, and Vespers Psalms; indeed, in other Canonical Hours, and with falsi bordoni, and similar services of worship at various other times: this exquisite technique has ravished me (especially in our city of Lucca, where most pleasing melodies were heard, now with a solo bass, now simply with the soprano, at one point the various wind instruments, at another the strings; I can say that it has few equals). There, having a year ago composed a lovely bouquet of flowers for 4, 5, 8 and 10 voices, according to theoretical guidelines, unsuitable for the organ, I resisted this tacit censure [of the organ]. And, having been pleased to accept the graceful method of praising that Centre of infinite greatness, I have been moved to postpone those, and to disseminate these slight [works] in the manner that it should be, I have decided, for your benefit. And if you will consider the partitura, indeed you will recognize that I have reduced it in form, which, I would say, will remain to serve all very well.

It can be assumed that the organ partitura is a bass-soprano short score. Calestani indicated that for him, at least, there was a shift in fashion towards a different accompanimental style, a style similar to Viadana's. It is interesting that his earlier works seemed to him unsuitable for the organ; one can understand that the different style was not as well-suited to accompaniment as solo works, but larger ensembles singing in the old style were regularly given organ accompaniment. Perhaps he referred to cori spezzati works, which would not easily be accompanied with only one organ. In any case, he felt strongly enough about the matter to postpone publishing the earlier material.

143 Quoted in Gaspari, Catalogo, II:189-90, and Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 222.
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MAYONE 1603

Ascanio Mayone, *Primo libro di diversi capricci per sonare* (Naples: Constantino Vitale, 1603).\(^{144}\)

Format: open score \(2 \times 5/5/5/5\).

Contents: 100 pp., 4 ricercars, 4 canzonas, 1 madrigal, 5 toccatas, 2 variation sets.

Mayone’s first volume marks an important stage in the history of keyboard music with works which display the full development of an idiomatic keyboard style.\(^{145}\) Born in Naples c. 1570, he studied with G. D. da Nola and Macque, and worked with Trabaci at the chapel of the Spanish Viceroy from 1602.

The dedication of the volume offers no helpful information, but its format and contents indicate a technique which was diverging from vocal hegemony. While the four ricercars are in the traditional style, with successive points of imitation in the manner of vocal music, the other works are modified for keyboard technique well beyond vocal style. Yet the format indicates contrapuntal thinking, even if the music itself does not show it. The choice of format is significant: it is unlikely that the technology to print intavolatura, so common in Venice, was unavailable to the Neapolitans; rather, the tradition of open score, begun by the Spanish, Rodio and Valente, was maintained. The vocal orientation of open score is a vestige of the earlier tradition.\(^{146}\)

\(^{144}\) Sartori 1603b; ed. Stembridge.

\(^{145}\) Apel, ‘Neapolitan Links’.

\(^{146}\) It was therefore composed in open score intended to be used at the keyboard, in all probability. I cannot agree with Stembridge that ‘it is reasonable to suppose that the printed score represents a transcription, for purposes of printing with moveable type, of music that is not strictly polyphonic’ (edn. p. 4).
This notwithstanding, the hand-made addition of flags for shorter note values in the GB-Lbl copy indicates the lack of appropriate printer’s type which Mayone required.

TRABACI 1603

Giovanni Maria Trabaci, Ricercate, canzone francese, capricci, canti fermi, gagliarde, partite diverse, toccate, durezze, ligature, consonanze stravaganti, et un madrigale passeggiato nel fine ... primo libro (Naples: Constantino Vitale, 1603).147

Format: open score (3 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 3 + 122 pp., 12 ricercars, 7 canzonas, 2 capriccios, 4 Spagna settings, 8 galliards, 2 sets of variations, 2 toccatas, 1 'durezze et ligature', 1 'consonanze stravaganti', 1 madrigal intabulation.

Trabaci's first volume of keyboard music was published by the same firm as Mayone's, the dedication dated six months later. The similar array of contents shows a similar outlook to Mayone's. He included a preface which discusses keyboard music and performance:

Queste mie fatiche di Musica da sonarsi sopra qualsiuoglia strumento, ma più proprionelmente ne gli Organi, e ne i Cimbali, sono state fatte da me con tutta quella osservata diligenza, e chiaro, e distinto modo che più possa esser facile a coloro, che vogliano porre in opera viua le presenti note. Ma si come il Cavalletto; quantunque la maestra natura l'abbia formato attissimo al corso; non potrà egli giain per regolamente correre, se non è guidato dalla disciplina dello Sprone, e del freno; così queste mie consonanze; ancor che state composte con molto aggiustamento, se da voi, benigni Lettori, non vi si pone lo studio, e l'ordine, che vi bisogna in dar loro il dueto spirito della attual Musica; facil cosa sarà, ch'elle non appaiano veramente tali ne i vostri motivi, quali in se stesse sono; e così non mia, ma vostra sarà la colpa del non riuscito fine del mio

147 Sartori 1603c; ed. Jackson, 'Trabaci'.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
These my pieces of music to play upon whatever instrument you wish, but most suitably on the organ and harpsichord, have been made by me with all of that strict diligence, clarity, and refined method, which more enables them to be easy for those who want to bring the present notes to life. But just as the horse, although it has been created by nature to be most suited to running, can never run according to rules if it is not guided by the discipline of the spur and bit; so it is with these my consonances. Even though they may have been composed with much understanding, if you, dear readers, do not apply the study and regulation which you need in order to give them the required spirit of living music, it it is quite likely that in your hands they will not appear as they truly are; thus not mine, but yours will be the fault if the end of my intentions is not attained. This is addressed for no other [reason] than charitably to help you and please you. 149

Since he stated that the works were most suited to keyboards, other means of playing them were also conceivable, such as harp and lute-like instruments, as the Spanish volumes specified, or instrumental ensemble, as specified in TRABACI 1615.

The preface is an 'escape clause' (unparalleled in the literature) should the works fail to please. Despite occasional deprecatory words, the tone seems stern and severe, that of a master reprimanding his pupils for erring in their lessons, and perhaps the volume should be seen in that light: an educational guide as well as a collection of keyboard music. There is an echo of MERULO 1592 here; the importance of preparation in playing the works is clear. The means of study, however, is not made clear.

The content and format reflect the same features as Mayone's first book: a mix of idiomatic keyboard music and vocally-orientated music set in a format which reflects older tradition. Manuscript corrections to the surviving copies evidently stem from the printer or Trabaci himself,

148 Sartori.
149 Jackson, 'Trabaci', I:337-8 (with emendations).
as in Mayone's volume, reflecting again the lack of type for short note-values.\footnote{150}

BERETTA 1604

Don Ludovico Beretta, Partitura del primo libro delle canzoni à quattro & otto voci da suonare (Milan: Agostino Tradate, 1604).\footnote{151}

Format: open score (4 x 5/5/5/5), cross-opening.

Contents: 42 pp., 17 canzonas à 4, 2 canzonas à 8.

Beretta is known only through this volume. It may have accompanied a set of partbooks, but they are now lost, if they ever existed. Open score was one of several options for keyboard accompaniment available to printers.\footnote{152} Open score format also allows for solo keyboard performance of the canzonas.

MERULO 1604

Claudio Merulo, Toccate d'intavolatura d'organo ... libro secondo (Rome: Simone Verovio, 1604).\footnote{153}

Format: engraved intavolatura (5 x 5/8).

Contents: 2 + 49 pp., 10 toccatas.

Merulo's second volume of toccatas was printed shortly after his death, and was Verovio's second and last publication for solo keyboard.

\footnotetext[150]{Mischiati, edn. vol. I, p. vii.}
\footnotetext[151]{Sartori II:1604g.}
\footnotetext[152]{Horsley ('Full and Short Scores', p. 473) noted that 'few [open scores] were published, the output averaging about two a year, and they clearly represented a great deal of labor and expense.'}
\footnotetext[153]{Sartori 1604d (+II); ed. Dalla Libera.
His workshop must have been slowing down by this time; it produced only one more book of music (O. Durante's *Arie Devote* of 1608), there being no further information on him after that date. The volume itself is a continuation of *Merulo* 1598 (which contained 9 toccatas ordered from tone one to tone four), picking up where Verovio left off: these toccatas are ordered from the fifth to tenth tones. Considering this organization, the nineteen toccatas were probably completed as a whole well before 1598.

**Padovano 1604**


Contents: 39 fols., 3 toccatas, 2 ricercars (Padovano); 5 toccatas (anon.). Padovano was elected organist at St Mark's, Venice, in 1552; he left for Graz in 1566, where he died in 1575. It was unusual to publish music by a composer who had died almost thirty years before; Gardano's work is also unusual in that the volume needed to be supplemented with five toccatas 'd'incerto'. Several of the works include rudimentary letter-notation for pedal parts, the earliest such indications in printed Italian keyboard music.

---


155 Sartori 1604e; ed. Benetti; ed. Speer.
[A. GABRIELI ?1604] [lost]

Andrea Gabrieli, [Messe d'intavolatura d'organo libro quarto].

The existence of this volume and its probable date are discussed above ([A. GABRIELI 1563]). The works were copied in the Turin tablatures (ed. Dalla Libera).

BANCHIERI 1605

Adriano Banchieri, L'organo suonarino ... entro il quale si pratica quanto occorrer suole à gli canti fermi in tutte le feste, & solennità dell'anno. Trasportato, & tradotto dal canto fermo fidelissimamente, sotto la guida di un basso in canto figurato suonabile, & cantabile, & con intelligibile docilità diviso in cinque registri (Venice: Ricciardo Amadino, 1605). 156

Formats: organ-bass, open score, short score.

Contents: treatise with music examples for organ. 1605 edn.: numerous liturgical works and 19 complete pieces, 7 repr. in 1611 edn.; 1611 edn.: liturgical works and 20 pieces, 2 repr. in Terzo libro di novi pensieri ecclesiastici (1613); 1622 edn.: complete organ versets for the Mass ('della Domenica'), 5 other pieces, and an additional sesto registro with 7 pieces: 4 sonatas, and 3 vocal works (for tenor or soprano). The sonatas were first printed in BANCHIERI 1612. 157

156 Mischiati, Banchieri, pp. 120-126; Sartori 1605d (+II); transl. Marcase. Mischiati listed four editions, not (as in Sartori) three: In 1611, its second edition, an appendix on basso continuo was added; there was a third edition printed in 1622 and reprinted unchanged in 1627; and a fourth edition printed in 1638 (the 1620 edition listed in Sartori is a ghost). See BANCHIERI 1611 for the textual additions of the second edition.

157 For a complete analysis of the musical contents, see Mischiati, Banchieri, pp. 120-126.
This volume is the first work to give detailed instructions for liturgical use of the organ. The word suonarino is a play on words, a reference to didactic books for clerics entitled cantorino which had been published since the early 16th century, one of which Banchieri edited (Bologna: Eredi di Bartol. Cochi, 1622). The Suonarino’s documentation of the uses of notation is significant. The work went through several editions, all of which will be considered to some extent in the present discussion. It is made up of five sections (registri) dealing respectively with organ music for Mass, ecclesiastical tones and psalm-playing, hymn-playing, Magnificats, and Marian antiphons.

The first registro deals with alternatim practice for the Mass, and includes music for the organist. Banchieri was specifically writing for organists ‘who do not have much ability to discern the inner parts’ (‘non hanno molta cognizione alle parti di mezzo’), and included for their benefit a simple figuring system in the alternatim music.\textsuperscript{158} He included music for four Masses, two Credos, and three sequences. Unlike ASOLA 1592, the music by Banchieri is not plainchant, but the bass part for a polyphonic setting based on chant. Example A.5 gives the first Kyrie from Suonarino, followed by the plainchant upon which it is based.

The organ part has several interesting features. The underlaid text, as if the music were the bass part for a polyphonic Mass, is striking. The text does not present one vocal part of a Mass setting, but incipits for several; Banchieri did not say why he gave it, but he was a priest, and knew that it was forbidden to omit any of the sacred words of the rite. The practice of replacing words of the Mass with organ music meant that some of the text was potentially left unsaid, and organists were occasionally admonished to sing the words to the music

\textsuperscript{158} Suonarino, p. 2. The details of the notation are considered in Arnold, Thorough-bass, pp. 16-18.
Example A.5. Suonarino (1605), p. 3 (Kyrie, 'Messa della Madonna'); plainchant for the same Mass taken from Graduale Romane (Venice: Liechtenstein, 1551), fol. 157v.

Primo Registro.

MESSA DELLA MADONNA
Basso con sicurissima guida fin'alla finale di ventetto in ventetto.

they played; this may be why Banchieri inserted them here. But Banchieri was also trying to imitate a vocal texture in the organ music with its 'middle parts', showing how the imitative parts would enter for each verset. The second line of Ex. A.5 shows this clearly: the entries for three parts are given at the head of the line, soprano, tenor and bass. The same may be seen in the Christe. Banchieri wanted to promote an imitative technique, styled on vocal polyphony and not idiomatic keyboard writing. It will be seen below (BANCHIERI 1609 and 1611) that he did not care for basso continuo as practised by some. The versets here give those who could not 'discern the inner parts' some idea of the imitative entries that should be used for improvising an organ verset—a halfway measure for those who could not play fantasia.

Another feature of the music in the 1605 edition is the pitch given for the choir at the end of the first four lines of music. The sharp above each of these indicates that a chord is intended, to be played separately by the organist after he finished his verset, for the choir to take their pitch. Apparently, they could not deduce their pitch simply from the last chord of the organ part. This changed in the 1611 edition, where he gave two pitches for the choir, beginning and ending. As can be seen from Ex. A.5 (line four), the first edition

159 For fuller documentation of problems with organ Masses and text, see More, 'Performance of Plainsong' [Ph.D.], p. 176, and Van Wye, 'Ritual Use', pp. 288, 302. Van Wye cited the Ceremoniale episcoporum (Venice, 1600), in which the writers praise the custom of singing the words of the organ verset, either by the organist or someone else: 'Sed advertendum erit, ut, quandocumque per organum figuratur aliquid cantari, seu responderi alternatim versiculis Hymnorum, aut canticorum, ab aliquo de choro intelligibili voce pronuntiatus id, quod ab organo respondendum est. Et laudabile esset, ut aliquis cantor coniunctim cum organo voce clara idem cantaret.'

160 This is acknowledged in the 1611 title, which says 'the second impression [is] attuned to the choir tone (questa seconda impressione, accordato in Tuono Corista)'.
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did not always give the starting note of the choir's part. This must have resulted in enough confusion to require revision.

There are no bar lines in the organ part, which looks like a voice part in a partbook. It would need careful preparation, and suggests that the technique of playing from a bass partbook was known to Banchieri. His system of organ-bass shorthand was, however, his own development.

Banchieri changed the system of notating music for organ versets at the Mass in the various editions of the work. In the 1611 edition, the versets were numbered (1-5 for the Kyrie, for example), and instead of text given for the imitative upper parts, he simply says 'Fugha', with no other text until the bass voice enters. In the 1638 edition, he scrapped the system entirely, and gave instead organ versets in short score, for one Mass only. Perhaps the earlier system was found to be too complicated for many organists. Example A.6 shows one of these versets.

In the music for one of the other Masses ('dell'Advento') after the Sanctus is a 'Devoto Affetto per suonare, & cantare alla levatione del Sanctissimo Sacramento' (p. 15), a short piece printed in choirbook format for soprano and bass. Concluding the section on music for the Mass is a set of eight pieces printed in four-part open score. They are also short, averaging about 15 bars each. Banchieri noted that these pieces, appropriate for the Gradual, Offertory, Elevation and Postcommunion, 'are convenient to play as they are, in score, and in addition are easy to copy into tablature (sono commode per sonare così in spartitura; & ancora facili alle mani per intavolarsi)'; open score was appropriate for most organists, but intavolatura transcription was an option for those who needed it. The seventh piece, 'concerto enarmonico', uses peculiar notation for chromatic alterations, which Banchieri leaves unexplained (Ex. A.7). The notation appears to refer to A sharps and D sharps with flat signs, as Ritter first observed. The final of the piece (B) is indicative of its intentional strangeness.

Banchieri's well-known table for those who were unsure of when to play the organ at Mass (Suonarino, p. 38) has been considered by a number of scholars for its liturgical significance; its references to other organ music are useful for this study. There are a number of

---

161 Suonarino, p. 21.
162 Ritter, Geschichte, p. 28.
163 Apel, Keyboard Music, p. 416, explained the notation with reference to a specific instrument, suggesting that the keys for D sharp and A sharp were to the left of the white-note D and A (see PESENTI 1645, where instruments with 17 or 21 keys per octave are documented). The problem with this theory is that Banchieri also used 'normal' d sharps in the piece (and elsewhere).
164 Bonta, 'Uses of the Sonata' (with repr. and transl.); Schaefer, 'Relationship'; Moore, 'Liturgical Use'.

---
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Appendix A

Prima Stradizione

SONATA SETTIMA CONCERTA ENARMONICO

Example A.7, 'Sonatina (1605)', pp. 34-5, 'Concerto enarmónico'.
orthodox references to *alternatim* performance of versets, but for the
Offertory (item 6) 'one plays a motet or musical *ricercata* (suonasi un
Motetto, o *Ricercata Musicale)*'; for item 8 'when the second Agnus Dei
has been sung by the choir, a capriccio, or *aria alla Francese* is played
(Replicato il secondo Agnus Dei dal Choro, si suona vn Capriccio, ouero
*Aria alla Francese)*'; and finally 'one may not play dances or impure and
lustful madrigals on the organ, because these pieces have been
prohibited by the Council of Trent (sopra l'Organo non si deue sonare
Arie di Balli, di Madrigali impuri, & lasciu, perche queste Armonie
vengono prohibite nel Sacro Concilio Tridentino)*'. Banchieri gave a
similar list for playing at Vespers (1611 edn., p. 98);165 in addition
to the liturgical instructions, the organist was advised in item 6 to
play a 'Franzesia' (i.e., canzona) or other piece after the Magnificat.
When Banchieri suggested using motets, canzonas, ricercars or
capriccios, he was following the practice of Merulo and others who
played such works at the keyboard.166 Also, the prohibition of dances
and madrigals indicates that they were regularly, if improperly, used in
the service.

In the second registro Banchieri dealt with psalm-playing using
similar notations: organ-bass for the psalms, open score for five pieces
at the end. On page 58 he recommended Diruta's forthcoming work for for
beginners who were using the volume but were not sure how to intabulate:

... non tacerò in questo proposito (a chi non ha sicura
cognizione nell'intauolare) si serva vn Libro secondo volume
aggiunto al Transilvano da Girolamo Diruta, che fra pochi giorni si
stamperà in Venetia Apresso Jacomo Vincenti, qual volume (oltre
molte vtilità, che aporterà a gl'Organisti) insegna con facilità
intauolare semplice, & diminuito ...

166 Bonta ('Uses of the Sonata', p. 83) concludes that performance
of such works during the Mass was well-known by Banchieri's time and may
date from the early 15th century.
I would not fail to mention in this connection (for those who do not have sure knowledge of how to intabulate), that a second volume added to Girolamo Diruta's *Il Transilvano*, which will be printed in a few days in Venice by Giacomo Vincenti, will serve [the reader]; which volume (apart from many other useful things it contains for organists) instructs intabulating with facility, both simple and embellished . . .

Diruta's work was in the event four years later in coming, but Banchieri's comment shows that it had been prepared and that he knew its material. Intabulating is discussed in DIRUTA 1609-10 Book I, pp. 1-10.

The third *registro* deals with hymns for the church year (organ-bass). The fourth *registro* gives *alternatim* magnificats to be either played or sung, in choirbook format (bass and soprano only). Banchieri gave options of alternating chant and singing or alternating chant and organ-playing, but not an entire polyphonic setting. The fourth *registro* concludes with four capricci in short score, and two *ripieni* for the *Deo gratias* in open score. All six pieces are brief, occupying one side of the folio each. The short fifth *registro* gives only the Marian antiphons (organ-bass) and tables for the church year to aid the organist.

The 1611 edition adds considerable material to the fifth *registro* and gives more detailed instructions for figured bass (see BANCHIERI 1611). It includes transposition instructions and several 'concerti' in short score for soprano/tenor and organ, as well as a number of additional pieces in open score.

Banchieri's comments and use of formats—open score, organ-bass, two-part choirbook, short score—give some indication of his preconceptions regarding what organ players wanted or were able to use. The implications are that previously, a large amount of improvisation took place; the unspoken prevalence of fantasia for liturgical organ-playing is evident in this pedagogical work. The five printings or editions of the work provide evidence that Banchieri exerted a
considerable influence over beginning organists in the first half of the seventeenth century.

A. GABRIELI 1605(i)

Andrea Gabrieli, Canzoni alla francese et ricercari ariosi, tabulati per sonar sopra istromenti da tasti ... libro quinto (Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1605).\textsuperscript{167}

Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/6).

Contents: 44 fols., 5 canzonas, 7 ricercars.

A. GABRIELI 1605(ii)

Andrea Gabrieli, Canzoni alla francese per sonar sopra stromenti da tasti ... con uno madrigale nel fine et un capriccio a imitatione beliss. ... libro sesto et ultimo (Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1605).\textsuperscript{168}

Format: intavolatura.

Contents: 43 fols., 8 canzonas, 1 madrigal intabulation, 1 ricercar.

MERULO 1605 reprint of MERULO 1567\textsuperscript{169}

\textsuperscript{167} Sartori 1605f (+II); ed. Pidoux.

\textsuperscript{168} Sartori 1605g; ed. Pidoux.

\textsuperscript{169} Venice: Angelo Gardano; Sartori 1605h. There is no dedication, privilege or advertisement, but ornamentation is slightly modified and the volume is entirely re-typeset.
ROGNONI TAEGIO 1605

Domenico Rognoni Taegio, Canzonæ à 4 & 8 vocè ... libro primo
(Milan: heirs of Simon Tini & Filippo Lomazzo, 1605). 170

Format: 4 partbooks + organ partitura.
Contents: 4 x 21, 120 pp., 21 canzonas: 17 à 4; 4 à 8.

Apart from this volume, Rognoni Taegio (d. before 1626) left two books of madrigals and a number of works in anthologies. The size of the partitura compared with the other partbooks of these canzonas indicates that this is an open score. Rognoni shed light on his motives for bringing out the open score in the preface to the organ part 'Alli virtuosi Organisti':

Haueuo pensato di non dar alle stampe questo Partito, sì perché alcuni non pensassero ch’io lo dassi fuori accioche con questa commodità l’opera hauesse maggior ricapito; sì perché anco gli studiosi di questa professione diuengono con questa commodità tepidi, onde nel partire si fanno pratici, et ne cauano molto frutto: Mà alcuni amici m’hanno detto che questa opera ordinariamente sarà suonata, et che vi fà bisogno del Partito, onde per compiacerli l’ho dato fuori, conoscendo che in ogni caso meglio è il Partito, che il Basso continuato... 171

I had thought of not printing this partito, in order that no one would think that I only printed it so that with this convenience the work would gain more recognition; and also because scholars of this profession have become lukewarm regarding this convenience, when they are experienced at making partitures, and gain much benefit from so doing; but some of my friends told me that these works would normally be played, and that a partitura is required; thus to satisfy them I published it, knowing that in any case the open score is better than basso continuo... 171

Although Rognoni Taegio was not primarily a keyboard player, his comments clearly substantiate that open score was ambivalently received. His words demonstrate that manuscript parts were occasionally made by organists for accompanimental purposes, and that open scores were still

170 Sartori 1605a.
171 Repr. Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 222; Sartori.
popular and useful as well as didactically beneficial for an organist to make. He seems to say that some prefer to copy their own accompaniment rather than use a printed volume; given the limitations of typesetting, this is understandable. But by publishing his own full score, Rognoni Taegio strongly encouraged full accompaniment from the organ; he clearly preferred this to basso continuo.

CIMA 1606

Giovanni Paolo Cima, Partito de ricercari & canzoni alla francese
(Milan: heirs of Simon Tini, and Filippo Lomazzo, 1606).172

Format: open score (2 x 5/5/5/5), cross-opening.

Contents: 95 pp., 7 ricercars, 16 canzonas, 1 exercise transposed 11 times, 2 ricercars (each transposed once), 2 canons.

Cima (c. 1570–1625 or after), a Milanese organist and musician, also wrote a book of motets (1599) and concertos (1610). This volume was dedicated by the printer Lomazzo to Signora Caterina Assandra, a composer and the daughter of Cesare Assandra, a Milanese nobleman and patron.

... le presenti Ricercate, & Canzoni Francese, fatte in Partitura
dal Mag. Sig. Paolo Cima ... , il quale per le molte preghiere
degli amici, et per giouare alli desiderosi di apprendere l'arte di
suonare d'organo, m'hâ concesso ch'io le stampassi, poco curandosi,
per altri rispetti, di farlo. Sapendo io dunque quanto sia il
desiderio del Sig. r suo Padre, che V.S. sia ornata di tutte le
virtù, mantenendole Maestri di lettere, di musica sì di cantare,
come di suonare varie sorti d'Istrumenti soliti usarsi nelle chiese
per lodare Dio; tengo sicuro che le sarà grato, che appresso alli
tanti libri di musica di eccellenti auttori, che tuttavia mi
richiedeva, per dare di V.S. maggiore occasione d'imparare, io ci
habbi aggiunti hora questi, et à lei dedicatile: poiche per
l'artificio che troverà in essi, potrà facilmente con la vivacità
del suo felice ingegno, farsi eccellentissima Suonatrice ... .

172 Sartori 1606a (+II); ed. Rayner.
... the present ricercars and canzoni francese [were] put into score by the magnificent Signor Paolo Cima ..., who, begged by his friends, and with the idea of aiding those desirous of learning to play the organ, has allowed me to publish his book, which except for the reasons named above he had little desire to see in print. Knowing what great concern your revered father has that your Ladyship should be accomplished in all the arts (for he keeps masters of language and of music, and tutors of both singing and of playing the sorts of instruments used in church for the worship of God), I feel certain that he, who has gathered together many books of music of all the best composers which he has always requested from me, in order to give your Ladyship greater occasion to learn, will be pleased that I have added this opus and dedicated it to you. Through the artifice which you will find herein, you will easily attain, aided by the liveliness of your blest ingenuity, to the state of a most accomplished player ... 173

Tini and Lomazzo's pedagogical interests are evident here. Clearly one of the reasons this volume was published is the father's care for his daughter's education. The dedication also suggests that open score was Cima's preferred format for the works, appropriately enough, since the music contained in the volume is all polyphonically orientated. In addition, several canons are included, lending a further air of artifice to the volume.174 The section on transposition,175 pedagogical in nature, gives a music example in each of the twelve chromatic keys, and includes instructions for adjusting the tuning for each key. Instructions for transposing are common (see I: 133), but it is more unusual to write out a piece in each key as Cima did here. Its practical value for beginning organists was surely intended, as transposition was an important skill to develop, and Cima's pedagogical method was deemed valuable enough to merit this extensive demonstration. Cima mentioned only one reason for transposition: 'for the convenience of singers in their concerti (per commodità de Cantori ne i concerti


174 See Durante, 'Artificioso Compositions', pp. 206-7, for a solution to one of them.

175 Similar to that found in Oporto 1577, Loc. 8, 5; see I: 65.
He stressed the accompanimental nature of transposition, thereby suggesting a free approach to the notated pitch of vocal music.

The ten-bar example is given first in d minor, and then transposed up by semitone eleven times. Interestingly, Cima used the notation in a prescriptive way; i.e., he used chromatic signs to indicate a key of the instrument only, and not any 'enharmonic' theoretically correct spellings (in the modern sense). For example, the transposition in E flat minor uses f sharps, not g flats (Ex. A.8). For all the transpositions Cima relied on the conventional accidentals, C, F, and G sharps, and B and E flats; his tuning instructions make it clear that the result is analogous to modern enharmonics, and no reference is made

Example A.8. CIMA 1606, transposition exercise 2 (edn. pp. 63-4). Accidentals apply only to the single note immediately following.

\[ \text{Example A.8.} \]

Accidentals apply only to the single note immediately following.

176 Edn. pp. 62, 89.
third above G sharp.\textsuperscript{177} Cima gave similar tuning instructions for nearly every transposition, specifying only the retuning of specific thirds in each case. The quality of thirds was apparently the prime consideration for Cima in transposing effectively. The entire transposition section presupposes the use of a stringed keyboard instrument with accessible tuning, not organ.

Following the short transpositions, Cima gave two lengthier ricercars for transposition; the first (tone 2, 50 bars) is transposed a whole tone lower, and the second (tone 5, 53 bars) a tritone higher, again with enharmonic spellings.

The titles of the works are noteworthy: seven ricercars are given first (key scheme: G, d, g, F, F, F, F), followed by six canzonas numbered 1 to 6, a ‘fantasia’ and a ‘capriccio’ both numbered sequentially among the canzonas as 7 and 8, and 8 more canzonas, numbered 9 to 16. The consecutive numbering is a sign that the two titles were seen as varieties of canzonas, not different forms, by Cima.

\textit{MERULO 1606}

Claudio Merulo, \textit{Libro secondo di canzoni d'intavolatura d'organo ... a quattro voci, fatte alla francese} (Venice: Angelo Gardano and Brothers, 1606).\textsuperscript{178}

\textit{Format}: intavolatura (4 x 5/7).

\textit{Contents}: 19 fols., 11 canzonas.

\textsuperscript{177}Edn. pp. 63, 89. The approach to chromatic alterations resembles that of New German Tablature, where E flat is always signified with a D sharp.

\textsuperscript{178}Sartori 1606d; ed. McDermott, 'Canzoni', II:63-110.
Merulo's posthumous second book of canzonas was part of Gardano's production of keyboard music. The dedication, by Merulo's nephew Giacinto, stated that the works were 'composed by [Merulo] for the common benefit of virtuosos (da lui gia composte à commune beneficio de virtuosi)', and indeed Merulo's canzonas seem not to address beginners but technically advanced performers. They accord with evidence from Merulo's earlier books of canzonas and toccatas (1592, 1598, 1604); he had the interests of performers in mind.

NANTERMI 1606


The Milanese Nantermi was organist at San Celso in 1601, the date the dedication was signed. The volume is a reprint of a 1601 edition, now lost; it is his only volume of music, although he contributed a few works to anthologies. Gaspari conjectured that there were partbooks accompanying the organ part, now lost.

In the dedication, Nantermi revealed one reason for publishing the score:

... che havendo dato alle stampe i presenti Motetti (primo parto del debil'ingegno mio) venghi a dedicarle la Partitura di essi, la

---

180 Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 223; Gaspari, Catalogo, II:469.
182 Gaspari, Catalogo, II:469.
quaie si come non serve ad altro, che à scoprir le viscere, & il core d'essi Motetti . . . 183

. . . that having given to the press the present motets (first-born of my feeble imagination), I have come to dedicate the partitura of them to you, which serves for no other reason than to uncover the inner workings and heart of the motets . . .

It appears that Nantermi wanted the motets to be studied in score; he did not mention helping the organist who would accompany the motets. It is possible that the vocal parts to this work were not printed at the same time.

AGAZZARI 1607

Agostino Agazzari, Del sonare sopra'l basso con tutti li stromenti e dell'vso loro nel conserto (Siena: Domenico Falcini, 1607). 184

Format (music examples): engraved organ-bass, intavolatura (5/7).

Contents: 12 pp., treatise.

Agazzari's short treatise on playing figured bass is well-known. Several of his comments reflect the use of various notations. Although he was one of the earliest to consider figured bass, many of his ideas are traditionally orientated. He began by giving the requirements for playing well:

Dico dunque che chi vuole suonar bene, gli convien posseder tre cose: prima saper contrapunto, ò per lo meno cantar sicuro, ed intendere le proporzioni, e tempi, e legger per tutti le chiaui, saper risolver le cattive con le buone, conoscere le 3. e 6. maggiori, e minori, et altre simiglianti cose. Seconda deue saper suonar bene il suo strumento, intendendo l'intavolatura, ò spartitura, et hauer molta prattica nella tastatura, ò manico del medesimo, per non star à mendicar le consonanze, e cercar le botte, mentre si canta, sapendo che l'occhio è occupato in guardar le parti posteli dauanti. Terza deue hauer buon orecchio, per sentir lo movimento, che fanno le parti infra di loro; del che non ne

183 Repr. ibid., and Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 223.

184 Sartori 1607f (+II); Kinkeldey, Orgel, pp. 216-21; Arnold, Thorough-Bass, pp. 67-74; Strunk, Source Readings, pp. 424-31.
I would say, then, that whoever wants to play well, will come to obtain three things: first, to know counterpoint, or at least to be able to sing securely, to understand proportions, times, to be able to read all the clefs, to know how to resolve dissonances, to know major and minor thirds and sixths, and other similar things. Second, he must know how to play his instrument well, understanding intabulations or open scores, and to have a great deal of experience at the keyboard, or hand position of the same, so as not to leave the chords to chance, groping for notes while singing, knowing that the eyes are employed in reading the music before him. Third, he must have a good ear, in order to hear the movement of the lower parts; which I do not speak about, as I am not able to make it clear in my discourse for those having bad ears by nature. 186

These three factors are closely related to several other writers' ideas. The first, thorough knowledge of counterpoint, recalls Sancta Maria. Understanding the principles of vocal technique is essential, as is the resolution of dissonance (which makes up a large part of Sancta Maria's treatise). The second factor, understanding the keyboard, recalls the work of Bermudo. Understanding notation, both intavolatura and open score, is necessary; so is basic keyboard technique. (The context requires the interpretation of the ambiguous spartitura as open score and not simply organ-bass, since the treatise itself instructs in playing the organ-bass.) The third factor is an obvious musical requirement. It is noteworthy that Agazzari stressed traditional aspects of playing. His enumeration of the necessary requirements for playing well bear less relation to playing figured bass than to simply playing the keyboard in the long-accommodated manner. The stress on vocal technique betrays his concern for the traditional. The use of figured bass did not mean abandoning the old style; rather, it was an adjunct, a

185 Agazzari, p. 4.
new technique to be employed alongside the old. Agazzari gave three reasons for the study of figured bass:

Per tre cagioni dunque è stato messo in vso questo modo: primo per lo stile moderno di cantar recitativo, e comporre: seconda per la commodità; terza per la quantità, e varietà d'opere, che sono necessarie al conserto.

Della prima dico, che essendosi ultimamente trouato il vero stile d'esprimere le parole, imitando lo stesso ragionare nel miglior modo possibile, il che meglio succede, con vna, ò poche voci, come sono l'arie moderne d'alcuni valenthuomini, e come al presente s'usa assai in Roma ne'conserti; non è necessario far spartitura, ò intauolatura; ma basta vn Basso con i suoi segni, come abbiamo detto sopra . . .

La seconda cagione è la commodità grande; perche con piccola fatica hauete molto capitale per le occorrenze, oltre che chi desidera imparare à sonare, ò scioltò dalla intauolatura, cosa à molti difficile e noiosa; anzi molto soggetta à gli'errori perché l'occhio, e la mente è tutta occupata in guardar tante parti massime venendo occasione di consertar all'impruoso.

La terza finalmente, che è la quantità dell'opere necessarie al conserto, mi pare sola basteuole ad introdurre simil commodità di sonare: poiche se si hauessero ad intauolare, ò spartire tutte le opere, che si cantano fra l'anno in vna sola Chiesa di Roma: dove si fa professione di consertare, bisognerebbe all'Organista che hauesse maggior libraria, che qual si voglia Dottor di Legge; onde à molta ragione si è introdotto simil basso, col modo però sopradetto; conchiudendo non esser bisogno ne necessario à chi suona, far sentir le parti come stanno, mentre si suona per cantarvisi, e non per sonar l'opera come sta che è diversa cosa dal nostro soggetto. 187

Thus for three reasons this method [figured bass] has been put into use: first because of the modern style of singing and composing recitative; secondly for convenience; thirdly because of the quantity and variety of the works which are necessary for the concerto.

With regard to the first, I say that since the true style of expressing the words has at last been found, by reproducing the same thought in the best manner possible, which succeeds best with a single voice, or only a few, as in the modern airs of various able men, and as is the constant practice at Rome in concertos, it is not necessary to make an open score or tablature; a bass, with its signs, as we said above, is enough.

The second reason is the great convenience; because for little effort much may be gained for one's needs, besides which anyone who wants to learn how to play is freed from the intavolatura, a 187Agazzari, p. 10.
difficult and tiresome thing to many, and indeed a frequent source of mistakes because of the eye and mind being entirely taken up with following so many parts, especially when occasion arises for making music on the spur of the moment.

And finally the third, which is that the amount of works needed for concerting seems to me reason enough to introduce a corresponding convenience for playing; since if one were required to intabulate or put into open score all the works that were sung in one year in only one church in Rome in which they follow the custom of concerting, the organist would need a larger library than any doctor of law; wherefore there is abundant reason for the introduction of such a bass, with the method described above. And, in conclusion, there is no necessity for the player to cause the parts to be heard as they stand, as long as he is playing to accompany singing and not in order to play the work as it stands, which is a matter apart from my subject. 188

In this quotation Agazzari qualified all his remarks with the admonition that they pertain to accompaniment, not playing a vocal work as a solo keyboard piece; a significant proviso. The first reason for figured bass clearly reflects the close ties between keyboard and vocal music. Just as Sancta Maria proposed a technique which imitated the techniques of vocal polyphony, so Agazzari linked figured bass with the new style of vocal writing. Agazzari mentioned two other methods for accompaniment: intavolatura and open score. Prints and manuscripts in these two formats were frequently used for accompanimental purposes as well, but were superceded by figured bass. Evidence remains for showing that organists made manuscripts from partbooks for accompanimental purposes. 189 But the new style demanded a different accompanimental approach.

The second reason for figured bass is reminiscent of VIADANA 1602: intavolatura is too difficult and awkward to read, especially for

---

188 Portions transl. Arnold, Thorough-bass, pp. 73-4; cf. Strunk, Source Readings, pp. 430-1.

189 London 2088 contains short scores of vocal works (see [FACOLI ?1586]); other similar MSS are considered in Lowinsky, 'Early Scores'.
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playing at sight. This has greater significance for accompaniment than solo keyboard music, as he acknowledges.

The third of Agazzari's reasons for figured bass was as pragmatic as the second; the sheer quantity and frequency of performance required steps to reduce the size of the organist's library and his requirements for music copying. He did not believe in doubling the voices in accompaniment, but left open the possibility of performance by solo keyboard, a subject apart from his treatise but clearly a possibility, similar to vocal works played by solo keyboard in the 16th century.

BANCHIERI 1607

Adriano Banchieri, Ecclesiastiche sinfonie dette canzoni in aria francese, a quattro voci ... opera sedicesima (Venice: Ricciardo Amadino, 1607).[190]

Format: 4 partbooks and organ-bass.

Contents: 4 x 20, 1 x 21 fols.; 14 sinfonias, 6 concertos.

Three of the works given here by Banchieri were printed in other volumes: no. 3 first appeared in the 1599 Messe Solenne a otto voci as 'Fantasia a 4. per cantare, & sonare'; no. 4 ('cantate domino') was printed in Pb-Banchieri 1596 and Pb-Banchieri 1603; and no. 13 appeared in BANCHIERI 1605 (in open score) as 'Quinta Sonata in aria Franzese, Fuga per imitatione'.[191]

In the organ-bass, Banchieri gave a notice to the organist instructing him on the use of the book:

[190] Sartori 1607d (+II); Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 223; Arnold, Thorough-bass, p. 899; Mischiati, Banchieri, pp. 61-3.

Queste Ecclesiastiche Sinfonie, ouero Canzoni all Francese, volendole sonare con tutte quatro le parte sopra l'istromento da tasti si possono spartire, et intavolare, che reusciranno comode. Ma volendole con voci, et strumenti, auertasi l'organista favorirle sonanda il Basso seguente senza alcuna alteratione ma con gravità, et sodezza . . . 192

Should one want to play these ecclesiastical sinfonias, or Canzoni alla Francese, with all four parts on keyboard instruments, they may be put into open score, and intabulated, which works well. But if one wants to perform them with voices and instruments, the organist is advised to assist them by playing the basso sequente without any alterations, but with seriousness and steadiness . . .

Banchieri explicitly recommended that the works be played by solo keyboard, suggesting both open score (spartire) and intavolatura, thus confirming the use of those two formats. Banchieri’s distinction between accompaniment and solo performance is also important to note. Further on in this preface, Banchieri cited his own Suonarino and AGAZZARI 1607 for those wishing further information on how to use the organ bass part. 193 Agazzari’s work was published a few months after Banchieri’s, so Banchieri must have had advance knowledge of its contents.

BIANCHIARDI 1607

Francesco Bianciardi, ‘Breve regola per imparar a sonare sopra il basso con ogni sorte d’instrumento’ (Siena: Falcini, 1607). 194

Format (music example): engraved intavolatura (5/7).

Contents: broadside treatise.

---

192 Sartori; Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 223.
193 Quoted in Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 223, Arnold, Thorough-bass, p. 899, and Sartori.
194 Sartori 1607e; Arnold, Thorough-bass, p. 75; Haas, ‘Das Generalbassflugblatt’.
Bianciardi (1571/2-1607), a Sienese organist and composer, wrote a broadside on figured bass similar to AGAZZARI 1607 and published by the same firm. The short summary includes a prefatory comment on the prerequisites for keyboard players:

Per sonare sopra il Basso, molte cose sono necessarie à sapersi, delle quale alcune si suppongano, ed altre ne descriveremo qui brevemente. Si suppone principalmente, che il sonatore sappia cantare, e sonare l'intavolature, o spartiture con molta pratica, e sicurezza, e che habbia cognizione almeno de' principi del contrapunto di conoscere le consonanze, e dissonanze, con pratica dell'udito, delle quali per maggior pienezza di questa nostra regola dovendone tante volte far mentione, e per ridurle à memoria al suonatore, ne metteremo questo breve esempio . . .

In order to play on the bass, it is necessary to know many things, some of which are assumed, and others which may be briefly described here. One assumes primarily that the player knows how to sing, and play intabulations or open scores with great experience or surety, and that he at least has understanding of the principles of counterpoint, so as to know the consonances and dissonances with a good ear, which for the greater benefit of this our treatise must be mentioned many times; and in order for the player to memorize them, we may give this brief example . . .

The parallels with Agazzari are clear: vocal technique, understanding of open score and intavolatura, the principles of counterpoint, and having a good ear. These postulates were considered essential for organists wishing to play figured bass.

MASSAINO 1607

Tiburtio Massaino, Musica per cantare con l'organo ad una, due e tre voci ... opera 32 (Venice: Raverij, 1607)\textsuperscript{195}

Format: 3 partbooks + organ-bass (short score; lost).

Contents: 60, 40, 20, 7 pp.; 52 works for 1-3 voices with basso continuo.

\textsuperscript{195}Eitner, Quellen-Lexicon, VI:371; RISM Recueils, 1607\textsuperscript{19}. 
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Massaino (before 1550-1609 or after) published 21 volumes of sacred and 9 volumes of secular vocal music. As Kinkeldey observed, the preface found in the now-lost organ part is unusually detailed:

... Se ben tal volta ho udito alcun suonatore, che habbia suonato a proposito con questi Bassi continuati, ne hò pero udito infiniti, che con il loro suonare pieno di mendo affatto, levano alle compositioni l'aria, & l'essere, che gli ha dato il proprio Padre. Non ostante però questa difficoltà hò risoluto di lasciargli uscire alla stampa, non perché giudichi che contengano in se stessi vaghezza, od Eccellenza, ma per dar gusto à chi tien meco amicitia da cui continuamente ne son ricercato. Io havea pensato di stampar seco l'Intavolatura per maggior commodità di semplici suonatori, & Monache, ma ho mutato pensiero per non accrescere tanto il Volume, che però hò posti appresso al Basso, una parte che sempre canti ... Non darò altro ricordo alli Signori suonatori, se non che suonino nelle istesse chiavi, dove sono scritti perché se questa operuccia capiterà per sua bona sorte alle mani d'Eccellenti Huomini saprano ciò che fare, se ai pratici, è stato ricordato quanto basto, da altri. 196

... Although I have sometimes heard a particular player who may have played correctly with this basso continuo, I have on the other hand heard innumerable players who have played it quite full of errors, destroying the air and essence of the compositions, which were given to them by the proper Father. But notwithstanding this difficulty, I have resolved to allow [the compositions] to be printed, not because I judged that they contained inherent beauty or excellence, but to give pleasure to those friends of mine who continually requested them. I had considered printing the intabulation with them, for the greater convenience of elementary players and monks, but decided against it so as not to increase the size of the volume too much; I have, however, given an upper part over the bass line ... I would give no other suggestion to players, except that they should play in the same clefs that are written, since if this little work is to be fully successful at the hands of able men, they will know very well what to do, as quite enough on such practices has been written by others.

Massaino took a sceptical view of the benefits of basso continuo. His high opinion of intavolatura, especially for the benefit of the less proficient, is noteworthy; indeed, to play music with all the parts given in complete form might pose less problems than a basso continuo part for those who are not capable of realizing one (assuming they could take the time and trouble to fully learn the intavolatura). Massaino compromised with a short score, and seems to suggest that intavolatura

196 Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 223.
is intended for the less able performers, even in an entirely accompanimental context. It is likely that sightreading is not considered by Massaino when he cites the use of intavolatura for convenience. His comments on clefs indicate that although transposition of vocal works was common, it was not always accepted by composers of the day.

ANTEGNATI 1608

Costanzo Antegnati, *L'Antegnata: intavolatura de ricercari d'organo, con una nuoua regola ch'insegna a suo figliuolo di suonar, & registrar l'organo* (Venice: Angelo Gardano and brothers, 1608).\(^{197}\)

Idem, *L'arte organica ... Dialogo tra padre, & figlio, à cui per via d'avvertimenti insegna il vero modo di sonar, & registrar l'organo: con l'indice de gli organi fabricati in casa loro* (Brescia: Francesco Tebaldino, 1608).

Format (*L'Antegnata*): intavolatura (4 x 5/6).

Contents: 15 pp., 12 ricercars (*L'Antegnata*); treatise on organs and organ building (*L'arte organica*).

Costanzo Antegnati is the most well-known member of a family of Brescian organ builders. These two works were published in the same year, but in different cities, despite their sharing one opus number (16), probably because the Brescian publisher Francesco Tebaldino did not print music. The preface to *L'arte organica* includes an introduction which refers to the twelve ricercars of *L'Antegnata*. In it

\(^{197}\) Sartori 1608d; ed. Apel.
Antegnati placed himself squarely in the tradition of the *prima prattica* and tacitly censured what he considered to be fashion for its own sake:

Ecco il libro, ouero regola tante volte promessoui, il quale io non hauerei hauuto ardire di lasciar vscire in luce, se non fossero state le persuasioni di molti di voi miei amici, haunendo rispetto à tanti authori Illustri, & Eccellentissimi come gli Signori Hieronimo d’Vrbino già mio honorato Maestro Annibale Padouano, Claudio da Coreggio, Luzzasco Luzzaschi, Andrea Gabrielli, & Giovanni suo nepote, Francesco Stiuorio, Giuseppe Ascanij, Ottauio Bariola, Germano Palavicino, & tant’altri, & vedendo hora certi modernetti Organisti approbati solo dalla propria loro istimatione, col esser lodati da qualche nobile personaggio, se ben poi non hauessero piu che tanto cognitione o d’intelligenza dell’arte, che non si degnano di questi, anzi li sprezzano, stimando piu presto loro le sue fantasie fatte all’improviso, che quelle di valent’huomini fatte pensatemente, & con grande studio. Questi miei ricercari fatto in questo stile, piu tosto posso dire triuiale, per compiacere alli amici, che hanno potuto comandarmi, non li ho fatti per concorre con altri, ne perche mi sia immaginato di far cose noue, quali non fossero mai state fatte, cosi dico di qualunque altra composizione da me fatta, anzi da ogn’altro fatta voglia che Armonia, è sorte di cantilena ella si sia, perché sarebbe vanità il creder altramente, sapendo che non è cosa nuoua la Musica, ne lo suonar d’Organo, ne le cantilene di mille foggie, ma è antichissima, come mi obligarei a trouargli, quanto sapessero trouare, ouero immaginarsi cosa nuoua, per strauagante ch’ella si sia.

. . . Lodo l’opera del Reuerendo P. Diruta nomato il Transiluano, che insegna à portar bene la mano nel suonare; & lodo parimente l’Organo Sonarino del Signore Adriano Banchieri ch’insegna à respondere ben al Choro, cose necessarissime à chi desidera far ben il mestiero, & in somma quelle opre [sic], che ponno portar vtile, & commodo à chi si dileta di quest’Arte. Però accettate, & pigliate da me il buon animo, che ho di giouarui in quel, che posso, non come Maestro, ma come buon Amico, & servitore, facendoui sapere come non faccio professione in questa mia operetta, è dialogo di dar regole di contraponto, ma alcuni particolari auertimenti, & regole circa il maneggiare d’Organi, perché di quelli precetti à pieno, come si sà, n’hanno trattato il Franchino, Gio: Maria Laffranco, Pietro Pontio, il Zarlino, L’Artusio, & molti altri authori antichi, & Moderni. 198

Here is the book, or method, many times promised, which I would not have had the courage to allow to be published, had it not been for the coaxing of many of my friends, since I, having respect for so many illustrious writers, such excellent men as Messers Girolamo [Cavazzoni] da Urbino, my late honoured master Annibale Padovano, Claudio [Merulo] da Coreggio, Luzzasco Luzzaschi, Andrea Gabrieli, his nephew Giovanni, Francesco Stivori, Gioseffo Ascanio, Ottavio Bariolla, Germano Pallavicino, and many others; and now seeing certain modish organists confirmed only by their own opinion, being

198Antegnati, L’Arte Organica, f. A2.
praised by some nobleman; so although they may not have any real understanding or intelligence regarding the art, if one does not bow to them, one is disdained by them, as they value their improvised fantasias more highly than those which were composed thoughtfully and with great scholarship by able men. These my ricercars composed in this style, however, are trivial, if I may say so; [I publish them] to please my friends, who have been able to sway me; I have not composed them in order to compete with others, nor because I supposed myself to be making new things, things that had never been made before; thus I say of any composition I have made, indeed of every other kind of Harmony or turn of melody, whatever it might be, because it would be vanity to believe otherwise, knowing that music is no new thing, nor playing the organ, nor a thousand melodies; rather it is as old as can be. So I am obliged to reveal all they thought they discovered, or had imagined as a new thing, for the extravagance that it is.

... I praise Diruta’s work Il Transilvano, which teaches the manner of carrying the hand well while playing; and I likewise praise Banchieri’s L’organo suonarino, which teaches the method of responding well to the choir; things most necessary for those who wish to be successful at the profession; and in short [I praise] those works which may be useful and convenient for those who enjoy this art. Yet accept and take from me the good spirit that I have to help you in that which I can; not as a master, but as a good friend and servant, since I am letting you know that I do not make a profession out of this my little work, or a dialogue for giving the rules of counterpoint, but some particulars and rules regarding the maintenance of organs. There are many others who give those precepts; as is known, they have been considered by Franchino [Gaffurio], Giovanni Maria Lanfranco, Pietro Ponzio, Zarlino, Artusi, and many other writers, both old and new.

Antegnati was well aware of the older tradition of printed keyboard music, beginning with Girolamo Cavazzoni, one of the earliest to cultivate and publish the imitative ricercar. Nearly all the composers he cited published imitative ricercars, whether in partbooks or intavolatura. He referred obliquely to the art of fantasia which

199 See Slim, 'Keyboard Ricercar', p. 132.
200 Of the composers Antegnati cited, G. Cavazzoni published four ricercars in CAVAZZONI 1543 and two in Pb-Arrivabene 1540 and Pb-Gardane 1551; Padovano published two in PADOVANO 1604 and thirteen in Pb-Padovano 1556; Merulo published eight in MERULO 1567 and sixty in Pb-Merulo 1574, 1607, 1608; Luzzaschi published two or three volumes of ricercars, the first and third of which are lost (see Pb-Luzzaschi 1578); A. Gabrieli published twenty-two in keyboard format (A. GABRIELI 1595, 1596, 1605, and seven in Pb-Gabrieli 1589); Giovanni Gabrieli published two in A. GABRIELI 1595 (2 'fantasie', 4 'fughe' and 12 ricercars in MS); Stivori published fifty-three in Pb Stivori 1589, [1594], 1599; and Bariolla published at least one book of ricercars (see
those ricercars represent, and the slipping away of that art in the hands of 'modish' performers. Yet he apparently believed that composed 'fantasias' could replace 'all'improviso fantasia'. This seemingly contradictory statement indicates that fantasia took on a new meaning which included notated music as well, at least for Antegnati. He implied that a new style of fantasia was arising, based perhaps on the rise of monody, but at any rate moving away from the imitative polyphonic style of the past. He was the first writer to suggest that notated organ music is better than unannotated fantasia. The notion that the works of the old masters were written as pedagogy or expedients for the less able is not important to Antegnati, who makes no such inference. He recognized the qualities of the works, and their superiority over the ephemeral improvisations he heard all too often. His Ecclesiastes-like tone perhaps betrays his age (59 at the time of publication) and set opinions regarding musical preference. His conservative attitude reflects another side of musical thought at a time of change.

Nevertheless, he endorsed the usefulness of the pragmatic and 'modern' treatises by Diruta and Banchieri; he was not so old-fashioned as to deny the usefulness of their works, despite the fact that such developments inevitably led to the decline of the old style and encouraged expedient performance. Antegnati obviously believed that intavolatura format was just as legitimate a notation for the learned style as any other— that the music was more significant than the

BARIOLLA 1585). No ricercars of Gioseffo Ascanio survive (see Eitner, Quellen-Lexicon, I:214); there are no references to him in Mischiati, Indici, and it appears that Antegnati knew of his work through MSS only. Germano Pallavicino (brother of Benedetto) published ricercars in Pb-Pallavicino 1610, and either there was a first book of ricercars published which Antegnati knew, or he had access to MSS of the second. There is no reference to either in Mischiati, Indici.
notation. This accords with his unpretentious parting words. His closing citation of the 'traditional' theorists confirms his belief in the supremacy of the old style.

FRESCOBALDI 1608

Girolamo Frescobaldi, Il primo libro delle fantasie a quattro (Milan: heirs of Simon Tini, and Filippo Lomazzo, 1608).\textsuperscript{201}

Format: open score, cross-opening (2 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 75 pp., 12 fantasias.

The format of Frescobaldi's first keyboard publication reflects the traditional values he held throughout his life. Its use at the keyboard is made explicit in the dedication, where Frescobaldi recalled that the dedicatee had heard him play them at the keyboard.\textsuperscript{202} The word 'fantasia' in the title is significant, particularly because it was so rarely used for written down ricercar-like works. The connotations of improvisation associated with the term suggest that the works originated in improvisation (although it is hard to imagine that they represent un-retouched spontaneous performances; they are surely idealized). The sectional structure of the pieces suggests a small-scale approach to their composition which accords with improvisation, notwithstanding their contrapuntal complexity.

\textsuperscript{201} Sartori 1608i; ed. Pidoux.

\textsuperscript{202} Repr. Sartori.
BANCHIERI 1609


Contents: treatise (no music examples).

Banchieri’s *Conclusioni* is an important document for determining some of the prevalent attitudes regarding a wide range of issues concerning aspects of playing the organ and other instruments. The work is divided into three parts: the first two are made up of 10 conclusioni (or chapters) each, followed by an appendix of six items (letters or chapters). The most significant material on the use of notations is found in the first part. The first five conclusioni are introductory and consider the ancient organ, the modern organ with bellows, celebrated organs, organists, and builders. In the sixth to tenth conclusioni, more practical matters are considered: the style of playing to be employed at the organ, and in organ compositions; when to play at Vespers and Mass (essentially the same as BANCHIERI 1605); and most importantly, four styles of playing which were in use.

In the fourth conclusion, Banchieri named two organists as outstanding past masters: Merulo and Luzzaschi. The irony of Luzzaschi as keyboard virtuoso is well-known; there is little keyboard music of his that survives.204 The scant evidence for Luzzaschi’s keyboard music taken together with Banchieri’s praise (as well as that of others; he was one of the few

---

203 Transl. Garrett; Mischiati, Banchieri, pp. 126-8. Repr. 1626; abbreviated repr. (in Latin) 1627. Regarding the supposed 1591 first edition, see Mischiati, Banchieri; it was probably a much-curtailed version of the 1609 print.

204 Newcomb, 'Il modo'.
performers able to cope with Vicentino's arcicembalo, which had thirty-five notes per octave\textsuperscript{205}) is a clear sign that the composition of written keyboard music was not considered to be a necessary adjunct to being an outstanding performer. Luzzaschi was undoubtedly a master of fantasia. It may be no accident that Banchieri cited Merulo as well: Merulo is a particularly apt reflection of the other side to keyboard playing with his concern for music printing and keyboard notations (see Merulo 1567, 1598, etc.).

In the seventh conclusion, 'Musical styles to be observed in organ compositions', Banchieri offered the following recommendations:

Le Messe, Salmi, Cantici, Motetti, & Concerti per concertare con l'Organo, debbono essere in istile, affetuoso, deuoto, vago, & recitatiuo . . . Si devono però praticare ne gli recercari, come hà praticato Aniballe Padovano, Andrea Gabrielli, & altri virtuosi; E ben che alle stampe siano molto compositioni di huomini Illustri nell'arte sotto tale istile si devono però aprezzare, servendosene spartire in far sicura fantasia à gl'Organisti, principianti, & nelle Chiese concertargli con strumenti soli, & Organo, & nelle Accademie come più piace. \textsuperscript{206}

Masses, psalms, chants, motets and concerted music played on the organ must be in an expressive, devout, attractive and declamatory style . . . But one must use ricercars, as Annibale Padovano, Andrea Gabrieli, and other virtuosi have done; and, although many such compositions are in print by men illustrious in the art, one must continue to grow in this style, employing it in open score in order for beginning organists to make confident fantasia. In church they may be played with instruments alone and with organ, and in the Academies as one pleases. \textsuperscript{207}

Banchieri recommended the practice (here translated 'use') of an art where 'ricercar' is the equivalent of fantasia. He was not saying that one must practise the ricercars of Padovano and Gabrieli;\textsuperscript{208} rather, one should follow their example and write one's own in open

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{205} Strainchamps, 'Luzzaschi', The New Grove, 11:379.
\item \textsuperscript{206} Banchieri, pp. 18-19.
\item \textsuperscript{207} Garrett, Conclusions, pp. 14-15 (with emendations).
\item \textsuperscript{208} See note 200 for their ricercars.
\end{itemize}
score in order to learn to play fantasia. The two musicians he cited were renowned practitioners of the old style, and organists at St Mark’s Venice (d. 1575 and 1586 respectively). Many ricercars were circulating in print, but Banchieri nevertheless recommended that organists develop their own style. The art of fantasia was a personal art for Banchieri, and at the highest level had little to do with playing others’ music. The use of open score was important to him, no doubt for its clarity in showing the parts of imitative polyphony and the complexities of counterpoint.

This place for fantasia in the hierarchy of the organists’ art is also made explicit in Banchieri’s tenth conclusion, ‘Four ways which have come to be used to play the organ’. This passage contains important information regarding the use of notation:

Quattro maniere con le quali viene praticato il suono dell’Organo. Fantasia, Intavolatura, Spartitura, & Basso.

A questi si ricercano tre osservazioni generali; che servono a tutte.

1. Cantore sicuro, per interesse della Battuta.
2. Pratica della Tastatura in ambedue le mani.
3. Cognizione, delle cadenze, & attenzione d’orechie.

1. Alla fantasia ricercasi cognizione delle modulazioni, con gli suoi termini assignati; cognizione di contrapunto; Modo di fugare in quinta, & quarta, & per ultimo vedere compositioni assai per fare (oltre il genio, che si ricerca) buona intelligenza.

2. Alla Intavolatura ricercasi (oltre le sudette condizioni) pratica di essa bene studiata, suonandola apuntatamente; Vero è che poco è in uso appresso quelli che professano il nome di sicuro Organista.

3. Alla spartitura si ricerca saper leggere sopra tutte le Chiavi, si per b molle come b quadro, buono orecchio, mano, & occhio, & a quelli, che l’occhio non serve così perfettamente sforzarsi di havere buona intelligenza, & seguitare sempre la parte grave, con gl’accompagnamenti, che si diranno nel Basso continuato, ouero seguente.

4. Resta per ultimo il Basso seguente (il quale tanto è in uso) Ma così non fosse egli vero, per essere cosa facile da praticarsi,
molti Organisti al giorno d'oggi riescono eccellenti nel concerto, ma vinti da tale vanagloria di essere sicuri in concerto, non curano più d'affaticarsi in fantasia, & spartiture, le quali sono quelle, che hanno immortalato uersi valent'huomini, si che senz'altro fra poco tempo vi saranno due classe di suonatori, parte Organisti, cioè quelli, che praticeranno le buone spartiture, & fantasie, & altri bassisti, che vinti da cotale infingardaggine si contenteranno suonare semplicemente il Basso del restante poi, tamquam asinus ad lira.

Non dico già che il suonare sopra il Basso seguente, non si vtile, & facile; ma dico bene, che ogni Organista douria cercare di suonarlo con le buone regole. . . 209

Four ways that have come into practice for playing the Organ. Fantasia, intabulation, open score, and basso [continuo].

For these three general observances are required, which serve for all:

1. [To be a] confident singer regarding the beat.

2. Experience at the keyboard with both hands.

3. Understanding of the cadences and an attentive ear.

1. For fantasia, one needs knowledge of the modes and their designated terminations; knowledge of counterpoint; the manner of imitation at the fifth and fourth; and finally, one needs to study quite a few compositions in order to develop (in addition to imagination, which is to be sought) good understanding.

2. For intavolatura, one needs to practise this (beyond the above-mentioned observances) with ample study, playing it accurately. It is true that it is in little use among those who claim to be confident organists.

3. For open scores, one must know how to read all the clefs, whether with B flat or B natural, with a good ear, hand and eye. Those whom the eye does not serve so perfectly are obliged to have a good understanding and always follow the low part with the accompaniment, which is called basso continuo or seguente.

4. Lastly the basso seguente (which is so much in use). But I wish that this were not the case; because it is an easy thing to practise, many of today's organists succeed well in ensemble playing, but, being overcome by such vanity in their confidence of ensemble playing, do not take care any longer to study fantasia and open scores, which have provided many able men with immortality. So, in short, we will soon have two classes of players: on the one hand organists, i.e. those who employ good open scores and fantasias; and on the other the bassisti, who, conquered by such

209 Banchieri, p. 24.
laziness, are satisfied merely to play the bass. Beyond that, they will be 'like an ass with a lyre'.

I am certainly not saying that to play above the basso seguente is not useful and easy; but I do say that every organist must seek to play them with good rules. 210

Banchieri went on to discuss the three classes of organ-basses: a score of bass parts from polychoral works; the bass alone; and the soprano-bass short score.

His division of organists into two classes is most significant, as is his opinion of those who use intavolatura. He firmly believed in the importance of fantasia and open score. The discussion is prefaced with general requirements: the ability to sing, rhythm, hand-technique, cadences and having a good ear. For fantasia, more advanced skills are required, and as Banchieri stated earlier the study of other compositions (ricercars) is necessary. For intavolatura, he showed that the best organists would little use the format. This is the clearest statement in the literature regarding the notion that intavolatura was a format not intended for the best organists; it is apparent that for Banchieri fantasia was the highest goal, reliant upon study of ricercars and open scores. Intavolatura was for those who set their sights lower. Banchieri obviously regarded the skill of reading from open score more highly than intavolatura. He strongly condemned those who played from the bass to the exclusion of any other method of performance, not even deigning to call them 'organists', but merely 'bassist'. His opinion is qualified, since he himself published organ-bass parts to most of his works which required accompaniment; he is clearly referring in Conclusioni to those who play organ-basses only, and neglect the other aspects of the organist's art. His admonitions indicate the increasing

210 Garrett, Conclusions, p. 20 (with emendations); cf. Soehnlein, 'Diruta', pp. 446-7; Arnold, Thorough-bass, p. 81.
side-effect of the use of organ parts for accompanimental purposes, perhaps unforeseen by Vincenti when he began to publish them: their usefulness and ease for organists inevitably meant that some of the less skilled never bothered beyond accompanying with basso continuo. This must have been disappointing to Banchieri; the art of fantasia, reached through study and use of open score, was too often neglected in favour of expediency.

Of course, musical tastes were in flux. The change away from contrapuntal complexity towards text expression meant that the organist’s role as accompanist was greater, and his role as soloist correspondingly less important. It was not only laziness which encouraged organists to leave behind the skills of reading open score and playing fantasia; the popularity of monody had its effect. Banchieri’s views are quite conservative, although he saw the advantages to the newer developments. He may have helped to counteract an overzealous development of basso continuo with this reminder of the other important facets to the organists’ art.

GIACCOBI 1609

Girolamo Giaccobi, Prima Parte de i Salmi Concertati a due, e più chori (Venice: Angelo Gardano and Brothers, 1609).211

Format: 9 partbooks + organ-bass (short score).

Contents: 7 Psalms for 8, 9, and 18 voices with continuo; 2 Magnificats.

211Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 223; Gaspari, Catalogo, II:233.
Giaccobi (1557-1629) was a prominent colleague of Banchieri in Bologna, primarily a composer of vocal music. In this volume he added a note to organists regarding accompaniment and use of the keyboard:

... Con la partitura poi per l'Organo, appresso il Basso continuo, con gli accidenti soliti segnati, si è anche la Parte più accuta; non perché l'Organista l'habbi a rappresentare continuamente, ma sì bene a fine, che havendola innanzi a gli occhi possa, & aiutare, & discretamente accompagnare il Cantante, massime quando resta solo, acciò gli sia lecito per mezzo di tal discrezione, & accentare, & con passaggi di suo gusto, dar quella perfetizione che gli parerà esser’ conveniente a tal Concerto. 212

... and with the organ part, with the basso continuo and customary accidentals, is also given the highest part; not because the organist must always play it, but rather, for the reason that having it before one's eyes enables one to help and discreetly accompany the singer, especially when he is alone, so that it may be granted him, by means of such discretion, accents, and ornaments according to his taste, to give that perfection which would seem to him to be proper for such a concerto.

Giaccobi followed the more modern trends by recommending freer accompaniment rather than doubling the voices. He also explained part of the reasoning behind giving a short score for accompaniment. It was a format continually used in accompanimental parts—not for the accompanist to double the top part, but to understand the implied accompanimental harmony.

MAYONE 1609


Format: open score (2 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 152 pp., 5 ricercars, 4 canzonas, 5 toccatas, 3 variation sets.

212 Ibid.

213 Sartori 1609f; ed. Stembridge. Sartori erred in indicating 152 fols. for the volume.
Mayone’s second volume was printed by a different firm, but has the same basic layout as his first (1603); the same title page may even have been used. He included a note to the reader this time; he may have been influenced by Trabaci’s (1603), or perhaps his first volume was misunderstood.

Let him whose curiosity should make him desirous of perusing this meagre creation, my Second Book, take notice that it contains divers ‘caprices’, and that in passage-work, or where the music is embellished with passage-work, there will always occur some false notes (which go against the rule of counterpoint) without which it is impossible for the music to be of good effect. I say this lest those who see this opus be scandalized and adjudge me a poor observer of the rules of counterpoint, which, however, I have always professed to observe as far as my limited ability will allow. Whoever wishes to convince himself of this, and takes no pleasure in this way of playing, can turn his attention to the Ricercars which I have placed at the beginning of the present volume (as I also did in my First Book) in which, I believe, these rules have been observed, so that each may savour that which appeals most to his taste. Also, in order to simplify the printing, I have been constrained (as was also the case in my First Book) to change the clefs in the middle of pieces in all the parts;

Stembridge, edn. p. 4.
let the reader take notice of this lest he be led astray at the sight of it. Furthermore, at cadences where there are trills, I have placed a sharp only by the first note of such, in order to take up less space; I say this so that the reader may consider all these things and, using his own judgement, perceive that they result not from idleness or lack of diligence, but in order to simplify the printing. For the rest I commend myself to the discretion of the well-disposed reader, knowing that he will excuse me, considering that mistakes always find their way into print, however much care be taken, and that my intentions have no other purpose (please God) save that of helping him—if there be any such person—who does not know, but wishes to learn, some piece of mine. 215

The similarities of this preface with TRABACI 1603 are evident; the user is warned not to judge the music on the basis of the rules of counterpoint, but on their effects. His first book may have been controversial due to its unusual keyboard writing. It is noteworthy that Mayone referred to two styles, which correspond to the prima and seconda prattica. Printing technology is cited as the cause for several facets of the volume's layout, which, coupled with the change in printer, may indicate the difficulties Mayone experienced having the book published. Notwithstanding, there are fewer errors in this volume than book I. 216

One work is intended to be played on the harp, the 'Recercar sopra il Canto Fermo di Costantio Festa & per sonar all'Arpa', on p. 27. Stembridge noted that its texture is generally similar to the remainder of the volume; coupled with Mayone's ability to play the harp, 217 this suggests that most of the contents were flexible enough for both instruments. The Spanish influence in writing for harp is apparent.

216 Ibid., p. 4.
217 Mayone is named as 'sonatore eccellente dell'Arpa à due ordini' in Cerreto's Della Pratica Musica (Naples, 1601). Alvini, introduction to Trabaci, Ricercate (repr.).
DIRUTA 1609-10

Girolamo Diruta, Seconda parte del Transilvano, dialogo divisi in quattro libri (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1609). 218

Format: open score, intavolatura (5/8).

Contents: 21 + 36 + 12 + 26 pp., treatise with music examples (2 canzonas, 12 ricercars, plainchant for hymns and Masses).

The second part of Diruta’s treatise is divided into four books; book I gives instructions for how to intabulate. For Diruta, performing from partbooks was not considered a possibility; performing from open score was also less important than intavolatura, apparently:

Primieramente in due modi vi voglio dimostrare lo stile c’hauete da tenere ad intauolare semplicemente senza diminuzione. Prima douete hauer la cartella rigata, e partita, eccetto le due ultime poste, delle quali vna sarà di cinque righe, & l’altra di otto, come trouarete in diversi luoghi: e poi pigliarete la parte del Soprano, & lo partirete a due battute per casella. Nella seguento posta il Contraalto, seguitando poi con l’istesso ordine il Tenore, & il Basso, come per gli esempij più chiaramente intenderete. Diuise c’hauere tutte le parti, incominciaresete ad intauolare il Soprano nelle cinque righe à due battute per casella; e poi intauolare il Basso sopra le otto righe: ... Le parti di mezo, cioè il Tenore, & il Contraalto s’accomodano come più piace, nelle otto righe, cuero nelle cinque, per commodità di fare le diminutioni. ... Inteso c’hauere il modo di partire, & intauolare à quattro, potrete poi anco intauolare à cinque, à sei, à sette, & anco à otto, osservando il medesimo ordine. 219

First of all, I want to show you two ways of maintaining the requisite style of simple intabulation without diminution. First, you must have the sheet lined for open score except for the last two staves, one of which will have five lines, the other, eight lines as you will find it done in various places. Then, you will take the soprano part and set it on a separate staff at two beats per measure. On the next staff you will set the alto, with the tenor and bass then following in the same arrangement, as you will grasp more clearly by means of the examples. After you have separated all the parts, begin intabulating the soprano on the

218 Sartori 1609-10; transl. and ed. Soehnlein; music ed. Zaszkaličky et al. The dating of the volume is ambiguous: the title page gives 1609, but the letter of dedication is dated 25 March 1610 (i.e. the first day of the new year, O.S.).

five-line staff at two beats per measure, and then intabulate the bass on the eight-line staff . . . The internal parts, that is, the tenor and the alto, are suited to either the eight-line or the five-line staves, whichever is more convenient for playing diminutions . . . After you will have grasped the manner of putting into open score and intabulating with four voices, you will then be able to intabulate further, for five, six, seven, and even eight voices, by following the same procedure. 220

Diruta did not suggest performing from open score here, but used it only as a means for making an intavolatura. Example A.9 shows the method; there are two systems on the page, each with four parts in open score reduced to intavolatura (5/8) underneath, to which various ornaments are added and labelled. Such a time- and paper-consuming procedure must have been intended for novices; Diruta went on to instruct the player on how to intabulate more quickly, by bypassing open score and transcribing from part books directly to intavolatura:

... Fatto c'hauete buona pratica d'intauolare sopra alla Partitura, assai piu facile ui sara quest'altro secondo modo: poiché senza partire le parti potrete intauolare, osservando però il modo sudetto, prima incominciarete d’intauolare il Soprano e il Basso, & poi le parti di mezzo. 221

... Because you have practised intabulation from open score so well, this second manner will be much easier for you, since you may intabulate the parts without scoring them; in keeping with the above system, though, you will begin by intabulating the soprano and the bass first, and then the middle parts. 222

As befits an instruction book, Diruta moved step by step in teaching the beginner how to intabulate. The genesis of short score may be seen in this technique, for short score arrangements simply left off the final addition of inner parts and the organist provided them himself. Diruta’s next step was to add diminutions to the intavolatura; but to reach the height of performance skill in composition is required:

221 Book I, p. 10.

L'E R'O P R I M O.
Canzane d'Antonio Marzaro detta l'Albergoa partita, & Intanolata.
Et per agiungere alla perfettione di questa bella, & artificiosa scienza si rechiede, non solamente la cognitione del contrapunto mà anco esser pratico compositore, per poter sonar di fantasia. Non hauete alcune volte sentito qualche Organista far vna intrata in vn’Organo con vna bella dispositione di mano, che par che voglia far cose grande, mà come a da imitar li canti del choro, ò siano canti fermi ò figurati, non tanto imità le fughe mà non suona per quel tuono che’l choro canta. Tutto questo procede da non hauer cognitione del contrapunto. Si che volendo voi arrivare alla perfettione dell’opera incominciata disponeteui donque d’aquistare il contrapunto, e la compositione, che con questo mezo verrete ad intauolar diminuito, & sonar bene di fantasia.

And to achieve perfection in this fine and ingenious science [intabulation with diminutions], not only is the knowledge of counterpoint required; one should be a practising composer, in order to be able to play fantasia. Have you not sometimes heard an organist with a fine, naturally-gifted hand play a processional piece on the organ so that it seems he is full of promise? But as soon as he has to respond to the singing of the choir, whether it is plainsong or polyphony, he not only does not imitate the themes but does not even play in the tone which the choir sings. All of this arises from not having knowledge of counterpoint. If you want to come to the perfection of the work you have begun, then prepare to acquire the knowledge of counterpoint and composition so that by these means you will succeed at figured intabulation and playing fantasia well.

Both counterpoint and composition are requisite to play fantasia. The written examples he gave are thus examples of how to approach the goal of fantasia. The space Diruta devoted to instructing how to intabulate is indicative of his old-style approach to keyboard playing, reminiscent of Bermudo, based on principles of vocal counterpoint. The ultimate aim, however, was to avoid the use of notation altogether by playing fantasia.

Diruta completed Book I by giving instruction in various ornaments and diminutions, and set G. Gabrieli’s canzona ‘La Spiritata’ in open score, then added an ornamented intavolatura below it. Book II returns to the subject of fantasia, at least according to its title:

223 Book I, p. 21.
224 Soehnlein, ‘Diruta’, p. 268 (with emendations).
225 See I: 25.
Appendix A

Il Secondo Libro... Nel quale si tratta il modo di far la fantasia sopra l'Instrumento da Tasti, Con una breue, & facile Regola del Contrapunto commune, & osservato. 226

The second book, ... which treats the manner of playing fantasia on a keyboard instrument, with a short and easy method of free and strict counterpoint. 227

It treats counterpoint, an important constituent of fantasia, but there are no more comments on the purpose of fantasia. Like Sancta Maria, Diruta progressed through intervals and voice-leading in two parts, avoiding consecutives and bad leaps. In discussing free and strict counterpoint, Diruta stipulated that one may be freer in performing fantasia than if one were writing a composition, although the stricter one is, the better:

A questa osseruanza non vi voglio astrignere sonando di fantasia; si bene nel far contrapunto scritto, o alla mente ma piu osservato che sonarete, meglio sarà. 228

I do not want you to be constrained by full observance when you play fantasia, although in either written or alla mente counterpoint, the more strictly you play the better it will be. 229

He equated 'contrapunto alla mente' with fantasia; and surely the most significant difference between the two is that fantasia was practised by a soloist, whereas 'contrapunto alla mente' was more generic and practised by various forces. 230 Book II continues with three-part counterpoint, and examples of cadential formulae. It concludes with a series of ricercars in open score for the student to study and imitate.

---

227 Soehnlein, 'Diruta', pp. 270.
228 Book II, p. 3.
230 See Ferand, 'Improvised Vocal Counterpoint'.
when writing his own counterpoint.\textsuperscript{231} It is clear that Diruta took the same attitude towards playing fantasia as Bermudo and Banchieri: one should not attempt it until one has studied and played the works of many other masters.\textsuperscript{232}

The ricercars in open score may be contrasted with the instructions for intabulation in Book I, which taken alone imply that Diruta did not value open score. It is clear by the ricercars that he did, and saw the format’s usefulness for these study-works. Book I, by not referring to performance from open score, is orientated towards beginners; Book II, by presenting ricercars in open score, is directed towards more advanced students.

Book III gives methods of transposition and a discussion of modes and tones, and Book IV the various aspects of playing in church, concluding with a discussion of organ registration for particular modal affects. Towards the end of Book IV, Diruta summarized his general philosophy:

\begin{quote}
In somma volendo arriuare alla perfettione di questa bella, & artificiosa scienza, non vi basta solo hauer l’intelligenza di tutto quello che vi ho trattato, mà vi è necessario di studiare molte cose, & possederle bene alla mente, come diversi Ricercari, Messe, Canzoni, Motetti, & madrigali. Li Ricercare, Motetti, & Messe, vi fanno fare buona fantasia, Je Canzone sonare allegro, & li Madrigali variati effetti d’Armonia; & non fate come quelli, che solo si contentano di fare quattro sonate struppiatamente senza fondamento alcuno, & sonare sopra vn Basso generale, & con questo spacciano il valent’huomo, & biasimano le buone regole, pensando di sapere assai, con il studiar poco ... Dicono che bisogna farci pratica, e stare attento con l’orecchia; io li rispondo che quando li cantori staranno appresso all’Organista, facilmente potranno conoscere, e sentire quelle parti, che fanno sesta, quarta, ouer altre dissonanze: ma quando saranno di lontano, impossibil sarà che non commetta errori quello che sonera sopra il Basso continuato, non mai sonera tutte le parti della compositione, e sempre sarà vn’Armonia. Si che non vi date a questa poltronaria, partite li
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{231} The ricercars thus serve a similar purpose to that stipulated in BANCHIERI 1609; see II: 100.

\textsuperscript{232} As Soehnlein noted (‘Diruta’, p. 325).
Canti, e sonate tutte le parti, che farete bel sentire, e non nascerà inconueniente alcuno. 233

In short, if you wish to attain perfection in this beautiful and ingenious science, it is not enough for you to understand only what I have dealt with here. It is still necessary for you to study many things like the various ricercars, Masses, canzonas, motets, and madrigals and master them from memory. The ricercars, motets, and Masses help you to create good fantasia; canzonas, to play with spirit; madrigals, varied harmonic effects. Do not be like those who are content only to bungle along in four parts without any foundation. They play on a bass and with this they put down the talented man and criticize good rules, imagining that they know a great deal with little study... [The proponents of basso continuo] say that it is necessary to have experience and to keep the ear alert. My answer is that when the singers stand close by the organist, he will easily discern and hear those parts which form the sixth, fourth, or other dissonances. But when the singers are at a distance it will be impossible for the one playing the basso continuo not to make errors. He will never play all the parts of the composition and always achieve a harmony. So that you do not fall into this slothful habit, score the compositions and play all the parts so that you make them distinctly heard and no obstacle will present itself. 234

Diruta emphasized the study and memorization of a repertoire with the goal of fantasia in mind, and recommended specific pieces for particular pedagogical purposes; vocal works were essential. Like Banchieri, he condemned those who played only basso continuo and did not take the trouble to study composition and the works of others. He preferred accompanists to double the voice parts, either by listening carefully, or writing the parts out in full.

Diruta was an adherent of the old style. Comments quoted here show his fundamental reliance on imitative vocal music, his corresponding disdain of basso continuo, and the importance of fantasia; the ricercars in open score confirm his viewpoint. Intabulation is taught expressly to lead to more advanced keyboard techniques. Students were expected to intabulate in order to study the vocal works of masters, and to add diminutions with a hand well-trained in counterpoint and composition.

233 Book IV, p. 16.
Through such study, they would be prepared to perform at the organ. Yet even if Diruta’s opinions are old-fashioned, the very fact that he wrote such a treatise reflects his desire to share aspects of the organists’ art with a wide and varied audience.

**PICCIONI 1610**

Giovanni Piccioni, *Concerti ecclesiastici a 1-8 voci con il suo basso seguito* (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1610).  


Contents: 58 motets for 1 to 8 voices.

Piccioni (c. 1550–c. 1619) an organist and composer in Orvieto, published nine volumes of secular and five volumes of sacred vocal music. In the preface to this work, he noted two points regarding performance at the organ; the first explains how to play the works on a small chamber organ: he advised playing them down an octave. The second pertains to the use of basso continuo:

... A questa sorte di concerti, io non ho voluto porre alcuna sorte di accidenti, come Diesis, B molli, numeri sopra le note, come fanno molti, poiche a quelli Organisti che non sono molto esperti sono piu tosti di confusione, & a quelli che sanno, & a valent’uomini, non occorrono tali accidenti, poiche con l’orecchio, e con l’arte li suonano à dovere. Finalmente sarà bene, che quelli Organisti, che non sono pratici a sonar sopra il Basso seguito, e che non possedono l’Arte della musica, volendo haver sodisfattione di questa sorte di concerti, li spartino, e l’intavolino. 237

... For this type of concerto, I did not want to include any type of accidentals, such as sharps, B flats, or numbers over the notes, as many employ, since for those organists who are not very expert, it will only serve to confuse, and for those who know, and for able

men, there is no need for such accidentals, since with the ear and art they play what they will. Finally it would be well if those organists who are not experienced at playing on the basso seguente and who do not possess the art of Music, but want to gain satisfaction from these kinds of concerti, would put them into open score or intabulate them.

This attitude towards basso continuo, that it was a skill which only the proficient organists could practise well and should be left alone by those unfamiliar with its finer points, is a natural outcome of its over-use by less-skilled performers. Paradoxically, if the performer required figures in the bass part to play it properly, he should not use the part at all but put the works in open score or intavolatura. He approved of the use of basso continuo, but was unwilling to add figures because it might wrongly encourage the less able to try to perform a technique they could not manage. The irony of this is that even worse performances undoubtedly resulted when less able performers tried to play from the unfigured bass.

BANCHIERI 1611

This, the second edition of BANCHIERI 1605 (Venice: Ricciardo Amadino; Sartori 1611c), includes an additional section on basso continuo and instructions for transposition. He concluded the little treatise with words of admonition similar to his opinions published in BANCHIERI 1609:

> Questo nuouo modo di suonare sopra il Basso non lo biasmo, ma non lodo però che gli Nouelli Organisti tralascino di studiare le ricercate a Quattro voci, & fantasie d’huomini Illustri nella professione, atteso, che oggidi molti con quatro sparpagliate di mano, & suonare sopra vn Basso continuo si tengono sicuri Organist, ma vero non è atteso che sicuri Organisti sono quelli i quali suonano vn ben tirato Contrapunto che si sentino tutte quattro le parti . . . 238

As for this new fashion of playing on a Basso continuo, I do not condemn it, but I do not praise it, because the new-fashioned

238 Suonarino (1611), p. 65.
Organists omit to study the Ricercatas in four parts and improvisations of illustrious men in the profession, seeing that nowadays many consider themselves adept Organists on the strength of four stretches of the hand and playing on a Basso continuo; but it is not true, seeing that adept Organists are those who play good counterpoint in which all four parts are heard ... 239

BARGNANI 1611

Ottavio Bargnani, Secondo libro delle canzoni da suonare a quatro, cinque, et otto voci (Milan: Heirs of Simon Tini and Filippo Lomazzo, 1611).240

Format: 5 partbooks + partitura.

Contents: 5 x 21, 97 fols., 15 canzonas à 4, 3 canzonas à 5, 2 canzonas à 8.

Bargnani (c. 1570-1627) published an earlier book of canzonas, now lost.241 The size of the partitura strongly suggests that it is an open score, suitable for use by solo keyboard. It also indicates that Bargnani preferred the accompaniment to double the parts rather than freely harmonize a bass.

239Arnold, Thorough-bass, p. 90.
240Sartori II:1611f.
241Pb-[Bargnani b. 1600].
FRANZONI 1611

Amante Franzoni, *Concerti Ecclesiastici a una, due, et a tre voci col basso continuo per l’organo libro primo* (Venice: Ricciardo Amadino, 1611). 242

Format: 2 partbooks + organ-bass.

Contents: 29, 29, 31 pp., 28 vocal sacred works for 1, 2, and 3 voices.

Amante Franzoni (fl. 1605-1630) gave instructions to the organist in the basso continuo partbook of this volume which are similar to PICCIONI 1610:

Havrei potuto nel presente Basso notare alcune Consonanze, e dissonanze per rendere più facile il sonare la presente opera, ma à bello studio l’ho tralasciato per non far torto à signori Organisti, quali col loro purgato orecchio sapranno secondare la compositione co’i loro leggiadri mouimenti. Tanto più hauendone à bastanza, et gratiosamente di ciò discorso Agostino Agazaro, nel Secondo Libro de suoi Concerti, alquale io me riporto. 243

I might have notated certain consonances and dissonances in the present bass part in order to make it easier to play the present work, but for good scholarship I have left it as it is so as not to make a book of regulations for organists, who with their purified ear will support the composition with their graceful movements. How much more, through his gracious discourse in the second book of his concerti, has Agostino Agazzari satisfied such questions, to which I refer [the reader].

The CCB texture of these works did not adapt to full accompaniment, hence Franzoni does not suggest copying out an intavolatura or open score but merely referred uncertain users to Agazzari. Franzoni commented that it is easier to perform from music with figures than without, but encouraged the study required for the performer to figure the music himself.

---

242 Sartori 1611a.
243 Sartori.
MERULO 1611

Claudio Merulo, Terzo libro de canzoni d'intavolatura d'organo ... a cinque voci fatte alla francese (Venice: Angelo Gardano, 1611). 244

Format: intavolatura (4 x 5/6).

Contents: 29 pp., 3 canzonas.

Merulo's last publication (brought out by his nephew Giacinto) is similar to his two earlier books of canzonas. The dedication again referred to 'the usefulness which these compositions will have brought the virtuosos (l'utilità che questa compositione hauerà apportato à i virtuosi)'.245 The works are challenging enough to be considered virtuoso keyboard music, and accord, along with MERULO 1592, 1598, 1604 and 1606, with the needs of 'amateur virtuosos' who were more interested in performance than composition. This is the last volume printed by the firm 'Angelo Gardano', and is anachronistic, since the printer used the form 'Angelo Gardano and Brothers' from 1606 to 1609.

244 Sartori 1611b; ed. McDermott, 'Canzoni', II:111-56.
245 Sartori; McDermott, 'Canzoni', II:112.
BANCHIERI 1612

Adriano Banchieri, *Moderna armonia di canzoni alla francese*, nuouamente comosta per suonare con facilità tutte le parti nell'organo, ò clauacimbalo, et dentroui (piacendo) concertare vno & dui stromenti acuto e graue, con l'aggiunta in fine di doi fantasie à quatro stromenti, & vno magnificat in concerto à quatro voci, opera vigesima sesta (Venice: Ricciardo Amadino, 1612).246

Format: 73 partbooks (only the *Partitura* is extant): 4-part open score (fantasias), short score (canzonas), organ-bass (Magnificat).

Contents: 19 fols., 15 canzonas, 2 fantasies, 1 Magnificat.

In the notice to 'Gli virtuosi suonatori', Banchieri gave several instructions for performing his new-style canzonas:

E Cosa chiara, che le Compositioni modernamente in Musica composte, a una, due, tre, & più voci per Concertare nell'Organo ò clawacimbalo, rendono assiememente facilità, e diletto all'Organista, Cantori, & Audienti; e di questo siamo in sicuro cagionarsi dall'accomodamento, & afetto, che recitativamente in armonia chiara e distinta si congiungono accenti & Concenti; L'istess'effetto hò giudicato io, possi succedere in queste mie nouelle Canzoni alla Francese, Seruendomi dell'istessa inuentione e maniera, e perche desidero sieno praticate secondo la me intensione, con ogni termine di modestia darò tali Auertenze, che

Prima, queste possonsi suonare semplicemente nell'Organo, dove con ordine musicale entrano tutte le parti con gli riempimenti a gusto orecchio & giudito dell'Organista.

Seconda, si possono in occorenza dentroui concertare uno, & dui strumenti, semplici, ò congiunti come piace, Acuto & Graue, come al dire Violino ò violone, ouero Trombone e Cornette ••. 

Quinta, la prima fiata deuesi suonare adagio in guisa di ricercare, ò nella replica strettamente, rendendo tal varietà nuouo diletto, e per ciò vengono signate le Repliche ••. 247

It is obvious that compositions which are composed in a modern style, for one, two, three and more voices concerted with the organ

---

246 Sartori 1612a; Mischiati, Banchieri, p. 78.
247 Sartori.
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or harpsichord, render similar ease and pleasure to the organist, singers, and listeners alike; and we are sure to recognize this from the comfort and affect which, recitative-like in clear and distinct harmony, is united to accents and concords. I have decided that the same effect can succeed in these my new Canzoni alla Francese, since I am using the same invention and manner. And since I wish that they would be practised according to my intention, with all modesty I would give such advice as:

First, these may be played simply on the organ, where all the parts enter with musical order and are filled out according to the tasteful ear and judgement of the organist.

Second, they may be concerted according to one's requirements, for simply one or two instruments, or united as one likes, high and low, that is, violin and violone, or trombone and cornett. . . [The third and fourth notices advise against distant transposition and instruct the user on the meaning of repeat-signs in the canzonas.]

Fifth, the first time through must be played adagio in the style of a ricercar, and strictly in the repeat, such variety rendering new delights, and thus signalling the repeats . . .

These works are written in a self-proclaimed 'new style' which aims to imitate recitative-like techniques using instruments, with text-considerations replaced by affect. Banchieri recommended playing them either with keyboard alone, or concerted. Sensitive to the newer trends, he adapted the traditional technique of earlier works for four equal parts to the new style, yet the two fantasias for four instruments appended to the volume reflect the old style. The final piece of advice has been taken to indicate that the canzonas are meant to be played twice in succession, and may be predecessors to the ricercar–canzona pairs of CIFRA 1619(ii). 248

DIRUTA 1612 reprint of DIRUTA 1593 (Venice: Alessandro Vincenti; Sartori 1612c).

248 Ladewig, 'Frescobaldi's "Recercari"', p. 172.
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ROVIGO 1613

Francesco Rovigo and Ruggier Trofeo, *Partitura della canzoni da suonare a quattro, & a otto ... nuovamente ristampate* (Milan: Filippo Lomazzo, n.d. [1613 or after]).

Format: open score.

Contents: 103 pp., 17 canzonas à 4 (6 by Rovigo, 11 by Trofeo); 2 canzonas à 8 (1 by each).

The title page names the two composers 'organisti eccellentissimi'; Rovigo died in 1597, Trofeo in 1614. Although an accompanying set of partbooks, now lost, might be postulated, listings in Mischiati, *Indici*, show that this is not the case. The first edition may have been published in 1583. The use of open score indicates keyboard performance according to the Milanese custom. There is no preface to the volume, but considering works such as BANCHIERI 1612, it may be that open score format was beginning to be considered suitable for instrumental ensembles as well, hence the reprinting of this older volume.

---

249. Sartori 1600b, II:1613?1; Mischiati, *Indici*, V:866. The *terminus post quern* may be established since Lomazzo did not use this form on his title pages until 1613.

250. The partitura alone is listed, with no partbooks.

FRANZONI 1613

Amante Franzoni, Apparata musicale di messa, sinfonie, canzioni, motetti, & letanie della Beata Vergine a otto voci. Con la partitura de bassi, & un nouo ordine, con che si mostra, come, & con istromenti, & senza si possa nell'organo rappresentare (Venice: Ricciardo Amadino, 1613). 252

Format: 8 partbooks + partitura.

Contents: 4 x 21, 4 x 13, 50 pp., Mass, 6 motets, 6 instrumental pieces for liturgical use.

This volume is intended for liturgical use primarily with instruments, but also by the organ alone, as the title indicates:

Musical apparatus for Mass, sinfonias, canzonas, motets, and litanies of the Blessed Virgin Mary à 8. With the score of basses, and a new order with which is shown how, whether with or without instruments, one can play them on the organ.

The partitura refers to a score of bass parts, Horsley's first type of organ-bass. 253 Use of the music by organ alone may be a less desirable alternative offered to make the volume more attractive to prospective purchasers; nevertheless, it was considered possible. The liturgical significance of the volume was considered by Bonta, who provided a valuable summary of the wide range of works used by organists in the liturgy. 254

252 Sartori 1613a (+II).
253 Horsley, 'Full and Short Scores', p. 467.
BOTTAZZI 1614

Bernardino Bottazzi, Choro et organo libro primo (Venice: Giacomo Vincenti, 1614). 255

Format: intavolatura (usually 4 x 5/8).

Contents: 136 pp., short treatise and 69 organ versets (3 Masses, 2 Credos); 22 hymns; 4 Marian Antiphons; 8 psalm-tone versets.

Bottazzi is known only from this volume. The full title explains his intentions:

... In cui con facil modo s'apprende in poco tempo un sicuro metodo di sonar sul'Organo Messe, Antifone, & Hinni sopra ogni maniera di canto fermo, et si trattano con ottimo ordine alcune regole di Intaouolatura, et si dano alcuni necessarji auuertimenti, et essempi pertinenti al vero, et perfetto organista, Nouamente trouato, e posto in luce à beneficio di chi professa l'arte dell'Organista reale da Fra Bernardino Bottazzi Ferrarese ... .

... In which with an easy manner one may learn, in a short time, a sure way to play Masses, Antiphons, and Hymns on the organ, based on any kind of cantus firmus; and which treats, in the best order, several rules for intavolatura, and gives several essential notices and examples useful for the true and perfect organist; newly discovered, and published for the benefit of those who claim the art of regal organist, by Brother Bernardino Bottazzi of Ferrara ... .

Bottazzi began his treatise with a lengthy introduction justifying the work. It soon becomes clear that royal organists are not the class he is addressing:

... et se vogliamo parlare della causa finale, la quale m'ha mosso, non è stata altra, che i disordini, et le confusioni, quali sogliono ben spesso occorrere nelle Chiese, et nei chori quando chi suona l'Organo, et chi hà cura del canto in choro non sano [sic], ne s'intendono insieme; queste confusioni dico, e questi disordini mi hanno mosso, nè per altro che per leuar loro et ogni abuso, che potesse nascere per questo non sapere dell'Organista, o del Chorista, io ho abbracciata la fatica di porui insieme la presente Opera, e farla vscire alla Stampa ... .

... deh non vi sdegnate di leggere tal volta quest'Opera nella quale vedrete auuertimenti, et essempi necessarji sapersi da

gl'Organisti, et da Choristi, fra quali (quando l'Organista non intende il tuono del canto, et il Chorista non hà cognizione del luogo, oue lascia l'Organo) chi non ode le dissonanze, et chi non conosce gl'abusì, gl'inconuenientì, e disordini che ne seguono?

Ne seguono disordini inconvenienti, et abusi tali, che sentendosi l'Organista suonare d'un tuono, & il Chorista pigliando, à cantare il suo canto fermo dell'altro: anco quelli, che sono presenti chiudono l'orecchie per non poterli udire, e certo se il canto fermo è d'un tuono, & l'Organista suona d'un'altro, è impossibile che il Chorista pigli la voce giusta: e mentre non piglia il canto su la propria chorda, ma canta in tuono trasportato dall'Organo, mai starà bene il canto, nè potranno i cantori giamai ridursi à quella soavità, à quell'armonia, à quella dolcezza, e perfettione, che s'ode quando à i Cantori cantano, & l'Organista suona nell'istesso tuono. Quindi è che s'odono tai volta i Cantori, quali non cantano nò, ma gridano, e strillano sendo [sic] il canto incommodo, & che nausea, & che fastidio apportano?

Ma quando con buon contrapunto, e perfette regole l'Organista suonará ad imitazione del canto fermo, e suonerà nell'istesso tuono del Choro, ò che armonia, ò che soavità, & ò che dolcezza?

... & io perciò ho determinato di far stampare quella parte del canto fermo, che tocca all'organista, & quella parte che tocca il Choro, cioè il primo, & secondo choro, che così egli potrà chiaramente vedere il tuono, & il modo d'imitare il choro, & anco lasciarlo in voce. & quelli organisti, quali non haueranno buon contrapunto, studiaranno l'intauolatura posta sotto, oouer sopra d'alcuni canti fermi, con gl'avuertimenti, che così facendo, con il loro longo studio, si faranno pratici, si che potranno poi anco all'improuiso suonare sopra ogni canto fermo ... 256

... and if we want to speak about the final cause which led me [to write this work], it has been none other than the confusion and disorder which is wont to occur quite often in churches and choirs when someone who plays the organ and someone who directs the choir neither know nor understand each other; these confusions, I say, and these disorders have led me, for no other reason except to raise them from all the abuses, which may have arisen from this lack of knowledge on the part of the organist or choir director, I have taken on the work of compiling the present work and putting it into print ... 

... pray you do not disdain to read this work occasionally, in which you will see advice and examples which are necessary for the organist and choir director to know, among whom (when the organist does not understand the tone of the singing, or the choir director does not recognize the place where the organ has left off), who does not despise the dissonances, and who does not know of the abuses, inconveniences, and disorders which follow?

256 Bottazzi, p. 5 (repr. Sartori).
There follows unbecoming confusion and such abuses, that upon hearing the organist play in one tone, [then hearing] the choir director taking up his plainsong in another, indeed those who are present close their ears so that they cannot hear them. And it is certain that if the cantus firmus is in one tone, and the organist plays in another, it is impossible for the choir director to get the correct pitch. And when he does not take the chant on the proper pitch, but sings in a tone transposed from the organ, the chant will never be good, nor will the singers ever reach that sweetness, harmony, grace, and perfection which is heard when the singers sing and the organist plays in the same tone. Hence it is that one sometimes hears singers who do not sing, no! but scream, and shriek, rendering the song unbearable; how sickening, how tiresome it is!

But when the organist plays in imitation of the plainchant with good counterpoint and perfect rules, and plays in the same tone as the choir, O what harmony, what grace, what sweetness!

... And thus I have decided to print that part of the cantus firmus which applies to the organist, and that which applies to the choir, that is, the first and second choir, so that [the organist] may be able to see the tone clearly, and the method of imitating the choir, or even to leave it to be sung. And those organists who do not have good counterpoint should study the intavolatura given below, or some of the canti firmi, with the advice given; so that by doing this and with constant study, they will become experienced, and indeed will even be able to play on any cantus firmus on the spur of the moment ...

Bottazzi's purpose was similar to that of BANCHIERI 1605, but orientated towards organists and choirmasters of more modest establishments; it is significant that Bottazzi stressed the usefulness of his book for both choirmaster and organist, unlike Banchieri. The preface addresses only one basic problem: playing the organ in the same key in which the choir sings. Obviously, such abuses and poor performances as he cited would not have been a part of musical events at churches with competent musicians. Even BANCHIERI 1605 must have been ambiguous to many (witness the changes in the 1611 edition; see II:116), and finding the choir pitch from the end of the organ verset was by no means easy for those unaccustomed to doing it. Bottazzi’s edition attempted to remove ambiguity by including chant for both the choir versets and organ versets, so that both the organist and the choir director know what the other is doing, and sing or play in the right
tone. Since all the chant is given, the entire Mass ordinary could be sung if desired. But the conclusion to the preface reveals Bottazzi's purpose for giving all the chant: the able organist will play 'all'improviso' accompaniments to the chant, i.e. fantasia. The music (intavolatura) which makes up most of the volume is thus not an end in itself, but a set of examples showing how to play at Mass and learning to play fantasia.

Following the preface, a short treatise of seven pages dealing with the fundamentals of counterpoint is given in a series of eighteen avvertimenti, instructing in 'those things most useful, and those rules which are most necessary for teaching to an elementary organist (le cose più necessarie, & quelle regole, delle quali è maggior bisogno per insegnare ad vn semplice Organista)'. It consists for the most part of rudiments, not all of which would have been the most useful instruction for beginners. Bottazzi gave brief instructions for transposition at the fourth and fifth in the eighth avvertimento, which he justified because of needs of the choir. The ninth avvertimento gives instructions for playing pieces based on cantus firmi:

Volendo l'Organista suonare sopra alcun soggetto di Canto fermo, come sopra vn Kyrie, Sequentia, Hino, Graduale, Alleluia, o simili, dourà pigliar vnà parte di tal canto fermo, & fare che le parti vadino (come scherzando, & l'vna a garra dell'altra) imitando quella parte di quel canto, sopra di cui vorra suonare, e ciò dourà con fughe hor'all'in sù, & hor'all'in giù, di modo che le parti faccino le fughe con l'altre parti, e non con il canto fermo, perche chi volesse far le fughe ad imitazione del canto fermo, tal fughe sono tanto praticate, & poste in uso, che o poche se ne possono fare, o niuna, che non siano comunissime, e molte volte udite: vero è nondimeno, che ne gl'Hinni, e nelle Sequenze ë

257 As Hammond noted (Frescobaldi, p. 369 n2), Bottazzi’s attempt to clarify the parts of the organist and choir director backfired when Apel took up Bottazzi’s work: Apel misinterpreted the complete presence of the plainchant, which caused him to doubt the whole range of Italian organ Mass tradition in alternatim practice (Keyboard Music, p. 420). See also Wilbert, ‘Messe organistiche’, pp. 220-21.

258 Bottazzi, p. 13.
grandemente necessaria l’imitatione del canto fermo; ma intorno a
gl’altri canti fermi si potra tenere l’ordine di sopra, facendo che
l’vna imiti l’altra parte. 259

If an organist wishes to play upon a cantus firmus subject, for
example upon a Kyrie, sequence, hymn, gradual, alleluia, etc., he
must take a portion of that cantus firmus and make the parts
progress (as if playfully, and one competing with another),
imitating that portion of chant upon which he wishes to play. That
is, he should play with imitations now above, now below, in such a
way that the parts imitate the other parts, and not the cantus
firmus, since points of imitation made from the cantus firmus are
constantly practised and employed, and little or nothing can be
made of them that is not banal, nor heard many times before.
Nevertheless it is true that with hymns and sequences it is largely
necessary to make a point of imitation with the cantus firmus; but
regarding the other cantus firmi one may keep to the direction
above, making sure that one part imitates another. 260

Bottazzi literally told the player how to improvise a verset for
alternatif use, i.e. play fantasia. His own versets clarify what seems
ambiguous in the quotation: he meant for the chant to be given in
semibreves, with other parts above and below not imitating it but
contriving new, freely-based material. Seen in the context of ASOLA
1592, BANCHIERI 1605 and DIRUTA 1609, Bottazzi was reacting against
over-use of familia: plainchants. Users of Banchieri’s volume would
have played versets with imitative subjects closely based on the chant
(see Ex. A.5); users of Asola, only given the chant upon which the organ
was to play, were likely to have imitated the cantus firmus rather than
making up new ideas; users of Diruta were given chant incipits to the
versets to be played by the organ, with a final added; they would have
made imitations based on the opening of each versets. Bottazzi
documented the over-use of a few chants, providing one reason why chant-
based versets fell out of use in the seventeenth century. The
avvertimento is out of place in the context of other more elementary

259 Ibid., p. 9.
260 My translation, essentially the same as that in Hammond,
Frescobaldi, p. 368 n5.
instructions, and is hardly relevant for beginners who cannot even match the tone of the choir; why Bottazzi placed it here is unclear, but it suggests the almost careless approach to regole in the short treatise, which was not reprinted (unlike Asola, Banchieri, and Diruta).

In the last avvertimento Bottazzi gave evidence of his intentions for elementary (‘semplice’) organists. He stated clearly that his avvertimenti are based on vocal writing: ‘we have written these rules according to ordinary vocal compositional techniques (h Abbiamo scritto queste regole secondo lo stile, con il quale ordinariamente si compongono i canti)’.\textsuperscript{261} The compositional style is conservative and bears little resemblance to monodic compositions then current; he still employed the cantus firmus in strict settings.\textsuperscript{262} Bottazzi’s volume is clearly isolated, his only known publication and one of the last intavolaturas printed in Italy with moveable type.

CORRADINI 1615

Nicolò Corradini, \textit{Ricercari a quattro voci} ([Venice: ?B. Magni, 1615]).\textsuperscript{263}

Format: open score (2 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 76 pp., 12 ricercars.

\textsuperscript{261} Bottazzi, p. 13.

\textsuperscript{262} Schrade judged the music of higher quality than Diruta’s in \textit{Il Transilvano} (‘“Choro et Organo”’, p. 517).

\textsuperscript{263} Sartori II:1615n.
Corradini (d. 1646) published these ricercars 'to play at the keyboard (per sonare nel Clavacino)', and 'for beginners in the art [of organ playing] (per principianti in detta arte)'.

FRESCOBALDI 1615(i)
Girolamo Frescobaldi, Toccate e partite d'intavolatura di cimbalo ... libro primo (Rome: Nicolò Borboni, 1615).

Format: engraved intavolatura (5 x 6/8).
Contents: 4 unn. fols. + 58 pp., 12 toccatas, 3 partite.

With his first book of toccatas Frescobaldi claimed a pre-eminent place in the field of Italian keyboard music. The volume and its prefatory comments offer several insights into prevailing attitudes towards notation of keyboard music. It was printed with engraved copper plates, the first since Verovio's last known volume (1608) and the first such keyboard music since MERULO 1604. The notational nuances of the engraved format were the subject of a detailed study by Darbellay, who convincingly argued that the various notational details of the intavolatura stem from the composer and not the engraver.

264 Quoted in G. Bresciani, 'Uomini Insigni Cremonesi' (MS, 18th c.), cited in Tagliavini, 'Un musicista', pp. 419-20. The frontispiece (and any other prefatory matter, if it ever existed) is now missing. Bresciani cites the date 1615; Tagliavini judges the printing to be similar to other volumes of Corradini which were printed by Magni.

265 2nd edition 1615-16, repr. 1616-?, 1628; 3rd edition 1637; Sartori 1615a (+II); ed. Darbellay, inter alia. The citation of a second edition in 1615 (Sartori 1615a bis) has been shown to be erroneous; see Hammond, Frescobaldi, p. 276, and Darbellay, 'Les éditions originales', pp. 12-13, 31b.

266 Darbellay, 'Peut-on découvrir?', p. 344. This summary of part of his doctoral dissertation will be expanded upon in Le toccate e i capricci di Girolamo Frescobaldi: genesi delle edizioni e apparato critico (Milan: Suvini Zerboni, forthcoming).
Engraving is significantly more subtle than typesetting, and there is ample evidence to suggest that Frescobaldi preferred it for toccatas. The publication of the volume played an important part in his abortive Mantuan sojourn; Frescobaldi was himself responsible for the considerable capital outlay required to print the volume, and could not leave Rome for the Gonzaga court until his creditors were assured of financial security. The 500 scudi required was partially offset by a loan from Gonzaga, the volume's dedicatee. There is no doubt that the project was financially successful; there were at least five printings, and remarks made by Frescobaldi's pupil Bartolomeo Grassi in the preface to FRESCOBALDI 1628(iii) confirm the immense popularity of the volume. However, Frescobaldi's underwriting of it personally indicates that the printer was unwilling to take the risk alone. Evidently Frescobaldi saw the advantages of the engraved format, and had enough faith in his works and their printing to support the project himself. The high cost of engraving was undoubtedly a reason for the printer's reluctance to risk the capital alone. Frescobaldi's financial support of the engraved intavolatura for these works shows extra effort (which contemporaries such as Trabaci and Mayone did not take), and indicates that engraved format was used almost in spite of the publisher.


268 Newcomb, 'Frescobaldi, 1608-1615', pp. 151-2; Hammond, Frescobaldi, pp. 50-52. Gonzaga promised 300 scudi, but actually lent less than half that amount. Although the Gonzaga emblem is prominently situated on the title page, there is no actual mention of the dedicatee in the volume. The omission was redressed in the second edition.

269 In Vincenti's 1649 catalogue, Merulo's toccatas are priced at 18 lire for the two volumes, whereas Padovano's typeset toccatas (1604) are priced at 2 lire. Mischiati, Indici, p. 182.
The specification 'cimbalo' on the title page, without reference to the organ, is an unprecedented designation for books of toccatas;\textsuperscript{270} the omission of the word was a bold step (it appears in the re-engraved title page to the 1628 edition). The twelfth toccata is more suited to the organ than harpsichord, with its sustained character and lack of ornamentation; Frescobaldi was making an overstatement on the title page, perhaps to emphasize the particularly strong affinities with the harpsichord for most of the volume. Not only did Frescobaldi lend an air of respectability to the harpsichord which is not seen in earlier publications (cf. VALENTE 1576), but he forthrightly declared its legitimacy as an artistic solo instrument.

The contents of the volume do not reflect the general Venetian custom (which Frescobaldi followed in most of his open scores) of publishing different genres under separate covers: partite combined with toccatas is also unusual because of the rarity of partite (outside Naples) altogether. The Neapolitan influence of Mayone and Trabaci is thus reflected (although it is not an 'all-purpose' book like the Neapolitans').

His note to the reader does not discuss notational formats, but is the first such note to consider fine details of performance tempi and other aspects of the musical affect of the works. It has been considered in detail by a number of scholars and need not be fully reproduced here,\textsuperscript{271} but the preamble, which explains why Frescobaldi wrote it, is pertinent:

\begin{quote}
Perche il modo de queste mie compositioni mi par gradito, ho pensato rappresentarlo in stampa con l'infrascritte auertenze;
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{270}As Newcomb observed, 'Frescobaldi's Toccatas', p. 43.

\textsuperscript{271}Darbellay, 'Liberté'; Tagliavini, 'L'arte'; Hogwood, 'Frescobaldi'; Hammond, Frescobaldi, pp. 222-51. See these for references to numerous other considerations of the preface.
protestando ch'io deferisco al merito altrui, et osservo il valore
di ciascuno; Mà si gradisca l'affetto, con cui l'espongo al
studio esercitio, sicuro che per mezzo di questo si troveranno
l'opere più facili, che in apparenza non sono. 272

Since the style of these my compositions seems pleasing to me, I
thought of presenting them in print with the following notices,
protesting that I defer to the merits of others, and observe the
worth of everyone. But if the affect with which I expound it to
the studious practitioner is appreciated, I am sure that by means
of this they will find the works easier than they appear to
be. 273

Frescobaldi acknowledged that the works appear to be difficult to
perform, but there is no hint that the intended users were novices.
This is the first solo keyboard source to state that playing an
intavolatura is difficult; 274 the format has come to be accepted as
suitable for presenting virtuosic keyboard music. The style of the
works is considerably different from that of Merulo and other Venetians
and might well have appeared formidably difficult to the user.
Frescobaldi is more charitable to his readers than Trabaci, who laid the
blame for any lack of success of the music squarely at the feet of the
user. 275

That Frescobaldi deemed a detailed preface necessary is significant
in its own right. Performance instructions indicate a range of
compositional nuance and intent; these were often left to the performer,
to judge from his deferential remarks. While there is still
considerable room for performance interpretation, the instructions must
direct and shape the performer’s judgement to a high degree. The lack

272 Unn. fol. 2.
273 Hegwood, 'Frescobaldi', p. 16 (with emendations).
274 See I:94 for consideration of the ease or difficulty of
intavolatura.
275 See TRABACI 1603 and 1615. The contradictory attitudes of
Trabaci and Frescobaldi both confirm, however, the rise of the concept
of performers distinct from composers.
of other performance indications in the volume is a sign of the novelty of the concept: the only available options in current use were tempo indications and dynamics (of marginal value for the harpsichord). Frescobaldi evidently found it easier to say what he meant in the preface than to devise new notational devices.

The remainder of the preface considers seven specific points of performance, aptly summed up by its concluding remark: 'there can be no doubt that perfection in playing consists principally in the understanding of tempi (Et non ha dubbio, che la perfettione del sonare principalmente consiste nell'intendere i tempi).'

The preface was revised and expanded with the second edition of the toccatas, probably issued within one year of the first (see FRESCOBALDI 1615-16).

FRESCOBALDI 1615(ii)

Recercari, et canzoni francese fatte sopra diverse obblighi in partitura ... libro primo (Rome: Bartolomeo Zannetti, 1615).

Format: open score (3 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 59 pp., 10 ricercars, 5 canzonas.

These keyboard works, the subject of a study by Ladewig, reflect Frescobaldi's desire to see his contrapuntally orientated works printed in open score. There is no preface or information regarding his intentions, but his more explicit statements in favour of the format in FRESCOBALDI 1624 and FRESCOBALDI 1635 are equally valid for this volume.

---

276 Unn. fol. 2.

277 Repr. 1618; repr. (with FRESCOBALDI 1624) 1626, 1628; revised repr. 1642; Sartori 1615g (+II); ed. Pidoux.

278 'Frescobaldi's "Recercari".'
Appendix A

MERULA 1615

Tarquinio Merula, *Il primo libro delle canzoni a quattro voci per sonare con ogni sorte de strumenti musicali con il basso generale* (Venice: Bartholomeo Magni, 1615). 279

Format: 4 partbooks + organ-bass.

Contents: 5 x 22 pp., 12 canzonas, 3 dances.

Merula (1594/5-1665), known primarily as a composer of vocal and instrumental music but an organist for much of his early career, is considered to be 'one of the finest and most progressive composers of his generation'. 280 This his first publication consists of traditional-style canzonas, and he recommended traditional performance in a note above the table of contents of the *basso generale* part:

Benche per maggior facilità di tutti li Signori Organisti vi sia posto il Basso Continuo alli presenti Canzoni, laudo nondimeno il partirle. 281

Although for the greater ease of all organists the basso continuo for the present canzonas is given, I nevertheless encourage putting them into open score.

He followed the practice of Diruta and others who recommended strict accompaniment doubling the parts, although he was willing to compromise enough to give only an organ-bass part. The recommendation to put them in open score suggests that they could have been performed by solo keyboard as well. 282

---

279 *Sartori* 1615d.


281 *Sartori*.

282 Curtis’s edition of Merula keyboard works includes one of the 1615 canzonas (‘La Marca’); the work is well-suited to keyboard performance.
TRABACI 1615

Giovanni Maria Trabaci, *Il secondo libro de ricercate, & altri varii capricci, con cento versi sopra li otto finali ecclesiastici per rispondere in tutti i Diuini Officij, & in ogni altra sorte d'occasione* (Naples: Giovanni Giacomo Carlino, 1615).

Format: open score (3 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 4 unn. fols. + 132 pp., 12 ricercars, 100 versets, 4 toccatas, 2 *Spagna* settings, 2 galliard sets, 1 canzona, 1 variation set, 1 madrigal.

This volume contains many more notices to the users than Trabaci's first. There is an opening 'A Lettori' similar in content to his first book which need not be given in full here. He noted that the works were suitable for any instrument, but especially harpsichord and organ, and went on to qualify the works, pointing out that good performance is dependent upon the user; the music itself is not at fault. But unlike the 1603 volume, Trabaci included in the prefatory matter a 'table of the more noteworthy passages, etc. (tavola dei passi et delle cose piu notabile)' found in the volume. They primarily indicate the more sophisticated or subtle musical devices he employs, and thus appear to be purely self-conscious attempts to demonstrate his skills. Trabaci also annotated the opening twelve ricercars with comments regarding their composition, for the same purpose. For

---

283 Sartori 1615c (+II); ed. Jackson, 'Trabaci'.
285 In the dedication, however, he merely said 'suitable for performance on the organ and various other instruments' (Jackson, 'Trabaci', I:348).
286 Jackson, 'Trabaci', I:316.
example, he pointed out inverted themes (p. 6), inganni (p. 8), etc. He even made note of a borrowed theme in one instance: 'Luzas. vsa questo [subject] in principio del suo 7. tono, Ricercat. lib. 3' (p. 20).

In an extended note to the readers on p. 41 Trabaci introduced the one hundred sacred versets which follow. While discussing the ecclesiastical tones, Trabaci noted that the ranges of modes are pertinent to voices, but less so to instruments, and hence he would 'use not only twenty-two tones but fifty if it is necessary and the occasion moves [him] (non solamente ventidue voci, ma Cinquanta, se mi sara necessario, e secondo l’occasione che mi trasporta)', when writing for instruments. Like Mayone, Trabaci then pointed to his ricercars for those who would seek music according to more traditional rules: 'These are rules of the First School and this counsel and subtlety should be observed in a motet, in a madrigal, and especially in a written ricercar, as may be seen in these twelve ricercars of my present book (Questa è regola di prima scuola, e questo avertimento, e sottigliezza si deve tenere in un Motetto, in un Madrigale, e particolarmente in una Ricercata scritta, come potrete veder’ in questi Dodici modi del presente mio Libro’). For Trabaci the organist’s highest art was not fantasia-creation but carefully composed music; but his small qualification ‘written’ to the ricercar citation demonstrates that the unwritten ricercar was also known. The note to the readers ends with a word of praise for the harpsichord, clearly Trabaci’s favourite instrument. Other notes to the reader offer further specific information regarding modes (p. 70) and the chromatic harpsichord and the accidentals which it needs (p. 87).

Trabaci also indicated that two sets of works were suitable for a

consort of viols: the galliards (p. 99), for three of which a fifth part is provided at the end of the volume, and one canzona (p. 114), a revised version of his 1603 canzona no. 1. For these works the embellishment is significantly reduced. For works intended for harp, however, the virtuosic writing is increased. The second toccata (p. 85), four of the 'Zefiro' partite (p. 117), and 'Ancidetemi pur' (p. 126) are all named as suitable for harp. In the latter work, Trabaci added dynamic markings and tempo directions, some of the earliest such indications in instrumental music. To judge from the frequent notes in the score, he was deeply concerned about the performance of his works; it would appear, from the lack of widespread use of such notes and indications, that Trabaci was idiosyncratic in this respect, but his comments nevertheless show important aspects of music performance.

FRESCOBALDI 1615-16

Girolamo Frescobaldi, Toccate e partite d'intavolatura di cimbalo ... libro primo (Rome: Nicolò Borboni, n.d. [1615-16]).

Format: engraved intavolatura (5 x 6/8).

Contents: 3 unn. fols. + 68 pp., 12 toccatas, four partite, 4 correnti.

The second edition of Frescobaldi's first book of toccatas includes the engraver's name and the date 1616 added to the bottom of unn. fol. 3. The date of the (re-engraved but essentially unchanged) dedication, 22 December 1614, is the same as before. Darbellay noted the significance of the second edition containing the same dedication, as well as the title page which claims that the volume is 'nuovamente

288 Sartori 1615-16b.
date in luce', despite its being (for the most part) a reprint. The apparent desire of Frescobaldi to ignore the existence of the first edition has been postulated as the reason for these 'un-alterations' to the otherwise considerably modified and expanded second edition. 289 Although possible, this suggests a level of dissatisfaction with the first edition on Frescobaldi's part which is difficult to justify. Unlike the first, in the second edition the dedicatee's name appeared at the top of the dedication page; considering this, the dedicatee's gift to Frescobaldi of a large sum of money (in August or September 1615) 290 may have had an influence on the reprinting. If so, its re-dedication (including the name of the dedicatee for the first time) and similar title page are understandable features of the edition.

The contents are expanded by altering and adding to the three existing partite, and adding another partita and 4 correnti. 291 The introductory note to the reader is almost doubled in length. Hammond was probably right to suggest that the volume startled its first users; 292 perhaps the expanded preface was called for by reactions to the first printing. The first edition's preamble and seven unnumbered points of performance practice are rearranged and expanded to include nine numbered notices. Significantly, the new preamble omits the comment on difficulty. With such an elaborate and unprecedented set of instructions to the performer, Frescobaldi might have felt that it was gratuitous to claim that the works were easier than their appearance

289 Darbellay, 'Les éditions', pp. 10-11, citing Sartori, 'Le 7 editioni'. This hypothesis is weakened by the fact that the dedication was reprinted a second time (FRESCOBALDI 1616-?).

290 Hammond, Frescobaldi, p. 52.

291 Hammond, Frescobaldi, pp. 160-61, and Darbellay, 'Les éditions', pp. 36-42, discussed the differences in the two versions more fully.

292 Frescobaldi, p. 144.
suggested; or perhaps he did not wish to frighten prospective users.

Most of the nine points which follow are straightforward comments on performance, but the first presents a striking metaphor:

Primieramente, che non dee questo modo di sonare stare soggetto à battuta, come veggiamo usarsi ne i Madrigali moderni, i quali quantunque difficili si ageuolano per mezzo della battuta portandola hor languida, hor veloce, è sostenendola etiandio in aria secondo i loro affetti, ò senso delle parole. 293

Firstly, this style of playing must not be subjected to the beat, as we see practised in modern madrigals, in which any difficulties are alleviated by taking the beat now languidly, now quickly, and even sustaining it with spaciousness according to their affects, or the sense of the words. 294

Frescobaldi could do no better than use analogy with the seconda prattica madrigal and its emphasis on text expression as he tried to verbalize the musical affect of his music. In the preamble, he spoke of the popularity of 'the manner of playing with singable affects (la maniera di sonare con affetti cantabili)'; the imitation of the vocal style is clearly a motivating force behind the new keyboard style, which is able to be expressive without text.

FRESCOBALDI 1616–? reprint of FRESCOBALDI 1615–16 295

---

293 Unn. fol. 2.

294 Hogwood, ‘Frescobaldi’, p. 18 (with emendations).

295 Sartori 1616f. The words ‘Nuovamente da lui date in luce, & con ogni diligenza corrette’ and the date are removed from the title page; the engraver’s name and the date 1616 are again given on unn. p. 3; the dedication is reprinted (date unchanged).
LUCINO 1617

Don Francesco Lucino, ed., Seconda aggiunta alli concerti ... a due, tre e quattro voci, di diversi eccellenti autori (Milan: Filippo Lomazzo, 1617). 296

Format: 4 partbooks + open score.

Contents: 4 x 59, 163 pp., 18 concertos for 2, 3, and 4 voices; 12 canzonas à 4.

Although this is primarily an accompanimental open score, the twelve canzonas by eight composers are suitable for solo keyboard, and the open score would have been used independently of the partbooks as well as accompanimentally.

FRESCOBALDI 1618 reprint of FRESCOBALDI 1615(ii) 297

[STROZZI before 1619] [lost]

Bernardo Strozzi, Affettuosi Concerti Ecclesiastici.

Little evidence remains of the work of Bernardo Strozzi. He is thought to have published five volumes of sacred vocal music between 1618 and 1629, none of which are extant. 298 The preface to this volume contains important comments on figured bass, extensively quoted by Praetorius. 299 He explained why he preferred composers to use figures for their organ-bass parts; some composers believed them unnecessary,

296 Sartori 1617d.
297 Sartori 1618g. Sartori erred in stating that it was engraved in copper.
298 Eitner, Quellen-Lexicon, IX:315.
299 Syntagma III (1619), pp. 147 [recte 127]-30; hence the terminus ante quem.
but Strozzi disagreed entirely. In the course of the lengthy discussion he commented on the use of ‘tablature’ (he probably used the word to mean open score):

Die Tabulatur aller Parteien is zwar vor dieser zeit erfunden worden/ daß man sie solte recht schlagen/ wie sie abgesetzt stünde/ vnd war gar wol gethan/ vnd wer sie recht verstehet/ vnd extempore daraus wol schlagen kan/ der folge ihr auff bester er immer kan. Aber dieweil es gar ein schwehr ding ist/ vnd auch langweilig/ dieselbe recht secūr zuschlagen/ vnd die Menschen so sie erfunden vnd gelehret waren/ zuvor gestorben/ oder auffs wenigste gar alt ist/ so wer es von nöthen/ nach dem das Alter mangelt/ sich der mühe auch zu überheben. Damit man aber in einem Concert ohne solche weitlautigkeit und difficultet alsozüglich mit einschlagen könte/ so ward der Bassus Continuus, welcher denn eine schöne Consonantiam und Harmoniam machet/ erfunden.

Dieweil aber ihrer etliche vermercketen vnd erkanten/ daß man viel dissonantien hörete/ wenn man solchen Baß also schlecht vnnd simpliciter hinweg machte/ dieweil die Musicalische Regeln ein jeder nach seiner Art/ Capriccio inclination vnd gutdünken anzeucht/ so war es hochnötig solche mittel zu erfinden/ dadurch man denselben recht justamente, vnd also/ daß keine errores gehört würden/ schlagen künde/ vnd so viel/ als immer möglich nach der Composition des Autoris richtete: Welches dann anderer gestalt vnd leichterer nicht geschehen können/ als durch diß mittel der Numern oder Zahlen/ durch welche auch ein jedweder kleiner Knab/ wenn er sich dieselben nur ein wenig bekant gemacht/ den Gesang so recht vnd gut ohne dissonantien schlagen vnd tractiren wird/ als wenn er aus der vollkommenen Tabulatur schläge.

Wie ich dann etliche gehört/ auch in effectu probiret, daß sie die Motetten des Palestrini (welche/ wie jederman wol weiß/ gar trefflich nach den Regulen formiret, fugiret, vnd in Summa mit schönen Ligaturen vnd Syncopationibus vermenget vnd intriciret seynd) mit hülf vnd zuthun solcher Signatur der Numerorum dergestalt tractiret vnd geschlagen haben/ daß sie den Zuhörern nicht anders vorkommen/ als wenn sie alle in der vollkommenen Tabulatur gesetzt weren/ dieweil sie keine dissonantien im schlagen gehört haben. 300

The tabulation of all parts is certainly to be found before the present time, in order that one may play correctly precisely what is set down, and this was quite proper; he who understands it correctly and can play it well extempore may follow it as best as he can. Yet since it is very difficult and tiresome to play it absolutely accurately, and since those who invented and taught it are now dead, or it is at any rate very old, it was therefore necessary, for those who lacked the age, to save themselves the

300Ibid., pp. 129-30. Italics here signify Roman type in the original.
trouble. <301> But in order for one to be able to strike up an ensemble immediately, without such vastness and difficulty, the basso continuo, which gives fine consonance and harmony, was discovered.

But while some of them noticed and acknowledged that one heard many dissonances if one rendered such a bass simply as it stood, for each applies the rules of music according to his own kind, manner, caprice and pleasure, thus it was essential to discover means through which one could play it quite correctly so that no errors would be heard, and as much as possible to treat it as the author’s composition demanded. This then could not have been brought about more easily or in any other form than by this means of numbers or figures, through which any little boy, if he makes himself familiar with them only a little, will play and interpret the song as correctly and well, without dissonances, as if he were playing from a complete tablature.

As indeed I have heard some, testing by actual experience, that interpreted and played the motets of Palestrina (which as everyone well knows, are quite admirably composed according to the rules, fugued, and are altogether interwoven and adorned with beautiful tied and syncopated notes) with the aid of such figures, that it did not seem otherwise to the hearers than if all had been set down in a complete tablature, since they heard no dissonances in the playing. 302

Strozzi indicated that accompaniment from an open score was common, 303 but difficult compared to playing from a basso continuo; difficulty is the main problem that was surmounted with the new technique. He used the familiar image of a child who is able to manage the new way, which hints at an exaggerated statement of the value of basso continuo. Although he said that listeners could not distinguish between a full-score and a figured-bass performance of Palestrina, he betrayed the rationale for judgement by commenting only on whether or not dissonances were heard. This is actually quite fair; for

---

301 Although this translation agrees with Praetorius, it makes little sense; he probably obscured the original Italian, which may have discussed how long a person needed to study (or how old one needed to be) in order to play a tablature well.

302 Steele, 'Continuo Accompaniment'. I am grateful to Professor Steele for drawing this quotation to my attention.

303 Open score was the predominant format for volumes with full accompaniment.
accompanimental purposes, it would be more satisfactory to omit the
voice-leading and sound the essential harmony, if mistakes could thereby
be avoided. Strozzi clearly saw the labour-saving value of figured bass
over open score.

CIFRA 1619(i)

Antonio Cifra, Ricercari e canzoni franzese ... libro primo (Rome:
Luca Antonio Soldi, 1619). 304

Format: 4 partbooks + open score (3 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 4 x 24, 56 pp., 10 ricercars, 6 canzonas.

The striking parallels between this volume and Frescobaldi's of the
same title (1615) have been considered by Ladewig. 305 Although he
convincingly showed that they were intended primarily for keyboard, it
is significant that these works were printed in partbooks and open score
simultaneously; obviously the works were printed in partbooks in order
to be performed by ensembles as well—the printing of canzonas in
partbooks with an open score organ part was by no means unique (although
the ricercars are). Cifra apparently wished to accommodate a wide
variety of performance options by printing in the two formats.

304 Sartori 1619b; ed. Luisi and Rostirolla.

305 'Frescobaldi's "Recercari"', pp. 138-69, and passim.
CIFRA 1619(ii)

Antonio Cifra, Ricercari et canzoni franzese ... libro secondo
(Rome: Luca Antonio Soldi, 1619).  

Format: open score (3 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 60 pp., 8 ricercars, 8 canzonas.

The only other volume of instrumental works by Cifra was printed three months later, this time without partbooks. It little resembles Frescobaldi's, unlike the first; the pieces are thematically related, each canzona based on a ricercar, although they are not placed adjacently in the printed volume.

ZOILO 1620

Cesare Zoilo, Madrigali a cinque il primo aggiuntovi il suo basso continuo a beneplacito (Venice: Bartholomeo Magni, 1620).

Format: 6 partbooks.

Contents: 6 x 25 pp., 21 madrigals.

Zoilo (1584-after 1622) a Roman composer who served the Duke of Braccio and the English College, produced only a few pieces in

---

306 Sartori 1619d; ed. Luisi and Rostirolla.

307 The possibility that partbooks were printed but are all lost cannot be ruled out, but seems remote.

308 Silbiger, Manuscript sources, p. 46, noted that it was more common to pair tonally or thematically related pieces in MSS than prints, which tended to group genres together throughout the century.

309 New Vogel no. 3028.
The preface is significant for the remarks on intavolatura and accompaniment:

L’Autore compose queste Madrigali, con intenzione che dovessero esser cantati, con cinque sole voci, & senza alcuna accompagnatura di qualsivoglia Instrumento & cosi desidera & prega che si cantino. Ha voluto con tutto cio aggiungervi il Basso continuo per conformarsi con l’uso de tempi, se ben in alcuni luoghi quando cantano due sole parti, volontieri l’haverebbe fatti apparir a modo d’intavolatura ma la stampa che in cio ha molta difficultà non lo permette.

The author offers these madrigals with the intention that they should be sung with five voices alone, without any accompaniment at all; thus he wishes and urges them to be sung. He wished notwithstanding to append the basso continuo, to conform to current usage, as it will be useful in some places when two parts alone are sung. He would willingly have made it an intavolatura, but since the press has difficulty with this, it could not be done.

Zoilo cited problems with the press regarding intavolatura, and indeed (in typeset form) it fell out of use around this time. Since publishing firms rarely printed full intavolatura accompaniments for vocal music, though, it would seem less a technical problem than one of printers’ conventions. Zoilo aligned himself with those who preferred doubling of vocal lines for accompaniment, or no accompaniment at all. The pressure for him to conform to current custom in supplying an organ part is also interesting, and a sign that compositional intent was affected by other factors; his naming of the press indicates that it was they who urged him to conform to current convention.

[PESENTI before 1621] [lost]

Martino Pesenti, Primo libro delle correnti.

This volume almost certainly corresponds to the one advertised in Vincenti’s 1621 catalogue (Mischiati, Indici, VII:87): ‘Corretti alla francese del Pisenti cieco novi’. PESENTI 1635 is its reprint.

---

311 Kinkeldey, Orgel, p. 226.
Appendix A

The following volume is a reprint of this.

PICCHI 1621


Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/8).

Contents: 60 pp., 12 dances.

Picchi (fl. 1600-1625) published only this work and a volume of canzonas (1625) (manuscript works appear in the Fitzwilliam Virginal Book and the Turin Tablatures); he was organist at the Casa Grande, Venice, during the period 1615-1625, and was portrayed in 1600 playing the lute. These dances are the last to be printed in typeset intavolatura with full texture, and are in a more virtuosic style than earlier dance volumes. Picchi promised more volumes in the preface to this work:

... Già che così hanno voluto, eccome per hora il Primo de quattro libri de balli, quali sarò anco quanto prima per far stampare quando vedrò in effetto, che questo Primo Libro sia per riuscire grato al mondo, doue prometto far veder cose in modo fuori della maniera usata, che per ciò non solo parrà à studiosi difficile il sonarle, ma quasi impossibile il vederle tuttavia non è cosa difficile non che impossibile à chi vuole, se al volere s’aggiunge la industria, e la solecitudine avverisca ciascuno, che quantonque, si scopriranno in molti luoghi queste mie compositioni discordanti, e false: suonino però non altrimente che come sentiranno soavissima melodia ...

... At [my friends'] request, here for now is the first of four books of dances; the other three I shall publish as soon as I see clearly that this first book pleases the world. Then I promise to show things in a way that is different from the usual manner, which

---

312 Sartori 1621h (+II); ed. Kreider; ed. Ferguson.
314 Picchi, fol. lv.
therefore will not only make it seem difficult for students to play them, but almost impossible to read them; however, it will neither be difficult nor impossible for those who desire it, if they couple their wishes with hard work and attention. May everyone note that although they may find discords and false relations in many places in these my compositions, they should be played in no other way than as they stand, so that the sweetest melody may be heard. 315

The other three volumes of dances were apparently never published. It would have been most interesting to see some of the works which seemed nearly impossible to read; that he should make such a comment at all is significant. It may refer to difficulty in reading intavolatura, or possibly the development of a new notation for keyboard, indecipherable to those who did not understand it (and therefore secretive). But in either case he did not intend the forthcoming work to be used by beginners. There is a hint of a point of view similar to that found in TRABACI 1603 and 1615: the composer seems to have been promoting his own skills. Although such comments would deter novices, Picchi was apparently unconcerned; his egocentric view is confirmed by the warning not to alter the false relations. The comments also indicate that playing the works come stanno with no emendations was not taken for granted; indeed, users would regularly have altered embellishment, and chromatic alterations are required in most early keyboard music. Picchi’s instruction reflects a compositional intent not common in earlier works.

The music within is based largely on common bass patterns such as passamezzo and saltarello, and is not difficult, probably suited to amateurs with modest ambition. It is curious that the first volume of dances should be reprinted (presumably the same note to the reader was in the first edition), since the remaining three were not printed at all.

315 Kreider, edn. pp. xi-xii (with emendations).
ANGLERIA 1622

Camillo Angleria da Cremona, La Regola del contrapunto e della musical compositione (Milan: Giorgio Rolla, 1622). 316

Format (music): open score, cross-opening format (2 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 117 pp., theoretical treatise with music examples:
Ricercar à 4, Cantilena à 5 (Angleria); 1 ricercar, 3 canons (G. P. Cima).

Angleria (d. 1630) is known only from this volume, a theoretical treatise on composition and aspects of organ-playing. He was a disciple of Merulo, and frequently referred to the Venetian; his ideas reflect the prima prattica. The work was also influenced by Cima, to whom it is dedicated; its main point of interest regarding performance practice concerns a description of Cima's method of transposition:

Questa prattica io l'hò vista con tanta sicurezza dal Signor Gio. Paolo Cima sopra il Clavicordo, che m'hà fatto stupire, in suonar' vn Soggetto sopra a qual si voglia Semitono, come se suonasse l'istesso Soggetto al suo proprio luoco, cosa da me non mai più sentita da altro Organista . . . 317

I have seen this technique [of transposition] practised with great skill on the clavichord by Signor Giovanni Paolo Cima who astonished me by playing a theme on whatever semitone he wished, just as though it were in its proper place; something I have never seen done by anyone else . . .

The transposition system as outlined in CIMA 1606 reflects the same facet of his art. Angleria continued:

... Con quella occasione mi fece sentire vn suo Stromentino toccato a lui con tanta policia, e prontezza di mani, che più non si poteua disiderare; doue io conobbi, che veramente è degno della fama, che hoggidi di lui per tutto è sparsa; Si come ancora dall'Opere sue date alla Stampa si può vedere, le quali sono Motetti à quattro da Capella, stringati, e buoni. Canoni ingegnosi à due, trò, & quattro. Ricercari dottissimi, parimenti à quattro. Concertini à vna, due, tre, e quattro voci, i quali sono tanto

316 Sartori 1622e (+II); RISM Ecrits I:89.
317 Angleria, p. 84.
gustosi, e grati à qual si voglia persona. In somma, esso ha tutte quelle parti, che ad vn pratico, e perfetto Organista si richiede . . . 318

On that occasion he allowed me to hear one of his instuments which he played with such amazing gracefulness and fluency of hand that one could not have wished for more; and wherever I go, his fame has truly spread, since his works are still being printed and may be seen, such as sacred motets for four voices, tightly woven and good; ingenious canons for two, three, and four voices; very learned ricercars for four equal voices; little concertos for one, two, three, and four voices, very tasteful and pleasing to everyone. In short, he has all that is required of an experienced and excellent organist . . .

It is noteworthy that Angleria’s description of an organist’s requirements emphasized compositional skill rather than performance technique: Cima’s works are ‘tightly woven’, ‘ingenious’, ‘very learned’ and ‘tasteful’; a vocal orientation dominates. To an adherent of the old style these things were more important than mere performance technique.

BANCHIERI 1622 Third edn. of BANCHIERI 1605 319

DIRUTA 1622 reprint of DIRUTA 1609-10 320

---

318 Ibid.
319 Venice: Alessandro Vincenti; Sartori 1622c (+II). See BANCHIERI 1605 for a discussion of the changes in format found in the volume.
320 Venice: Alessandro Vincenti; Sartori 1622h (+II).
GRANCINI 1622

Michel'angelo Grancini, Partitura dell'armonia ecclesiastica (Milan: Giorgio Rolla, 1622). 321

Format: open score.
Contents: 113 pp., works for 1, 2, 3, and 4 voices, 2 canzonas and falsi bordoni à 4.

This volume of vocal music could have been used for solo keyboard performance, particularly the canzonas and falsi bordoni. The similarities between this title and that of Grancini's Partitura delle messe, motetti et canzoni a otto voci ... opera quarta (Milan: Filippo Lonazzo, 1627) (nine partbooks) suggest that there may have been other partbooks printed for the 1622 collection which are now lost, and that the extant partbook was intended to be an accompanimental open score. Grancini (1605-1669) was a Milanese organist and composer; this his first volume indicates the vocal orientation that the remainder of his published music was to hold.

CORRADINI 1624

Nicolò Corradini, Partitura del primo libro de canzoni francese a 4. & alcune suonate (Venice: Bartolomeo Magni, 1624). 322

Format: open score.
Contents: 72 pp., 10 canzonas, 4 sonatas.

The ten canzonas would have been suitable organ works, but the four sonatas were intended for instrumental ensemble. The sonatas are scored for CCBB, CCB, CB, and two cornetts in dialogue. The use of the terms 'canzona' and 'sonata' suggests different performance practices, and that canzonas would have been played at the organ, sonatas by instrumental ensemble.

---

321 Sartori 1622d (+II).
322 Sartori 1624a.
FRESCOBALDI 1624


Format: open score (3 x 5/5/5/5).
Contents: 3 unn. + 95 + 1 unn. pp., 12 capriccios.

The Capricci had a somewhat turbulent genesis, to judge from the irregular features of the print, 324 and correspondence which refers to its publication. 325 The earliest reference (21 October 1623) states that Frescobaldi was 'putting in order the book to send to Venice to print, since these printers [in Rome] abide by a fixed price (mettendo in ordine il libro per mandare a Venetia a stampare, chè questi stampatori qui stanno con il prezzo rigoroso)'. 326 The following letters indicate that the book was not completed until well after April 1624. Notwithstanding the above quotation, Frescobaldi apparently had business dealings which led to the Roman publisher Soldi taking on the work. He must have regretted this, since as late as 28 June 1625 he was unwilling to part with a copy before spending two hours correcting the printer's defects. 327 His dissatisfaction with the edition may have led

323 Repr. 1626 (with FRESCOBALDI 1615(ii), Venice: Alessandro Vincenti); 1628 (as 1626 with small changes in the preface); 1642 (as 1626, but preface as 1624); Sartori 1624b (+II); ed. Darbellay.
324 See Darbellay, 'L'énigme'.
325 The correspondence leaves the title of the volume unnamed, but there can be little doubt that it refers to the Capricci. Hammond, Frescobaldi, pp. 68-9; idem, 'New Biographical Information', pp. 16-17. Darbellay, preface to edn. p. v, promised to clarify this in his forthcoming critical commentary (see note 266).
326 Hammond, Frescobaldi, pp. 68-9, 352 n32.
327 Ibid., pp. 68-9, 353 n35.
to publishing the remainder of his typeset open scores in Venice with one publisher. 328

The volume's format, the difficulty of the music, the didactic intent and contrapuntal complexity of the works, and the adjustment of contents in three later editions all merit attention. Its format (open score) invites comparison with the fantasias, ricercars and canzonas, rather than the toccatas; Frescobaldi alludes to the format specifically in the well-known introduction 'to those who study this work':

Per che il sonare queste opere potrebbe riuscire ad alcuni di molta fatica, vedendole di diversi tempi, & variationi, come anco pare, che da molti sia disessa la prattica di detto studio della partitura hò voluto auuertire che in quelle cose, che non paressero regolate, con l'uso del contrapunto, si debba primieramente cercar l'affetto di quel passo & il fine dell'Autore circa la dilettazione dell'udito & il modo che si ricerca nel sonare In questi componimenti intitolati Capricci, non hò tenuto stile Così facil come nei miei Ricercari Ma non si deue però guidicare la difficoltà loro prima di mettergli bene in pratica nell'instrumento doue si conoscerà con l'studio l'affeto che deue tenere ... 329

Since for some [players] the performance of these pieces may prove to be very difficult, in view of the different tempi and variations, and further, since it seems that many players have abandoned the practice of the so-called study of open score, I wish to point out that in those places that seem not to be governed by contrapuntal practice, one should first search for the affect of the passage, and the composer's intention for pleasing the ear, and [thus] discover the manner of playing it. In these compositions entitled Capriccio I did not maintain as easy a style as in my

328 Alternatively, Roman publishers may have refused to serve Frescobaldi. The irregular or inconsistent pagination, ordering, foliation, and titles of the print prompted Darbellay ('L'enigme') to construct a hypothetical model of the volume's genesis which posits that Frescobaldi interrupted the printer's work with revised versions of several pieces, and drastically reordered the entire volume. The conjectured result of the interruptions was costly delays in production, and a hastily completed volume with a large number of errors. If Frescobaldi really was responsible for the printer's problems, it is not far-fetched to suppose that printers would be reluctant to enter into further dealings with him. But the apparent contradiction in Frescobaldi's having contemplated sending the volume to Venice to print in order to get a better financial deal, and the necessity (according to Darbellay's hypothesis) of his having regular dealings over revisions with the Roman firm Soldi needs to be resolved before Darbellay's hypothesis can be accepted without reservation.

329 Sartori.
ricercars, but their difficulty should not be judged before trying them out adequately at the keyboard, where one will discover through study which affect must prevail . . . 330

There is an echo of the preface to Toccate I, which also mentions the apparent difficulty of the works; here, however, Frescobaldi plainly stated that they are not as easy as the ricercars (1615), and some might find them very difficult. Frescobaldi suggested that the practice of playing from open score had been abandoned (as Kinkeldey, Ladewig and Darbellay noted). 331 This attitude, also found in BANCHIERI 1609, is confirmed by Frescobaldi's pupil Grassi (see FRESCOBALDI 1628(iii)), who complained that because of lack of alignment one almost needed to be a composer to play from open score. But for Frescobaldi, the format was ideal for study of the contrapuntal complexities of the music; he chose the format to encourage intellectual appreciation, despite its fall from general use. In this instance, he was more interested in the study-aspects of the music than their ease of performance.

Close study of the works would have been worth the effort: the twelve capriccios make abundant use of compositional artifice and strongly suggest a didactic intent. Two works are based on oblighi or requirements (the durrezze strives for as many dissonances as possible, the ligature al contrario always resolves dissonances upwards); two are based on ostinati (Cucu and 'fifth part to be sung'); 332 three are based


331 Orgel. p. 211; 'Frescobaldi's "Recercari"', p. 288; Darbellay, edn. p. xlv.

332 Singing a part while playing was apparently a time-honoured didactic practice: 'It will be a skill not to be spurned if, while playing a song (cantio), motet, Pugae, or something else, they sing the tenor or alto or, if they prefer, a voice that is making variation. Likewise, if, in playing three or four voices, they mix in one by singing, which they do not play.' Sebastiani, Bellum Musicale

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
on solmization subjects; four on borrowed themes (Bassa Fiamenga, Spagnoletta, Or che noi rimena (= Balletto), Ruggiero); and one seems purposefully not to have used a borrowed theme but develops 'un soggetto'. Darbellay considered the circumstances surrounding the partite on 'Or che noi rimena', which do not properly belong to the collection and were deleted in the subsequent reprints. The contrapuntal devices are intended to challenge the performer, and would be lost to those who would perform without understanding.

The technical and musical difficulties of the capriccios lie primarily in the different tempi and proportions. Darbellay examined this aspect of the works in detail and showed the significance of the subtle notational nuances Frescobaldi employed. The starting point for Darbellay's observations was the second half of the preface (not quoted here) which deals with performance details, some of which are similar to those found in Toccate I. Frescobaldi confronted the limits of mensural notation to achieve his affective purposes: 'no other publication of Frescobaldi exhibits such a consistency of notational means'. This careful approach clearly moved Frescobaldi to plea for similar study of the music by the users, confirming the didactic basis to these works. Their difficulties must have been often surmounted, since the volume underwent three reprints in the following twenty years.

---

333 The works are discussed more fully in Darbellay, edn. pp. v-viii, and Hammond, Frescobaldi, pp. 162-73.
334 Darbellay, edn. p. xxxv.
335 'Tempo Relationships'.
336 Ibid., p. 322.
Appendix A

DIRUTA 1625 reprint of DIRUTA 1593

BONIZZI 1626

Vincenzo Bonizzi, Alcune opere ... passeggiate principalmente per la viola bastarda ma anche per ogni sorte di stromenti, e di voci (Venice: Alessandro Vincenti, 1626).

Format: short score.

Contents: 80 pp., 9 madrigals by Striggio, Willaert, Crecquillon, and Rore arranged for ornamented performance.

Bonizzi (d. 1630) a student of Merulo’s in Parma, followed him as organist of the Ducal chapel, the Cathedral, and the Cappella della Steccata. This volume, his second and last published work, deals with embellishment and viol playing; a short note on format appears in the preface:

Volontieri v’havrei messo la partitura delle Opere accio meglio si potesse vedere quel poco di studio che vi è dentro, ma per non tardar più poi che detta fatica sarebbe stata lunga, hò tralasciato, hauendo mesto solo il Basso Continuo, col rimettermi al giudicio di chi le vorrà vedere ... 340

I would gladly have made an open score of the pieces so that one would be able to see such little scholarship as they contain, but to avoid delay, since [making an open score] would have been lengthy, I have left it as is, having given only the basso continuo, to submit myself to the judgement of those who would like to see them ... 340

The publication of an open score was not possible, just as, in ZOIL 1620, intavolatura was not possible; Bonizzi’s wishes were subject to the constraints of printing. Bonizzi’s words support Lewinsky’s

337 Venice: Alessandro Vincenti; Sartori 1625e.
338 Sartori 1626c.
340 Sartori.
argument for open score for study purposes, but reference to the basso continuo part shows that open score would have been used for accompanimental purposes as well.

CAVACCIO 1626


Contents: 68 pp., 4 toccatas, 4 ricercars à 3, 4 ricercars à 4, 20 canzonas (19 à 4, 1 à 8).

Cavaccio (c. 1556-1626), a Bergamo musician, published at least 24 volumes of works, two of which are for instruments. This volume contains no preface or direction for its use, and appears to be intended without preference for either instrumental ensemble or keyboard. Three features suggest keyboard performance: the format, the inclusion of keyboard genres, and the dedication of two ricercars à 3 to Bergamo organists. Other features suggest that instrumental performance was also intended: there is no idiomatic keyboard writing; the toccata style is idiosyncratic and bears little relation to Venetian keyboard practice; the keyboard is not mentioned on the title page; Cavaccio was not primarily an organist; at least ten works are based on earlier partbook-versions; three-part ricercars are rare in keyboard literature; and the eight-part polychoral canzona reflects instrumental

341 'Early Scores', p. 144.
342 Sartori 1626e (+II); ed. Kreider.
Appendix A

performance practice (and is dedicated to an instrumentalist). The volume can be regarded as ambivalently designed for both modes of performance, and is an early example of open score for use by instrumental ensemble.

FRESCOBALDI 1626


Format: open score.

Contents: 169 pp., 11 capriccios, 10 ricercars, 5 canzonas.

This volume is a combined reprint of FRESCOBALDI 1615(ii) and 1624, with one capriccio ('Or che noi rimena') omitted (apparently because of its anachronistic style; see Darbellay, edn. pp. vi-vii). The change to a Venetian press may be a result of the problems encountered when preparing FRESCOBALDI 1624 for publication.

BANCHIERI 1627 reprint of BANCHIERI 1622 346

---

345 Sartori 1626i (+II).

346 Venice: Alessandro Vincenti; Sartori 1627h (third edition of BANCHIERI 1605).
BIUMI 1627

Iacomo Filippo Biumi, Partito delle canzoni alla francese a 4. & à 8. con alcune arie de correnti à 4 ... libro primo. Opera seconda (Milan: Gratiadio Ferioli, 1627). 347

Format: partbooks + open score.

Contents: 133 pp. (score), 16 canzonas à 4, 2 canzonas à 8, 4 correnti à 4.

Biumi (c. 1580-1653) was a Milanese organist and succeeded Cesare Borgo at Milan Cathedral in 1623. 348 This accompanimental volume may have been used as solo keyboard music, due to its format and the presence of canzonas.

FRESCOBALDI 1627

Girolamo Frescobaldi, Il secondo libro di toccate canzone versi d'hinni magnificat gagliarde, correnti et altre partite d'intavolatura di cimbalo et organo ([Rome: Borboni,] 1627). 349

Format: engraved intavolatura (5 x 6/8).

Contents: 2 unn. fols. + 90 pp., 11 toccatas (2 for organ with pedal, 2 for clevation), 1 madrigal intabulation, 6 canzonas, 4 hymns, 3 magnificats, 2 partite, 5 galliards, 6 correnti, variations on ciaconna, passacaglia.

Frescobaldi's second book of toccatas has parallels with the first: the first twelve works are roughly analogous and both books contain

347 Sartori 1627d.
348 Donà, 'Biumi', The New Grove, 2:748.
349 Repr. 1637; Sartori 1627b (+II); ed. Darbellay, inter alia.
partite and correnti. But the second book includes other genres and is written in a self-proclaimed 'new manner'. Although there is no preface to the work, the dedication offers some information. The dedicatee (the Bishop of Ancona, Mons. Luigi Gallo) was a skilled harpsichordist, to judge from Frescobaldi's praise. Frescobaldi appears to have been impelled to print the volume, for he opens the dedication thus:

Non hauendo io più saputo negar à tanti, che gran pezza mi pregano à publicar le presenti mie moderne fatiche . . . 350

Not knowing how to deny any longer all those who for so long have bidden me to publish these my new works . . .

This common topos of dedications may have more truth here than usual; Grassi, in FRESCOBALDI 1628(iii), testified to the popularity of his works, as does the general frequency of Frescobaldi reprints. He must often have been asked to publish 'modern' works. Frescobaldi declared a reluctance to publish; such an attitude was deemed worthy to promote. The connotations of secrecy and the mystery of Frescobaldi's skills recall 16th-century practice (cf. VALENTE 1576).

In complimenting the dedicatee, Frescobaldi cited the requirements for the 'new manner' of playing:

... la sua tanta gratia, ageuolezza, uarieta di misura, e leggiadria, conditioni necessarie à questa nuova maniera . . .

... your great grace, facility, variety of measure, and elegance, necessary condition. for this new manner . . . 351

'The novelty of artifice with which [the works] are ordered and woven (la nouita dell'artifitio, col quale sono ordite, e tessute)' is mentioned for a third time before the close of the dedication, emphasizing an important aspect of Frescobaldi's attitude towards the music and its users, who were apparently not interested in 'old-style'

---

350 Unn. fol. 1.

works. But Frescobaldi was, to judge from the actual contents. Both new and old styles are found in the volume. The toccatas offer similar pieces to the first book as well as newer ones: the pairs of Elevation and organ pedal-point toccatas are the most notable of the latter. The well-known proverb following the ninth toccata 'not without effort does one reach the end (non senza fatiga si giunge al fine)' is an explicit comment on difficulty rarely seen with respect to a particular composition, justly so for this virtuosic piece. 352 The intabulated madrigal (from Arcadelt's first book of four-part madrigals, first published in 1539) is a modern transformation of a genre nearly extinct in 1627. The sacred works are most clearly in a prima prattica style, perhaps befitting formal use in liturgical settings. Otherwise, the variety of the contents reflects a Neapolitan influence, as Hammond observed. 353

It has been established that Frescobaldi took care to set works in particular formats to suit particular goals. 354 It is striking, therefore, that this volume contains works better suited to open score format, the hymns and Magnificats. 355 Their character is far-removed from the remainder of the collection, and their inclusion anomalous. Uncharacteristically, they appear to be an afterthought (even more so in the 1637 edition, which reprints the note to the reader from Toccate I (revised version), inappropriate for these works). It is almost as if

352 This is the first such proverb in the keyboard literature of which I am aware. It may be a literary quotation (similar to the one in FRESCOBALDI 1635), but if so its source has not yet been identified.

353 FRESCOBALDI, p. 174.

354 See FRESCOBALDI 1615(i) 1624.

355 Ladewig, 'Frescobaldi's "Recercari"', p. 284, mistakenly made a similar comment not about the liturgical works but the canzonas, which are actually more appropriate to intavolatura than his open-score canzonas, as Harper noted ('Instrumental Canzonas', p. 55).
the preface to FRESCOBALDI 1635 (which refers to Vespers music) refers to these works. Perhaps they were added in deference to the cleric to whom the volume was dedicated.

Curiously, the printer did not indicate his identity, although the difficulty of his work, its artistic merit, and Frescobaldi’s established reputation suggest that its engraver and publisher would be acknowledged. The other six printings of Toccate I and II all indicate the printer (Nicolò Borbone), and this volume was doubtless prepared by him as well. The possibility that the omission of publisher here is significant remains to be explored.

FRESCOBALDI 1628(i) reprint of FRESCOBALDI 1626

FRESCOBALDI 1628(ii)

Girolamo Frescobaldi, Il primo libro d’intavolatura di toccate di cimbalo et organo partite sopra l’arie di romanesca ruggiero monica follie e correnti ... ristampato (Rome: Nicolo Borbone, 1628).

This volume is a reprint of FRESCOBALDI 1615-16 (Sartori 1628k (+II)). The title has been altered substantially; most significantly,

---

356 They also indicate place and license; only one edition (FRESCOBALDI 1615-16) does not give a date on the title page.

357 Silbiger, ‘Michelangelo Rossi’, p. 29, erred in supposing Borbone’s only omission of publication data to be ROSSI 1634.

358 Darbellay noted two differences between title-pages of the first and second editions: the addition of two lines in 1637 (‘con privilegio’, and publication details). Moreover, the figure ‘3’ in the date of the 1637 edition appears to have been altered from ‘2’, suggesting the possibility of a second edition in 1627 (preface to edn., p. xi). Eitner, Quellen-Lexicon, indexes an edition dated ‘Roma 1628’, now untraceable.

359 Venice: Alessandro Vincenti; 1628; Sartori 1628k (+II).
the word 'organo' is included. Darbellay observed that the re-issue was influenced by the printir•_ of Toccate II a year earlier. The prefatory matter takes that volume into account as well, reproducing the portrait printed there. The emendation of the title is an appropriate gesture of conformity by Frescobaldi, who by this time did not need to make a symbolic statement regarding the harpsichord.

FRESCOBALDI 1628(iii)

Girolamo Frescobaldi, In partitura il primo libro delle canzoni ad una, due, tre e quattro voci. Per sonare con ogni sorte de stromenti. Con due toccate in fine, una per sonare con spinettina sola, ouero liuto, l'altra spinettina è violino, ouero liuto, è violino ... date in luce da Bartolomeo Grassi, Organista in S. Maria in Acquirio di Roma (Rome: Paolo Masotti, 1628). Format: open score (6 x 5/5; 4 x 5/5/5; 3 x 5/5/5/5; 2 x 5/5/5/5/5).

Contents: 152 pp., 37 canzonas for 1, 2, 3, or 4 parts and continuo, 1 toccata for 'spinettina' and violin, 1 toccata and 1 canzona for 'spinettina sola'.

The editor of this volume, Bartolomeo Grassi, is known from this and a volume of vocal works only. Partbook-versions of many of the works were published by Robletti in Rome in the same year. Silbiger

---

360 'Les éditions', p. 21.
361 Sartori 1628i.
362 Harper, 'Instrumental Canzonas', p. 100-105, considered the available evidence and suggested that Grassi's edition preceded the partbooks; Jensen, 'La Revisione', p. 321, and Hammond, Frescobaldi, p. 189, came to the opposite conclusion, but their hypothesis seems less tenable. Although the partbooks have a dedication written by Frescobaldi, they lack his customary care in production, certainly not
suggested that Grassi’s edition appears to have been made without Frescobaldi’s imprimatur. The volume was carefully produced, and hand-entered corrections and beamings may be additions by Grassi himself, surely justifying his prefatory claim of ‘great effort and expense (tanta fatica, & spesa)’ in producing the volume. Although this is primarily an accompanimental source, Grassi’s epistle ‘to the students of this work’ (unusually placed at the end) gives important clues regarding the printing and use of keyboard notations (marginal numbers in square brackets are employed here to facilitate the discussion which follows):

[1] Ho posto questo volume in partitura accio sia comodo a i professori d’ogni sorte di strumenti, & che nell’istesso tempo possino vedere tutte le parti cosa necessarissima a chi desidera sonar bene. Ogni Sonatore potrà sonare queste Canzoni in compagnia, è solo valendosi per studio della Scherzi, e passaggi vaghissimi che sono sopra il Basso continuo che sta sempre in fine di tutte le parti . . .

[2] Se trouaranno qualche tempo non solito, cioè essere ad’una parte, segnato il tempo di proportione, & all’altra seguire il tempo ordinario, non perciò credano, che sia per errore, ma considerino bene la partitura, che troueranno esser molto aggiustata, & facile, tanto più che come vedranno quest’opera è stata stampata con si esquisita diligentia in quesia parte, che ogni una delle note porta il suo valore al debito luogo, cosa da me sin hora non più veduta nelle passate partiture, onde avviene, che son quasi affatto dismesse, essendo necessario alli senatori di diuenir prima buoni Compotisti [sic] per imparare a compartire il valor delle note.

[3] Il Volume delli Ricercari, & l’altro delli Capricci del medesimo Signor Girolamo, sono parimente in Partitura, & hanno hauuto tanto applauso, che è stato necessario in poco tempo ristamparli tre volte, & se quelle son’ opere ad uso solo di chi sona tasti, come non potrò dire che questa habbia da essere la più desiderata di tutte le altre, potendo servire non solo a sonatori di Cimbalo, ma qualsiuoglia altro Stromento.

the case with the open score edition; but the question is undecidable at present. The different versions of 1628 and a third edition (1634) are considered by Harper and Jensen, and Harper, ‘Frescobaldi’s Reworked Ensemble Canzonas’.

363 Manuscript sources, pp. 8, 188.

[4] Il Primo Libro delle Toccate del medesimo Signor Girolamo, che è stato a i virtuosi di grandissimo gusto per non essere in partitura, e stato necessario a chi ha voluto servirsiene per altri stromenti di accomodarlo con gran fatica alla loro intauolatura onde posso sperare che tanto più deue esser gradita quest'opera mentre ognuno può accomodarui sopra qualsiuoglia sorte di stromento;

[5] Consiglio dunque ogni studioso che faccia prouisione di tutte le opere del Signor Girolamo, cominciando dal primo libro delle Toccate in Rame, e seguendo il secondo dato adesso in luce, con infinita spettativa di tutti i professori di quest'arte, non essendo men degno del primo, anzi piu copioso di diuersita di opere, si da Organo, Come da Cimbalo, & ogni sonatore di tasti hauendo questi due libri in materia di Toccate, Galanterie, & risposte necessarie à tutti li bisogni per la Chiesa; potrà chiamarsi contento; ma per piglian viuacità, & motuii allegri si di fughe, come d'altro passaggi, si proueda in ogni maniera della presente opera che la trouerà in questo genere, come in grauita e dottrina perfettissima; aggiunga anco i Capricci, & Ricercari del medesimo se vuole grauità di stile.

[6] Il Signor Girolamo ha fatto infiniti altri volumi, & continuamente ne vâ formando di nuoui, perche e così eminente in comporre che alla sprouista, come vede continuamente Roma, fa cose marauigliose; ma la fatica, & spesa delle Stampe non permette, che si vedano in luce . • . .

[1] ... I have put this volume in open score so that it may be convenient for players of any type of instrument, so that they may be able to see all the parts at the same time, something very necessary for those who wish to play well. Every player may play these canzonas in a group, and alone . . .

[2] If they find some unusual tempo markings, that is, if one part has a proportion sign and the other follows the regular mensuration, they should not think that this is an error, but study the open score well, which they will find to be greatly adjusted and easy. Moreover, as is seen, this work has been printed with such careful diligence in this regard that every single note carries its value in the proper place, something I have never seen in previous open scores before now, which results in their near-complete neglect, since it is first necessary for players to become competent composers in order to learn how to separate the note-values.

[3] The volume of ricercars, and the other volume, of capriccios, by the same Girolamo, are likewise in open score, and have had so fine a reception that it has been necessary to reprint them three times in a short period of time; and if those works are for the use of keyboard players only, how can I deny that this volume might be even more desired than all the others, it being able to be used not only by harpsichord players, but by any other instrument that is wished.

365 Unn. p. 151.
[4] The first book of toccatas by the same Girolamo, which has been favoured most greatly by the virtuosos because it is not in open score, has had to be transcribed into [another] tablature, at no small effort, for those who wanted to play it on other instruments; whereas I would hope that this work would be much more well-received, since anyone can play it on whatever instrument he likes.

[5] I therefore advise every student that he provide himself with all the works of Signor Girolamo, beginning with the first book of engraved toccatas, and following with the second now published, awaited with great anticipation by all the proponents of this art, not being less worthy than the first, but with a greater variety of works, for organ as well as harpsichord; and every keyboard player, having these two books of toccatas, galanteries, and responses required for all who have need of them in church, may deem himself content. But if one wants liveliness, and cheerful passages, whether imitative or embellished, this work provides them in every manner, as well as works with gravity and perfect learnedness; and add the capriccios and ricercars by him if further gravity of style is desired.

[6] Signor Girolamo has composed innumerable other volumes, and is continually making new ones, since he is indeed outstanding at composing as well as improvising, as Rome witnesses constantly, where he does amazing things; but the effort and expense of printing them does not permit them to be published...

[1] This is the first time ensemble performance from open score is confirmed in a preface. It was probably a practice well before this time, applied to many open scores considered in the present study. The advantage Grassi cited is self-explanatory; the works are also made more flexible, and could be performed with a full ensemble or a smaller fraction if necessary.

[2] This open score was prepared carefully and the parts aligned properly, unlike earlier ones. Grassi revealed one reason why the practice of reading open score had fallen into disuse, and hoped by remedying the practice of not aligning parts to make the volume more

---


367 Ladewig, 'Frescobaldi's "Recercari"', p. 288 n26, appears to be too dogmatic regarding the use of open score when he denied that they could have been used by instrumental ensembles, considering Grassi's comments.

368 See TRABACI 1615, CAVACCIO 1626.
accessible. The similarity of the phrase here with that in FRESCOBALDI 1624\textsuperscript{369} is hardly coincidental; Grassi, like Frescobaldi, wished to promote the use of open score. Comment [3] confirms that open scores had not entirely fallen into disuse. Declaring that only composers could manage to read open scores may be an exaggeration, but it was no doubt difficult for many.

[3] The open-score volumes of Frescobaldi (excepting the notably absent FRESCOBALDI 1608) were popular enough to require a number of reprints; the three Grassi referred to are most likely 1618, 1626, and 1628. Significantly, he said they were intended for keyboard players only, and not for ‘qualsivoglia sorte di strumenti’. But leaving Frescobaldi’s primary intentions aside, instrumentalists may have also used them, considering comments [1] and [4].

[4] Implied is that the volumes in open score did not have to be transcribed. ‘Whatever instrument’ clearly refers to keyboard, lute, harp, and ensemble instruments. Grassi’s aside that the toccatas were greatly favoured by virtuosos because they are not in open score is interesting. Point [2] suggests that performers found them easier to play from than open score; ‘virtuosos’ may be a generous reference to all keyboard players, who seem to be more numerous than the ‘composisti’ of point [2]. The reference to other tablatures probably refers to performance on the lute or other plucked instruments;\textsuperscript{370} Grassi had suggested the use of theorbo in one piece of the present volume, and

\textsuperscript{369}It seems that many players have abandoned the practice of the so-called study of open score (da molti sia dismessa la prattica di detto studio della partitura’) (II:153).

\textsuperscript{370}There is a wealth of evidence regarding the interaction of lute and keyboard music in the 17th century (see I: 80). It is unlikely that Grassi was suggesting performance by instrumental ensemble of the works in Toccate I and II, due to their particularly idiomatic keyboard writing, excepting the sacred works of Toccate II.
the title refers to other plucked instruments. Open score is abstract enough to be read by any instrument or instrumental ensemble as long as it is printed carefully enough to be easily usable, and thus obviates the need for tablature transcription.

[5] Grassi concluded with a summary of Frescobaldi's output for keyboard (confirming that Grassi's epistle was for keyboard players), with most emphasis on the two books of toccatas. He acknowledges that _Toccat II_ has been awaited by Frescobaldi's followers with great expectation, but his claim that it would suffice for all church usage is tenuous. The two books contain enough variety to satisfy the needs of some performers, it would appear, but Grassi's edition would supplement the works (and is thus intended for solo keyboard, at least in part), as would the ricercars and capriccios, for their learned style. The canzonas (1615) and fantasias (1608) are unmentioned.

[6] Grassi went on to describe some of Frescobaldi's Roman activities. Composition and improvising were different for Grassi, and the dichotomy of performer and composer is significantly joined in the person of Frescobaldi. It is contradictory to claim such popularity for Frescobaldi's works in one breath, and to excuse the lack of printing others because of financial factors in the next, at least in terms of modern economics; Grassi's 'effort and expense of printing' needs to be examined more closely to clarify why certain works of Frescobaldi were printed and why some may not have been. Grassi has been shown to be inaccurate, hyperbolic or incomplete earlier in his epistle, and he was probably so here as well. It is premature to suggest that were it not
for problems with the press, many more works would have been published. 371

Most of the works are more suited to instrumental than keyboard performance, but Grassi’s comments show that solo performance on keyboard or plucked instruments was intended as well, and some pieces include figures below the bass part for ease of accompanimental performance. The publication in open score appears to have been Grassi’s own initiative, in order to make the canzonas more accessible to a variety of performance modes, as well as for study and playing a more complete basso continuo. It was to be the last open score of Frescobaldi’s to be printed in Rome, and the quality of its production, due largely to Grassi, may be a reaction to the production problems of Frescobaldi 1624.

SABBATINI 1628

Galeazzo Sabbatini, Regola facile, e breve per sonare sopra il basso continuo, nell’organo, manacordo, ò altro simile strumento ... dalla quale in questa prima parte ciascuno da se stesso potrà imparare da i primi principij quello che sarà necessario per simil effetto (Venice: Salvadori, 1628). 372

Sabbatini (1597-1662), a musician in Pesaro, studied with Vincenzo Pellegrini and published four books of motets and five books of

371  Hammond, Frescobaldi, pp. 66-7, seems to have placed an inordinate amount of faith in Grassi’s remarks (although he later (p. 189) questioned them).

372  Repr. Venice: Alessandro Vincenti, 1644, and Rome: Paolo Moneta, 1669; Sartori 1628b (+II); Arnold, Thorough-bass, p. 110; RISM Ecrits, II:742.
This small theoretical work (30 pp.) had an enduring value through the course of the century, to judge from its reprinting. There are no musical examples, but one comment to beginners is noteworthy:

Quanto si deue auertire, che saria bene, che il principiante sapesse o imparasse qualcche sonata a mente su 'l manaccordo per saper poi disporre le ditta nel toccarle consonanze . . . 374

All that must be advised is that it will be well if the beginner would know or learn a few sonatas by heart at the keyboard, in order to then know how to finger the music when playing.

He followed with a few fingering examples. The recommendation that students memorize is a consistent feature of keyboard theory books, beginning at least with Bermudo. Even within the context of a practical discussion which considers none of the aspects of fantasia, memorization has an important role to play. The title shows that the volume is autodidactic, a sign of its less serious nature.

PIETRAGRUA 1629

Gasparo Pietragrua, Concerti et canzon francese à una, due, tre e 4. voci (Milan: Giorgio Rolla, 1629). 375

Format: 4 partbooks + partitura (?open score).

Contents: 4 x 54, 123 pp., vocal works for 1-4 voices and 8 instrumental works.

Little is known of Pietragrua; his two extant publications both name him as organist. The size of this partitura suggests that it is an accompanimental open score. It may have been suitable for use by solo

---

374 Page 10.
375 Sartori 1629c.
keyboard; of the instrumental works, six are intended for pairs of instruments and accompaniment, and two canzonas are intended for equal voices, thus more plausibly for keyboard solo as well. The makeup of the volume and its instrumental specifications are a sign of the shifting emphasis towards non-keyboard instruments, and its use as a solo keyboard source, although likely, was secondary.

PESENTI 1630

Martino Pesenti, Secondo libro delle correnti alla francese per sonar nel clavicembalo, et altri stromenti, con alcune correnti spezzate a tre ... raccolte da me Alessandro Vincenti (Venice: Alessandro Vincenti, 1630).376

Format: short score, 3-part open score.

Contents: 33 pp., 17 correnti, 2 voltas (short score); 5 correnti (open score).

Pesenti (c. 1600–c. 1648) was a Venetian composer and harpsichordist, blind from birth. His output includes five books of dances, one sacred and seven secular vocal volumes,377 and is thus a significant contribution to 17th-century keyboard music, at least quantitatively. This collection of dances was primarily intended for keyboard; 'altri stromenti' probably refers to lutes and other plucked instruments which could perform from the short score. The inner parts to the works were meant to be filled in by the performer, although no figures are given (see the prefatory note in PESENTI 1635).

376 Sartori 1630a.

ROSSI ?1634

Michelangelo Rossi. Toccate e corente d'intavolatura d'organo e cimbalo ([Rome: Nicolò Borbone,] n.d.).378

Format: engraved intavolatura (5 x 6/8).
Contents: 44 pp., 10 toccatas, 10 correnti.

Rossi (1602-1656) was better known for his violin playing than his keyboard skills, but relations among Frescobaldi, Froberger and him are not implausible.379 Silbiger showed that this volume, formerly thought to have been published around 1640, certainly dates before 1638, and most likely c. 1633-4.380 It has no dedication or prefatory matter, but the emulation of Frescobaldi's Toccate I and II is apparent in both format and contents. It is noteworthy that both this volume and Frescobaldi's Toccate II are without publisher, place and date on the title page, and both have been shown to be printed by Borbone. The frequent reprinting of the volume indicates its popularity over the span of twenty years.

379 Silbiger, 'The Roman Frescobaldi Tradition', includes the most recent discussion of Rossi. See also Apel, Keyboard Music, p. 487.
CASATI 1635

Hieronymo Casati, Armonicae cantiones una 2. 3. 4. 5. vocibus
(Milan: Georgio Rolla, 1635). 381

Format: 6 partbooks + organ-bass (2 of 4 sonate in open score).

Contents: 60 pp. (organ-bass), vocal works and 4 sonatas à 1, 2, 3, and 4.

The two works in 3- and 4-part open score here are clearly specified for stringed instruments in the table of contents: 'La Maltiuglia Suonata à 3' is for CCBBc or CBBc or CCBc; 'La Bentiuoglia Suonata à 4' is for CBBBbc or CCBc. The occurrence of open score for accompanimental purposes in this case reflects the various alternative performing ensembles proposed by the composer; the accompanist would adapt his part to the ensemble. It is unlikely that the sonatas would have been played by solo keyboard. The specific citation of instrumentation here is a sign of the growing independence of instrumental from keyboard and vocal music, and the use of open score for accompaniment in order to fill in parts as necessary. 382

381 Sartori 1635c (who noted the format); Newman, Sonata, p. 118.

382 I was unable to examine this work first-hand; from Sartori's description it appears that the accompaniment of instrumental works was intended to be quite different from vocal works, none of which were given in open score. The significance of this remains to be explored.
FRESCOBALDI 1635

Girolamo Frescobaldi, Fiori musicali di diverse compositioni toccate, kirie, canzoni, capricci e recercari in partitura a quattro utili per sonatori ... opera duodecima (Venice: Alessandro Vincenti, 1635). 383

Format: open score (3 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 2 unn. fols. + 103 pp., three organ Masses (made up of toccatas, versets, canzonas, and ricercars), 1 Bergamasca, 1 Capriccio.

This is the last complete keyboard volume Frescobaldi published and the only one primarily intended for liturgical use. Frescobaldi discussed the usefulness of open score for keyboard performance in the introduction:

Essendo stato sempre desideroso (per quel talento che me è da Dio conceduto) di giocare con le mie fatiche alli studiosi di detta professione, sempre ho dimostrato al mondo con le mie Stampe, d'intavolatura, et in partitura di ogni sorta di capricci e d'inventioni dar segno del mio dessideroso [sic] affetto, acciò che ogniuno vedèdò, e studiando le mie opre ne restasse contento, & approfittatto [sic]. Con questo mio libro dirò solo che il mio principal fine è di giocare alli Organisti hauendo fatto tale compositione di tal stile di sonare, che potranno rispondere a Messe á Vespri, il che conoscendo esser a loro di molto profitto e potranno anco seruirsi a suo beneplacito di detti Versi, nelle Canzioni finire nelle sue Cadenze cosine Ricercari, quando paressero troppo lunghi, stimo di molta importanza à sonatori il praticare le partiture perchè non solo stimo, à chi hà desiderio affaticarsi in tal compositione ma necessario Essendo che tal materia quasi paragone distingue e fa conoscere il vero oro delle virtuose attionì dal Ignoranti altro non mi occorre solo che l'esperienza è dell tutto maestra: provi et esperimenti chi vuol in questa arte avanzarsi la Verità di quanto ho detto vedrà quanto eseguirà [sic] di profitto ... 384

Having always endeavoured (because of that talent God has granted me) to instruct with my works studious persons of the [musical] profession, I have continually tried, through my publications in intavolatura and open score [containing] all kinds of caprices and inventions, to give an indication to the world of my earnest

383 Sartori 1635a (+II); ed. Pidoux.
384 Sartori.
sentiments, so that everyone who sees and studies my work may be pleased by it and profit from it. With this book I will say only that my primary aim is to help organists, having completed certain compositions in such a style of playing as to make them suitable for responses at Mass or Vespers, and know them to be very profitable to performers. The Verses may be used as one pleases; in the Canzonas and ricercars the organist may finish at the cadences if the pieces appear too long. I consider it a matter of great importance for players to use open score; not only do I think it important, but necessary for those who wish to study such compositions, because this practice, like a touchstone, distinguishes and makes evident the true worth of the virtuoso from that of the ignorant; otherwise, I have said enough, except to add that experience is the master of all: experiment and try things out, you who wish to advance in this art. The truth of what I have said will be seen by the amount of profit that will follow. . . 385

This is Frescobaldi's clearest statement of his estimation of the value of open score. The volume is clearly didactic in design and format, as the tone of the introduction shows. The format is essential for proper study of the music, and for Frescobaldi, performing from open score was a true gauge of the abilities of an organist.

The versets given are all for Kyries; Frescobaldi said further below that they might be used elsewhere if one wished, but this is surely an undesirable alternative, since the plainchant to the Kyries is continually prominent.386 It is interesting that Frescobaldi cited Vespers here, since music specifically for Vespers was printed in 1627, and use of this volume for Vespers would be much more free.387

The volume consists of three organ Masses, quite different from others of the period, within which didactic elements may be seen. In several pieces an obligo is given, one of which is identical to one in

385 Pidoux, edn. p. [iii]; MacClintock, Readings, pp. 135-6 (with emendations). Hammond observed the 'chatty incoherence' of this preface (Frescobaldi, p. 86) and gave a more literal translation.

386 They could theoretically have been used at any place where versets were required, i.e. other items of the Mass or Vespers Ordinary; Bottazzi's complaints (BOTTAZI 1614) confirm that the 'wrong' versets were commonly performed in establishments with small resources.

387 See Bonta, 'Uses of the Sonata', p. 80.
the Capricci: the performer is to sing a fifth part. Frescobaldi quoted a Petrarch canzone for this obligo. At the conclusion of the Bergamasca is the didactic comment 'He who plays this Bergamasca will learn not a little (Chi questa Bergamasca sonerà non pocho imparerà)'. Moore showed that the liturgical plan of the volume is related to usage at St Mark's, suggesting that it was intended primarily for establishments with considerable musical resources at their disposal. But the didactic elements occurring throughout the volume indicate a broader intention, and correspondingly less rigour in liturgical performance. The three Masses are not internally consistent, suggesting freedom of liturgical usage.

388 'Intendomi chi può che m'intend'io (Understand me who can for I understand myself)'. Hammond, 'New Biographical Information', p. 26, who noted that the canzone appears in ANGLERIA 1622. Unlike the example in the Capricci, the performer is left to discover where to sing the obligo himself. The placement of ricercars in the Masses, if not didactic, is certainly intellectually based: see Kirkendale, 'Ciceronians', p. 41, for rhetorical parallels.

389 Moore, 'Liturgical Use', p. 369. His suggestion that the city of publication, Venice, was chosen by Frescobaldi because of specific liturgical use is possible but unlikely: see FRESCOBALDI 1624 and 1628(iii) for the theory that Frescobaldi preferred or was compelled to use the Venetian press for commercial reasons.

390 Bonta, 'Uses of the Sonata', pp. 72-80, Hammond, Frescobaldi, pp. 203-6, and Apel, Keyboard Music, p. 477 attempted to fit the three Masses into one mould too dogmatically, with differing results. The freedom Frescobaldi gave to the performer in numerous 'alio modo' sections confirms his more flexible approach to liturgical usage and makes it unnecessary to reconcile the three Masses to one 'ideal'. This would accord with the 'looser and perhaps more varied tradition' that Moore showed ('Liturgical Use', p. 370).
PESENTI 1635

Martino Pesenti, *Primo Libro delle correnti alla francese per sonar nel clavicembalo, et altri stromenti ... nuovamente ristampate con una agionta di alcune correnti et un baletto a tre* (Venice: Alessandro Vincenti, 1635). 391

Format: short score (6 x 5/5), open score (4 x 5/5/5).

Contents: 26 pp., 22 correnti, 3 with volte; 4 additional correnti (short score); 1 balletto (open score).

Appended to the concluding table of contents of Pesenti's first book of correnti is a short note to the player:

Non vi apporterà meraviglia ritrovare in alcune di queste mie Correnti, None, Settime, Semiquinte e simili dissonanze, poichè non accompagnandole con le parti di mezzo, e sonandole a battuta presta rendono vagezza, et affetto contrario alla natura loro. 392

Do not be surprised to find in some of these my correnti dissonances such as ninths, sevenths, diminished fifths, etc., since failing to accompany them with the inner parts and play them with a quick beat renders a beauty and affect contrary to their nature.

Despite the lack of figures in the volume, the player was to fill in the inner parts. Pesenti's work marks the trend away from the full intavolatura style common at the end of the previous century. He required the performer both to read open score and realize competently unfigured short score.

---

391 Sartori 1635d (+II). The original of this reprint (b. 1621) is lost.
392 Sartori.
Appendix A

FRESCOBALDI 1637(i)

Girolamo Frescobaldi, Toccate d'intavolatura di cimbalo et organo partite di civerse arie e corrente, balletti, ciaccone, passaghagli ... libro primo (Rome: Nicolò Borbone, 1637).\(^{393}\)

A reprint of FRESCOBALDI 1615-16 with an aggiunta of nine works.\(^{394}\) The emendation of the title to include organ (see FRESCOBALDI 1628(ii)) is retained.

FRESCOBALDI 1637(ii)

Girolamo Frescobaldi, Il secondo libro di toccate, canzone versi d'hinni magnificat gagliarde. correnti et altre partite d'intavolatura di cimbalo et organo (Rome: Nicolò Borbone, 1637).\(^{395}\)

This is a reprint of Toccate II (1627); although the title is unchanged, the printer and date are given on the title page of this print. The last four pages of the first edition are not included in this; those works were revised and included in the aggiunta of Toccate I.\(^{396}\) The preface to Toccate I is included here, despite its inappropriateness for the liturgical works. Sartori noted that only some of the extant copies include the preface, thus suggesting two print runs. The two 1637 volumes constitute Frescobaldi's 'summing up' in a

\(^{393}\) Sartori 1637f (+II).

\(^{394}\) Darbellay, 'L'énigme', p. 154 n4, noted that the aggiunta was initially intended for FRESCOBALDI 1637(ii), and was revised by Frescobaldi during the actual engraving of the volume.

\(^{395}\) Sartori 1637g (+II).

\(^{396}\) See Darbellay, 'Le Cento partite', for a discussion of the evolution of these works. See also note 394.
sense; he probably saw them as a collected edition of his most popular keyboard works.

[ROSSI before July 1638] [lost] reprint of ROSSI ?1634

BANCHIERI 1638 Fourth edition of BANCHIERI 1605

[DELLA PORTA before 1639] [lost]

Francesco Della Porta, Ricercate à 4 (Milan).

This volume almost certainly corresponds to the works copied into the Turin Tablatures, edited (and misattributed to Costanzo Porta) by Billeter. If so, it consisted of 5 ricercars and 5 canzonas without thematic interrelations.

Della Porta (c. 1600-1666) was a Milanese organist who published four volumes of sacred vocal music. Since these are numbered opp. 2-5, it is plausible to propose this volume as opus one. A terminus ante quem for its date of publication may be established by the date of the Turin manuscript.

---

397 The existence of this reprint is postulated in Silbiger, 'Michelangelo Rossi', p. 29.
398 Sartori 1638f (+II).
399 Ed. Billeter; Sartori before 1666, citing Picinelli, Ateneo, p. 219.
400 Mischiati, 'L'intavolatura tedesca', p. 63 n76.
402 Ibid.; see I: 221.
Appendix A

PESENTI 1639

Martino Pesenti, Correnti alla francese, gagliarde, e balletti da cantarsi à voce sola, e suonarsi nel clavicembalo, & altri instrumenti ... con un brando d’incerto dall’istesso sig. Pesenti diminuito in più modi. libro primo opera decima, raccolte d’Allessandro Vincenti (Venice: Vincenti, 1639). 403

Format: [short score].

Contents: 32 pp., 14 correnti, 3 ballettos, 3 galliards, 5 embellished branles.

Sartori indicated that this is a similar volume to Pesenti’s other works; the works (except the branles) are texted, and intended for dual-purpose use, to judge from the title. They could have been sung with accompaniment or played as solo keyboard works.

DEL BUONO 1641

Gioanpietro Del Buono, Canoni oblighi et sonate in varie maniere sopra L’ave Maris Stella ... a tre, quattro, cinque, sei, sette, et otto voci, e le sonate a quattro (Palermo: Ant. Martarello & Santo d’Angelo, 1641). 404

Format (sonatas): open score (3 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 72 fols., 84 canons, 14 sonatas for ‘cimbalo’.

Little is known of Del Buono beyond this, his only extant work. 405

It is didactic, manipulating a single theme in myriad ways. The

403 Sartori 1639a.
404 Sartori 1641a.
405 Described in Newman, ‘Del Buono’. 
fourteen sonatas are specified for 'cimbalo', despite their sacred orientation; the format is normal for keyboard study-works. Apel noted links (including open score format) with earlier south-Italian keyboard works that these well-crafted pieces evince.  

**PESENTI 1641**

Martino Pesenti, *Correnti alla francese, balletti, gagiarde, pass'è mezi a due, et a tre da suonarsi nel clavicembalo, et altri instrumenti ... libro terzo opera duodecima* (Venice: Allessandro Vincenti, 1641).  

Format: short score, 3-part open score.  
Contents: 26 pp., 9 dances (short score), 8 dances (open score).

This volume continues the trend set in Pesenti’s two earlier volumes of correnti, although in the table of contents are found the indications ‘à 2’ and ‘à 3’, not seen earlier. Filling in the inner voices may therefore not be necessary in these works.

**SALVATORE 1641**

Giovanni Salvatore, *Ricercari a quattro voci canzoni francesi, toccate, et versi per rispondere nelle Messe con l’organo al choro ... libro primo* (Naples: Ottavio Beltrano, 1641).  

Format: open score (3 x 5/5/5/5).  
Contents: 121 pp., 8 ricercars, 4 canzonas, 2 toccatas, 3 organ Masses.

---

407 Sartori II:1641h.  
408 Sartori 1641c; ed. Hudson.
This is Salvatore's only printed volume. Its intended use is multiple: the works may all be played at the keyboard and used liturgically, and two canzonas (the second and third) appear with a note that they may also be performed with a consort of viols ('può sonarsi con il Concerto di Viole'), recalling TRABACI 1615. Specifying only two canzonas (although it would have been possible to play much of the music with instruments) is a sign of the growing specialization of instrumental and keyboard music. Embellishments and idiomatic keyboard writing appear throughout the volume, thus making it most suited to that instrument. The volume is consistent within the Neapolitan tradition, excepting the organ Masses, which are not found in earlier Neapolitan keyboard music publications. Their form follows the north Italian models of Merulo, Banchieri, Bottazzi, etc.

CROCI 1642

Antonio Croci, Frutti musicali di messe tre ecclesiastiche per rispondere alternatamente al choro, tra quale ci n'é una per quelli che non arriuano all'ottaua, con cinque canzoni, & un ricercaro [sic] cromatico composto nel istesso modo, con tre altri ricercari pur cromatici reali ... opera quarta (Venice: Allessandro Vincenti, 1642). 410

Format: intavolatura (2 x 5/8).

Contents: 98 pp., 5 canzonas, 5 ricercars, 3 organ Masses.

409 Apel, Keyboard Music, pp. 489-90.
410 Sartori 1642b (+II). The volume is occasionally dated 1641 in secondary literature, for unknown reasons (Apel, Keyboard Music, p. 493; Hammond, Frescobaldi, p. 204).
Apel noted the simple character of the works in this volume; Croci, a Minorite, was primarily filling a didactic need with this music, as he showed in the preface:

Mi son risoluto alla fine sodisfare all’animo di chi mi può comandare col dar in luce le presente mie Compositioni fate in diversi tempi, & in diverse occasioni, e spero, si come hanno giouate [sic] à quelli à quelli hò insignato l’istesso faranno à chi le studiara e ciò sarà non solo per benefitio della mia Religione, mà uniouersalmète à tutti quelli, i quali vorano esser professori d’octetà [sic] virtù; giouara grandemente per facilitare le Compositioni del Molto Illustre Signor Gerolamo Frescobaldi tanto eccelète in questa professione, e si potranno servire ancho deli Kyrie, & altri Versetti à suo beneplacito secondo l’occorenze. Hò voluto far la Prima Messa per quelli, che non ariuono all’ottaua, accio queste mie compositioni possano giouare à tutti studiandole, ne vedranno l’utilità, che da queste ne cauarano. 412

I am resolved finally to satisfy the wishes of those who may command me, by publishing the present compositions which I composed at various times and for various occasions; and I hope, since they have been useful to those whom I have taught, the same will be true for those who study them. And thus they will be of benefit not only to those of my [religious order], but universally to all those who desire to be practicians of that skill. They will be of great use in preparing to play the works of the most illustrious Girolamo Frescobaldi, most excellent in this profession; they may also be used for the Kyrie and other versets according to their place and need. I wished to write the first Mass for those who cannot reach the span of an octave, in order that these my works can be useful to all; and by studying them, they will see the usefulness which will be gained from them. 413

Croci showed an intimate connection with his order, the authorities of which apparently urged him to publish his works. The style of music reflects its didactic nature. Hammond noted Croci’s suggestion that these works might prepare one for Frescobaldi; this should be seen in the context of the entire preface, since Croci continually emphasized the pedagogical nature of the works. He even composed pieces for

412 Sartori.
413 Monroe, 'Italian Keyboard Music', II:20 (with emendations).
414 Frescobaldi, p. 95.
children who could not reach an octave; in addition to the first Mass, two canzonas have the same rubric.

The format, intavolatura, had not been employed for sixteen years (since the 1625 reprint of DIRUTA 1593), and even here a full four-part texture is not used throughout. This is a sign of the fall from use of typeset intavolatura, abandoned after this volume. The title is a clear allusion to FRESCOBALDI 1635, published by the same house seven years earlier. But the similarities of the two volumes are few, and Croci’s is aimed for less skilled users than Frescobaldi’s.

FRESCOBALDI 1642 reprint of FRESCOBALDI 1626

PESENTI 1644 reprint of PESENTI 1630

---

415 I was unable to examine the original and have relied on Monroe’s two transcriptions, ‘La Galantina’ and ‘La Gata Melata’ (‘Italian Keyboard Music’, II:25-31). Two-part writing makes up much of the two pieces, suggesting a short score to be filled out in performance.


417 Venice: Alessandro Vincenti; Sartori 1642h (+II), without dedication.

418 Venice: Alessandro Vincenti; Sartori II:1644h.
FASOLO 1645

Giovanbattista Fasolo, *Annuaie che contiene tutto quello che deue far un organista, per rispondere al choro tutto l'anno... opera ottava* (Venice: Allessandro Vincenti, 1645). 419

Format: open score (3 x 5\(\times\)5/5/5).

Contents: 264 pp., 1 Te Deum, 19 hymns, 3 organ Masses, 8 Magnificats, *Salve Regina*, 8 ricercars, 8 canzonas, 4 fugues.

This large collection of works for the liturgical year has a preface important for documenting liturgical use of the organ. 420 Its format attests to the continued use of open score for keyboard, although there were to be few more published in Venice in the century. The volume is related to FRESCOBALDI 1635 by publisher and basic contents, although Fasolo's work is larger and, it would appear, more broadly aimed. The last four 'fughe' are based on themes also used by Frescobaldi: Bergamasca, Girolmetta, Bassa Fiamenga, and Ut re mi fa sol

Yet unlike Frescobaldi's publication designed and ordered for liturgical use, Fasolo's is more comprehensive and related to Neapolitan style, with different genres grouped together. Fasolo in fact worked in southern Italy for much of his life, and the volume reflects southern influence despite having been printed in Venice. The preface is rather disorganized, but its comments on performance practice nevertheless reflect the importance such directions had acquired since since

---

419 Sartori 1645d (+II); ed. Walter.


421 Hammond, Frescobaldi, p. 87.
FRESCOBALDI 1615(i). At no point did he discuss the use of open score, which appears to have been taken for granted as the proper format for organists.422

Fasolo also provided comments regarding performance practice regularly throughout the work. There are frequent tempo markings, and occasional registration suggestions. For one hymn (Ave maris stella), he presented 'other verses, easier and more up-to-date (altri versi più facili, e più moderni)'; they are indeed simpler, and use \( C \) mensuration and semibreve bars rather than \( C \) and breve bars. The Pange lingua setting includes two verses 'più moderni' with the same mensuration alterations. For Veni creator spiritus, he provided two sets, the first in older style and transposed Tone 8 (two sharps, D final), the second in the more modern mensuration, transposed down a tone (one flat, F final), with the following note:

\[
\text{Li seguenti versi sono più allegri le' hò trasportati una Seconda di sotto alla natura del Tono per facilitarli, che il diesis è troppo scabroso sotto il tempo maggior perfetto e imperfecto, chi haurà prattica, e velocità di mano le potrà ridurre alla quarta bassa. 423}
\]

The following verses are more cheerful; I have transposed them a whole tone lower than the natural of the Tone [i.e. from G to F] to make them easier, since the sharps are too awkward [to play] with tempus major perfect and imperfect. He who is experienced and has quickness of hand can adapt them a fourth lower [i.e., as the first set of verses].

This comment on the technical difficulty of a specific transposition is unique in the literature, and indicates Fasolo's concern for manual facility in his works.

422 Notwithstanding, Bonta ('Uses of the Sonata, p. 55) cited a copy with MS figured-bass additions indicating its use for accompaniment of instrumental ensemble.

He several times commented on the 'enjoyment' of the suspensions and dissonances in 'durrezze and ligature' pieces. The fughe are not capriccio-like, but carefully wrought polyphony; Fasolo called his settings of the melodies obblighi. In the Girometta, the second (final) section bears the heading Fuga d'inganno, a clear reference to Trabaci's technique and a sign of the 'learned' style of the fughi.

FRESCOBALDI 1645


Although Hammond relegated these works to an appendix as mere attributions, he showed convincingly that they are authentic. Harper dated them on stylistic grounds and classed them into three groups ranging from c. 1615 to c. 1627. This volume is the last extant non-liturgical (strictly speaking) work in four-part open score to be issued by Venetian presses in the seventeenth century; a sign of shifting trends in printing as well as in keyboard playing.

E.g. 'this is to be played very slowly so that the ligatures may be enjoyed (Si suonerà assai largo accio si godano meglio le ligature)'; ibid., I:66 (Missa in duplicibus diebus, Elevatio). See also ibid., I:36, 52.

Ibid., II:89. The inganno appears in the countersubject, bars 5 and 13.

Sartori 1645a (+II); ed. Pidoux.

Frescobaldi, pp. 253-5.

Instrumental Canzonas’, pp. 57-62.
PESENTI 1645

Martino Pesenti, Correnti gagliarde, e balletti diatonici, trasportati parte cromatici, e parte henarmonici, con un balletto a tre, passi, e mezi a due, & à tre, per sonarsi nel clavicembalo, & altri stromenti ... libro quarto. Opera decima quinta. Raccolte d'Allessandro Vincenti (Venice: Allessandro Vincenti, 1645). 429

Format: [short score, 3-part open score]. 430

Contents: 75 pp., 33 dances (short score), 4 dances (open score).

Pesenti's last book of correnti experiments with 'chromatic' and 'enharmonic' transposition; Apel noted that the music is 'rather insignificant'. 431 The transposition distinctions are specious; the former term is used for flat keys and the latter for sharp. Apel also noted that the transposition notation is different from that of CIMA 1606, and corresponds more closely to modern notation (logically enough; Pesenti was using instruments with more than 12 notes per octave, 432 whereas Cima relied on retuning a 'normal' instrument). The purpose of the transpositions seems to be purely speculative: Pesenti said 'I composed the correnti, galliards and balletti, set them in the Diatonic [genus], and transposed them in part to the Chromatic, in part to the Enharmonic [genus], so that everyone might see all three genera (Ho composto le Correnti, Gagliarde, e Balletti, & le ho fatte Diatonichie

429 Sartori 1645b.

430 Deduced from the title-page.


432 But Apel’s reading of the preface (ibid.) is incorrect, and therefore gives a false count of the keys of the 'enharmonic' instruments: the Vido 1601 instrument has 21 keys per octave, not 28; the Pesaro 1548 has 17, not 24. Pesenti does, however, quote Zarlino as claiming the existence of an instrument with four divisions for each of the seven tones A–G, i.e. 28 notes per octave.
trasportate parte Cromatiche, e parte Henarmoniche acciò ogn'uno possi vedere tutti tre li generi)'. There is no mention of accompaniment or other purpose for the transpositions.

Apel observed the unusual circumstances surrounding such careful considerations of chromatic notations coming from a blind man who could presumably not see the distinctions. In addition, Pesenti’s final note of the preface is striking:

Hà posto il Zerlino questo segno dell’Henarmonico. [x] Et io invece dell’Henarmonico ho posto il ordinario, perché li Stampatori non si ritrouano hauere il detto segno.

Zarlino used the following sign for enharmonic [notes]: [x] [i.e. a sign resembling a modern double-sharp]. I, however, have used the ordinary [sharp sign], because the printers did not have the other one.

Apart from Pesenti pointing up the lack of ability on the printer’s part to meet his needs (although the sign could hardly have been too challenging for the printer to make), Pesenti seems to reveal his intimate awareness of a visual sign. Perhaps his blindness was not total.434

[ECCHINO before 1649] [lost]

Tommaso Cecchino, Note musicali per risponder con facilità e al choro per tutte le feste dell’anno con due sonate anco per il violino ([?Venice: Alessandro Vincenti]).

This volume (Sartori before 1649b) is listed in Vincenti’s 1649 catalogue (Mischiati, Indici, IX:632). It may be deduced from the price of the volume compared to similar works that the volume was more modest in scope: BOTLAdZI 1614 is priced at 12 Lire, BANCHIERI 1605 6 Lire,

---

433 Sartori.

434 Cf. VALENTE 1576, another product of a ‘blind’ man.
Appendix A

CROCI 1642 5 Lire, FASOLO 1645 16 Lire, whereas the price of this volume is 3 Lire 10 soldi.

[GIOVANNI 1650 or 1652] [lost]


Format: engraved intavolatura.

Contents: as title.

Evidence for this volume exists only in a manuscript copy of its title page and preface (see Sartori); Hogwood considered the preface, similar in many respects to that of FRESCOBALDI 1615(i). 436 It appears to be the first copper-engraved music print to have been published outside of Rome (the preface to GIOVANNI 1652 mentions 'il primo mio Libro di Toccate intauolate, è stampato in rame nell'anno 1652'; hence also the question of date for this volume).

The preface includes several noteworthy points. It begins with the common disclaimer that the volume was prepared at the behest of friends, but continues by expressing concern for its reception:

In questo Libre ho cercato quanto più ho potuto d'agiusarmi al particolare et all'universale insieme, col facile, e difficile, per Corrispondere alla diversità dei genii, mà non sò però Se in ciò haurò fortuna, il che stimai cosa difficile, et ardua al possibile. 437

In this book I have tried, so far as I was able, to adapt myself to the specific and general at the same time, with ease and difficulty

435 Sartori 1650d (+II).
436 'Frescobaldi'.
437 Sartori.
corresponding to the variety of genres; but I do not know, however, if I will be successful in this respect, which I would judge to be something difficult, indeed as hard as could be.

In the preface to his second volume, Giovanni noted that this volume had met with some success: 'il has] already been dispersed in Italy, where it has met with quite a good reception (già sparso per l’Italia, parmi habbi incontratata [sic] assai buona fortuna)'. His concerns expressed here appear to have been without foundation. Giovanni 'did not try to compose unplayable extravagances (non mi sono curato di fare stravaganze insonabili)' in the capriccios of this volume.\footnote{Apel, Keyboard Music, p. 681.} Considering that overtones of Frescobaldi abound in the preface, this may imply that Giovanni found Frescobaldi’s capriccios rather difficult.

\footnote{Sartori 1652a.}
Alberto del Vivaio, a Florentine mathematician and musician who urged publication of this work:

... Non lasciaro di dire, che dilettandosi il Sudetto Sig.r Alberto de Vivaio d'instruire per suo diporto certi fanciulli di poca età, colla pratica dell'intauolatura li rende miracolosi al Mondo. suonando molti di essi qualsiuoglia Suonata per dificile ch'ella sia anche all'improviso, ond'io godo Ccome [sic] facea la bona memoria de Sig.r Girolamo Frescobaldi, in servire questo signore di mie opere manuscritte ad utilita di quei fanciulli, à fine, che si uadino approfittando cotidianamente col gusto della professione, incaminandosi nel medesimo tempo allo studio della musica, a Contrapunto fondamento, e strada di uera perfettione, ... 440

I should not fail to mention that the above-mentioned Signor Alberto de Vivaio delights in instructing certain children of tender age, as an amusement, in the practice of intavolatura; he renders them miraculously, many of them playing any sonata, no matter the difficulty, even at the spur of the moment; wherefore I rejoice, similar to the memory of Signor Girolamo Frescobaldi, in serving [Vivaio] with my manuscript works for the use of those children, to the end that they might progress, profiting daily with the taste of the profession, setting out at the same time on the course of the study of music, the fundamentals of counterpoint, and the road to true perfection ...

The work was intended for pedagogical use, at least in part. The lack of liturgical pieces and the use of open score support this hypothesis. The use of the word intavolatura here is not unambiguously indicative of a two-stave system; in a generic sense it could refer to any keyboard notation, including open score (as it is used in Vincenti’s 1649 catalogue; see Mischiati, Indici, p. 182). But considering the lack of reference to printed keyboard sonatas in the 17th century, manuscript works must have constituted a significant portion of Viviao’s repertoire.

The resemblance of this preface to VALENTE 1576 is noteworthy; this time, however, it is not the notation itself, but Vivaio’s instruction that works miracles with pupils, using the volumes of Frescobaldi and Giovanni. Performing written music ‘all’improviso’ (sightreading) is a

440 Ibid.
prime feature of instruction. The notation itself, open score, is also significant: it is the last volume in that notation intended for keyboard players that Vincenti printed.

ROSSI 1657 reprint of ROSSI ?1634

ROSSI 1658 or later reprint of ROSSI ?1634

CAZZATI 1662

Maurizio Cazzati, Partitura di Correnti, e Balletti per sonare nella Spinetta, Leuto, ó Tiorba: Ouero Violino, e Violone ... opera XXX (Bologna: Antonio Pisarri, 1662).

Format: short score (4 x 5/5).

Contents: 31 pp., 12 ballettos, 2 branles, 12 correnti, 1 'aria ouero balletto'.

Alvini noted the suitability of this work for keyboard, and drew parallels between it and PESENTI 1635, PESENTI 1645, and STROZZI 1687. It is different in this respect from his other books of dances (Sartori II:1654a, II:1651d, II:1659b, 1667b), which are clearly intended primarily for instrumental ensemble performance.

---

441 Rome: Carlo Ricarii; Sartori 1657a.

442 Rome: a spese di Giovanni Battista Caifabri; Sartori before 1657. Silbigier has demonstrated that the volume is a later reprint than ROSSI 1657, and convincingly argues for a date after 1663 ('Michelangelo Rossi', p. 23).

443 Sartori 1662.

444 Preface to repr., unn. p. 2.
Bernardo Storace, Selva di varie compositioni d’intavolatura per cimbalo ed organo ove si contengono capricci, e partite sopra diverse arie toccate, canzoni, e recercari correnti, gagliarde, balletti, ciaconne passagagli sopra varij toni e nel fine una pastorale (Venice: n.p., 1664). 445

Format: engraved intavolatura (5 x 6/8).

Contents: 101 pp., 23 dances or dance sets, 2 toccata–canzona pairs, 2 ricercars, 1 pastorale.

Nothing is known of Storace beyond this volume. He named himself vice-maestro di cappella of the Senate of Messina on the title page, and the contents of the large collection have Neapolitan characteristics. The Roman practice of engraved intavolatura makes its first appearance in keyboard music published in Venice with this volume. Although significant as one of the few keyboard sources printed in Venice in the latter half of the century, it offers no further evidence regarding its usage.

Francesco Antonio Mamiliano Pistocchi, Capricci puerili variamente composti, e passeggiati in 40. modi sopra un basso d’un balletto ... per suonarsi nel clavicembalo, arpa, violino, & altri stromenti ... opera prima (Bologna: Giacomo Monti, 1667). 446

Format: short score.

Contents: 32 pp., 40 variations on balletto.

445 Sartori 1664b; ed. Hudson.
446 Sartori 1667c.
This volume was composed by an eight-year-old prodigy elected to the Accademia filarmonico in 1667. The title suggests various means of performance for the volume, printed as a novelty; Pistocchi’s father had a hand in it, as the concluding note to the reader explains. Publication of the work in an age with so few serious keyboard volumes is a sign of the decline of keyboard music-printing altogether.

BATTIFERRI 1669

Luigi Battiferri, Ricercari a quattro, a cinque, e a sei, con 1 2 3 4 5 6 soggetti sonabili ... opera terza (Bologna: Giacomo Monti, 1669). 447

Format: open score (3 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 39 pp., 12 ricercars: 10 à 4, 1 à 5, 1 à 6.

Battiferri (c. 1600/1620-after 1669) published this collection of old-style ricercars with the knowledge that the genre was no longer common. The volume was printed in Bologna, fast overtaking Venice as the principal music-publishing centre of northern Italy. In the lengthy introduction, Battiferri nostalgically recalled the Ferrara of former times and made several comments important to this study: 448

Ancorche non sia espressa mia professione il suonare d'Organo, e di Cimbalo, dilettandomi tanto, che basti à sodisfar me stesso, feci tre anni sono nella mia Patria questi Ricercari, più per fuggir l'otio, che per altro fine. E perché molt'anni sono in questa Illustrissima Città di Ferrara fui onorato due volte della Carica di Mastro di Cappella dell'Accademia della Morte, e per la terza volta vengo ricondotto in questa dello Spirito Santo; e per essere informatissimo dell'I Soggetti Insigni, partoriti dalle sudette Accademie singolari nel genere di suonare, come furono li Signori Organisti Ferraresi, Luzasco Luzaschi, Milliuille Milleuilli,

447 Sartori 1669h (+II); ed. Butler. I was unable to consult M. Tozzi's Ricerche su L. Battiferri vita e opere (Bologna: Forni, 1980).

448 Cavicchi, 'Appunti’, signaled the importance of this preface, but did not consider the issues of performance practice it raises.
Ercole Pasquini, and for the last time the celebrated Girolamo Frescobaldi, Mostro degli Organisti, inventor of all styles of playing, and my master, have moved for extraordinary reasons to bring these ricercars to print, having observed that this form is almost extinct, with the death of those subjects, and in order to further arouse and inspire others to make known the excellence of the above-named composers, as was well known. 449

Although I should not claim that the profession of playing the organ and harpsichord is my own, it delights me greatly, so that quite sufficiently for my own purposes, I composed these ricercars three years ago in my homeland [Urbino], more to avoid laziness than for any other reason. And since many years ago in this illustrious city of Ferrara I was twice honoured with the charge of Maestro di Capella of the Accademia della Morte, and now for a third term I return to that of the Holy Spirit; and in order for the reader to be fully informed of the remarkable subjects, 450 born of the above-named academies and exceptional in the field of performance as were the Ferrarese organists Signori Luzzaschi, [Alessandro?] Milleville, Ercole Pasquini, and lastly the most celebrated Girolamo Frescobaldi, the greatest of organists, inventor of all styles of playing, and my master; I have brought myself, by the extraordinary entreaties of friends and virtuosos, to bring to print the ricercars here appended, having well observed that this form is almost extinct, with the death of those subjects, and in order further to arouse and inspire others to make [the above-named composers’] excellence known to the

449 Sartori.

450 A play on words: his ricercars are based on ‘soggetti’, as were many of those by the Ferrarese ‘subjects’ he names.
world, knowing very well that talents of great worth are not lacking (whom I highly revere) who are able to produce work more worthy and valuable than this of mine. So have sympathy (kind reader) if it is not of that perfection that would be desired, since, as I said, it is not my profession. Remember that death comes when we least expect it, and sometimes with your labours left undone, he who was never a scholar becomes a maestro in an instant.

The above-named composers made a practice of playing the four parts, but today, from certain [players], scarcely is heard a real entrance by the second part, much less the third or fourth. Nor did they consider themselves worthy for [merely] playing a simple basso continuo, which many now do; nor did that which they played in the space of an hour serve them for years; but they immortalized themselves (in addition to their extremely quick, delicate, and well-regulated hand) by playing works for study, with excellent counterpoint of perfect imitations, always varying, in responding punctually to the cantus firmus. And especially, they attended to playing ricercars, that being the most learned type of playing, analogous in the field of composition to sacred [music]. Nor respond by saying that nowadays it is done a certain way, this being a response of weak intelligence, while we see that in the order of things, the science has come before. And if you should profit from these two styles [the old and the new], <451> you too may yet become immortal. 452

The preface is quite self-deprecating, Battiferri several times excusing his works for their presumption and lack of quality. This appears to be conventional in most respects. It is unusual, however, that he immediately proclaimed that he was not a keyboard player (the parallels with ANTEGNATI 1608 are clear). One may conclude that the art of which he is a proponent has fallen on hard times indeed—at least that he felt so, strongly enough to publish his ricercars despite his self-proclaimed lack of talent compared with others of his day. He composed the works to 'avoid idleness', an understated indication that serious thought and care went into them. He quite clearly saw the

451 Cavicchi, 'Appunti', p. 106, interpreted the two styles to be ricercars and sacred polyphony; these would seem to be one style, not two, and thus render this awkward passage even more obscure. The two styles most logically would be the older 'science' and the 'way things are done nowadays'.

Ferrara school of ricercars to be the most artful and noteworthy, and no doubt had manuscript works to which he could refer. It is noteworthy that of the four organists named by Battiferri, only Frescobaldi published keyboard music in an 'orthodox' keyboard format. The art of playing ricercars was nearly extinct at the time he was writing, and earlier ricercar volumes were apparently neglected (it had been twenty-seven years since the most recent reprint of Frescobaldi's ricercars).

One of the primary aims of the volume was to remind musicians of the work of the old masters. Battiferri modestly acknowledged his insufficient skill compared with others of his day, and that he was an inadequate replacement of the 'immortal' ones who came before. This is somewhat overstated, considering the important points which follow.

Some modern players could not play imitative works at all, apparently. The rebukes are sharp for those who allow a meagre amount of musical material to serve them for years. Basso continuo played a large part of organists' practice, and obviously reflected the increase of instrumental music used in the liturgy. Battiferri's biases towards the learned style led him to condemn this, perhaps without fully acknowledging the rise in popularity of a variety of instrumental works.

---

453 This point which Battiferri recognized so well has only recently come to be considered by modern scholarship, with the recovery of Ferrarese works by Luzzaschi and Macque. See Newcomb, 'Stile antico' (I am grateful to Professor Newcomb for providing me with a typescript of his paper).

454 Luzzaschi published three books of ricercars [lost; book II extant in MS form] which appear to have been printed in partbooks, along with a few keyboard works in anthologies. The Milleville family of musicians was active in Ferrara and it is uncertain to which member Battiferri refers; Both Alessandro (?1521-1589) and Francesco (?1569-after 1639) were organists and composers, neither of whom is known to have published any organ music. Ercole Pasquini (?-before 1620) is not known to have published any keyboard music, but thirty compositions (ed. Shindle) are extant in MSS. (Strainchamps, 'Luzzaschi', Newcomb, 'Milleville', Shindle, 'Pasquini', The New Grove, 11:378-82, 12:323-4, 14:266-7).
in church (the shift in taste was not entirely due to inadequate organists). In discussing the most important facets of playing the organ, fantasia was not cited. Although playing alternatim versets was listed as a quality of organists (with the implication that they were improvised), playing ricercars, not fantasia, was the goal Battiferri stressed. The old-style ricercars were important, an intellectual and musical challenge equal to the best vocal music (and a part of a musician's proper upbringing, Battiferri implied). But the art of playing them by 'improvising' fantasia without music is unacknowledged, and was apparently lost to him.

He recognized two styles, and as a pupil of Frescobaldi he could hardly fail to note the differences between ricercars and toccatas, or put another way, open scores and intavolaturas. But 'the science comes first'; he stressed a pedagogical and musical hierarchy that accounted for more than simply the modern style of playing. Both ways were important. Although he may be seen as a dated arch-conservative, Battiferri also represents the first wave of new regard of the old learned style. Apel noted that the volume was 'much appreciated', and was modelled on FRESCOBALDI 1608, since it groups the ricercars in four groups of three (on one, two, and three subjects, with the last group consisting of one each à 4 on four subjects, à 5 on five subjects, and à 6 with six subjects). They were copied by Fux and Zelenka, and Bach may have known them. This may be regarded as the first volume which recognizes the existence and importance of the stile antico ricercar,

455 Cavicchi, 'Appunti', p. 106, noted that the final exhortation of the preface is 'derivata da un motto di matrice frescobaldiana'.

456 *Keyboard Music*, p. 689. Battiferri may thus be one of few 17th-century musicians to refer to FRESCOBALDI 1608.

which was to have continuing importance throughout the 18th and 19th centuries.458

PENNA 1672

Lorenzo Penna, Li primi albori musicali, per li principianti della musica figurata; distinti in tre libri. Dal primo spuntano li principj del canto figurato; dal secondo spiccano le regole del contrapunto; dal terzo appariscono li fondamenti per suonare l'organo, à clavicembalo sopra la parte (Bologna: Giacomo Monti, 1672).459

Format (music examples): open score.

Contents: theoretical treatise in three books, as title.

As Arnold observed, this work is of primary importance for the study of basso continuo. Two quotations shed light on the tuition of keyboard players:

... e chi non sà, che il Contrapunto è la Teorica della Musica, & il suonare l'Organo su la Parte, è la Prattica de essa? Dunque prima di questa è necessario, se bene non simpliciter, non di meno secundum quid l'apprender quella. 460

... And who does not know that counterpoint is the theory of music, and playing the organ on the [bass] is its practice? Therefore before this [learning the art of figured bass] it is necessary to learn [counterpoint], if not at first hand, at least by secondary sources.

This is taken from the introduction to the instructions for playing basso continuo and indicates the division of theory and practice held by Penna. Theory and counterpoint are equated; ricercars and other

458 See Fellerer, 'Italienischen Orgelmusik', pp. 81-3, and Riedel, 'Influence', p. 222 (and n38) for assessment of stile antico keyboard music in the 18th century.

459 Repr. 1679, 1684, 1690, 1696; Arnold, Thorough-bass, pp. 133-54; RISM Ecrits, II:642.

460 Book III, p. 5.
keyboard works are therefore held to be theoretical in nature, and useful for learning the rudiments of playing, as is made clear further below:

... Ne meno deuo qui insegnare, come habbi da regolarsi il studioso di questa Professione, in risponder al Choro nelle Messe, Vespri, Complete, & altre cose di Canto fermo, perche essendo in stampa tanti belli Ricercari, Toccate, Canzoni, Capricci &c. di Valenthuomini, come di vn Vrbino da Bologna, d'vn Luzasco Luzzaschi, di vn Claudio Merolo, di vn Girolamo Frescobaldi, & Altri, non deuo esser proseco; dunque rimetto li Principianti, à veder li predetti Auttori, & in particolare Girolamo Frescobaldi, che fù il Mostro de suoi tempi in questa professione; oltre che con la cognizione del secondo libro potrà il Scolare formare da se: Versetti, Toccate, Canzoni, &c. 461

... Neither can I teach here how one normally studies this profession [playing the organ], in responding to the choir in Masses, Vespers, Compline, and other services with cantus firmus, because there being in print many fine ricercars, toccatas, canzonas, capricci, etc., by worthy men, such as [Girolamo Cavazzoni], Luzzasco Luzzaschi, Claudio Merulo, Girolamo Frescobaldi, and others, I need not waste words. Thus I refer beginners to the preceding authors, and in particular to Girolamo Frescobaldi, who was the greatest of his time in this art; and added to the understanding of the second book [on counterpoint], the student will be able to form versets, toccatas, etc., for himself.

For non-accompanimental keyboard playing, Penna surprisingly recommended music from nearly one hundred and forty years earlier as an aid to students; but only keyboard music, not vocal. The 16th-century keyboard tradition based on vocal techniques had evolved into an independent set of works for Penna. He thus aligned himself within a continuum beginning with one of the earliest printed keyboard sources. The goal of fantasia is still present, for Penna’s aim was to combine study of the keyboard music with study of counterpoint in order to achieve the ability to form one’s own keyboard music. But the performance of fantasia was not Penna’s main purpose in writing this work, and he leaves off the discussion of solo keyboard playing after

461 Book III, p. 6.
this point. His comments nevertheless indicate the existence of an unwritten keyboard music tradition at the end of the 17th century.

The volume went through six printings between 1672 and 1696; Penna’s opinions thus may well have been prevalent for the last quarter of the century.

FONTANA 1677


Format: open score (3 x 5/5/5/5).

Contents: 1 unn. fol. + 48 pp., 12 ricercars.

This is the last book of keyboard ricercars to be printed in 17th-century Italy. The infrequency of such works was well-known to Fontana, as he noted in the preface:

Credei mia obligazione il mandare alla luce alcuni RICERCARI, su la speranza, che siano per riuscire gradeuoli non poco alli Studenti della medema Professione, si perché da mezo secolo scorso non v’ha nessuno in Roma, che ne habbia dati alla Stampe, come anche per hauerui impiegata ogni attentione nella loro tessitura. 463

I believe it is my obligation to publish several ricercars, with the hope that they may be not a little pleasing to the students of my profession, indeed since in the last half-century no one in Rome has published them, nor likewise given any notice to their texture.

Fontana, like Battiferrì, saw the importance of four-part imitative writing for students. In his dedication, he referred to the stile antico of his works, the first usage of that term to describe the style of imitative ricercar related to to 16th-century fantasia. Ricercars seem to have become study-pieces rather than performance-pieces.

462 Sartori 1677b (+II); ed. Doderer.
463 Sartori.
Cavicchi noted the almost boastful tone of the preface, perhaps a sign that Fontana thought ricercar playing was a lost art.

G. B. DEGLI ANTONII 1687(i)

Giovanni Battista Degli Antonii, Ricercate sopra il violoncello o clavicembalo ... opera prima (Bologna: Gioseffo Micheletti, 1687).

Format: figured bass.

Contents: 39 pp., 12 ricercate.

Degli Antonii was a Bolognese organist; these works have a wide aim reflecting pedagogical usage for cello or keyboard, but are more suited to cello. That such a dual purpose was conceived is an indication of the lesser attention given by organists to the more traditional style of ricercars.

G. B. DEGLI ANTONII 1687(ii)

Giovanni Battista Degli Antonii, Versetti per tutti li tuoni tanto naturali, come trasportati per l'organo ... opera seconda (Bologna: Giacomo Monti, 1687).

Format: short score.

Contents: 123 pp., versets on the eight tones, with transpositions of each tone: up a tone, and down a tone.

---

464 Cavicchi, 'Appunti', p. 106.
465 Sartori 1687a.
466 La Monaco, 'Degli Antonii', The New Grove, 5:523.
467 Sartori 1687f (+II).
This collection of organ versets uses a new type of notation which adds figures to both upper and lower parts of a short score in order to realize a full texture and also indicate which hand plays which parts of the chord. 468 Degli Antonii explained this in the preface:

Eccovi ò cari Lettori, che m'è sortito finalmente di compensare al vostro virtuoso genio, ed al mio viuò desiderio di seruirvi con questa nuoua intauolatura per rispondere al coro per la mano destra, e sinistra ambe distinte, e tutto hò indagato à fine, che vi si renda più ageuole il modo, toltoui dalla Stampa, che non può formar note, o sia figure una sopra l'altra; Et in caso d'hauer à sonar Versetti, far Toccate, o Caprizzi hò inuentati li numeri, nè quali si terrà quest'ordine . . . 469

Take this, 0 dear readers, since it has fallen to me finally to reward your virtuous spirit, and my ardent desire to serve you, with this new tablature for responding to the choir with right and left hands separated. I have tried to do all of this with the goal of making the way easier for you, since it has been obstructed by the press, which cannot make notes, or rather figures one above the other. And in cases of having to play versets, perform toccatas, or capriccios, I have invented the numerals which follow this order . . .

By 'right and left hands separated' Degli Antonii was referring to the intavolatura system wherein the notes to be played by each hand were typeset on either the upper or lower stave. In typeset form, intavolatura had fallen from use (CROCI 1642, DIRUTA 1625, and PICCHI 1621 were the last such volumes); open scores were more prevalent, and any intavolaturas that were issued (although there were none since STORACE 1664) had been expensive engraved volumes which did not contain alternatim music in any case. This was clearly not to Degli Antonii's liking; he merely said here that the printers could not manage the old system of full four-part texture in intavolatura style (the unquoted remainder of the preface shows that 'figures' refers to notes, not

468 See the example in Apel, Keyboard Music, p. 694. A similar (but not identical) system first appeared in STROZZI 1687, from where Degli Antonii may have had inspiration for his new notation. See below, note 473.

469 Sartori.
numerals). Technologically there should have been no difficulty, since it had been done long before; however, the cost of the technique must have been too much to merit printing intavolaturas. There is no implication that the new notation is in any way easier than intavolatura (although its ease compared to open score seems to be implied), and although it relies on figured-bass techniques it is certainly not a labour-saving shorthand in that sense. It is merely an outcome of the printing industry's unwillingness to print intavolatura in the old manner.

Degli Antonii's description of the notation would suffice for a practised musician, but it is somewhat vague. Perhaps realizing this, he recommended that the user ask a teacher or professional if unsure of the proper performance practice. The transposition of versets indicates that the volume is aimed towards those unable to transpose for themselves. They are for general-purpose use, to be played wherever a verset, toccata or capriccio may be required. There is no chant basis to the music. All these factors show that this collection was primarily prepared for beginners.

STROZZI 1687

Gregorio Strozzi, Capricci da sonare cembali, et organi ... opera quarta (Naples: Novello de Bonis, 1687). Format: open score (4 x 5/5/5/5), short score.

Contents: 119 pp., 29 pieces: 3 capriccios, 3 ricercars, 3 sonatas, 3 toccatas, 1 elevation toccata, 1 madrigal intabulation, Romanesca partite, 3 galliards, 8 correnti, Balletto, Aria, Toccata de Passagagli.

470 Sartori 1687h (+II); ed. Hudson.
The conservative nature of this volume has been noted by several scholars; Strozzi clearly followed the Neapolitan tradition in format as well as contents. Its appearance at the end of the century is anachronistic and the last of its line. The various specifications for other instruments may be noted: harp is specified for certain partite (edn. p. 97), once by itself and once in combination; the third galliard is also for a ‘concerto de viole’; and the seventh corrente is noted ‘e per Organetti o Flauti’. Such indications have precedents in earlier Neapolitan volumes as well. Indeed, highly embellished works such as these had not been printed in open score since FASOLO 1645.

Two types of format are used; most of the volume is in open score, but the dances are divided between open and short score. The first six are printed in open score with the following note appearing after the sixth:

In queste Gagliarde e Correnti descritte a quattro parti fuor de l’uso delle Intavolature, il Senatore potrà accomodar le mani alle posizioni comuni, che con l’osservar per lo più le parti del Basso e del Soprano, s’hauerà a sufficienza l’aria che si desidera.

In these galliards and correnti written in four parts now fallen out of use in intabulations, the player may set his hands in the usual position, and by observing for the most part the bass and soprano, one will have as much spaciousness as desired.

This confirms the lack of printed keyboard intavolatura in four parts at the close of the century (see DEGLI ANTONII 1687(ii)). Strozzi implied that he would have preferred to print the dances in a four-part intavolatura but was constrained to use open score because of printing problems. It seems odd that he felt obliged to explain how to read the score here, since the entire volume to this point was also in score. Perhaps the freedom (‘aria’) that performers had when playing from short

---

471 Hudson, ‘Strozzi’; Silbiger, Manuscript Sources, p. 188 n8; Apel, Keyboard Music, p. 688.
472 Edn. p. 112.
score was to be emulated with the dances, and Strozzi was demonstrating how to fill in a short score by giving an example. Apparently, performers were not expected to follow the inner parts exactly in these works, although they surely would have been in the non-dance pieces. For such dances, open score was virtually never used, and it had been common for a number of years to play from short score and/or a figured bass part (as Pesenti's volumes show).

This more usual performance practice is seen in the remainder of dances, printed in short score with figures supplied which apply to both left and right hands, similar to DEGLI ANTONII 1687(ii). Strozzi did not emphasize the technique's novelty, merely noting that the printed numbers stand for consonances to be played.

Strozzi continually gave performance directions in the volume: tempo and dynamic indications as well as terms like stretto, arpeggiando, etc. In the archaic setting of Ancidetemi pur, he gave the madrigal text with the keyboard part, unlike Trabaci, Mayone, and Frescobaldi. These concerns for performance practice show that Strozzi was not entirely an anachronism to his age.

---

473 Edn. pp. 113-22. The appearance of this notational technique in the works of two composers in the same year is a striking coincidence. Strozzi appears to have precedence over Degli Antonii, whose volume's preface is dated 23 December 1687 (Strozzi's is undated). Hudson, 'Notes on Strozzi', p. 219, erred in claiming this to be the only instance of a 'figured soprano'.

474 Ibid., p. 115.

475 Hudson's assessment that Strozzi 'failed . . . to keep abreast of the times' seems unduly harsh ('Notes on Strozzi', p. 221).
G. B. DEGLI ANTONII 1696

Giovanni Battista Degli Antonii, Versetti per tutti li tuoni ...

_opera settima_ (Bologna: Carlo Maria Fagnani, 1696). 476

_Format:_ short score.

Contents: 25 pp., 48 versets: 6 on each of the eight tones.

This volume is a successor to DEGLI ANTONII 1687(ii). The note to the reader again tells the users why the new notation is used: the printers could not manage four-part intavolatura.

_Nel servirsì de'presenti Versetti si osservino li numeri posti, e sopra, e sotto le Note; i quali vengono divisi per maggior chiarezza della Mano, a cui servono da una riga al altra: E questi si pongono, perché non si può dalle Stampe porre le note dell'accompagnamento alla Mano destra o sinistra, necessarie per la debita armonia._ 477

When using these versets one should observe the numbers above and below the notes, which are divided, for the sake of clarity, between the hands (which are divided onto two staves). This [notation] has been used because the printer was not able to print the notes of the inner parts for the left and right hands, [although] they are essential to the proper harmony.

G. B. DEGLI ANTONII 1697 reprint of G. B. DEGLI ANTONII 1696 478

ARRESTI ?1697


_Format:_ engraved intavolatura (5 x 5/8).

Contents: 2 unn. fols. + 21 pp., 18 sonatas.

---

476 Sartori 1696e.

477 Ibid.

478 Sartori 1697g.

This volume is an early collection of solo keyboard sonatas, the antithesis of stile antico keyboard music. Its format reflects the preferences of keyboard musicians at the time, and is a sign of renewed activity in keyboard music printing; no intavolaturas of any kind had been printed since STORACE 1664.

ARRESTI after 1701

Giulio Cesare Arresti, Partitura di modulationi precettive sopra gl’hinni del canto fermo gregoriano con le risposte intavolate in sette righe per l’organo. Opera giovevole per li studenti in tal professione ... opera VII (n.p.: n.p., n.d.).

Format: 3-part open score, engraved intavolatura (7/7).
Contents: 36 pp., verse settings of 9 hymns.

Sartori noted the payment made to Arresti’s heirs for the expense of this publication in 1701, but stylistically the works belong to the first half of the 17th century. Apel noted the unusual format of the volume: open score is employed on the verso side of each opening for the ‘modulationi precettive’, or instruction pieces, and engraved intavolatura appears on the recto, for ‘responding with the organ’. The volume is didactic, and the two formats present different verses, not parallel transcriptions, apparently meant to demonstrate how to compose hymns for both singing and playing.

480 Sartori p. 434, II:143. The lack of dedication to this volume, despite the statement of dedication on the title page, may be an indication that this exemplar is a reprint.

481 Apel, Keyboard Music, p. 691.
APPENDIX B

PARTBOOKS SUITABLE FOR USE AT THE KEYBOARD
INTRODUCTORY NOTE

This appendix lists Italian partbooks that contain music most suited to transcription and performance at the keyboard (see I:134 for a fuller discussion of the use of partbooks by keyboard players). Since this list is of secondary importance and reliant upon bibliographies in the secondary literature, bibliographical details are kept to a minimum. Reference to Brown and Sartori is made in the given dates, each of which is followed by a subscript number (for Brown) or letter (for Sartori) as appropriate. Works cited in the similar appendix in Ladewig, 'Frescobaldi's "Recercari"' (p. 296) are annotated '[L1]'. These volumes explicitly state in title or preface that keyboard performance was possible. Ladewig also provided a list (not complete in every respect) of partbook music copied into keyboard MSS (p. 298); references derived from this list are annotated [L2].

As stated at the outset of this thesis (I:3), partbooks were doubtless commonly used as source-material for keyboard music; this appendix includes only the most obviously adaptable music. Inclusion is based upon content (ricercars and canzonas were the most common genres shared by instrumental ensemble and keyboard), number of partbooks in the set (three- or four-part texture is the most suited to keyboard adaptation), inclusion of works in contemporary manuscripts or prints explicitly intended for the keyboard, or specific citations and

---

\[1\] Ladewig, 'Frescobaldi's "Recercari"', pp. 294-301.
quotations of the works' performance at the keyboard. A brief explanatory comment is given in each case.

Reprints are tabulated with the letter 'R' following their date and a cross-reference to the first printing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of ptbks</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arrivabene</td>
<td>1540</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 rics. 1 mot.</td>
<td>Title refers to use of organ; ricercars. [LL]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane</td>
<td>1543</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20 vocal 3 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars. The mixture of texted and untexted works indicates a general interchange: the ricercars may have been vocal studies; and the vocal works may have been played on the organ or instruments (Kämper, Studien, p. 123).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buus</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10 rics.</td>
<td>Title refers to use of organ; ricercars; composer was organist; three ricercars copied in keyboard MSS. &lt;2&gt; [LL] [L2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buus</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 rics.</td>
<td>Title refers to use of organ; ricercars; composer was organist. [LL]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiburtino</td>
<td>1549</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8 vocal 21 inst.</td>
<td>Title reference to fantasia, ricercars. Nos. 23-29 repr. in Gardane 1551.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15 rics. 2 vocal</td>
<td>Ricercars; copied in keyboard MS (Turin tablatures).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane</td>
<td>1551</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See 1543. [Date of repr. is ambiguous: 1 pb dated 1551, 2 dated 1552.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 Coimbra 48 (see I:63), Florence 107.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of ptbks</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Padovano</td>
<td>1556</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; composer was organist; copied into keyboard MS (Brussels 26661). &lt;3&gt; [L2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforti</td>
<td>1558</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane</td>
<td>1559</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23 wks.</td>
<td>Imitative works similar to ricercars or canzonas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruffo</td>
<td>1564</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ruffo</td>
<td>See 1551.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardane</td>
<td>1569</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16 madr.</td>
<td>First canzona 'da sonare' printed in partbooks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merulo</td>
<td>1574</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; composer was organist; copied into keyboard MS (Turin tablatures). &lt;4&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malvezzi</td>
<td>1577</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; composer was organist; copied into keyboard MS (Florence XIX.107). [L1] [L2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Luzzaschi b.1578]</td>
<td></td>
<td>rics.</td>
<td>Reference to bks 2 and 3 of ricercars imply the existence of bk 1; composer was organist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3Bottrigari, in Il desiderio, commented on Padovano’s ricercars:

Voi n’havete (aspettate) esempio da un gran valent’huomo, & famoso sonatore di Organo; il qual fu Annibale Padoano in una sua come dicono i pratici sonatori, fantasia stampata nel suo primo libro de Ricercari.

You have an example by an excellent man and famous organist, Annibale Padovano, in one of his ‘fantasias’, as the practical players say, printed in his first book of Ricercari.

This indication of the analogous nature of the terms fantasia and ricercar is particularly clear. (Bottrigari, Il Desiderio, p. 21; transl. MacClintock, p. 32; cited in Kämper, Studien, p. 130.)

4Words in the dedication also indicate organ performance; these are pieces he has ‘offered to God on the organ’ (‘Deo in organis obtuli’). Quoted in Bartholomew, Rauerij, p. 78, and Kämper, Studien, p. 118.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of ptbks</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Luzzaschi 1578]</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; composer was organist; copied in keyboard MS.</td>
<td>&lt;5&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Luzzaschi a.1578]</td>
<td></td>
<td>rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; composer was organist. Reference in TRABACI 1615.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingegnieri 1579</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19 madr. 2 canz.</td>
<td>Canzonas; early appearance of canzonas in partbooks.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Maschera 1582]_4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21 canz.</td>
<td>Canzonas; composer was organist; copied in keyboard MSS, keyboard anthologies.</td>
<td>&lt;6&gt; The most popular canzona volume in Italy (at least eight printings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingegnieri 1584 R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See 1579.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maschera 1584</td>
<td>10 R</td>
<td></td>
<td>See 1582.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassano 1585</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20 fants.</td>
<td>Fantasias.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macque 1586</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars and canzonas; composer was canz. organist. See Silbiger, Manuscript Sources, p. 165.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 MS copy recently discovered and ed. Pascale.

6 Two in Schmid, Tabulatur Buch (1607); two in Pb-Raverij 1608; ten in Woltz, Nova Musices (1617); Vienna 714; US-Wlc (see MASCHERA 1590); Brussels 26650; Castell’Arquato MSS (see Silbiger, Manuscript Sources, p. 100); Berlin 40615.

7 Maschera’s canzonas were certainly a part of many organists’ repertoire, as Ottavio Rossi, a Brescian historian, wrote in 1620:

Fiorenzo Maschera fu uno de’ primi che componesse canzoni Francesi sopra l’Organo. Nel quale istromento egli già quarant’anni si essercitò con molta lode... Le sue composizioni sono stimate leggiadrissime et non è dubbio ch’egli notabilmente giovò a gli Organisti.

Fiorenzo Maschera was one of the first to compose canzoni francesi for the organ, on which instrument he formerly played for forty years with much praise... His compositions are esteemed to be most delicate and without a doubt he helped organists significantly.

## Appendix B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of ptbks</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bassano</td>
<td>1588&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 wks.</td>
<td>Similar to Bassano 1585.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maschera</td>
<td>1588&lt;sub&gt;6R&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See 1582.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Padovano</td>
<td>1588&lt;sub&gt;7R&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See 1556.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vincenzi</td>
<td>1589&lt;sub&gt;8&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13 canz.</td>
<td>4 canzonas à 4 suitable for keyboard arrangement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieli</td>
<td>1589&lt;sub&gt;3&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24 madr.</td>
<td>Ricercars; composer was organist;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7 rics. copied in keyboard MS (Turin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tablatures).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stivori</td>
<td>1589&lt;sub&gt;7&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; composer was organist; vol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dedicated to Merulo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabrieli</td>
<td>1590&lt;sub&gt;1R&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See 1589.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Antegnati b.1591]</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;?&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>canz.</td>
<td>Canzonas; composer was organist, organbuilder; copied in keyboard MS and print. &lt;8&gt; See Mischiati, Indici, I:176, VII:74; and Schaal, Das Inventar, p. 57.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardano</td>
<td>1593&lt;sub&gt;8R&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See 1551&lt;sub&gt;6&lt;/sub&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maschera</td>
<td>1593&lt;sub&gt;5R&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See 1582.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raval</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19 wks., 3 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; see 1596.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bariola</td>
<td>1594&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 canz.</td>
<td>Canzonas; composer was organist;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>copied in keyboard MS (Turin tablatures).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Metallo</td>
<td>1594&lt;sub&gt;9&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;?&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>canz.</td>
<td>2 canzonas 'per sonare'; 13 vocal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>canzonas copied in keyboard MS (Basle F.IX.43). [L2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Stivori</td>
<td>1594&lt;sub&gt;12&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; composer was organist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sponga</td>
<td>1595&lt;sub&gt;8&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; composer was pupil of A. Gabrieli and an organist.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>8</sup> Woltz, Nova Musices, and Vienna 714.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of ptbks</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banchieri</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11 canz.</td>
<td>Canzonas; composer was organist; copied in Woltz, Nova Musices. &lt;9&gt; [L1] [L2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maschera</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>See 1582.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazzi</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars, canzonas; composer was organist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raval</td>
<td>1596</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; piece titled 'Viderunt te atque Deus per organum'; dedication. &lt;10&gt; [L1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavaccio</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19 canz.</td>
<td>Canzonas; revised for organ (see CAVACCIO 1626, an open score).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bellanda</td>
<td>1599</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 vocal 2 canz.</td>
<td>Dedication comments that the two canzonas (à 3, à 4) are intended for organ: 'Ho di più voluto aggiungerli alcune sonate d’Organo'. [L1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 A letter to this volume’s dedicatee in Banchieri’s Lettere armoniche (Bologna: Girolamo Mascheroni, 1628) includes a comment which shows that the partbook-canzonas would have been copied into a more suitable format and performed on the organ:

... Il volgo chiama Canzoni alla Francese ridotte in arie all’Italiana per sonare nell’Organo in partitura, ouero sopra la parti con quattro stromenti da fiato, o da arco.

... Vulgarly called canzoni alla francese, corrected to arie all’italiana to play on the organ in open score, or with the parts with four wind or bowed instruments.

10 There is a note regarding other works suitable for the organ (quoted in Sartori.) Raval has an orthodox view of the organist’s repertoire based on vocal works:

... oltre a tante differenze di compositioni per l’Organo: Messe, Motetti, Madrigali, et altre opere, quale aspetto col favore di V. Eccell. mettere in luce. ...

... As well as many different compositions for organ: Masses, Motets, Madrigals, and other works, which I look forward, with the favour of Your Excellency, to publishing.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of ptbks</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Borgo</td>
<td>1599d</td>
<td>4 23 canz.</td>
<td>Canzonas, ricercar; composer was organist;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>copied in keyboard MS (Turin tablatures).</td>
<td>&lt;11&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stivori</td>
<td>159910</td>
<td>4 12 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars, canzonas; composer was organist;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dedicated to G. Gabrieli.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Bargnani b.1600]</td>
<td>canz.</td>
<td>Cited in Mischiati, Indici, V:52, probably the same as volume referred to in Pb-Canale 1600.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canale</td>
<td>1600d</td>
<td>4 19 canz.</td>
<td>Canzonas; composer was organist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortaro</td>
<td>1600c</td>
<td>4 21 canz.</td>
<td>Canzonas; composer was organist; canzona titles refer to organists; copied in anthologies; copied in keyboard MS (Turin tablatures).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canale</td>
<td>1601a</td>
<td>4 20 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; composer was organist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 batt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 canz.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quagliati</td>
<td>1601b</td>
<td>4 19 wks.</td>
<td>Ricercars and canzonas (according to title);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>composer was organist.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonelli</td>
<td>1602b</td>
<td>4 8 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars, canzonas; composer was organist;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>copied in keyboard MS (Turin 2 toccs. tablatures).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 madr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banchieri</td>
<td>1603a</td>
<td>4 21 canz.</td>
<td>Canzonas (entitled 'Fantasia'). Several are reprinted from BANCHIERI 1595 and Pb-Banchieri 1596.</td>
<td>[L1]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 One partbook recently discovered; See Sartori II:205, and edn.

12 Canale stated at the end of his volume that his pupil Bargnani had borrowed themes from him, and 'wished by this means to pay homage to his teacher (ha voluto con questo mezo honorare li scritti del suo Maestro)' (Sartori).

13 E.g. 'La Claudia' [Merulo], 'La Malvezza' [Malvezzi], 'La Portia' [Costanzo Porta], and 'L'Antegnata' [Costanzo Antegnati]. See Sartori, 'Une Pratique'.

14 Schmid, Tabulatur Buch; DIRUTA 1609-10; and Woltz, Nova Musices.

## Composer Date | No. of ptbks | Contents | Comments |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maschera 1604fR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See 1582.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayone 1606c</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; composer was organist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maschera 1607iR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See 1582.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merulo 1607b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; composer was organist; copied in keyboard MS (Turin tablatures).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merulo 1608a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 rics.</td>
<td>Ricercars; composer was organist; copied in keyboard MS (Turin tablatures). &lt;16&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raverij 1608f</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>36 canz.</td>
<td>17 canzonas à 4; composers were organists (G. Gabrieli, Merulo, Guami, Maschera, Antegnati, Luzzaschi, Lappi, Frescobaldi, Grillo).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Rognoni 1608o</td>
<td>8?</td>
<td>26 canz.</td>
<td>19 canzonas à 4 suitable for organ performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soderino 1608g</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15 canz.</td>
<td>Canzonas; composer was organist.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortaro 1610jR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See 1600.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pallavicino 1610</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>2 mot.</td>
<td>This volume (Secondo libro delle fantasie, over ricercari a quattro voci ... con duo motetti nel fine sopra il canto fermo (Venice: Ricciardo Amadino) is Germano Pallavicino’s only known work. One partbook is extant (not listed in Sartori; see RISM Einzeldrucke).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16 The dedication (written by Merulo’s nephew) indicates that organ would be suitable for performance:

... e però dono le presenti Compositioni d’un singolar Maestro à V.Re. mio unico Precettore perciò che se l’Auolo mio viuesse publicar queste noue sue fatiche à prò de gli studiosi dell’Organo ...

... and now, however, I give the present compositions from an exceptional master to Your Reverence, my only precept being that if my ancestor had lived to newly publish these his works for scholars of the organ ...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>No. of ptbks</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Antegnati b.1621]</td>
<td>4?</td>
<td>canz. (Three vols.) Canzonas; references in Mischiati, Indici, pp. 137, 166, 190, and 218 indicate a total of four volumes of canzonas by Antegnati. See [Antegnati b.1591] for the first in this series.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maschera</td>
<td>1621R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>See 1582.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortaro</td>
<td>1623</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>canz. Not listed in Sartori; see RISM Einzeldrucke. Canzonas; appears to be similar to Mortaro 1600c.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

TOCCATAS FROM TURIN VOLUME II

NOT PUBLISHED IN MODERN EDITIONS
INTRODUCTORY NOTE TO APPENDIX C

The works are edited from New German Tablature. Original note values are retained. Although there are no bar lines in the original, the notes are generally grouped by semibreve; this edition groups by breve. Chromatic inflections are transcribed according to modern usage: accidentals apply for the whole bar unless cancelled. The few adjustments made in the edition are given in footnotes. The tablature adopted an ornamental sign ['] in places, which indicates a groppo or ornamental trill.
1. MS: no note.
Appendix C

Intonatio / quarti toni / Joh: Leo: Hassler.  [Turin vol. II M3]
Appendix C

Toccata overò / Ricercar / Primi toni. / Joan Leo Hasl.

[Turin vol. II M4]
1. Chord illegible (cut from edge of MS).

2. Semibreve illegible (cut from edge of MS).
Appendix C

Toccata / di Giouan / Staden

[Turin vol. II M40]
Appendix C

Toccata / di Giou. / Staden.

[Turin vol. II M41]
1. MS: no chord.
Appendix C

Toccata / di Giouan / Staden.

[Turin vol. II M42]
Toccata / di Giouan / Staden. [Turin vol. II M43]

1. MS: 2 quavers are octave lower.
2. MS: d natural.
3. MS: minim is octave lower.
4. MS: C:
5. Lowest note trimmed from MS.
Toccata /sexti toni / Gio: Leo / Hassler

[Turin vol. II M74]

1. No note value.

2. MS: extra pitch (d") with no note value.
1. MS: \[ \text{p} \text{ p} \]

2. No note value.
1. MS:  
2. MS:  
3. No note value.
4. No note value.
1. MS: \( \hat{\} \)

2. MS: \( \hat{\} \)

3. No note value.
Appendix C

1. MS: 7

2. No note value.

3. MS: 7
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